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In his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, John Calvin emphasizes that Christ truly nourishes the souls of believers with his body and blood. This transpires, says Calvin, *virtute spiritus sancti*—by the power of the Holy Spirit, who is the *vinculum*—the bond—between Christ and his own. Such pneumatological emphasis does not appear in Calvin's first doctrinal exposition on the sacrament, that is, in his 1536 *Institutio*, but emerges soon after: first, in 1536 in the midst of the Lausanne Disputation, when he speaks of the Spirit as the bond between believers and the ascended Christ; then, shortly after, in his first catechism for Geneva; and then again, more robustly, with patristic and biblical reference, in the 1539 revision of his *Institutio*. Given the distinctive emergence of this emphasis in Calvin's thought, the question at the fore of this study is this: What is
the provenance—the impetus, the derivation, or source—of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with regard to believers' participation in the Lord's Supper, and, further, his particular expression of that emphasis? With due caution regarding the difficulty of discerning the provenance of any particular element of his thought, this study offers a consideration of 1) Calvin's early doctrine of the Trinity, 2) the thought of several of his contemporaries, and 3) his patristic references on this point. In the end, Calvin's emphasis is suggested to be his assimilation of elements deriving from each of these three resources. Finally, Calvin's liturgy is considered, since it exhibits a failure on his part to assimilate his pneumatological emphasis liturgically and euchologically.
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INTRODUCTION

With respect to one of her studies, Irena Backus, an esteemed scholar of Reformation thought, forthrightly declares, "This paper aims to be neither definitive nor exhaustive."\(^1\) With respect to my own study, I follow Dr. Backus' lead to say that, despite my aims, this dissertation is, in the end, neither definitive nor exhaustive. While I have striven to be thorough, to the point of exhausting many sources and resources, ultimately this study is a first foray into the works of Calvin, some of the works of his contemporaries, and some of the works of his predecessors, culled for the answer to this one pressing question: What is the provenance—the impetus, the derivation, the source—of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with regard to believers' participation in the Lord's Supper, and, further, his particular expression of that emphasis? Ultimately this question is driven by interest in the liturgical and sacramental theology of the Reformed tradition, of which Calvin is considered a significant progenitor.\(^2\)

Once upon a time, I might have dared to hope that the answer to this question would entail a discovery and exposé of Calvin's sacramental-pneumatological epiphany.


\(^2\) In one sense, the justification for pressing this question lies in a study I would like to take up after its completion, namely, a historical and theological survey of the derivation and development of the epiclesis in Lord's Supper, or Eucharistic, liturgies of churches of Reformed confession. A start is provided in Friedrich Lurz "'Durch die Kraft des Heiligen Geistes.' Die Wiederentdeckung der eucharistischen Geist-Epiklese im 16. Jahrhundert.' *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 39 (2000), 9-34.
This was a naïve hope indeed, for short of Calvin himself having offered an account of, or even a mere allusion to, just such an event, no such event could be credibly discerned or described, much less defended. Presumably no such event exists. Calvin's emphasis emerged contextually, theologically, among contemporaries engaged in the reform of sacramental practice and its accompanying doctrine. So this study will not be definitive in the sense of identifying a definitive moment or a definitive source, and in this way providing a definitive answer. Rather, it will (I trust) plausibly and respectably demonstrate that Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with regard to believers' participation in the Lord's Supper is a sacramental-theological result of his assimilation of his expressed understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity, and his assimilation of the thought of his contemporaries and his predecessors. Calvin is a son of the Christian tradition, so his thought is founded on his exposure to the Christian tradition and its expression among his contemporaries. It is, in short, an assimilation of such thought.

To come to such a demonstration, I have striven simply to listen\(^3\): By way of his published works, I have striven to listen to Calvin—closely, carefully, critically. In listening to Calvin in this way, I have striven to listen in on Calvin himself listening closely, carefully, and critically to his contemporaries and his predecessors. Calvin expected them to be listening closely, carefully, and critically to Scripture, even as he would, toward a faithful theological appropriation of its message, sacramentally and liturgically. In all this, I have striven to listen exhaustively, drawing as much primary

\(^3\) The last sentence of Richard A. Muller's *The Unaccommodated Calvin* (Oxford University Press, 2000) evoked this concept of "listening": "A clever theologian can accommodate Calvin to nearly any agenda; a faithful theologian—and a good historian—will seek to listen to Calvin, not to use him."
and secondary source material to my desk (and my computer's desktop) as possible. The literature required is voluminous: This is but a first foray, but nonetheless a fruitful foray.

The outcome of the study is presented in four parts as follows:

Following this introduction, the first part of this study (I) comprises three chapters that provide a thorough study of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and of the context of its development. In the first of these chapters, Chapter 1, an attempt is made to grasp Calvin's so-called mature doctrine of the sacrament, drawing on just a few of his writings on the Lord's Supper prepared late in his life. The point is to map the role he ascribes to the Holy Spirit in these works, and then, in the following chapter, to use this map as a relief against which to set a carefully considered, chronological reading of the complete course of his major writings on the Lord's Supper. The question at the fore of the survey in Chapter 2 is, Is there a point at which Calvin's appeals to the work of the Holy Spirit appear to emerge, and if so, do the circumstances up to and including that occasion suggest something about the provenance of this emphasis? Or, put another way, does that occasion suggest something about how that provenance might be discerned, understood, and developed for the purposes of a study such as this?

The answer, in short, is yes. Two prominent expressions specific to Calvin's pneumatology of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper noticeably emerge. The first—concerning the Spirit as "the bond" who unites believers to Christ and thus affords for them the true, spiritual communication of Christ's true body and true blood—appears already in 1536 in Calvin's second treatment of the sacrament. At the Lausanne
Disputation, held in the fall of 1536, some six months after the release of the first edition of his *Institutio*, Calvin pointedly asserts:

> we say that it is not the natural body of our Lord Jesus nor his natural blood which is given to us in his Holy Supper. We affirm that it is a spiritual communication, by which in virtue and in power he makes us participant of all that we are able to receive of grace in his body and blood; or again, to declare better the dignity of this mystery, it is a spiritual communication by which he makes us truly participant of his body and his blood, but wholly spiritually, that is by the bond of his Spirit.⁴

The second concerns "the *virtus* of the Spirit," a phrase Calvin first employs in the 1539 *Institutio* with respect to the *communicatio* and even *exhibitio* of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament. As is demonstrated below, in a seminal passage in the 1539 *Institutio*, he declares that Christ truly feeds his people with his own body, and that Christ bestows this communion upon them *by the power of his Spirit*. "In this manner," says Calvin, "the body and blood of Christ are shown to us [*exhibetur*] in the Sacrament."⁵

These two expressions regarding the Spirit, so characteristic of Calvin's matured doctrine of the Lord's Supper, must seemingly derive from *somewhere*, but where? This is yet another way to express the question that motivates the study at hand. A further step toward ascertaining an answer to the question is an examination of Calvin's personal background and immediate life's circumstances up to and at the time of these expressions' first emergence. This examination is provided in Chapter 3. The purpose of the biography is, principally, to establish Calvin as a humanist, yes, but as a humanist

---

⁴ John Calvin, "Two Discourses on the Articles of Lausanne," *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 44.

⁵ *Institutio* 1539, derived from the Battles translations of the 1536 and 1559 editions (*Inst. 1536*, 107, and *Inst. 1559 LCC* 4.17.18), along with a close examination of the Latin text (*CO* 1:1009). See further discussion of this passage in Chapter 2 below.
among humanists who dwell deeply on the biblical-theological tradition of the church in hope of seeing that tradition resuscitated for the reform of the church, both its practice and its doctrine.

The second part of this study (II), Chapter 4, provides a survey of answers previously given to the question of the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This survey is the presentation of the status quaeestionis as it were—I say "as it were" since the question itself, as far as I know, has never before been straightforwardly asked nor systematically explored. Secondary literature on Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is vast, thus not all such works are cited, but only those principle works in which representative answers to the question at hand are imparted, whether explicitly or implicitly. What this study as a whole shall demonstrate is that while these answers might not be ultimately untrue, they are given rather facilely, begging for fuller consideration, a fuller consideration that this study, especially in its third part, aims to advance.

The third part of this study (III) comprises three chapters as well, each providing an aspect of this expanded answer to the question of the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with regard to believers' partaking of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper. As indicated above, the overriding, operative thought in these three chapters is assimilation. In the first of these chapters, I strive to listen closely to Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity, especially as it is expressed early on, in order to discern its apparent assimilation with his developing doctrine of the sacrament. In the second, I strive to listen intently to Calvin's contemporaries, particularly those with whom we know Calvin had to do, either in personal interaction or through
publication, to discern the prospective assimilation of their thought into his own. In the third, I listen intently to voices of the Christian tradition, some of whom Calvin assimilates directly, with explicit references to their thought, and some of whom we might well wonder whether he assimilates indirectly.

Finally, in the fourth and final part of this study (IV), I listen intently to Calvin's liturgy and the liturgies from which it is taken to be formed. What is discovered is striking: While Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is pneumatologically rich in his *Institutio* and in his incidental theological treatises, it is not so in his liturgy. His exposition of the meaning of the sacrament in his form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the prayers which accompany that celebration, simply do not account for the integral work of the Spirit as one might expect given Calvin's persistent appeals to the person and work of the Holy Spirit in his theological discourses on the sacrament. So there is, it seems, an interesting failure on Calvin's part to assimilate his doctrine liturgically. His successors, however, fill this gap, out-Calvin-ing Calvin, as it were, liturgically and euchologically.

All of this, then, serves as something of a response to an observation made by Hermann Sasse in his seminal study *This Is My Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar*. In pressing the relation of Luther's theology to that of his contemporaries, Sasse writes of Calvin:

> The origin of the idea of the Holy Spirit as the *transporteur* who brings the body of Christ to us is unknown. Perhaps Calvin was influenced in this respect by one

---

6 To borrow from the introduction to that chapter: Calvin is a second generation reformer. By the time he prepared his first doctrinal exposition of the Lord's Supper in the first edition of his *Institutio* (1536), those who preceded him in the effort toward reform had already composed and published numerous, even voluminous expressions of the same.
of the Greek Fathers for whom the invocation of the Holy Spirit effects the Real Presence. In the liturgy of Geneva there is no trace of an invocation of the Spirit.⁷

CHAPTER 1

CALVIN'S LATE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER,
WITH ATTENTION GIVEN TO THE ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Expositions of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper abound. Even those that closely consider Calvin's conception of the role of the Holy Spirit and believers' participation in the Lord's Supper are not few in number. Though these expositions exist, yet another is offered here. Its uniqueness lies preeminently in the fact that it is written as a setup for the study that follows. Accordingly, this exposition of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is construed—for the most part—from just one of his late discourses on the Lord's Supper, the Dilucida explicatio sanae doctrinae de vera participatione carnis et sanguinis Christi in sacra coena ad discutiendas Heschusii nebulas of 1561. However, since no one explication of Calvin's on the Lord's Supper articulates every aspect of his doctrine as well or as clearly as when various themes or expressions of various treatises are balanced with those of others and finally coalesced, other of Calvin's late explications on the sacrament are appealed to as well. Such works include his Institutio christianae religionis (1559), his second Commentarii in Isaiam prophetam (1559), Confession de foy pour présenter à le empereur (1562), and the

---

8 See the survey of Chapter 4.
Optima ineundae concordiae ratio (1560), appended to the published editions of the Dilucida explicatio (1561). From this survey of Calvin's so-called mature doctrine, one discerns that in Calvin's conception of the sacrament, the role of the Holy Spirit is manifold on the occasion of a celebration of the Lord's Supper, dynamic with respect to both the "communication" of Christ's body and blood, and the "reception" of them by believers.

* * * * *

In 1561, three years before his death, Calvin penned the last words he himself would publish on his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. His treatise, Dilucida explicatio sanae doctrinae de vera participatione carnis et sanguinis Christi in sacra coena ad discutientes Heschusii nebulas, is a response to a treatise composed by Tileman Heshusius, a strict Lutheran who had taught at the University of Heidelberg and who had been caught up in a fierce debate there on the Lord's Supper. Calvin's work

---

9 Calvin published his first commentary on Isaiah in 1551, though that volume was a compilation of his lectures (praelectiones) on Isaiah. When that edition sold out, Calvin was urged to have it reprinted. He did, but only after greatly revising it, publishing a much more extensive commentary in 1559. See Wulfert de Greef, The Writings of John Calvin: An Introductory Guide, trans. Lyle D. Bierma (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1993), 102-03.

10 Many scholars speak of Calvin's "eucharistic doctrine" or "doctrine of the eucharist." Though Calvin is not averse to acknowledging that the sacrament is a "eucharist," or "thanksgiving," (see e.g. his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11:26 as well as the Inst. 1559 LCC 4.14.22 and 4.17.12), he, like some of his contemporaries, such as Bucer, prefers the term "Lord's Supper." Thus, in this dissertation, I give preference to this term as well. Indeed, such use follows on Calvin's emphasis that this sacrament is preeminently a meal hosted by Christ himself and in which believers' souls are truly nourished with Christ's body and blood.


12 Heschusius' treatise, entitled De praesentia corporis Christi in coena Domini contra sacramentarios and published in Jena in 1560, is clearly an attack on Calvin, Bullinger, and their
comprises four parts: an introduction, in which Calvin identifies three recent opponents on this topic and offers two concise doctrinal statements on the Lord's Supper in response to two of them; a general, free-flowing discourse on the Lord's Supper occasioned by the general claims of his third opponent, Heshusius; a survey of numerous church fathers concerning the Lord's Supper, occasioned by Heshusius' treatment of the same; and finally a survey of objections that Heshusius raises as Calvin's but which Calvin seeks to reframe, given that Heshusius has not accurately represented his (Calvin's) views. In each of these sections, Calvin's doctrinal themes on the Lord's Supper emerge and merge, re-emerge and remerge, even as they will in the discussion below. It seems that when one pulls just one strand of such doctrine, the entire doctrine ravels with it.

1.1 Overture: Two Summary Statements on the Lord's Supper

Although Heshusius' attack upon the Sacramentarios is the primary impetus for Calvin's treatise, as just noted, Calvin uses this occasion to answer two other of his detractors as well: a certain Staphylus and Nicholas Le Coq. Addressing each of their independently issued accusations at the outset of his treatise, Calvin offers key summary statements of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, each of which refers to the role of the Holy Spirit. In response to Staphylus, who accuses Calvin of being one among those "who hold that the virtue of Christ's body only, and not the body itself, is
in the Supper," Calvin refers to his own, previously-published treatises that address the allegations of Joachim Westphal. There, says Calvin, "the reader will find that in the Supper our souls are nourished by the [true] body of Christ, which was crucified for us, nay, that spiritual life is transferred into us from the substance of his body."

Calvin emphasizes and clarifies his position with a rhetorical question: "When I teach that the body of Christ is given us as food by the secret energy (virtute) of the Spirit, do I thereby deny that the Supper is a communion of the body?" As shall soon be evident, this question, rhetorical as it may be, in fact anticipates the principal concern of Calvin's entire discussion in this treatise, namely, the "mode" of the communication of Christ's body and blood in the Supper, a mode which for Calvin requires the Holy Spirit.

Calvin treats Le Coq's allegations even more succinctly. In his response, as in his response to the charges set forth by Staphylus, Calvin broaches significant dimensions of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, including that of the role of the Holy

13 Tracts and Treatises 2:501. "... qui virtutem duntaxat coporis Christis in coena esse volunt, non corpus ipsum, ..." (CO 9:466).


15 The term is vero, which Beveridge translates "real" but is better translated "true." This is in accord with Joseph Tylenda's acute study "Calvin and Christ's Presence in the Supper—True or Real," Scottish Journal of Theology 27:1 (1974), 65-75.

16 Tracts and Treatises 2:501. "... reperient lectores vero Christi corpore, quod pro nobis crucifixum est, animas nostras pasci in coena: imo spiritualem vitam ex corporis ipsius substantia in nos transfundit. Si arcana spiritus virtute corpus Christi in cibum nobis dari trado, an ideo nego coenam communicionem esse corporis?" (CO 9:466).
it is declared in my writings more than a hundred times, that so far am I from rejecting the term substance, that I ingenuously and readily declare, that by the incomprehensible agency (\textit{virtute}) of the Spirit, spiritual life is infused into us from the substance of the flesh of Christ. I also constantly admit that we are substantially fed on the flesh and blood of Christ, though I discard the gross fiction of a local intermingling.\footnote{Tracts and Treatises 2:502. \textit{"Atqui plus centies occurrit in scriptis meis, adeo me non reiicere substantiae nomen, ut ingenue et libenter profitear spiritualem vitam incomprehensibili spiritus virtute ex carnis Christi substantia in nos diffundi. Ubique etiam admitto, substantialiter nos pasci Christi carne et sanguine. . . ."} \textit{(CO 9:467)}.}

Again, given Calvin's persistent concern for a fitting understanding of the "mode" of the "true communication" of Christ's body and blood in the Supper, this response, like the one before it, serves as something of a précis for the whole treatise.

1.2 Exposition: On Communication

Following these brief, ancillary interchanges with the arguments of Staphylus and Le Coq, Calvin turns to those of Heshusius. Calvin's first point of emphasis is that what transpires in the Lord's Supper—namely, the "true communication" of Christ's body and blood—is a mystery beyond the grasp of human reason.\footnote{Tracts and Treatises 2:505. \textit{CO 9:469}.} Calvin writes:

\textit{. . . the bread which we break is truly the communion of the body of Christ. But as this connection of Christ with his members depends on his incomprehensible energy, I am not ashamed to admire this mystery which I feel and acknowledge to transcend the reach of my mind.}\footnote{Tracts and Treatises 2:508. \textit{. . . constituo panem quem frangimus vere communicationem esse corporis Christi. Quia autem haec Christi cum membris suisconiunctio ex incomprehensibili eius virtute pendet, mysterium hoc, quod sentio et agnosco captu metis meae esse superius, admirari non pudet"} \textit{(CO 9:471)}. This theme recurs throughout Calvin's writings. It is perhaps most strikingly articulated in his \textit{Inst.} 1559 4.17.7 (from 1539) and 4.17.32 (from 1543).}
To make his point even more forthrightly, Calvin adopts the interrogative mood, laying out an effusion of rhetorical questions that suggest that what transpires in this mystery is not just beyond the grasp of reason, but even an affront to it:

For what is more repugnant to human reason than that souls immortal by creation, should derive life from mortal flesh? This we assert. What is less accordant with earthly wisdom, than that the flesh of Christ should infuse its vivifying energy into us from heaven? What is more foreign to our sense, than that corruptible and fading bread should be an undoubted pledge [pignus] of spiritual life? What more foreign from philosophy, than that the Son of God, who in respect of human nature is in heaven, so dwells in us, that everything which has been given him of the Father is common to us, and hence the immortality with which his flesh has been endowed is ours?\textsuperscript{20}

For Calvin, that Christ can give us his body and blood as life-giving meat and drink is as much a mystery as the way (modo) in which Christ does so. While one must curb one's "pertness and curiosity" with respect to such mystery, it does not follow, says Calvin, "that we are to shut our eyes in order to exclude the rays of the sun." So, while the communion of the Lord's Supper itself, and all that it signifies, is a mystery, it is a mystery "deserving of contemplation." It is fitting to consider, among other things, "in what way (quomodo) Christ can give us his body and blood for meat and drink."\textsuperscript{21}

Indeed, that is the question that is at the fore in this particular treatise,\textsuperscript{22} and, one might well argue, at the fore of Calvin's whole doctrine of the Lord's Supper. For

\textsuperscript{20} Tracts and Treatises 2:512-13. "Quid enim rationi humanae magis repugnat, quam animas creatione immortales vitam mutuari a carne mortal? Hoc asserimus. Quid terrenae prudentiae minus con sen taneum, quam carnem Christi vim suam vivificam e coelo ad nos usque diffundere? Quid magis alienum a nostro sensu, quam panem corruptibilem et caducum spiritualis vitae indubium esse pignus? Quid magis a philosophia remotum, quam filium Dei, qui secundum humanam naturam in coelo est, sic habitare in nobis, ut quidquid ei a patre datum est, nobis sit commune, adeoque ut immortalitas, qua donata est eius caro, nostra sit?" (CO 9:474).

\textsuperscript{21} Tracts and Treatises 2:516. "Quin potius si consideratione dignum est mysterium, attendere convenit quomodo corpus suum et sanguinem nobis det Christus in cibum et potum" (CO 9:476-77).
Calvin, as for his contemporaries, the "substance of the flesh of Christ" is integral to the Supper, and so is a theologically and biblically fitting understanding of how, or "in what way" (quomodo), or "by what mode," it is communicated to those who gather at the table. For Calvin, that "mode" is "spiritual," meaning, "not carnal" or "non-corporeal." For Calvin, that "mode" is "spiritual," meaning, "effected by the Holy Spirit." Early on in this treatise he offers his understanding, here quoted at length:

When I say that the flesh and blood of Christ are substantially offered and exhibited to us in the Supper, I at the same time explain the mode, namely, that the flesh of Christ becomes vivifying to us, inasmuch as Christ, by the incomprehensible agency of his Spirit, transfuses his own proper life into us from the substance of his flesh, so that he himself lives in us, and his life is common to us.

22 The following statement, among others, makes it clear that Calvin's interlocutor here puts the issue elsewhere, on "presence" and "substance": "Hinc conficitur, neque de praesentia, neque de esu substantiali, sed tantum de utriusque modo esse certamen" (CO 9:472). Beveridge translates this: "... our dispute relates neither to presence nor to substantial eating, but only as to the mode of both" (Tracts and Treatises 2:510). See also Tracts and Treatises 2:528, which reads, "... I [Calvin] deny that the point on which the question turns is, whether the words, This is my body, are used in a proper sense or metonymically, ... . The proper question, therefore, regards the mode of communication ... ." In his own study of the debate between Calvin and Heshusius, David Steinmetz affirms Calvin's assessment, concluding his study saying that at this point in the history of the debate, "the disagreement between Lutheran and Reformed theologians is not over the fact of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, but its mode. ... the mode of the real presence is the issue in dispute." According to Steinmetz, and to Calvin actually, Heshusius has "frozen" the dispute at 1551, when in fact a good deal of conciliation had been achieved in the meantime. This is the whole point of Calvin's Optima ineundae concordiae ratio, si extra contentionem quaeratur veritas, which Calvin had written previously, in 1560, and appended to his response to Heshusius for publication. See Steinmetz, "Calvin and His Lutheran Critics," in Calvin in Context (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 183 and 181 respectively.

23 Calvin frequently refers to the "Word of God." See e.g., Tracts and Treatises 2:505, 510, 512, and 561.

24 E.g., Optima ineundae, i.e, "The Best Method for Obtaining Concord" in Tracts and Treatises 2:577-78.

25 E.g., Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.33 (CO 2:1033).

26 Tracts and Treatises 2:506. "Quam substantialiter Christi carnem et sanguinem nobis offerre et exhiberi in coena dico, simul modum designo, quod Christi caro nobis sit vivifica: quoniam Christus incomprehensibilis spiritus sui virtute ex substantia carnis suae vitam in nos transfundat, quae illi propria est: ut ipse in nobis vivat, eiusque vita nobis sit communis ... ." (CO 9:470). This passage bears striking resemblance to a passage found later in this treatise, a passage in which Calvin refers to Cyril of Alexandria's commentary on John 6 (Commentary Book 4): "In the twenty-fourth chapter he [Cyril] distinctly maintains, that the flesh of Christ is made vivifying by the agency of the Spirit, so that Christ is
I come to close quarters at once with the man who maintains that we are not partakers of the substance of the flesh of Christ, unless we eat it with our mouths. His [Heschusius'] expression is that the very substance of the flesh and blood must be taken by the mouth; whereas I define the mode of communication without ambiguity, by saying, that Christ by his boundless and wondrous power unites us into the same life with himself, and not only applies the fruit of his passion to us, but becomes truly ours by communicating his blessings to us, and accordingly conjoins us to himself in the same way in which head and members unite to form one body. I do not restrict this union to the divine essence, but affirm that it belongs to the flesh and blood, inasmuch as it was not simply said, My Spirit, but, My flesh is meat indeed; nor was it simply said, My Divinity, but, My blood is drink indeed.27

According to Calvin, "the flesh of Christ becomes vivifying to us, inasmuch as Christ, by the incomprehensible agency (virtus) of his Spirit, transfuses his own proper life into us from the substance of his flesh. . . ." In the Supper, says Calvin, believers "feed on Christ entire, as well as expressly on his flesh and blood"28—by the Spirit.

And indeed when Christ invites us to eat his body and drink his blood, there is no necessity to bring him down from heaven, or require his actual presence in several places, in order to put his body and blood within our lips. Amply sufficient for this purpose is the sacred bond of our union with him, when we are united into one body by the secret agency of his Spirit.29

---

27 Tracts and Treatises 2:506. "Cominus hominem aggredior aperto marte, qui negat substantiae carnis Christi nos fieri participes, nisi eum ore comedamus. Sic enim loquitur, ipsam quoque substantiam carnis et sanguinis ore hauriendam. Ego vero communicationis modum definio sine ambagibus, Christum pro immensa et admirabili sua potentia efficere ut secum in eandem vitam coalescamus, nec tantum applicare nobis passionis suae fructum, sed vere nostrum fieri, ut bona nosbicum sua communicet, ideoque nos sibi coniungere, sicut membra et caput corpus unum efficiunt. Atque hanc unitatem non ad essentiam divinam restringo, sed pertinere affirmo ad carnem et sanguinem: quia non simpliciter dictum sit. Spiritus meus vere est cibus, sed caro mea: nec simpliciter etiam dictum sit: Divinitas mea vere est potus, sed sanguis" (CO 9:470).

28 Tracts and Treatises 2:516. "Quod si attollere sursum corda non pigeat, tam integro Christo quam distincte carne eius et sanguine vescemur" (CO 9:477).

29 Tracts and Treatises 2:516. "Et sane dum Christus ad corpus suum comedendum, et ad bibendum suum sanguinem nos invitat, non elicendus est e coelo, vel cogendus ut se coram sista pluribus locis ad ingerendum corpus suum et sanguinem ori nostro: quia abunde sufficere debet sacrum in us because the Spirit of God dwells in us" (Tracts and Treatises 2:541. "Capite autem 24 aperte disputat spiritus virtuto vivificam reddi carnem, ut in nobis sit Christus, quia spiritus Dei in nobis habitat" [CO 9:495]).
In 1557, his last word to Joachim Westphal, the foreunner of Heshusius, Calvin succinctly states: "The spiritual mode we oppose to the carnal, because the Holy Spirit, who is the bond of our union with Christ, infuses life into us from the substance of his flesh and blood."\(^{30}\)

For Calvin, appreciating the role of the Holy Spirit here is crucial: it is by the \textit{virtus} of the Spirit that Christ entire is communicated to believers; it is by the "secret \textit{virtus} of the Spirit," who affords for us, or effects, the "sacred bond of our union with Christ." The communication of his body and blood, then, depends on the \textit{virtus} of the Spirit.

Elsewhere Calvin seemingly "defines the mode of communication" not principally with respect to the Spirit, but with respect to Christ and his "boundless and wondrous power (\textit{virtus})."\(^{31}\) When speaking of the communication of Christ, or his body and blood, or his flesh, Calvin at times emphasizes the \textit{incomprehensibil-} and \textit{arcan- virtus} of the Holy Spirit proximal to emphasizing the \textit{potentia}, \textit{vis}, or even \textit{virtus} of Christ or of the flesh of Christ.\(^{32}\) In Calvin's conception, the three are to be neither confused nor conflated, although his terminology and its context might lead to such

\[^{30}\text{Tracts and Treatises 2:445. "Sed spiritualem modum opponimus carnali: quia spiritus sanctus, qui vinculum est nostrae cum Christo coniunctionis, vitam nobis ex carnis cius et sanguinis substantia inspirit" (CO 9:215).}\]

\[^{31}\text{Tracts and Treatises 2:507. CO 9:470.}\]

\[^{32}\text{See e.g., Optima ineundae (1560), Tracts and Treatises 2:577 (CO 9:521) and Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.9 (from 1539).}\]
ends. Read critically it becomes clear that in Calvin's understanding, the Spirit has *virtus*, Christ has *potentia* or *virtus*, and even the very flesh of Christ has *vis, potentia*, or *virtus*. Christ's flesh, given this variously-termed *vis, potentia*, or *virtus*, is lifegiving, and so—according to Calvin—this lifegiving-ness, that is, the life-giving flesh itself, must be communicated to believers if they are to share the life that is Christ's, if they are to have any hope of immortality. As Calvin reads it, this is the point of Christ's sermon recounted in John 6, where Christ asserts that his flesh is meat and his blood is drink, and that those who do not eat of it do not have life. This truth, of course, gives rise to the significance of the Lord's Supper, the "special end" of which, says Calvin, "is to communicate Christ and his life to us."

Such communication is accomplished, as Calvin variously puts it, by Christ's *potentia*, or by Christ's *virtus*, or by the Spirit's *virtus*, nothing being prohibited from being communicated to believers by any

---

33 Presumably those, such as Staphylus, who accused Calvin of being a "virtualist" did indeed conflate these things.

34 On this point, with respect to John 6, see *Dilucida explicatio* (CO 9:511; *Tracts and Treatises* 2:562-63). In *Optima ineundae*, Calvin writes: "substantially we become partakers of the flesh of Christ—not that any carnal mixture takes place, or that the flesh of Christ brought down penetrates into us, or is swallowed by the mouth, but because the flesh of Christ, in respect of its power and efficacy, vivifies our souls in the same way that bread and wine nourish our bodies" (*Tracts and Treatises* 2:577). Calvin brooks no pretense, then, as to what body it is that Christ holds forth. The passage quoted just above may just as well be quoted here: in the Supper, given the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit, says Calvin, "distance of place is no obstacle to prevent the flesh, which was once crucified, from being given to us for food" (*Tracts and Treatises* 2:554); "I agree with Augustine," says Calvin, "that in the bread we receive that which hung upon the cross" (*Tracts and Treatises* 2:516).

35 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:529; CO 9:486.


37 E.g., *Tracts and Treatises* 2:506, 508, and 510.

38 *Tracts and Treatises* 2: 516, 518, 531. In his Commentary on 1 Corinthians 11, Calvin writes: "My conclusion is that the body of Christ is really (realiter), to use the usual word, i.e., truly (vere) given to us in the Supper, so that it may be health-giving food for our souls. I am adopting the usual terms, but I
"natural distance of space." With respect to the Spirit, whose role is of primary interest in this undertaking, Calvin asserts toward the end of the *Dilucida explicatio* in a tight, summary fashion:

I say that although Christ is absent from the earth in respect of the flesh, yet in the Supper we truly feed on his body and blood—that owing to the secret agency of the Holy Spirit we enjoy the presence of both. I say that distance of place is no obstacle to prevent the flesh, which was once crucified, from being given to us for food.\(^{39}\)

Though Calvin refers to Christ's *potentia*, this concept of the "incomprehensible" and "secret" *virtus* of the Holy Spirit is predominant in these late treatises. *Spiritus virtute* sounds throughout his works as a refrain, so often is it repeated.

For Calvin, to emphasize the Holy Spirit, or the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit, or the Holy Spirit as *vinculum*, is *not* to suggest that those who partake of the sacrament partake of the Spirit of Christ alone, not Christ himself. Later in the *Dilucida explicatio*, Calvin refers his readers to his *Institutio* on this point:

Moreover, I say in my Institutes, 'I am not satisfied with those who, when they would show the mode of communion, teach that we are partakers of the Spirit of Christ, omitting all mention of the flesh and blood: as if it were said to no

---

Calvin emphasizes the fact that believers truly partake of Christ, that "the bread which we break is truly the communion of the body of Christ."\(^{41}\) Says Calvin, "I distinctly affirm, that our flesh which he assumed is vivifying by becoming the material of spiritual life to us."\(^{42}\) According to Calvin, Christ's flesh is the very \textit{materia} of a believer's \textit{spiritualis vitae}, and so it is this \textit{materia}, this flesh, that must be communicated to believers.\(^{43}\) Therefore, as Calvin has just said, this flesh is "substantially offered and exhibited to us in the Supper,"\(^{44}\) and it is by the \textit{virtus} of the Holy Spirit that it is communicated, or, so to speak, "conveyed." Again, as has been noted, Calvin asserts unequivocally,

\begin{quote}
I say that although Christ is absent from the earth in respect of the flesh, yet in the Supper we truly feed on his body and blood—that owing to the secret agency of the Holy Spirit we enjoy the presence of both. I say that distance of place is no obstacle to prevent the flesh, which was once crucified, from being given to us for food.\(^{45}\)
\end{quote}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:554, with reference to \textit{Inst.} 1559 LCC 4.17.7.
\item \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:508. "... panem quem frangimus vere communicationem esse corporis Christi" (CO 9:471). An other excellent presentation of the foregoing discussion may be found in Jill Raitt, "Three Inter-related Principles in Calvin's Unique Doctrine of Infant Baptism," \textit{Sixteenth Century Journal} 11 (1980), 51-61. The title of Raitt's articles is deceiving inasmuch as she speaks of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper amid her discussion of his doctrine of Baptism.
\item \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:507. "... distincte affirmo, quam a nobis sumpsit carnem, eam nobis esse vivificam, ut nobis sit materia spiritualis vitae" (CO 9:470).
\item Calvin brooks no pretense, then, as to what body it is that Christ holds forth in the Supper. See footnote 33 above.
\item \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:106. See footnote 26 above and its referent.
\item \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:555. "... nos tamen vere in coena corpore et sanguine eius pasci, et fieri arcana spiritus virtute, ut fruamur urrisque praeuenta. Dico non obstare locorum distantiam, quo minus caro, quae semel crucifixa est, nobis in alimentum detur" (CO 9:505).
\end{itemize}
In order to assure readers that he truly means that Christ's flesh and blood are "substantially offered and exhibited" in the Supper, Calvin recognizes the necessity of clarifying the relation between the sacramental sign, symbol, or figure, and that which it signifies. Indeed, their relation is essential to the communication of "Christ and his life to us" in the Supper. "Although I distinguish between the sign and the thing signified," says Calvin, "I do not teach that there is only a bare and shadowy figure, but distinctly declare that the bread is a sure pledge of that communion with the flesh and blood of Christ which it figures." Christ does not present "an empty image to amuse the eye," he says, "but he truly (vere) and in reality (re) performs what he promises by an external symbol." The "general rule in regard to all the sacraments, which not only human reason compels us to adopt, but which a sense of piety and the uniform usage of piety dictate," says Calvin, is that the "symbol" bears with it an "inseparable connection with the thing and reality." For Calvin, a "true symbol" bears with it "the exhibition of the

---


47 Calvin discusses this also in, e.g., his 1541 Petit Traicté de la saincte cène, his 1545 Catechism for the church of Geneva, his 1546 Commentary on 1 Corinthians, and his treatises addressed to Westphal in the mid-1550s.

48 See footnote 36 above.

49 Tracts and Treatises 2:507. "Etsi autem signum discerno a re signata, non tamen trado nudam et umbratilem figuram esse, sed articulato pronuncio panem certum esse pignus communicationis cum carne et sanguine Christi quam figurat: quia Christus neque pictor sit, neque histrio, neque Archimedes quispiam; qui inani tantum objecta imagine oculos pascat, sed vere et re ipsa praestet quod externo symbolo promittit" (CO 9:470-71). See also Tracts and Treatises 2:563; CO 9:512.

50 Tracts and Treatises 2:508. "... qua individua sit huius cum re et vertitate connexion" (CO 9:471). See also Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.5: "... we should not, by too little regard for the signs, divorce them from their mysteries, to which they are so to speak attached." In the Institutio, in the context of this passage which appeared already in 1543, Calvin sharply distinguishes between adnecto and adfigo – "annexed" and "affixed" – with respect to this "connection." This distinction will be further noted in the succeeding chapter. See also Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.12, 16, and 19, where this distinction is repeated. These passages, too, derive from the 1539 Institutio. See also Raitt, "Three Inter-related Principles," 55.
reality" \textit{(rei exhibitionem)}. That is its "nature," as he puts it in his 1562 \textit{Confessio}: "to bring and communicate truly to the receivers the thing signified by them."\textsuperscript{52} In his \textit{Optima ineundae concordiae ratio}, which Calvin composed in 1560 and published in 1561 as an appendix to the \textit{Dilucida explicatio}, Calvin avers that there "is an inseparable tie (\textit{inseparabile vinculum}) between the sign (\textit{signi}) and thing signified (\textit{rei signatae}),"\textsuperscript{53} such that it is "lawful" to say "that the body of Christ is given us 'under the bread,' or 'with the bread,' because the thing denoted is not a substantial union \textit{(substantialis unio)} of corruptible meat with the flesh of Christ, but sacramental conjunction \textit{(sacramentalis coniunctio)}."\textsuperscript{55} In his \textit{Institutio}, Calvin says as much whenever he speaks of the "signs" and "their mysteries" being "so to speak \textit{attached}\textsuperscript{(quodammodo annexa sunt)}.\textsuperscript{56} "
So, according to Calvin, in the sacraments, the thing signified is truly offered, truly communicated, with the sign, symbol, or figure, and objectively so. This is the thrust of Calvin's use of the term *exhibere* and its derivatives. The symbols

---


58 Calvin's use of *exhibere* is pointed, and seems to follow on Bucer and Melanchthon's pointed use of this word. By 1536, Bucer and Melanchthon's efforts to conciliate the followers of Zwingli and Luther led them to a fresh, mutually agreeable statement on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, The Wittenberg Concord (1536). Melanchthon subsequently employed *exhibere* in his revision of the Augsburg Confession (1541). The easy English cognate of *exhibere* is "to exhibit," but it means much more than "to present," as in "to show," as the English implies. Rather, it means "to present," as in "to offer," "to proffer," "to hand over." With regard to Bucer, Hazlett notes that the term is typically, though not uniquely, employed by him and embraces "both the figurative representation and the actual offering of Christ's body" (Hazlett, "Eucharistic Communion," 74, with reference to his dissertation, "Development of Bucer's Thinking," 413-14). In a *retractatio* of 1536, Bucer declares that the body and blood of the Lord are truly exhibited in the supper—*vere exhibere* (for text and citation, see footnote 925 below). With respect to the First Helvetic Confession (1536, also known as the Second Basel Confession), Burnett writes: According to this confession, in the Supper, "the Lord truly offers his body and blood, that is, himself, to his own.' The confession rejected [sic] any local inclusion or carnal presence of the Lord's body and blood. Rather, 'through the institution of the Lord, the bread and wine are symbols through which the true communion of his body and blood are exhibited by the Lord himself through the ministry of the church.' Assessing this, Burnett notes that "the key term was [sic] the verb *exhibere* and its variants *exhibitive* and *exhibentes*. These were translated into German as *darreichen* and *anbieten* (to offer or present), but the Latin term goes beyond its English cognate, 'to exhibit (or present),' to include the sense of 'to deliver or procure.' (Amy Nelson Burnett, "The Myth of the Swiss Lutherans: Martin Bucer and the Eucharistic Controversy in Bern," *Zwingliana* 32 [2005], 48). These references demonstrate that the objects of *exhibere* may be "the communion of Christ's body and blood" and/or "Christ's body and blood." Presumably these two objects are what Hazlett has in mind when he says the term "embraces both the figurative representation and the actual offering of Christ's body." Calvin's use suggests these two objects as well. Already in his 1536 *Institutio* he says that "in this manner, the body and blood of Christ are shown (exhibitetur) to us in the Sacrament" (*CO* 1:123), though the instrumental weight of this expression increases so that in the *Catechismus ecclesiae Genevensis/Le Catéchisme de l'église de Genève* of 1545 he includes this telling exchange (emphasis added):

M: Solamne eorum, quae dixisti, *beneficiorum significationem* habemus in coena, *an illic re ipsa nobis exhibentur?*

C: Quum Dominus noster Christus ipsa sit veritas, minime dubium est, quin promissiones, quas dat illic nobis, simul etiam impleat, et figuris suam addat veritatem. Quamobrem non dubito, quin sicuti verbis ac signis testatur, ita etiam suae nos substantiae participes faciat, quo in unam cum eo vitam coalescamus (*CO* 6:128).

M: Avons-nous en la Cene simplement *le tesmoignage des choses* dessusdictes, ou si elles y sont vrayement donnees?*

C: Entant que Iesus Christ est la verité, il ne faut doubter que les promesses qu'il fait à la Cene, n'y soient accomplies: et que ce qu'il y figure, n'y soit verifié. Ainsi, selon qu'il le promet et represente, ie ne doubt de pas qu'il ne nous face participans de sa propre substance, pour nous unir avec soy en une vic (*CO* 6:127).

Then in 1561, in the *Dilucida explicatio*, he avers that a "true symbol" bears with it "the exhibition of the reality" (*rei exhibitionem*) (see footnote 51), and that "by the *virtus* of the Spirit there is a present *exhibitio* of the thing," the referent of "thing" being Christ's body" (see discussion in Chapter 1, at...
themselves, because of their "nature," have a certain efficacy such that they bear with them "the thing signified," "the thing" to which they are "in a manner," or "sacramentally," "conjoined." They have such efficacy, however, not of themselves, but because it has been granted them by God: by his Word, by his Spirit, who uses them as instruments. Speaking of the "force and truth of the sacrament," Calvin says that "what God has ordained remains firm and keeps its own nature . . . . nothing prevents the symbol consecrated by the Lord's Word from being actually what it is called, and from keeping its own force." To the 1559 edition of his Institutio, in his discussion of footnote 73). And then in the Confessio of 1562 he sums this saying that in the Supper, "through the signs of the bread and wine our Lord presents to us his body and blood" (as in Brian Gerrish, "Sign and Reality: The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions," in The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982], 122, with reference to CO 9:768: "Car là par les signes du pain et du vin nostre Seigneur Iesus nous presente son corps et son sang. . . ."

Even so, Calvin does also speak of the exhibitio of the communion of the Christ's body and blood, as in the 1537 Instruction:

"The signs are the bread and the wine, under which the Lord presents (exhibit) to us the true yet spiritual communication of his body and blood."

"Les signes sont le pain et le vin, souzb lesquelz le Seigneur nous presente la vraye communication de son corps et de son sang. . . ." (CO 22:69).

Here, too, Calvin's French term is most directly given, presenter, though his distinction in the 1545 Catéchisme, in which he employs donner should not be overlooked. Calvin also uses offrir.

For other brief discussions of exhibere, see Joseph Tylenda, "The Ecumenical Intention of Calvin's Early Eucharistic Teaching," in Reformatio Perennis, ed. Brian A. Gerrish (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1981), 31-32; Richard A. Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg? An Examination of Calvin's Early Eucharistic Thought," Calvin Theological Journal 45, no. 2 (forthcoming) (I am grateful to Richard Muller for having given me a manuscript of this essay 26 August 2008, and a final pre-publication copy 6 July 2010), and especially Richard A. Muller, "Calvin on Sacramental Presence, in the Shadow of Marburg and Zurich," Lutheran Quarterly 23 (2009), 151-152.


See Inst. 1559 LCC 4.14.16 (from 1543, however). "It ought perhaps to be expressly pointed out that Calvin does not start from a general theory of signs; he ground the sacramental union of signum and res strictly in the divine Word, so that to doubt the presence of the reality is to question the fidelity of God. In addition to the passage quoted at length in n. 28 above [Petit traicté, CO 5:439; Tracts and Treatises 2:172], see, for instance, Inst. 4.17.20 (CO 2:1371). Calvin believes, of course, that he is simply following the Augustinian formula: it is the addition of the Word to the element that makes a sacrament (Inst. 4.14.4. CO 2:1279)" (Brian Gerrish, "Gospel and Eucharist: John Calvin on the Lord's Supper," in
the sacraments generally considered, Calvin inserted the following telling statement on this point:

God therefore truly executes whatever he promises and represents in signs; nor do the signs lack their own effect in proving their Author truthful and faithful. The only question here is whether God acts by his own intrinsic power (as they say) or resigns his office to outward symbols. But we contend that, whatever instruments he uses, these detract nothing from his original activity.  

In the 1562 *Confessio*, Calvin seemingly builds on this thought: "We hold," he says, that the sacraments "are useful only when God gives effect to them, and displays the power of his Spirit, using them as instruments." As Calvin sees it, the power of the Spirit is not unrelated to the efficacy of the symbol itself.

With his emphasis on the "conjunction" between "sign" and "thing signified," Calvin dissociates his teaching from any that presents the bread and the wine as mere signs—or mere "representations," shall we say—of "the absent body" of Christ. Even as he does so though, Calvin also emphatically affirms that the body of Christ is indeed locally absent, given Christ's ascension to the right hand of the Father. That is to say, to Calvin, it should not be said of the bread that it is "properly Christ," because if it were "properly Christ," then Christ would be "locally present"; but Christ is no longer

---


64 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:510-511. "... proprie ... Christus" (*CO* 9:473-74).
locally present on earth, at least not physically or corporeally, not even in the sacrament. As Calvin puts it, "the body of Christ is indeed absent in respect of place, but . . . we enjoy a spiritual [i.e., not carnal or corporeal, but by the Spirit] participation in it, every obstacle from distance being surmounted by his divine energy." Calvin repeatedly asserts that Christ, or the Son of God, "in respect of human nature is in heaven." He is, in short, "locally present" in heaven. And yet this reality in no way inhibits Christ from being "everywhere," even as God the Father is "everywhere":

. . . Christ is everywhere by a communication of properties, as was taught by the fathers, . . . accordingly, it is not the body of Christ that is everywhere, the ubiquity being ascribed in the concrete to the whole person in respect of the union of the Divine nature. . . . it is impossible to comprehend how the body of Christ is in a certain part of heaven, above the heavens, and yet the person of Christ is everywhere, ruling in equal power with the Father. . . . . Christ is whole everywhere, but not wholly (totus ubique sed non totum); in other words, in his entire person of Mediator he fills heaven and earth, though in his flesh he is in heaven, which he has chosen as the abode of his human nature, until he appear to judgment.

---

65 Tracts and Treatises 2:511-12. CO 9:474. Furthermore, if the bread were "properly Christ," then it would necessarily have to be worshiped (on this point, see also page 511). Later in the treatise Calvin writes of these two positions and of his own "medium" one: "When he [Heshusius] compares the two sentences, The bread is the sign of the absent body, and, The body is truly and substantially present and is given under the bread, it is easy to answer that there is a medium between these extremes, that the body is indeed given by the external symbol, but is not sisted (sic) locally" (Tracts and Treatises 2:555). "Nam quod duas inter se sententias committit, panem esse signum absentis corporis; et corpus vere et substantialiter adesse, et sub pane dari, responsio facilis est: Inter haec duo extrema aliquid esse medium, dari quidem corpus per externum symbolum, sed non sisti localiter" (CO 9:505-06).

66 Tracts and Treatises 2:510. "Intera nos simul omnes indigne gravat, ac si doceremus panem signum esse absentis corporis: quasi non articulate pridem commonefecerim lectores de absentia duplici: ut sciant corpus Christi absesse quidem loco, sed spirituali eius participacione nos frui: quia omnem distantiam superest divina eius virtus" (CO 9:472).


68 In the Ultima admonitio, Calvin declares "Christ is locally absent in respect of his human nature" (Tracts and Treatises 2:450). "Ioco igitur abst Christus secundum humanam naturam" (CO 9:218). "Unlike Calvin, Luther [and the gnesio-Lutherans after him] understood the problem of the divine transcendence, not as a problem of distance, but as a problem of inaccessible immanence" (Steinmetz, "Calvin and His Lutheran Critics," 176).

69 Tracts and Treatises 2:514. CO 9:475.
Given this understanding of the person of Christ and his two natures, Calvin affirms that Christ's presence is "real"—or as Calvin prefers to put it, "true"—in the sacrament; accordingly, he "reject[s] the sentiments of all who deny the presence of Christ in the Supper." "Though it is absent in respect of place," says Calvin, "I uniformly maintain, that through the agency (virtus) of the Spirit there is a present exhibition of the thing"—"it" and "the thing" being references to Christ's body. Later, and again speaking definitively with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper itself, Calvin declares that

. . . . although Christ is absent from the earth in respect of the flesh, yet in the Supper we truly feed on his body and blood—that owing to the secret agency (virtus) of the Holy Spirit we enjoy the presence of both. I say that distance of place is no obstacle to prevent the flesh, which was once crucified, from being given to us for food.

For Calvin, the "absence" and "presence" of Christ should not be taken to be radically opposed in respect of the sacrament, especially with respect to what the sacrament itself offers and how. So he writes: concerning

the two sentences, 'The bread is the sign of the absent body,' and 'The body is truly and substantially present and is given under the bread,' it is easy to answer

---

70 Tracts and Treatises 2:514-515. CO 9:475-76. It cannot be overlooked that Calvin is citing Heshusius and then avering that Heshusius is actually purporting what Calvin calls "so exactly our doctrine." See also Tracts and Treatises 2:505.


72 Tracts and Treatises 2:517. CO 9:477.


74 Tracts and Treatises 2:554. "Dico, quamvis Christus secundum carnem a terries absit, nos tamen vere in coena corpore et sanguine eius pasci, et fieri arcana spiritus virtute, ut fruamur utriusque praesentia. Dico non obstare locorum distantiam, quo minus caro, quae semel crucifixia est, nobis in alimentum detur" (CO 9:505).
that there is a medium between these extremes, that the body is indeed given by the external symbol, but is not sisted [sic] locally.\textsuperscript{75}

Seemingly putting this notion that "the body is given by the external symbol" (recalling that it is the "nature" of a "true symbol" that it bears with it "the exhibition of the reality" such that it "brings and communicates truly to the receivers the thing signified" by it\textsuperscript{76}) together with the notion that "through the agency of the Spirit there is a present exhibition of the thing," Calvin writes in the 1559 edition of his \textit{Institutio}, "We say that Christ descends to us, as well by the external symbol as by his Spirit, that he may truly quicken our souls by the substance of his flesh and blood."\textsuperscript{77}

In sum, Calvin affirms—\textit{vehemently}—that, owing to the "secret," "incomprehensible," and "boundless" \textit{virtus} of the Holy Spirit, who is the bond of believers' union with Christ, Christ's body is truly offered in the sacrament, truly exhibited, truly communicated—"as well by the external symbol as by his Spirit," it might be said. "Christ holds forth his body," really, truly, objectively, in keeping with his promise.\textsuperscript{78} Calvin writes, as already mentioned above: "The bread which we break is truly the communion (\textit{vere communicationem}) of the body of Christ\textsuperscript{79}; and, "the body is indeed given by the external symbol"\textsuperscript{80}; and also that, in the Supper, "the body of

\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:555, emphasis added. \textit{CO} 9:505-06, above.

\textsuperscript{76} See footnotes 51 and 52 above.

\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Inst}. 1559 LCC 4.17.24. "Dicimus Christum tam externo symbolo quam spiritu suo ad nos descendere, ut vere substantia carnis suae et sanguinis sui animas nostras vivificet" (\textit{CO} 2:1023).

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:524. \textit{CO} 9:482.

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:508. \textit{CO} 9:470.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:555, emphasis added. \textit{CO} 9:505.
Christ is given us . . . by the secret energy of the Spirit." According to Calvin, the Holy Spirit is at work with respect to the sacrament so that by its "external symbol"—that is, by its aliments, by its bread and wine—"there is a present exhibition" of Christ's body and blood, a true bestowal, or communication, of his flesh.

1.3 Exposition: On Reception

In the economy of the Lord's Supper as Calvin describes it, the Holy Spirit functions not only as the agent of the communication of Christ's body and blood, but also as the agent of the reception of that lifegiving gift. Thus, for example, in the *Dilucida explicatio*, Calvin asserts unequivocally, "my axiom [is] that Christ, considered as the living bread and the victim immolated on the cross, cannot enter any human body which is devoid of his Spirit." 82

The context of this claim, of course, concerns *manducatio indignorum*. According to Heshusius (according to Calvin), if Christ's body and blood is not received, that is, "consumed" or "eaten," 83 by an "unworthy," or unbelieving, 84 recipient at the Table, then Christ's body and blood has not been truly offered, i.e., according to Heshusius, it cannot be claimed that Christ's body and blood have been really and truly "present." But as Calvin sees it—and says it, in fact—"it is one thing to offer and

---


84 See e.g., *Tracts and Treatises* 2:513, for one of Calvin's expressions of Heshusius' view.
another to receive. 85 The "nature" of the sacrament does not change: As has been pointed out above, Calvin is emphatic that it is the "nature" of the sacrament that it would bear with it "the thing" it signifies, namely, Christ's body and blood. Christ himself, at the hand of the minister, 86 truly holds forth this spiritual food at his Table, but it cannot be received except by faith. It cannot be received by unbelievers. In the Dilucida explicatio, Calvin writes:

I admit, that by partaking of the sign they [the unworthy] insult the body of Christ, inasmuch as they reject the inestimable boon which is offered to them. . . . It is indeed true, that contumely is offered to the flesh of Christ by those who with impious disdain and contempt reject it when it is held forth for food; for we maintain, that in the Supper Christ holds forth his body to reprobates as well as to believers, but in such manner that those who profane the Sacrament by unworthy receiving make no change on its nature. . . . 87

Then again in the Optima ineundae concordiae ratio appended to the Dilucida explicatio, Calvin writes concerning the "dispute" of "Whether believers alone receive Christ, or all, without exception, to whom the symbols of bread and wine are distributed, receive him?":

Christ offers his body and blood to all in general; but as unbelievers bar the entrance of his liberality, they do not receive what is offered. It must not, however, be inferred from this, that when they reject what is given, they either make void the grace of Christ, or detract in any respect from the efficacy of the Sacrament. The Supper does not, through their ingratitude, change its nature. . . . 88

85 Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.33 (CO 2:1033) for this very locution; also e.g., Dilucida explicatio, in Tracts and Treatises 2:522 and 524 for the concept.

86 Calvin speaks of this in his treatises as well as in his liturgy: The Communion Prayer includes these words: "we beseech thee to grant us this grace: that we may receive at His hands such a great gift and benefit with true sincerity of heart and with ardent zeal" (Bard Thompson, Liturgies of the Western Church, First Fortress Press Edition, [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980], 204). "... accounting the worthiness of this precious gift which He gives, let us present ourselvses to Him with ardent zeal, . . . ." (Thompson, Liturgies, 207).

87 Tracts and Treatises 2:524. CO 9:483.
In an elaboration on this point in a passage new to his 1559 *Institutio*, Calvin works in a metaphor of Augustine: "I hold that men bear away from this Sacrament no more than they gather with the vessel of faith."  

Faith receives Christ. It is the instrument by which one receives Christ and all his benefits. And faith, says Calvin, is wholly a gift of the Holy Spirit, a manifest expression of Christ's dwelling in us by the Holy Spirit. Insofar as the Spirit is the agent of faith, then, the Spirit is also the agent of the reception of what is truly and objectively held forth to all by Christ in the Supper, namely, Christ's body and blood. So, in the context of a discussion of the Lord's Supper, Calvin readily declares, as has been cited, "Christ . . . cannot enter any human body which is devoid of his Spirit." Any who come to the table "devoid of the Spirit," devoid, if you will, of faith, receive the elements of the sacrament, but do not partake of Christ. The body and blood of Christ are given them, says Calvin, but they partake only of the sign, the symbol, the bread and the wine of the sacramental celebration.  

Believers, however, in whom Christ dwells by his Spirit, receive Christ's body, by the Spirit, by the symbol. Liturgically, in the moment of the communion, Christ holds forth his body and blood, and believers' souls, eating with

---


89 *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17.33 (*CO* 2:1033). The citations here of Augustine's works in LCC are those of the translator Ford Lewis Battles and/or John T. McNeill, not Calvin's. Calvin simply makes a general reference to Augustine.

90 E.g., *Dilucida, Tracts and Treatises* 2:522. *CO* 9:481. Also *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17.33 (*CO* 2:1033): "And this is the wholeness of the Sacrament, which the whole world cannot violate: that the flesh and blood Christ are no less truly given to the unworthy than to God's elect believers. At the same time, it is true, however, that, just as rain falling upon a hard rock flows off because no entrance opens into the stone, the wicked by their hardness so repel God's grace that it does not reach them. Besides, to say that Christ may be received without faith is an inappropriate as to say that a seed may germinate in fire."
the mouth of faith,91 are truly fed, truly nourished, unto eternal life. "For there under the symbols of bread and wine," says Calvin, "the Lord presents us with his body and blood, and we are spiritually fed upon them, provided we do not preclude entrance to his grace by our unbelief."92

In anticipation of this moment, those who would participate in this mystery are invoked to lift up their hearts: *Sursum corda*. Given his historical context and his understanding of the sacrament, Calvin interprets this liturgical injunction polemically. In his *Institutio* Calvin writes,

in order that pious souls may duly apprehend Christ in the Supper, they must be raised up to heaven. But if the function of the Sacrament is to help the otherwise weak mind of man so that it may rise up to look upon the height of spiritual mysteries, then those who are halted at the outward sign wander from the right way of seeking Christ. What then? Shall we deny that this is superstitious worship when men prostrate themselves before bread to worship Christ there? Doubtless the Council of Nicaea meant to forestall this evil when it forbade us to fix our humble attention upon the symbols set before us. And for the same reason it was established of old that before consecration the people should be told in a loud voice to lift up their hearts. Scripture itself also not only carefully recounts to us the ascension of Christ, by which he withdrew the presence of his body from our sight and company, to shake from us all carnal thinking of him, but also, whenever it recalls him, bids our minds be raised up, and seek him in heaven, seated at the right hand of the Father (Col 3:1).93

---

91 Calvin expresses this explicitly in, e.g., his commentary on John 6: To the Supper, "we also must bring the spiritual mouth of faith that we may be truly nourished by" the flesh of Christ (*The Gospel according to St. John 1-10*, trans. T. H. L. Parker, *CNTC* 4:174-75).

92 1562 *Confessio, Tracts and Treatises* 2:158. *CO* 9:768. (All of the headings in Beveridge's edition are Beveridge's; Calvin presents one continuous prose exposition.) For this concept, see also the *Inst. 1559 LCC* 4.17.34.

93 *Inst. 1559 LCC* 4.17.36. While this passage is not new to the *Institutio* in 1559, inasmuch as Calvin did not edit this passage in 1559, Calvin ratifies this position. "Nam ut Christum illic rite apprehendant piae animae, in coelum erigantur necesse est. Quod si hoc sacramenti officium est’mentem hominis infirman alioqui adiuware, ut ad percipientam spiritualium mysteriorum altitudinem sursum assurgat, qui in signo externo detinentur, a recta quaerendi Christi via aberrant. Quid ergo? superstiosum esse cultum negabimus, quem sese homines coram pane prosternunt ut Christum illic adoren? Huic malo procul dubio volui obviare nicaena synodus, quem vetuit nos humiliter attentos esse ad proposita symbola. Nec alia causa institutum olim fuit ut ante consecrationem populus alta voce admoneretur..."
The *sursum corda* concerns one's disposition toward the elements of the sacramental celebration. One is not to fixate on the bread and wine, as if they were "properly" Christ, as if Christ were "locally present" in or under them.  

Rather one is to rise by faith, by the symbol, to heaven. Says Calvin,

> if we are lifted up to heaven with our eyes and minds, to seek Christ there in the glory of his Kingdom, as the symbols invite us to him in his wholeness, so under the symbol of bread we shall be fed by his body, under the symbol of wine we shall separately drink his blood, to enjoy him at last in his wholeness.

Since the Lord's Supper is, as Calvin puts it elsewhere, "a heavenly action, or a kind of vehicle which carries [true worshipers] above the world," at the outset of its celebration, those who would participate are enjoined to "lift up" their hearts and minds. They are enjoined to exercise faith. In the main, given his predominant patterns of speech, Calvin speaks of believers being raised up not by the Holy Spirit, as so many are wont to read him, but by faith. "Faith," says Calvin in the *Optima ineundae habere sursum corda*. Ipsa quoque scriptura, praeterquam quod Christi ascensionem diligenter nobis enarrat, qua corporis sui praesentiam a conspectu nostro consuetudineque subduxit, quo nobis ommem de eo carnalem cogitationem excutiat, quoties ipsius meminist, mentibus sursum erigi iubet, et ipsum in coelo quaeetere sedentem in patris dextera (Col. 3, 1)" (CO 2:1039).

---


96 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:519. CO 9:479.


98 This is most expressly stated in his *Maniere de interroguer les Enfans qu'on veut recevoir a la Cene de nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ*, 1553. As no standard English translation is available, the entire dialogue on the Lord's Supper is rendered here in French as it is found in CO 6:159-160:

LE MINISTRE. Et la Cene que nous signifie-elle?
L'ENFANT. Elle nous signifie que par la communication du corps et du sang de nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ,
"concordiae ratio" of 1560, "raises us upwards, and casts its anchor in heaven, so that instead of subjecting Christ to the figments of our reason, we seek him above in his glory." 99 In his 1559 Commentarii in Isaiam prophetam, on Isaiah 6:7 Calvin writes

We perceive and feel a sign, such as the bread which is put into our hands by the minister in the Lord's Supper; and because we ought to seek Christ in heaven, our thoughts ought to be carried thither. By the hand of the minister he presents to us his body, that it may be actually enjoyed by the godly, who rise by faith to fellowship with him. He bestows it, therefore, on the godly, who raise their thoughts to him by faith; for he cannot deceive. Unbelievers indeed receive the sign; but because they linger in the world, and do not arrive at Christ's heavenly kingdom, they have no experience of the truth; for he who has not faith cannot raise his thoughts to God, and therefore cannot partake of Christ. Faith alone opens for us the gate of the kingdom of God; and therefore, whoever wishes to eat the flesh of Christ must be carried by faith to heaven beyond human conception. In short, it is the Spirit of God alone who can make us partakers of that fellowship. 100

---


100 In his 1559 Commentary on Isaiah at Isaiah 6:7, Calvin offers a tight exposition on "sacraments," with particular reference to the Lord's Supper. Given its relevance to the discussion and progression of this chapter as a whole, the first two thirds of that tight exposition are quoted here, including the text cited above: "Lo, this hath touched thy lips. He shows that the confirmation which was obtained by the sign was not without effect, but that the blessing signified by it was at the same time bestowed, so that Isaiah knew that he had not been deceived. Hence we may infer, that in the sacraments the reality is given to us along with the sign (Unde colligere possumus, in sacramentis rem nobis cum signo exhiberi); for when the Lord holds out a sacrament, he does not feed our eyes with an empty and unmeaning figure, but joins the truth with it, so as to testify that by means of them he acts upon us efficaciously. And this ought to be the more carefully observed, because there are few persons in the present day who understand the true use of sacraments, and because many godly and learned men are engaged in frequent disputes respecting them. First of all, we ought to believe that the truth must never be
The *sursum corda* and the *communion* are distinct, though integrally related, liturgical moments in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the Holy Spirit works in believers with respect to each *with respect to faith*. By faith, by the symbol, believers rise to Christ in heaven, where, with the mouth of faith, they feed on Christ's flesh and blood under the symbols of bread and wine. Inasmuch as faith is entirely the work of the Holy Spirit,\(^{101}\) the Holy Spirit is the agent, if you will, of believers' preparation for communion in response to the liturgical invocation *sursum corda*,\(^ {102}\) as well as the agent of believers' very reception of Christ's body and blood in the liturgical action of communion. The *sursum corda* and the *communio* are two parts of a mystery, "a secret too lofty for either my mind to comprehend or my word to declare," says Calvin in an early edition of the *Institutio*. "To speak more plainly," he continues,

> I rather experience than understand it. Therefore, I here embrace without controversy the truth of God in which I may safely rest. He declares his flesh the food of my soul, his blood its drink. I offer my soul to him to be fed with such food. In his Sacred Supper he bids me take, eat, and drink his body and blood

---

\(^{101}\) See, e.g., *Catechismus ecclesiae Genevensis* (1545), *Tracts and Treatises* 2:84; and *Institutio* 1539, as in *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.14.8-10 (from 1536 and 1539).

\(^{102}\) This "lifting up by faith," as Calvin occasionally puts it, makes believers "capable" of their communion with Christ. E.g., *First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, trans. John W. Fraser, *CNTC* 9:247 (*CO* 49:488); *La Forme de Prières* 1542 regarding the administration *de la Cène* (see Thompson, *Liturgies*, 207; *CO* 6:199).
under the symbols of bread and wine. I do not doubt that he himself truly
presents them, and that I receive them.\textsuperscript{103}

1.4 Coda

Christ invites his own to his table, and there, under the symbols of bread and
wine, by his Spirit, truly offers (exhibere) his flesh and blood as spiritual food for the
spiritual journey. Having lifted up their hearts and minds to heaven by faith, believers
are truly nourished with his flesh; eating with the mouth of faith, they truly feed on his
body and blood under the symbols of bread and wine. In his sacred Supper, Christ truly
communicates his body and blood to those who gather there, and believers truly receive
it—all owing to "the secret and incomprehensible virtus of the Holy Spirit," the bond of
our union with Christ, as Calvin so often puts it. As suggested at the outset of this
chapter, in Calvin's understanding, the role of the Holy Spirit is manifold on the
occasion of a celebration of the Lord's Supper, dynamic with respect to both the
"communication" of Christ's body and blood, and the "reception" of that spiritual food
by believers.

* * * * *

Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to believers'
nourishment in the Lord's Supper is prominent—even preeminent—in treatises he
composed and published late in life. But was it always so? Did he always emphasize the

\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Institutio} 1543, as in \textit{Inst.} 1559 LCC 4.17.32. (LCC includes an interpolation of a reference to
John 6 that does not appear in the original printings.) "Itaque veritatem Dei in qua acquiescere tuto licet,
hic sine controversia amplector. Pronuntiat ille carnem suam esse animae meae cibum, sanguinem esse
potum. Talibus alimentis animam illi meam pascendam offero. In sacra sua coena iubet me sub symbolis
panis ac vini corpus ac sanguinem suum sumere, manducare ac bibere. Nihil dubito, quin et ipse vere
porrigat, et ego recipiam" (\textit{CO} 2:1032).
Holy Spirit with respect to the economy and efficacy of the sacrament? Did he always intimate the Spirit's action with respect to both the communication and reception of what is offered in the Lord's Supper?

Such are the questions raised in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 2

A STUDY OF CALVIN'S REFERENCES TO THE HOLY SPIRIT
IN HIS PRIMARY EXPOSITIONS ON THE LORD'S SUPPER

Three recent studies, one an extended chapter excerpt, another a dissertation, and still another a conference paper, aim to demonstrate that Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper was anything but static from 1535, the year in which Calvin wrote his first *Institutio*, to 1561, the year in which he issued the *Dilucida explicatio contra Hesclusius*.

The most recent, the extended chapter excerpt, is that of Randall C. Zachman. In the midst of his study *Image and Word in the Theology of John Calvin*, Zachman provides a lucid, narrative exposition of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper based solely on the reformer's works. Throughout his chronological survey of Calvin's writings, Zachman attends especially to Calvin's references to the sacraments as "images," but along the way offers acute insights into the development of various dimensions and expressions in Calvin's doctrine of the sacrament.⁴

In his dissertation, Thomas J. Davis demonstrates that, contrary to the assumptions of many previous studies of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper—which

often redact the theological inflections of Calvin's early discussions of the Lord's Supper according to those of his presumed summa on the topic, namely, Book IV, Chapters 14 and 17, of the 1559 edition of his Institutio—Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper develops throughout his lifetime. In the final pages of his work, Davis summarizes his understanding of Calvin's development in the following way:

At the beginning of his career, as he wrote on the Eucharist in his 1536 Institutes, Calvin flatly and unequivocally denied substantial partaking of Christ in the Eucharist. He claimed that the Eucharist could not, in fact, be thought of as an instrument of grace. Moreover, he delineated no clear eucharistic gift. . . . Calvin's eucharistic theology matured. It developed in such a way that Calvin claimed as essential those very elements that he had originally denied as part of his eucharistic doctrine. . . . He goes from denying substantial partaking to strongly affirming it, linking that participation in the body of Christ to the very means of salvation, Christ the mediator in his flesh and blood. Calvin advances from denying the Eucharist as an instrument of grace to claiming for it the highest honor—an intermediary brilliance sent and used by God to illumine Christian existence. Finally, Calvin moves from no affirmation of a gift to asserting that there is presented by the Eucharist a twofold gift: Jesus Christ himself, on the one hand, and the clearest picture possible for sinful human creatures of the promises of God on the other.106

Finally, in a brief, heavily annotated study of his own, Wim Janse echoes Davis' general conclusion.107 "Calvin's eucharistic views," says Janse, "were not from the beginning a detailed, coherent, and unified doctrine, of which the Agreement of Zurich (1549) or the 1559 Institutio are supposed to be the representative expression, but show

---


106 Davis, Clearest Promises, 212. See also Davis, Clearest Promises, 7-8, which also provides a summary. The conclusions of each of Davis' chapters, which are ordered according to phases in Calvin's career, also provide summaries of developments in each respective phase of Calvin's career.

a historical development. As Janse reads him, Calvin betrays "'Zwinglianizing' accents" in his early work, given most notably "the absence of, e.g., instrumentalist language" in his Discours of 5 and 7 October 1536 of Les Articles de Lausanne, his 1536 Institutio, and his first catechism. "Evidence of 'Lutheranizing' influences received via Bucer," says Janse, "is offered by, among other documents, the Confessio fidei de eucharistia of September 1537, the 1539 Institutio, the Short Treatise (1541) and Calvin's 1 Corinthians Commentary (1546)." In whatever way one might wish to refine or nuance the details of these studies of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the overall leaning of their studies is sure and worthy of full acceptance: Calvin's expressed (whether by publication or correspondence) doctrine of the Lord's Supper betrays some development of thought, or at least development of expression.

Given that Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper develops, at least to some degree, and given that the Holy Spirit figures prominently in Calvin's late expressions of that doctrine (as the previous chapter demonstrates), one may legitimately wonder whether the Holy Spirit figures so prominently in the entire run of Calvin's works on the Lord's Supper. That is, did Calvin always emphasize the role, power, work, or agency of

109 Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 67-68. Janse wonders, in the form of a passing question, Might these "'Zwinglianizing' accents" be "an effect of Farel's influence?"
110 Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 67. Notice that Janse takes Calvin to be the principal author of the 1537 Confessio fidei, not Farel, as many other scholars have.
111 For instance, both Davis and Janse suggest Calvin admitted no "instrumental" language with respect to the sacraments in his early works. Such a claim seems to need refining. Granted, Calvin does not use "instrumental" language in, e.g., the section De coena domini of the 1536 Institutio, however he does in fact refer to the sacraments as instruments (instrumentis) in the untitled section on the sacraments generally considered.
the Holy Spirit with respect to the "communication" and "reception" of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper, or did such emphasis develop in some way?

This question is actually quite easy to answer, and the answer is Yes. The Holy Spirit's role seemingly diversifies in Calvin's works, some dimensions of the Spirit's role "suddenly appearing" in one of Calvin's discussions of the Lord's Supper whereas it had not in those previously published. So the more difficult question is, In what way did it develop? Can the "provenance" or "derivation" of such development be discerned?

The last question, of course, is the over-arching question of this whole dissertation. Its "answer" remains to be taken up in the second half of this study. This chapter, however, shall deal with Calvin's discernment of the role of the Holy Spirit regarding the Lord's Supper. Attention will be paid to how Calvin speaks of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament. In the previous chapter, a close reading of Calvin's late treatises on the Lord's Supper demonstrated that, in his conception, the role of the Holy Spirit is manifold, dynamic in the "communication" and "exhibition" of Christ's body and blood, and their "reception" by believers. In this chapter, a close reading of other of his works shall demonstrate that a conception of the activity of the Holy Spirit persisted in Calvin's thought throughout the entire run of his discussions on the Lord's Supper, but that this conception changes, or grows, or is enhanced, such that the work of the Holy Spirit concerns not merely the "reception" of what is offered in the sacrament, but its "communication," and even "exhibition" as well. In pursuing this study, one cannot help but observe, too, that Calvin's conception (or at least his expression of his conception) of what is offered in the sacrament shifts as well.112
The chapter itself unfolds as a chronologically ordered survey of Calvin's principal discussions of the Lord's Supper. What is of primary interest here is not so much the intellectual, ecclesial, cultural, and social milieu of these documents, essential as these dimensions of Calvin's work are, but rather Calvin's very references to "the Holy Spirit" and "the Spirit" in the expression of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{113}

2.1 1535: Basel

Calvin's first exposition on the Lord's Supper appears in the initial edition of his \textit{Institutio}, written by August 1535 and printed in March 1536 under the title \textit{Christianae religionis institutio, totam fere pietatis summam, et quidquid est in doctrina salutis cognitu necessarium, complectens; omnibus pietatis studiosis lectu dignissimum opus, ac recens editum}.\textsuperscript{114} Composing his summary of Christian doctrine and piety in six chapters, Calvin turns to the two 'evangelical' sacraments in the fourth,\textsuperscript{115} and there in three sections: an untitled discussion of the sacraments in general, \textit{De Baptismo}, and \textit{De...}

\textsuperscript{112} Concerning this shift with respect to the teaching of the 1539 \textit{Institutio}, see Zachman, \textit{Image and Word}, 333-334: "It soon becomes clear that Calvin no longer understands the testimony, offer, and exhibition in the Supper to represent the communion with Christ that believers always enjoy. Instead, he claims that God is not a deceiver, and thus does not set forth an empty symbol before us. Thus, even though 'the breaking of the bread is a symbol; it is no the thing itself,' Calvin nevertheless insists that "by showing the symbol, the thing itself is shown" (citing \textit{Institutio} 1539 XII.18; \textit{CO} 1:1002B).

\textsuperscript{113} While reference will be made to the circumstances of Calvin's works, the nature and significance of such circumstances, especially for the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit, will be further plumbed in forthcoming chapters as warranted.

\textsuperscript{114} For discussion see de Greef, \textit{Writings of John Calvin}, 195ff. For the text, see \textit{CO} 1:1-252 and \textit{Inst.} 1536.

\textsuperscript{115} Chapter 5 concerning the "false sacraments," is entitled "Sacramenta non esse quinque reliqua quae pro sacramentis hactenus vulgo habita sunt declaratur, tum qualia sint ostenditur" (\textit{CO} 1:141).
In the first and third of these sections, which are of primary interest here, ascriptions to the work of the Holy Spirit are consistent, though few.

In the first section, on sacraments generally considered, Calvin refers to the role of the Holy Spirit on two occasions. In both, he refers to the Holy Spirit as the one who illumines believers' minds and softens their hearts in order that the sacraments might have their effect, namely, to "make us more certain of the trustworthiness of God's Word." In the first instance, Calvin is giving an answer to those who are concerned about the risk of ascribing to the sacraments a "work," or "effect," which should be ascribed to the Holy Spirit alone, namely, the "increase" of faith; he is giving an answer to those who simply cannot conceive of sacraments as "instruments" lest God's glory be diminished, his power being derogated to something creaturely.

On the first point, says Calvin, indeed, "faith is the proper and entire work of the Holy Spirit, illumined by whom we recognize God and the treasures of his kindness, and without whose light our mind is so blinded that it can see nothing; so dull that it can sense nothing of spiritual things." In the economy of faith though, says Calvin, God

---

116 In his translation, Battles suggests there are four sections, giving the opening section a heading "The Sacraments in General," and then fashioning a section out of the last three paragraphs of the discussion of the Lord's Supper and calling it "The Administration of the Sacraments." Battles also introduces a division and numbering of paragraphs within the sections. See Inst. 1536.

117 Inst. 1536, 88 and especially 89 for an emphasis on the sacraments as "confirmations of our faith." CO 1:103.

118 It would seem Calvin is addressing the concerns of Zwingli himself, as he does similarly in the Catechismus ecclesiae Genevensis, 1545. Locher asserts "the whole discussion of the sacraments in the Catechism of Geneva presents one single debate with Zwinglianism" (Gottfried Locher, "Discord among Guests," in Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981], 321n34 and 324n46).

119 Inst. 1536, 90.

120 Inst. 1536, 89. CO 1:104.
instructs us by his Word, confirms that word by the sacraments, and finally "illumines our minds by the light of his Holy Spirit and opens our hearts for the Word and sacraments to enter in, which would otherwise only strike our ears and appear before our eyes, but not at all affect us within." Some paragraphs on, Calvin reiterates this function of the sacraments and of the Holy Spirit's with respect to them, saying that the sacraments' sole office is to attest and confirm for us God's good will toward us. And they are of no further benefit unless the Holy Spirit accompanies them. For he it is who opens our minds and hearts and makes us receptive to this testimony. . . . The Holy Spirit . . . is he who brings the graces of God with him, gives a place for the sacraments among us, to make them bear fruit.

On the second point, Calvin declares forthrightly: "we place no power in creatures." For Calvin, it is clear that "God uses means and instruments (instrumentis) which he himself sees to be expedient, that all things may serve his glory, since he is Lord and Judge of all." Indeed, God "feeds our bodies through bread and other foods, he illumines the world through the sun, and he warms it through heat; yet neither bread, nor sun, nor fire, is anything save in so far as he distributes his blessings to us by these instruments (instrumentis)." "In like manner," says Calvin, thus explicitly referring to the sacraments as instruments, God "nourishes faith spiritually through the sacraments. . . ." According to Calvin, just as we refrain from putting confidence in bread, sun, or fire, but instead give glory to God for their benefit, so also we refrain from letting our

121 Inst. 1536, 89. CO 1:104.

122 Inst. 1536, 92; emphasis added. CO 1:107. Emphasis on the sacraments as "testimony" is often assumed to be evidence of a "Zwinglian" conception of the sacraments, though this was an early emphasis of Luther as well. Here, at this time in Calvin's discussion of the Lord's Supper, it may be noted that the sacraments are instruments communicating a "testimony" of God's grace, not "instruments" communicating the grace of Christ, the life-givingness of his flesh and blood, indeed, his very body and blood, as Calvin will eventually affirm (see Zachman, Image and Word, 332 and 333-34).
confidence "inhere in the sacraments," and from letting "the glory of God be transferred to them."\textsuperscript{123}

In such passages, Calvin \textit{intimates} that the Holy Spirit is active with respect to the \textit{communication}, or impartation, of what the sacrament grants, which is, preeminently, a testimony of God's good will. After all, he says the "Holy Spirit . . . is he who brings the graces of God with him." But Calvin's \textit{emphasis} with respect to the work of the Holy Spirit clearly falls on \textit{reception}. That is, the Holy Spirit illumines minds and softens hearts so that the testimony offered might be received.

In his section on the Lord's Supper in particular, Calvin refers to the Holy Spirit but \textit{once}, ascribing to the Spirit a pedagogical role related to Scripture, not the sacrament. Given its account and instruction concerning the ascension of Christ, Scripture, says Calvin, does not warrant an estimation of the sacraments that gives rise to the adoration of its elements. To avoid that erroneous understanding of the sacraments, says Calvin, believers ought to fix their "ears, eyes, hearts, minds, and tongues completely upon God's sacred teaching; for that is the school of that best schoolmaster, the Holy Spirit, in which we so advance that nothing need be acquired from elsewhere."\textsuperscript{124}

As was discovered in the previous chapter, eventually Calvin repeatedly appeals to the role of the Holy Spirit when he speaks of believers' reception of, and Christ's communication, and even exhibition, of his body and blood in the Lord's Supper. Here, in 1536, while Calvin does speak of the communication and exhibition of Christ's body

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Inst.} 1536, 90.

\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Inst.} 1536, 109. \textit{CO} 1:125.
and blood in the Supper, he *does not* speak of the Holy Spirit with respect to either.\textsuperscript{125} When Calvin does speak of the Holy Spirit, he speaks of the Holy Spirit with respect to *reception*: the Holy Spirit is the one who illumines minds and softens hearts for the sake of the effect of the sacrament, which again, according to the 1536 *Institutio*, is preeminently to "make us more certain of the trustworthiness of God."\textsuperscript{126} Later, Calvin, while not rescinding this dimension of the work of the Holy Spirit (nor this aspect of the sacrament), will further elucidate the role of the Holy Spirit. He will speak of the Holy Spirit not only as the one who "works efficaciously in believers" so that Christ's body and blood are truly received by them, but also as the one who in fact grants such efficacy to the sacraments that Christ's body and blood are truly exhibited, truly communicated by means of their signs.\textsuperscript{127} Clearly some "development" is to be discerned here.

\textsuperscript{125} So, *Inst.* 1536, 109: "For the Lord so communicates his body to us there [in the Supper] that he is made completely one with us and we with him." And *Inst.* 1536, 107: "In this manner, the body and blood Christ are shown (exhibetur) to us in the Sac," "in this manner" referring to Christ's exerting his "power" (*CO* 1:123). This point, especially concerning this second quotation, will be taken up further below, in the discussion of Calvin's first revision of the *Institutio*, published in 1539.

\textsuperscript{126} This is Calvin's emphasis it seems: sacraments as *testimony*. See *Inst.* 1536, 90, 91, 92, and 93 for four prominent expressions. Calvin's emphasis here seems to be that the sacraments "feed" and "nourish" "faith" with "testimony"; later, he emphasizes that the sacraments "feed" and "nourish" "souls" with the body and blood and Christ.

\textsuperscript{127} To be fair, it must be noted that already in this 1536 edition of the *Institutio*, Calvin says, "For the Lord so communicates his body to us there [in the Supper] that he is made completely one with us and we with him" (*Inst.* 1536, 109). Still, the Holy Spirit is conspicuous by an absence in this expression of that communication. Furthermore, Calvin's intimation here of the communication of Christ's body in the occasion of the sacrament is overwhelmed by his repeated emphasis on the sacrament as "testimony," as well as his emphasis on the communication of "all those benefits which Christ has supplies us with in his body" (*Inst.* 1536, 107).
2.2 September 1536 to April 1538: Geneva

Several documents on the Lord's Supper long associated with Calvin derive from his first stay in Geneva. The first document of interest is an account of Calvin's two discourses offered at the Lausanne disputation in October 1536. Calvin, whom Farel and Viret invited to attend the colloquy, spoke twice, on October 5 and October 7. The accounts of his orations themselves were not published until sometime in 1537, under the title *Deux discours de Calvin au colloque de Lausanne*. In the first of these orations (or at least in the account thereof), Calvin declares:

> it is not the natural body of our Lord Jesus nor his natural blood which is given to us in his Holy Supper. We affirm that it is a spiritual communication, by which in virtue and in power he makes us participant of all that we are able to receive of grace in his body and blood; or again, to declare better the dignity of this mystery, it is a spiritual communication by which he makes us truly participant of his body and his blood, but wholly spiritually, that is by the bond of his Spirit.

---

128 While scholarly opinion varies as to the exact order of their drafting and appearance, the following assumes an appropriate chronology.

129 In his first address to those gathered, Calvin defends the ministers of reform against the charge, levied by the Roman Catholic delegates, that those of reforming persuasion, with respect to the "presence" of Christ in the Lord's Supper, "demonstrate "contempt for the authority of the church fathers" and introduce "new doctrine" (de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 151).

130 See de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 151. See also "Two Discourses on the Articles," *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 38-46; CO 9:877-86. I am unclear of the circumstances of the publication of Calvin's discourses independent of the publication of the proceedings of the disputation itself. However, Piaget, in the introduction to his edition of the disputation proceedings, gives an extensive description of the process of the transcription of speakers' orations and of their preservation for publication soon after the event. See Arthur Piaget, ed., *Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 1536, publies integralement d'apres le manuscript de Berne* (Neuchâtel: Secretariat de l'Universite, 1928), vi-xii.

131 *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 44. "Mais que c'est une communication spirituelle par laquelle in vertu et en efficace il nous fait participans de tout ce que pouvons recepvoir de grace en son corps et son sang, ou encore, pour mieux declairer la dignite de ce mystere, par laquelle il nous faict vrayement participans de son corps et son sang, mais le tout spirituellement cest a dire par le lien de son esprit" (CO 9:884). Here in the French, one recognizes that "his Spirit" is genitive, standing in some specific relation to "the bond." As shall be noted to come, the same is true elsewhere in Latin. The question that arises is, Just what sort of genitive is this? How does it define the relationship between "Spirit" and "bond"? And what, if anything, does this betray of Calvin's understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to
In light of his first treatment of the Lord's Supper, i.e., in his initial edition of the *Institutio*, Calvin's appeal to the Spirit here is striking. Whereas in his first exposition of the Lord's Supper Calvin speaks of the Spirit almost exclusively with respect to "reception," that is, as the one who illumines minds and softens hearts in order that the sacraments might "enter in," here Calvin speaks of Christ's Spirit as a "bond," presumably between Christ himself and his own. The Spirit is a *lien*, by which (par) Christ, "in virtue and in power," communicates "all that we are able to receive of grace in his body and blood," making us "participant of his body and blood." The Spirit, then, as this *lien*, is the "agent" of such communication.

The next statement of interest is the 1536 *Confession de la foy*, likely presented to the Genevan council by Farel (and perhaps Calvin) on 10 November, scholars agree. The believers' participation of Christ's body and blood, particularly in the Supper? A conversation with Richard Wevers, 3 Nov 2006, was invaluable for considering this. It would seem this genitive is an "appositional" genitive, where "Holy Spirit" and "power" are almost something of a redundancy, and yet the force of each (especially theologically in this case) is enhanced with two being in relation. Another clear, general example, morbid though it be, is *poena mortis*, the penalty of death, or death penalty. *Spiritus virtute* could be construed as "Spirit power."

---

132 "Confession of Faith which all the citizens and inhabitants of Geneva and the subjects of the country must promise to keep and hold (1536)," *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 26-31; CO 22:85-96. Scholarly opinion varies as to the relation between this document and Calvin's *Instruction et confession de foi* of 1537. The full title of the confession would seem to suggest that it is an extract of the *Instruction*, but Olivier Labarthe makes the case that the structure of the *Confession de la foy* actually follows that of two prior works of Farel, his *Sommaire* and his *La manière et façon*, whereas the *Instruction et confession* follows the structure of Calvin's 1536 *Institutio*. This would seem to suggest that Farel is the principal author of the *Confession de la foy* and Calvin of the *Instruction et confession de foi*. See Backus and Chimelli, *La Vraie Piété: Divers traités de Jean Calvin et Confession de foi de Guillaume Farel* (Genevè: Labor et Fide, 1986), 42; and O. Labarthe, *La Relation entre le premier catéchisme de Calvin et la première confession de foi de Genève* (thèse de licence, University of Geneva, 1967). See also Jean-François Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre imprimé* (Geneva: Droz, 1997), translated by Karin Maag as *John Calvin and the Printed Book* (Kirksville, Missouri: Truman State University Press, 2005), 63: "In early 1537, [Calvin] wrote a catechism, *Instruction et confession de foi*. A few months earlier, in late 1536, Farel had written a *Confessio de foy* [also referred to as the *Confession de la foy*]."
Wulfert de Greef notes in his survey of Calvin's writings that this confession was published in Geneva "without mention of either the name of the author or the date of publication."\(^{134}\) That such a document was printed without identifying its author stands to reason given its genre: as Jacques Pannier points out, a confessional statement such as this belongs to the church and is readily understood to be the work of a company of church leaders, not one person, even if one person is its principal author.\(^{135}\) In the case of the *Confession de la foy*, some claim Calvin is its principal author,\(^{136}\) others Farel.\(^{137}\) Even if Farel is its principal author—which is most likely—still, Calvin would have been party to its composition and would certainly have subscribed to it publicly since it was incumbent on all in Geneva to do so.\(^{138}\)

The confession itself is composed of twenty-one articles, the topic of the "Holy Supper" being taken up in the sixteenth. "The Supper of our Lord," it begins, "is a sign

---

\(^{133}\) Backus and Chimelli, *La Vraie Piété*, 42, note that the Register of the Council of Geneva marks this date as that when Farel presented to the Council the church order, or articles concerning the government of the church. Some surmise that the text of this confession accompanied these articles in the presentation. See *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 25.

\(^{134}\) De Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 125. For his own part, de Greef believes it was published in 1536 or 1537, but definitely before the 1537 *Instruction et confession de foi*.


\(^{136}\) Including Calvin's first biographers, Theodore Beza and Nicholas Colladon. See Backus and Chimelli, *La Vraie Piété*, 42.

\(^{137}\) E.g., Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, on the grounds that "Throughout this period, Farel remained the leading figure in Geneva, since he had initiated the Reformation in the city, . . . it was Farel who wrote the confession of faith and organized the liturgy based on his Bernese-inspired manual published in 1533." Gilmont cites one of his own works: "L'oeuvre imprimé de Guillaume Farel," *Actes du Colloque Farel Neuchâtel, 29 septembre-1er octobre 1980. Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 2 (Geneva: Revue de theologie et de philosophie, 1983): 122-23. See also footnote 132 above regarding Labarthe's argument about the structure and content of the confession being more clearly that of Farel than of Calvin.

\(^{138}\) Also *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 25.
by which under bread and wine he represents (represente) the true spiritual communion which we have in his body and blood."¹³⁹ Noteworthy here is the fact that the Supper, taken as a whole, is a sign, as opposed to its elements, bread and wine, being signs. Also, inasmuch as it "represents" "the true spiritual communion which we have" in Christ's body and blood, the sign "represents" the general reality of believers' perpetual union with Christ. Furthermore, aside from this passing, indirect reference in the phrase "spiritual communion," no particular mention of the Holy Spirit is made in this article. Here "spiritual" could—and indeed should—be taken to mean "not carnal," or "non-corporeal." For his part, however, Calvin is inclined to speak of the bread and wine as signs, signs that "present" the communion of Christ's body and blood; and, as already demonstrated at Lausanne, he specifically and carefully explicates his understanding of "spiritual communion," qualifying "spiritual" with specific reference to the Holy Spirit in saying that the communion is accomplished par le lien de son esprit.¹⁴⁰

In early 1537 Calvin wrote and published a short catechism for the church of Geneva, the Instruction et confession de foy dont on use en l'église de Genève.¹⁴¹ First published in French, in March 1538 he published the catechism in Latin,¹⁴² which may

¹³⁹ Calvin: Theological Treatises, 26-31. "La cene de nostre Seigneur est ung signe par lequel soubz le pain et le vin il nous represente la vraye communication spirituelle que nous avons en son corps et son sang" (CO 22:91).

¹⁴⁰ This analysis is perhaps further evidence that Calvin is not to be taken as the principal author of this confession. On Calvin's qualifying his use of spiritual, see also Jean Cadier, Le Doctrine Calviniste de la Saint Cène, Études théologiques et religieuses, vol. 26 (Montpellier: Faculté De Théologie Protestante De Montpellier, 1951), 53.

¹⁴¹ CO 22:33-74. See Instruction in Faith (1537), trans. and ed. Paul T. Fuhrmann (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992). See discussion above regarding its relation to the Confession de la foy 1536, which is taken to have been written by Farel.
be the language in which he originally composed it. Among the 33 articles, Calvin speaks of the sacraments in general in articles 26 and 27, and of the Lord's Supper in particular in article 29. Given that this catechism appears to be a compendium of Calvin's 1536 *Institutio*, it is striking that in his discussion of the sacraments in general Calvin makes no mention of the Holy Spirit at all, not even as the one who "illuminates minds" or "opens our hearts for the . . . sacraments to enter in." As noted above, Calvin emphasized this role regarding "reception" throughout his discussion of the sacraments in the first edition of the *Institutio*.

In the article on the Lord's Supper, however, the Spirit figures prominently and in just the way that it figures in the *Deux discours de Calvin au colloque de Lausanne*. The promise that is added to the mystery of the Supper, says Calvin, is that the body and blood of the Lord was once offered in such a way for us "that it is now ours, and will be ours perpetually." "The signs are the bread and the wine," he continues, under which the Lord presents (*exhibet*) to us the true yet spiritual communication of his body and blood. This communication is content with the bond of his spirit, and does not require at all a presence of the flesh enclosed

---

142 *Catechismus, sive christianae religionis institution* (CO 5:323-362). According to Gilmont, Calvin wrote this catechism first in Latin, translated it into French and published this version first, not publishing the Latin version until 1538 (Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 63). For an English translation of the 1538 Latin edition, see *John Calvin: Catechism 1538*, trans. and ed. Ford Lewis Battles (Pittsburgh, 1976). In preparing this catechism, one wonders to what extent Calvin availed of himself the many catechisms (no fewer than nine) that were in use in Geneva at the time (see the introductory material to Henry O'Brien, "The Holy Spirit in the Catechetical Writings of John Calvin: A Comparative Study with Other Constructive Presentations of Christian Doctrine between 1529 and 1566" [Dissertation, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1991]).


144 See quotation of *Institutio* 1536 above. Interestingly, there is no article about Scripture either. Mention is made of the word of God only at the end of Article 3: "What We Must Know of God." Even there, however, no mention of the Holy Spirit as the one who "illuminates our minds" and "opens our hearts" is made.

under the bread, or of the blood under the wine. For, although Christ, being elevated to heaven, has left his abode on earth in which we are still pilgrims, yet no distance can dissolve his power of nourishing his own with himself.\textsuperscript{146}

Calvin emphasizes here that Christ truly "presents"\textsuperscript{147} something in the Supper. Calvin's Latin is significant here, as he employs the term \textit{exhibere}, by which he means that Christ truly offers, or proffers, as in "hands over," something in the sacrament.\textsuperscript{148}

What Christ "presents," says Calvin, is the true \textit{communicatio} of his body and blood, a communication that is wholly dependent on the "bond" of the Holy Spirit. As in the \textit{Deux discours}, Calvin here explicates his meaning of the phrase "spiritual communication." Such communication is not simply "not carnal," but is inherently "content with the bond of his [Christ's] spirit"—\textit{contente du lien de son esprit},\textsuperscript{149} or \textit{vinculo spiritus eius contenta}—who thus affords participation in Christ's body and blood.

\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Instruction in Faith}, trans. Fuhrmann, 68. "Les signes sont le pain et le vin, soubz lesquelz le Seigneur nous presente la vraye communication de son corps et de song sang, mais spirituelle: laquelle contente du lien de son esprit ne requiert point une presence enclose ou de la chair soubz le pain ou du sang soubz le vin. Car combine que Christ esleve au ciel a laisse l'habitation de la terre en laquelle nous sommes encore pellerins, toutesfois nulle distance ne pault dissouldre sa vertu qu'il ne repaisse de soy mesmes les siens" (CO 22:69). "Symbola sunt, panis et vinum, sub quibus veram corporis ac sanguinis sui communicationem Dominus exhibet: sed spiritualem, quae scilicet vinculo spiritus eius contenta, praesentiam aut carnis sub pane, aut sanguinis sub calice conclusam et circumscriptam minime requirat. Tametsi enim ipse in coelum sublatus residere in terra desit, in qua nos adhuc peregrinamur, nullum tamen intervallum eius virtutem solvere potest, quiin fideles semetipso pascat, ac efficat ut loco absentem, tamen praesentissima sui communicacionem fruantur" (CO 5:350).

\textsuperscript{147} Recall also that the \textit{Confession de la foy} employs the term "represents."

\textsuperscript{148} Calvin employed this term already in the 1536 \textit{Institutio}, though in a passage not cited above. For further discussion of \textit{exhibere/exhibitio}, see footnote 58 above.

\textsuperscript{149} This is exactly as it is in the discourses at Lausanne.
In September 1537, Calvin, Farel, and Pierre Viret, as delegates from Geneva, participated in a Swiss-Strasbourg synod held at Bern. Convened for the purpose of examining Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito's rapprochement with Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg in May 1536 (i.e., with the mutual signing of the Wittenberg Concord), the colloquy concluded, at least in part, with Calvin, Farel, and Viret's submission of, and Bucer and Capito's subscription to, a Confessio fidei de eucharistia. As with the 1536 Confession de la foy, one must be cautious to claim Calvin, Farel, or Viret as the sole author of this consensus statement. Furthermore, since it is a consensus statement, one must also be cautious about claiming it as a comprehensive summary of any one subscriber's entire doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Still, it yields fruit for this survey.

Interestingly, the principal emphasis of Calvin, Farel, and Viret's statement is believers' "spiritual life" (vitam spiritualem) in general, their perpetual union with Christ, which, they say, rests not "on the fact that he vivifies us with his Spirit, but that his Spirit makes us participants in the virtue of his vivifying body, by which

150 The Genevan ministers were invited by the Council of Bern at the request of Bucer and Capito. They were requested to present a statement regarding the Lord's Supper, and were looked upon as a neutral, third party to the ongoing discussion between Bucer, or Strasbourg, and the Swiss cities, given the rapprochement of Strasbourg with Luther in the signing of the Wittenberg Concord, May 1536. See Henri Vuilleumier, L'Age de la Réforme, vol. 1 of Histoire de L'Église Réformée du Pays de Vaud sous le Régime Berinois (Lausanne: Éditions la Concorde, 1927), 635; and Registres du Conseil de Genève à L'Époque de Calvin, text est. Paul Hochuli Dubuis and Sandra Coram-Mekkey (Genève: Librairie Droz: 2004), 2:583. See also Cornelis Augustijn, "Farel und Calvin in Bern 1537-1538," in Calvin im Kontext der Schweizer Reformation, ed., P. Opitz (Zürich, 2003), 9-23.

151 See Davis, Clearest Promises, 104. Interestingly, Bucer and Capito's addendum of their concurrence with Calvin, Farel, and Viret's statement (this addendum Bucer declares is composed in his own hand) does not emphasize believers' perpetual union with Christ, but clearly emphasizes what they take to be true of what transpires "in the Holy Supper," "in the Supper," "in his blessed Supper." In their estimation, and in their interpretation of the confession they are signing, implying that the signs Christ sets before us in Supper are "naked and bare," is an error not to be tolerated in the church. Already here one can see an anticipation of Bullinger and Calvin's debate of the 1540s, by which time Calvin has moved beyond this "Bullinger-esque" confession (i.e., the Confessio fidei de eucharistia). For Bucer's addendum, see Calvin: Theological Treatises, 168.
participation we are fed on eternal life." According to the three ministers from Geneva, this communion of Christ's very body and blood "Christ [himself] offers in his blessed Supper under the symbols of bread and wine, presenting them to all who rightly celebrate it according to his own proper institution." Scripture "manifestly declares" that the body of Christ is truly food for us, and his blood truly drink, which is a "great mystery," the "sublimity" of which "no one is adequately able to explain in words." Though Christ is in heaven and though we as pilgrims in mortality are neither included nor contained in the same space with him, yet the efficacy of his Spirit is limited by no bounds, but is able really to unite and bring together into one things that are disjoined in local space. Hence we acknowledge that his Spirit is the bond of our participation in him, [but such that] he really feeds us with the substance of the body and blood of the Lord to everlasting life, and vivifies us by participation in them.

152 Calvin: Theological Treatises, 168.
154 Calvin: Theological Treatises, 168. Eventually Calvin echoes this wonder in Institutio 1539 (see Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.7).
155 Calvin: Theological Treatises, 168, with modification. "Nam utcunque nos in hac mortalitate peregrinantes in eodem loco cum mipso non includimur, aut continemur, nullis tamen finibus limitata est eius spiritus efficacia, quin vere copulare et in unum colligere posit, quae locorum spatiiis sunt disiuncta. Ergo spiritum eius vinculum esse nostrae cum ipso participationis agnoscimus, sed ita ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini substantia vere ad immortalitatem pascat, et eorum participacione vivificet" (CO 9:711). It is notable that here and again "Spirit" and "bond" stand in direct relationship, but this time unmediated by a genitive construction. Indeed, they are seemingly identified: "his Spirit is the bond." Interestingly, in their addendum of subscription, Bucer (and Capito, though Bucer wrote the addendum) never mentions the Holy Spirit, though they are clearly concerned with emphasizing that "Christ is present in the Supper through his word and symbols" (Calvin: Theological Treatises, 169.) "In hac autem nihilominus est per verbum suum atque symbola" (CO 9:712). Thus the bread and cup may be for us "really the communion of his body and blood" (Calvin: Theological Treatises, 169). The liturgical language in Bucer's expression is rich: regarding the consecration (word), the sursum corda (being raised "by faith"), and the communion (the bread and cup may be for us "really the communion of his body and blood). Again, it is striking that the Spirit is not mentioned.
Interestingly, the Spirit is given a fresh priority in this statement, and in two ways: 1) it is the "efficacy of the Spirit" which is spoken of as "unbounded," not the \textit{virtus} of Christ, as in the 1536 \textit{Institutio}\textsuperscript{156}; and 2), following on this, it is \textit{the Holy Spirit} who acts "[to make] us participants in the virtue of his vivifying body" and (as the bond of our participation in/with Christ) "[to feed] us with the substance of the body and blood of the Lord." To this point in his discussions of the Lord's Supper, Calvin gives priority to Christ, retaining Christ as the subject of the actions of feeding, nourishing, or making us participants in his benefits. When the Spirit is mentioned, the Spirit is, shall we say, a "passive" agent, operating at Christ's behest, as when Calvin employs a locution such as "Christ by his Spirit."\textsuperscript{157} Here, the Spirit is an "active" agent. Ultimately, in both constructions, Calvin is identifying the Spirit as the "agent" for the communication of what Christ offers, but it seems the person of the Spirit is given unique priority when the Spirit is made the subject of the action.

The next of Calvin's substantial expositions on the Lord's Supper is his \textit{Petit traicté de la saincte cène de nostre Seignur Jésus Christ}. Typically this work is taken to have been prepared by Calvin during his brief tenure in Strasbourg, 1538-1541. However, evidence from his letters suggests that Calvin drafted this exposition earlier, perhaps as early as 1536. In their study of the evidence, Rodolphe Peter and Jean-

\textsuperscript{156} See below for further discussion of the 1539 \textit{Institutio}.

\textsuperscript{157} This arouses further wonder as to whether Calvin should be considered the author of this confession, or Viret or Farel.
François Gilmont conclude, "If it is difficult to place the writing of the Petit traicté back to 1536, it is a least necessary to place it before the revision of the 1539 Institutio."\textsuperscript{158}

At some time, Calvin was commissioned by "aucun bon personnages" to write an explanatory treatise on the Lord's Supper for lay folk put off by the recent "diverses opinions et disputes contentieuses."\textsuperscript{159} Prepared while he was in Geneva and perhaps in Strasbourg, but not published until his return to Geneva in 1541, Calvin's Petit traicté is not first a polemical work but a pastoral one. Still, being pastoral, Calvin's treatise is in fact polemical inasmuch as he aims by it to chart "an irenic middle course between Luther and Zwingli,"\textsuperscript{160} to stake out "the common ground which could well serve as the foundation for the theologians in dispute to come together."\textsuperscript{161} At the outset of his treatise, Calvin identifies five topics for discussion: 1) the reason for the sacrament's institution, 2) its fruit, 3) its legitimate use, 4) its "contamination" by errors and superstitions, and finally 5) its recent reform.\textsuperscript{162} In the treatise, he refers to the role of


\textsuperscript{159} CO 5:433. On this intent, see de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 134, and Calvin: Theological Treatises, 140. According to de Greef, Nicolas Des Gallers "provided" a Latin translation of the work in 1545: Libellus de coena Domini (de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 134).

\textsuperscript{160} Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 6.

\textsuperscript{161} Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 6, and Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention", 37, respectively. Janse points out that in this treatise Calvin reveals Bucer's "Lutheranizing" influence upon him, i.e., that this treatise is a strongly "Lutheranized" exposition of the Lord's Supper. Janse notes that even a magistrate of Bremen, in attempting to declare his orthodoxy as a Lutheran, was able to cite this treatise as his confession concerning the Lord's Supper and to have that confession received with approval. See Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 39.
the Holy Spirit on three specific occasions, once each within the second, third, and fifth topics.

On the first occasion Calvin is keen to set straight those who, as he puts it elsewhere, "would make us participants of the Spirit only." His target is Zwingli and any who follow him in this understanding. According to Calvin, if believers are to receive the benefits of Christ's reconciling work, if they are to partake of "all the graces which he purchased for us by his death," then

the thing requisite must be not only to be partakers of his Spirit, but also to participate in his humanity, in which he rendered all obedience to God his Father, in order to satisfy our debts, although, properly speaking, the one cannot be without the other; for when he gives himself to us, it is in order that we may possess him entirely.

In the conclusion of his treatise (that is, on the third occasion that he speaks of the Holy Spirit), Calvin reiterates that we indeed partake of Christ's humanity in the Supper and deliberates as to how:

We all then confess with one mouth, that on receiving the sacrament in faith, according to the ordinance of the Lord, we are truly made partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. How that is done some may deduce better than others, and explain more clearly than others. Be this as it may, on the one hand, in order to exclude all carnal fancies, we must raise our hearts upwards to heaven, not thinking that our Lord Jesus is so debased as to be

---

162 Notice the indiscretion of Beveridge's translation and edition of this text (in *Tracts and Treatises* 2:163-98) in that Beveridge takes the liberty of dividing the work into sixty articles, giving each of the articles a heading. In many cases, Beveridge presumes a significant break in the text, but with his articles and headings in fact disrupts the coherence of Calvin's discussion and argument. J. K. S Reid's translation (in *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 4:16-66) is more discrete in that Reid divides the treatise into five articles, just as Calvin's introduction and succeeding discussion allow, though Reid, too, inserts headings whereas Calvin's treatise is in fact one, unbroken prose discussion.

163 *Institutio* 1539. CO 1:1000. See below.


165 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:170. CO 5:438.
enclosed under some corruptible elements; and, on the other hand, not to impair the efficacy of this holy ordinance, we must hold that it is made effectual by the secret and miraculous power of God, and that the Spirit of God is the bond of participation, this being the reason why it is called spiritual.\textsuperscript{166}

Calvin's tight explanation here is noteworthy for several reasons, including these four: 1) First, he is clear here that the sacrament grants, or conveys, more than a testimony of God's faithfulness alone. \textit{On receiving the sacrament}, he says, \textit{we are truly made partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ}. Calvin leaves implicit here what he had made explicit elsewhere in this treatise, namely, that the sacrament is an instrument by which God deigns to effect the very communication of Christ, not only the promise of the communication of Christ.\textsuperscript{167} \textit{What} is granted in the Supper has shifted from testimony alone, to true communication and partaking of the "proper substance of the body and blood of Christ." 2) Second, the \textit{sursum corda} is appealed to here, as on so many other occasions in Calvin's works, as a correction to an error, namely, the adoration of the elements, which is taken to assume the proper, local, circumscriptive presence of Christ within the bread and wine.\textsuperscript{168} The lifting of one's heart is distinct from the communing of one's soul. It affords not the communion itself as much as a theologically and devotionally proper apprehension of, or disposition

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:197-198, emphasis added. "Nous confessons doncq tous d'une bouche, que en recevant en Foy le Sacrement, selon l'ordonnance du Seigneur, nous sommes vrayment faictz participants de la proper substance du corps et du sang de Iesus Christ. Comment cela se faict, les uns le peuvent mieux desduire et plus clairement exposer que les autres. Tant y a que d'une part il nous fault, pour, exclurre toutes phantasies charnelles, eslever les cuerz en hault au ciel, ne pensant pas que le Seigneur Iesus soit abaissé iusque là, de estre enclos soubz quelques elemens corruptibles. D'autre part, pour ne point amoindrir l'efficace de ce sainct mystere, il nous fault penser que cela se faict par la vertu secrete et miraculeuse de Dieu, et que l'Esprit de Dieu est le lien de ceste participation, pour laquelle cause elle est appeleé spirituelle" (\textit{CO} 5:460, emphasis added).

\textsuperscript{167} See e.g., Zachman, \textit{Image and Word}, 333-34.

\textsuperscript{168} Steinmetz, \textit{Calvin and His Lutheran Critics}, 175 and 177.
toward, the liturgical act of communion. 3) Third, Calvin ascribes the efficacy of the sacrament to the "secret and miraculous power" of God, for the first time "intensifying" the power with a pair of adjectives. In later treatises, Calvin frequently refers to the "secret and incomprehensible," rather than "secret and miraculous," virtus of the Spirit. 4) Finally, echoing his Lausanne discourse, the 1537 Instruction, and the 1537 Confessio fide de eucharistia, Calvin asserts the Holy Spirit is "the bond" of participation, that is, the Spirit as the bond affords the partaking of "the proper substance of the body and blood of Christ."

The second occasion on which Calvin appeals to the Holy Spirit is yet worthy of consideration, not least because in it Calvin makes explicit what is rendered implicit in the quotation above, namely, that the sacrament is an instrument. The Lord does not "admonish" merely by the sign, says Calvin,

for the principal point is, that he operates in us inwardly by his Holy Spirit, in order to give efficacy to his ordinance, which he has destined for that purpose, as an instrument by which he wishes to do his work in us. Wherefore, inasmuch as the virtue of the Holy Spirit is conjoined with the sacraments when we duly receive them, we have reason to hope they will prove a good mean and aid to make us grow and advance in holiness of life, and specially in charity.169

Calvin's locution with respect to the Holy Spirit here is striking, given that he speaks of the "vertu de sainct Esprit" being "conioincte avec les Sacremens." More familiar in Calvin's discussions of the Lord's Supper is the emphasis that the "reality" is "conjoined" with the sacrament or with the sign, a point that Calvin emphasizes just

169 Tracts and Treatises 2:174. "Combien que pour entendre droictement ceste utilité il ne fault pas estimer que nostre Seigneur seulement nous advertisse, incite et enflambe noz cueurs par le signe exterieur. Car le principal est qu'il besongne en nous interieurement par son sainct Esprit, à fin de donner efficace à son ordonnance, qu'il a destinée à cela comme instrument, par lequel il veult faire son oeuvre en nous. Parquoy, entant que la vertu du sainct Esprit est conioincte avec les Sacremens, quand on les reçoit deuement, nous avons à esperer un bon moyen et ayde pour nous faire croistre et proffiter en saincteté de vie, et singulieremment en charité" (CO 5:441).
paragraphs before in this very treatise. Having demonstrated that "la matiere et
substance des Sacramens c'est le Seigneur Iesus," the visible signs of bread and wine
being "as it were instrumens by which the Lord distributes [his body and blood] to us,"
Calvin goes on to affirm that the visible signs "n'est pas une figure nue, mais conioincte
avec sa verité et substance." "It is with good reason then," says Calvin, "that the
bread is called the body, since it not only represents, but also presents it to us." Just
lines later, Calvin asserts again, this time on the ground that God cannot deceive or lie,
that "la substance interieure du Sacrement est conioincte avec les signes visibles."

170 CO 5:437; Tracts and Treatises 2:169, though Beveridge leaves out "matter."

171 CO 5:439; Tracts and Treatises 2:171.

172 Tracts and Treatises 2:171. "C'est doncq à bon droict que le pain est nommé corps, puis que
non seulement il le nous represente, mais aussi nous le presente" (CO 5:439). Interestingly, Calvin
distinguishes "represents" and "presents," perhaps because he is writing here in French and wishes to be
sure that the French present bears the freight of the Latin exhibere. Just prior to this Calvin writes: "to
deny that a true communication of Jesus Christ is presented [presentee] to us in the Supper, is to render
this holy sac frivolous and useless—an execrable blasphemy unfit to be listened to" (Tracts and Treatises
2:170). "Cela resolu, nous confesserons sans doubte que de nyer la vraye communication de Iesus Christ
nous estre presente en la Cene, c'est rendre ce saint Sacrement frivole et inutile, qui est un blaspheme
execrable et indigne d'estre escouté" (CO 5:438).

173 "Si Dieu ne peut tromper ne mentir, il s'ensuit qu'il accomplit tout ce qu'il signifie. Il faut
doncq que nous recevions vrayement en la Cene le corps et le sang de Jesus Christ, puis que le Seigneur
nous y represente la communion de l'un et de l'autre. Car autrement, que seroit-ce à dire, que nous
mangeons le pain et beuvions) le vin en signe que sa chair nous est viande et son sang breuvage, s'il ne
nous donnoit que pain et vin, laissant la verité spirituelle derriere? Ne seroit-ce pas à faules enseignes
qu'il auroit institué ce mystere? Nous avons doncq a confesser que si la representation que Dieu nous fait
en la Cene est veritable, la substance interieure du Sacrement est conioincte avec les signes visibles; et
come le pain nous est distribué en la main, aussi le corps de Christ nous est communiqué, à fin que nous
en soyons faictz participans. Quand il n'y auroit autre chose, si avons nous bien matiere de nous
contenter, quand nous entendons que Jesus Christ nous donne en la Cene la propre substance de son corps
et son sang, à fin que nous le possedions pleinement, et, le possedant, ayons compaignie à tous ses biens"
(CO 5:440). "If God cannot deceive or lie, follows that it accomplishes all that it signifies. We must then
truly receive in the Supper the body and blood of Jesus Christ, since the Lord there represents to us the
communion of both….If he [the Lord – meaning Christ or God?] gave us only bread and wine, leaving
the spiritual reality [the body and blood] behind, would it not be under false colours that this ordinance
had been instituted? We must confess, then, that if the representation which God gives us in the Supper is
true, the internal substance [the body/blood] of the sacrament is conjoined with the visible signs; and as
the bread is distributed to us by the hand, so the body of Christ is communicated to us in order that we
may be made partakers of it….Jesus Christ gives us in the Supper the proper substance of his body and
With such claims Calvin is formulating implicitly what he categorizes explicitly in treatises to come, namely, that it is simply the "nature" of a sacrament, a true symbol, that the "sign" and the "thing signified" are conjoined.  

So to suggest, in just this way, that the "vertu de sainct Esprit est conioincte avec les Sacremens" is unique, even for Calvin, as he nowhere else employs this locution with respect to the sacraments. He does, however, employ it with respect to the proclamation of the Word, and this in a discussion composed just a few years, if not months, after the publication of the *Petit traicté*. In 1543, Calvin published a third edition of his *Institutio*. In that edition, he added a short passage in which he employs an agricultural metaphor to illustrate the work of the Holy Spirit with respect to the presentation of the Word of God: if the Word of God "falls upon any stiff-necked person, [it] will become as barren as if it were cast upon sand; if it lights upon a soul cultivated by the heavenly Spirit, it will be most fruitful."  

With just one interrogatory sentence intervening, Calvin immediately adds

Paul excellently explains both [the birth and growth of faith upon the hearing of the Word] in various passages. For when he wishes to remind the Corinthians how effectively God uses His work (1 Cor 2.4), he glories that he has the ministry of the Spirit, as if *the power of the Holy Spirit were joined by an indissoluble bond to his preaching for the inward illumination and moving of the mind*. . . . Thus the apostles express the power of the Spirit in their blood, in order that we may possess it fully, and possessing it have part in all his blessings" (*Tracts and Treatises* 2:172).  

---

174 As noted in Chapter 1, Calvin says as much in the 1562 *Confessio*, the 1561 *Dilucida explicatio*, and the 1560 *Optima inuendae*.

175 *Institutio* 1543, per *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.14.11. Calvin retained this sentence unedited in succeeding editions of the *Institutio*. "...ita verbum Domini, si in duram aliquam cervicem in ciderit, velus in arenam proiectum sterilescet; si animam nactum fuerit coelestis spiritus manu subactam, fructuosissimum erit* (*CO* 1:945).
preaching, as far as God uses the instruments ordained by himself for the unfolding of his spiritual grace. . . . \textsuperscript{176}

For Calvin, Word and Sacrament bear the same "office," namely, to "offer and set forth Christ to us."\textsuperscript{177} But such communication is not received unless the Holy Spirit prepares the heart, soul, and mind to appropriate Christ (as Calvin emphasized in his 1536 \textit{Institutio}), and literally "accompanies" the Word and the Sacrament in order that they might make their way in to the heart, soul, and mind (as he is wont to add now). With such locutions, is Calvin perhaps anticipating his late claim that "through the agency of the Spirit there is a present exhibition of the thing"?\textsuperscript{178}

Calvin's next significant statement of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper comes by way of revision. While still in Geneva, probably during the latter half of 1537 and the first quarter of 1538,\textsuperscript{179} Calvin undertook a major revision of his 1536 \textit{Institutio},...
transforming his work from a lay-person's catechetical handbook of Christian doctrine and life to "the repository of the *loci communes* and *disputationes* that might otherwise [appear] in the commentaries."\(^{180}\) Like the work as a whole, Calvin's chapters on the sacraments expand exponentially.\(^{181}\)

In his discussion of the sacraments in general (which is now a distinct chapter, entitled *De sacramentis*), Calvin retains—unedited—each of his initial expressions of the Holy Spirit as the one who illumines believers' minds and softens their hearts in order that the sacraments might have their effect, namely, to "make us more certain of the trustworthiness of God's Word."\(^{182}\) Indeed, he not only retains these expressions, he actually increases their number with several references in one particular passage. In this passage, Calvin reemphasizes and elaborates on the necessity of the Holy Spirit's work within one's heart in order that the sacraments might "properly fulfill their office" for "the confirmation and increase of faith."\(^{183}\) With respect to the work of the Holy Spirit, Calvin's concern here regards the *reception* of what the sacrament grants. It is only by the presence and power of the Spirit within that "hearts are penetrated and affections

\(^{180}\) Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 119. See Muller 119-120 for a fuller description of this shift in genre.

\(^{181}\) See Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 40ff; Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 119ff.

\(^{182}\) *Inst.* 1536, 88; *CO* 1:103. For emphasis on the sacraments as "confirmations of our faith," see also *Inst.* 1536, 89; *CO* 1:104.

moved and our souls opened for the sacraments to enter in."\textsuperscript{184} In the succeeding paragraph Calvin reaffirms this point, saying,

The Spirit does this same sort of work in us. For, that the Word may not beat your ears in vain, and that the sacraments may not strike your eyes in vain, the Spirit shows us that in them it is God speaking to us, softening the stubbornness of our heart, and composing it to that obedience which it owes the word of the Lord. Finally, the Spirit transmits those outward words and sacraments from our ears to our soul.\textsuperscript{185}

Calvin furthers his point in the succeeding paragraph. Working an agricultural metaphor, he declares that "the Word of God, if it falls upon any stiff-necked person, will become as barren as if it were cast upon sand; if it lights upon a soul cultivated by the heavenly Spirit, it will be most fruitful."\textsuperscript{186} Again, in each of these fresh appeals to the role of the Spirit, Calvin's concern is the Spirit's work within for the sake of the "reception" of what the sacrament has to offer, a confirmation of faith.

In Calvin's chapter on the Lord's Supper, the Holy Spirit figures much more prominently even if not much more frequently. Three passages with fresh references to the Holy Spirit are of particular note:

1) By this season of Calvin's career, Calvin is already well-apprised of the impassioned controversy between the Swiss churches, largely influenced by Zwingli, and the followers of Luther, both moderate and radical. He proves this not least with his summary of the debate, and his characterization of Luther's view on the one hand and


\textsuperscript{185} *Institutio* 1539, which here is identical to *Inst*. 1559 LCC 4.14.10. See respectively *CO* 1: 944-45, 1559 in *CO* 2:948.

\textsuperscript{186} *Institutio* 1539, as in *Inst*. 1559 LCC 4.14.11. "... ita verbum Domini, si in duram aliquam cervicem in ciderit, velus in arenam proiectum sterilescet; si animam nactum fuerit coelestis spiritus manu subactam, fructuosissimum erit" (1539: *CO* 1:945). Calvin retained this sentence unedited in succeeding editions of the *Institutio*.
Zwingli and Oecolampadius' on the other, at the conclusion of the *Petit traicté*. Already there, Calvin strives at times to dissociate his teaching from Zwingli's. He does so again here, saying,

I am not satisfied with those persons [i.e., e.g., Zwingli] who, recognizing that we have some communion with Christ, when they would show what it is, make us partakers of the Spirit only, omitting mention of flesh and blood. As though all these things were said in vain: that his flesh is truly food, that his blood is truly drink...  

Calvin's reference to Zwingli is indirect. His theological concern, however, is direct and was shared, too, with the drafters and signatories of the 1537 *Confessio fidei de eucharistia*, already discussed above. With this statement in the 1539 *Institutio*, Calvin essentially rephrases the opening sentences of the 1537 *Confessio* in order to make the same point. The 1537 *Confessio* reads:

We confess that the spiritual life which Christ bestows upon us does not rest on the fact that he vivifies us with his Spirit, but that his Spirit makes us participants in the virtue of his vivifying body, by which participation we are fed on eternal life. Hence when we speak of the communion which we have with Christ, we understand the faithful to communicate not less in his body and blood than in his Spirit, so that thus they possess the whole Christ.  

2) Some paragraphs later, Calvin contrasts his own conception of believers' partaking of Christ's body in the Supper with those conceptions that would either "draw [Christ's body] back under these corruptible elements or... imagine it to be present everywhere":

there is no need of this for us to enjoy a participation in it, since the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in

---


body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of Christ, with whom [Christ] we are joined in unity, and is like a channel [the Spirit] through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us. For if we see that the sun, shedding its beams upon the earth, casts its substance in some measure upon it in order to beget, nourish, and give growth to its offspring — why should the radiance of Christ's Spirit be less in order to impart to us the communion of his flesh and blood? On this account, Scripture, in speaking of our participation with Christ, relates its whole power to the Spirit. But one passage will suffice for many. For Paul, in the eighth chapter of Romans, states that Christ dwells in us only through his Spirit. Yet he does not take away that communion of his flesh and blood which we are now discussing, but teaches that the Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ completely and have him dwelling in us.  

This passage is new to the 1539 edition of the Institutio. Read closely, it yields two valuable observations for the point of this chapter: a) Calvin again acknowledges "the Spirit is the bond" of believers' union with Christ. b) In this passage, Calvin ascribes to the Spirit a role that does not principally concern believers' reception of what Christ offers, but rather Christ's communication of what he offers. Here, "the Lord bestows . . . through his Spirit" and the Spirit "imparts to us the communion of his flesh and blood." Calvin increasingly renders the Spirit as the agent of the

---

190 "It" is genitive, so this phrase could perhaps be better rendered as Beveridge gives it: "partaking of it," the antecedent of "it" being "the body of Christ." See Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 2:565.

191 Institutio 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17 12, emphasis added. "Neque id sane opus est, quo ipsius participacione fruamur; quando hoc beneficii per spiritum suum nobis Dominus largitur, ut unum corpore, spiritu et anima secum fiamus. Vinculum ergo istius coniunctionis est spiritus Domini, cuius nexu copulamur; et quidam veluti canalis, per quem quidquid Christus et est et habet ad nos derivatur. Nam si solem conspicimus radiis in terram emicantem, ad generandos, fovendos, vegetandos eius foetus, suam quodammodo substantiam ad eam traiicere: cur inferior spiritus Christi esset irradiatio, ad communionem carnis et sanguinis eius in nos traducendam? Quapropter scriptura, ubi de nostra cum Christo participatione loquitur, vim eius universam ad spiritum refert. Pro multis tamen unus locus sufficit. Paulus enim ad Rom. cap. octavo, Christum non aliter in nobis, quam per spiritum suum habitate disserit: quo tamen illam, de qua nunc sermo est, carnis et sanguinis communionem non tollit, sed ab uno spiritu effici docet, ut totum Christum possideamus, et habeamus in nobis manentem" (1539: CO 1.1003-04, emphasis added).

192 As in his own compendium of the 1536 Institutio, i.e., the 1537 Instruction et confession de foi, Calvin here sets "Spirit" and "bond" in a direct relationship, unmediated by a genitive construction. Spirit and bond are strongly identified: Vinculum ergo istius coniunctionis est spiritus Christi—the bond . . . is . . . the Spirit . . .
communication of what Christ offers, not only the agent of its reception, working within.

3) The third passage for consideration is one that already appears in the 1536 edition of the *Institutio* but is significantly edited in the 1539 edition. In editing this passage, Calvin incorporates a single—though singular—reference to the Spirit. Speaking of Christ's "presence" in the sacrament given Christ's ascension to the Father, with whom he reigns, Calvin writes in his 1536 edition:

> This Kingdom is neither bounded by any location in space nor circumscribed by any limits. Thus uncircumscribed, Christ can exert his power wherever he pleases, in heaven and on earth; he can show his presence in power and strength; he is always able to be among his own people to live in them, sustain them, strengthen, quicken, keep them, as if he were present in body.

> In this manner, the body and blood of Christ are shown *exhibetur* to us in the Sacrament . . .

In 1539, Calvin edits this passage such that it reads as follows, his addition being indicated with italics:

> This Kingdom is neither bounded by location in space nor circumscribed by any limits. Thus uncircumscribed, Christ can exert his power wherever he pleases, in heaven and on earth. He shows his presence in power and strength, is always among his own people, and lives in them, sustaining them, strengthening, quickening, keeping them, as if he were present in the body. *In short, he feeds his people with his own body, the communion of which he bestows upon them by the power of his Spirit.* In this manner, the body and blood of Christ are shown to us *exhibetur* in the Sacrament . . .

---


194 1539 *Institutio*, as in *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17.18, emphasis added and modified, given that Battles translates the second sentence in the negative ("Thus Christ is not prevented from exerting his power . . . .") in his translation of the 1559 edition, though there is no negative in the Latin; and given that this passage is only slightly further edited in succeeding editions of the *Institutio*. "Hoc regnum nec ullis locorum spatiiis limitatum, nec ullis dimensionibus circumscriptum, quin Christus virtutem suam, ubicunque placuerit, in coelo et in terra exerat; quin se praesentem potentia et virtute exhibeat; quin suis
In this passage Calvin concerns himself and his readers with how it is that Christ is both incarnate in a "true body" (as he puts it earlier in this very discussion)\textsuperscript{195} and yet also 'present'—or in his terms "exhibited," given his use of the Latin \textit{exhibere} here\textsuperscript{196}—in the Sacrament. In the 1536 edition, Calvin responds to this conundrum with an appeal to the \textit{virtus} of Christ. The "in this manner" of the ultimate sentence quoted above refers to the exertion of Christ's \textit{virtus} by Christ himself: by this \textit{virtus} "the body and blood of Christ are shown (\textit{exhibitur}) to us in the Sacrament." In the 1539 edition, however, Calvin's response to the conundrum appeals not only to the \textit{virtus} of Christ but finally to the \textit{virtus} of the Holy Spirit. With the insertion of a single phrase, Calvin conveys an apparent revision, or amendment, of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In the Supper, Christ, not simply by his own \textit{virtus} but emphatically by \textit{the virtue of the Spirit} bestows—or \textit{transfuses}, as the Latin suggests—the communion of his very body and blood to his people in order that they might be fed, nourished, and sustained. Again, as noted above, Calvin increasingly renders the Spirit as the agent of the communication of what Christ offers, not only the agent of its reception, working within. He seemingly

\begin{quote}
semper adsit, in iis vivat, eos sustineat, confirmet, vegetet, conservet, non secus ac si corpore adesset; quin denique suo ipsius corpore eos pascat, cuius communionem spiritus sui virtute in eos transfundit. Secundum hanc rationem corpus et sanguis Christi in sacramento nobis exhibetur. . . " (CO 1009, emphasis added). Also note that in 1539 a new paragraph does not begin with "In this manner . . . " This becomes the last sentence of the current paragraph. In the 1539 edition a new paragraph begins after "in the Sacrament."
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{195} \textit{Inst.} 1536, 106.

\textsuperscript{196} On the significance of \textit{exhibere}, meaning "to proffer," see footnote 58 above.
perceives a "coordinated" agency between Christ and the Holy Spirit, the *virtus* of Christ and the *virtus* of the Spirit.\(^{197}\)

The very construction of Calvin's thought and locution is not to be overlooked here. As noted in the previous chapter, in his last summary of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, composed to answer one among several of his gnesio-Lutheran detractors, Tilemann Heschusius, Calvin repeatedly refers to the *virtus of the Holy Spirit* as that "through" or "by" which Christ "transfuses his own proper life into us from the substance of his flesh."\(^{198}\) This concept, and this particular expression of it, is a significant point of emphasis for Calvin already in 1537 or 1538, the years in which he revised his *Institutio* for eventual publication in 1539. It bespeaks the "coordinated agency" of Christ and the Spirit with respect to what is truly offered and truly communicated in the sacrament.

As has been shown in this chapter to this point, Calvin first ascribes to the Spirit a role as the "agent" of the *reception* of what is offered in the sacrament (as in the 1536 *Institutio\(^{199}\))*, but very early on Calvin's rhetoric takes on a new inflection, even as he ascribes to the Spirit an additional role, namely, as the "agent" of the *communication* of what is granted in the Supper (as in the *Deux discourses* of 1536/37, the *Confessio et instruction* of 1537, and now the *Institutio* of 1539\(^{200}\)). On the occasion of the celebration of the sacrament, the Spirit not only works within the one who partakes in

---

197 I am indebted to Nathan Mitchell for this helpful expression of "coordinated agency," which he offered upon a close reading and consideration of an early draft of this chapter.

198 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:506, from the *Dilucida explicatio* (CO 9:470).

199 See discussion above.

200 See discussion above.
order that they might truly receive what is truly offered, but the Spirit is also the one "through whom" or "by whom" Christ himself truly communicates what is to be received, given that the Spirit is the *vinculum*, the bond, of believers' union with Christ.

### 2.3 1538-1541: Strasbourg

Exiled from Geneva in April 1538, Calvin was soon compelled by Bucer to minister to the growing population of French refugees in Strasbourg. Upon the departure of Farel and Calvin, the Genevan church sank into further chaos. In de Greef's words, "the Roman Catholics tried to profit from the troubled situation" in Geneva, and Cardinal Sadoleto, bishop of Carpentras, was appointed to submit an open letter to the Genevan council and citizens challenging them to return to "obedience to the bishop of Rome." Sadoleto's letter is dated 18 March 1539. The Genevan council considered it, and then forwarded it to Bern for a response; the Bern ministers considered it and in turn forwarded it to Calvin for his response. In a mere six days' time, Calvin composed his response, his principal aim being to demonstrate that he and his followers were bent on renewing the church, not destroying it. In his response, published in Strasbourg in September 1539 under the title *Jacobi Sadoleti Romani Cardinalis Epistola ad senatum populumque Genevensem*, Calvin touches on the topic of the Lord's Supper briefly. He emphasizes the "presence of Christ" in the Supper, but without specific mention of

201 De Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 152. Sadoleto had sent such letters to Philipp Melanchthon in Wittenberg in 1537, and to Jean Sturm in Strasbourg in 1538.

202 De Greef cites a number of works regarding Sadoleto, including Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 126, 246, 254-59, 279-81, 294-97.

203 *CO* 5:384-416. For bibliographic information regarding modern editions and translations, see de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 153n10. The Genevan council saw to its publication in Latin and French in 1540, in order that it might be available to a diverse audience.
the Holy Spirit. As in his 1536 *Institutio*, Calvin founds this presence on Christ's

*spiritual virtus*:

> In the case of the Eucharist, you blame us for attempting to confine the Lord of the universe, and his divine and spiritual power . . . . But had you any regard for sincerity, assuredly you are not ignorant how great a difference there is between the two things—between removing the local presence of Christ's body from bread, and circumscribing his spiritual power within bodily limits. 204

To Calvin, Christ's spiritual power is anything but circumscribed within Christ's bodily limits, and it is on this basis that he grounds the presence of Christ in the Supper:

> We loudly proclaim the communion of flesh and blood, which is exhibited to believers in the Supper; and we distinctly show that that flesh is truly meat, and that blood is truly drink—that the soul, not contented with an imaginary conception, enjoys them in very truth. That presence of Christ, by which we are ingrafted in him, we by no means exclude from the Supper, . . . . 205

Unlike in his most recent discussions of the Lord's Supper, Calvin does not specifically identify the Holy Spirit, though the Spirit is arguably readily implied by the use of "spiritual." Still, the "omission" is surprising, given his "loud proclamation" of the communion of Christ's flesh and blood, and his emphasis that the "presences of Christ, by which we are ingrafted in him," is not excluded from the Supper.

### 2.4 1541-1545: Geneva

In September 1541, at the behest of the Genevan city council and church, Calvin returned to his first charge and was immediately engaged in putting out works that would benefit the citizens of Geneva pastorally. By the end of November, he had prepared a fresh catechism for Geneva, this time in the form of a dialog between a

---

204 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:45.

205 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:45-46.
minister and catechumen. He published the catechism first in French in 1542, *Le Catéchisme de l'église de Genève, c'est a dire le Formulaire d'instruire les enfants en la chrestienté*, and then in Latin in 1545, *Catechismus ecclesiae Genevensis, hoc est, formula erudiendi pueros in doctrina Christi*.

In his discussion of the third strophe of the Apostles' Creed, relating to "faith and the Holy Spirit," Calvin asserts that God by his Spirit "make[s] us capable" of "redemption and salvation." Elaborating on this point Calvin writes, "I mean that the Spirit of God, while he dwells in our hearts, makes us to feel the virtue of Christ (Romans 8:11)." "For when our minds conceive the benefits of Christ," says Calvin, it is owing to the illumination of the Holy Spirit; to his persuasion it is owing that they are sealed in our hearts (Eph 1:13). In short, he alone makes room in us for them. He regenerates us and makes us to be new creatures. Accordingly, whatever gifts are offered us in Christ, we receive by the agency of the Spirit.

A little on, Calvin emphasizes the role of the person of the Holy Spirit to illumine our minds so that spiritual wisdom might be comprehensible: "the Holy Spirit by his

---

206 *CO* 6:1-134.

207 *CO* 6:1-146. Standard English translations may be found in *Tracts and Treatises* 2:33-94, and *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 88-139.

208 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:50.

209 Strikingly, Calvin's prooftext here, Romans 8:11, is the same text Calvin cites in his 1539 *Institutio* (cf. *Inst. 1559 LCC* 4.17.12) when he speaks of the Holy Spirit as "the bond . . ." of our participation in Christ. There he also cites a sermon of Chrysostom. See above.

illumination makes us capable of understanding those things which would otherwise far exceed our capacity, and forms us to a firm persuasion, by sealing the promises of salvation on our hearts."211 Given all that Calvin has already said of the work of the Holy Spirit, such depictions are entirely expectable: The Holy Spirit is the "agent" of believers' reception of Christ and his benefits.

Eventually the catechism turns to the sacraments, a dialog that Gottfried Locher characterizes as one long argument against the views of Zwingli.212 In Calvin's discussion of the sacraments generally considered, one first encounters the question of the purpose of the sacraments with respect to the proper office of the Holy Spirit, the concern being that if the sacraments seal the promises of God on our minds, then the office of the Holy Spirit is affronted. Calvin replies that enlightening the mind and sealing promises to the heart are indeed actions of the Holy Spirit alone, but that "this does not at all prevent God from employing the sacraments as secondary instruments (d'instrumens/organis), and applying them to what use he deems proper, without derogating in any respect from the agency (vertu/virtuti) of the Spirit."213 So then, one understands that "the power and efficacy of a sacrament is not contained in the outward element, but flows entirely from the Spirit of God," since "the Lord hath been pleased to

211 Tracts and Treatises 2:53. "Mais le sainct Esprit nous illumine, pour nous faire capables d'entendre ce qui autrement nous serait incomprehensible, et nous fortifie en certitude, seellant et imprimans les promesses de salut en noz cueurs" (CO 6:45). "Verum spiritus sanctus illuminatione sua capaces nos intelligendi facit, ea, quae captum nostrum longe alioqui excederent: nosque ad certam persuasionem format, salutis promissiones cordibus nostris obsignando" (CO 6:46).

212 Locher, "Discord Among Guests," in Zwingli's Thought, 321n34 and 324n46.

213 Tracts and Treatises 2:84. CO 6:111 and 112.
exert his energy (virtutem) by his instruments," which "he does without detracting in any respect from the virtue of his Spirit."\textsuperscript{214}

As noted above, in an earlier portion of his catechism, Calvin emphasizes the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit. In his discussion of the sacraments generally, he refers to the "efficacy" of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament. When he takes up the Lord's Supper in particular, Calvin elaborates on this second role, first in reference to the question of "presence" and that of which we truly partake in the Supper.

The catechism's dialog proceeds as follows:

\textit{Minister:} Have we in the Supper only a figure of the benefits which you have mentioned, or are they there exhibited to us in reality (\textit{an illic re ipsa nobis exhibentur})?  
\textit{Child:} Seeing that our Lord Jesus Christ is truth (\textit{veritas}) itself, there cannot be a doubt that he at the same time fulfils the promises which he there gives us, and adds the reality (\textit{veritatem}) to the figures. Wherefore I doubt not that as he testifies by words and signs, so he also makes us partakers of his substance (\textit{de sa propre substance/ita etiam suae nos substantiae participes faciat}), that thus we may have one life with him."  
\textit{Minister:} But how can this be, when the body of Christ is in heaven, and we are still pilgrims on the earth?  
\textit{Child:} This he accomplishes by the secret and miraculous agency of his Spirit, to whom it is not difficult to unite things otherwise disjoined by a distant space.\textsuperscript{215}

According to Calvin, believers are made partakers of the \textit{propre substance} of Christ's body and blood. The question is \textit{how}, given that Christ is in heaven and we are on earth.

\textsuperscript{214} Tracts and Treatises 2:84. This dialog is rendered in CO as follows:  
LE MINISTRE. Tu entens donc que l'efficace des Sacremens ne gist pas en l'element exterieur: mais procede toute de l'Esprit de Dieu.  
L'ENFANT. Voire: selon que Dieu veut besongner par les moyens qu'il a instituez, sans deroguer à sa puissance (CO 6:113).  
MINISTER. Vim ergo efficaciamque sacramenti non in externo elemento inclusam esse existimas, sed totam a spiritu Dei manare?  
PUE. Sic sentio: nempe, ut virtutem suam exserere Domino placuerit per sua organa, quem in finem ea destinavit. Quod quidem ita facit, ut spiritus sui virtuti nihil detrahat (CO 6:114).

\textsuperscript{215} Tracts and Treatises 2:91. "C'est par la vertu incomprehensible de son Esprit, laquelle conioinct bien les choses separees par distance de lieu" (CO 6:127). "Hoc mirifica arcanaque spiritus sui virtute efficit: cui difficile non est sociare, quae locorum intervallo alioquì sunt disiuncta" (CO 6:128).
We are made partakers of Christ's *propre substance*, says Calvin, "par la vertu incomprehensible de son Esprit," as he puts it in French, "mirifica arcanaque spiritus sui virtute," in Latin. In his summary response here, Calvin approaches what will soon become for him a regular pattern of speech to emphasize a concept—a reality—that he refuses to take for granted: It is only because of "the secret and incomprehensible virtus of the Holy Spirit" that believers partake of Christ and all his benefits in the Supper, that their souls are nourished by his body and blood, quickened by its lifegiving vigor.\textsuperscript{216} Christ, by his Spirit, "makes us partakers of his substance." Christ, by his Spirit, communicates his body and blood, spiritual food for the spiritual journey. Here, again Calvin indicates the "coordinated agency" of Christ and the Spirit.

While generating this catechism, Calvin was also generating a manual for conducting the Sunday service of Word and Sacraments in Geneva. Already in 1540, working off Farel's *La maniere et fasson* (1524), used in Geneva in the 1530's, and off (presumably Bucer's) Strasbourg liturgy, Calvin had produced a liturgy for his congregation of French refugees in Strasbourg.\textsuperscript{217} This original edition is no longer extant, but it can be inferred from a 1542 reprint undertaken by Pierre Brully, Calvin's successor as leader of the French congregation in Strasbourg. This 1542 edition was published under the title *La Manyère de faire priers aux églises françoyses*.\textsuperscript{218}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Hence, in an early exchange on the Lord's Supper, the Minister asks: "Do we therefore eat the body and blood of our Lord?" To which the catechumen immediately and pithily replies, "Ita sentio—I understand so," after which the catechumen elaborates saying our whole salvation relies on Christ's "making himself ours." See *Tracts and Treatises* 6:123 and 124.}
\footnote{According to Bard Thompson, this first edition of Calvin's liturgy is lost (Thompson, *Liturgies*, 189; see also Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 64).}
\footnote{Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 64.}
\end{footnotes}
same year Calvin published a liturgy for use in the church at Geneva, thereby replacing the use of Farel's Maniere. This new liturgy, very similar but not identical to that left to the church in Strasbourgh, was published without mention of the author and under the title La Forme de prières et chantz ecclésiastiques, avec la manière d'administrer les sacrements, et consacrer le mariage, selon la coutume de l'église ancienne.219

As with Farel's and Bucer's before his own, Calvin's form and prayers for the celebration of the Lord's Supper are preceded by an exhortation to all who are about to participate in the sacrament.220 Strikingly, the Holy Spirit is mentioned but once in the specific prayers, exhortation, invitation, and consecration Calvin composes to accompany the celebration of the sacrament, and that mention appears in a Trinitarian doxology at the conclusion of the post-communion prayer. In the exhortation, Calvin intimates the work of the Spirit adverbially: "although we see only bread and wine, yet let us not doubt that he accomplishes spiritually in our souls all that he shows us externally."221 Even here, "spiritually" could simply be taken to mean, as it is meant to be taken elsewhere, "non-carnally," "non-corporeally." So except for this one adverbial intimation, the Holy Spirit simply does not figure into Calvin's liturgical text. Although by this time Calvin is much inclined to appeal to the "secret and incomprehensible


220 If Thompson's renderings are accurate, Bucer simply includes a rubric to this effect: "the Minister makes a short exhortation, if he has not done so at the end of the Sermon, to the effect that the Holy Supper is to be observed with true faith and mete devotion; and he explains this Mystery" (Thompson, Liturgies, 177). Farel includes an exhortation, but it precedes the Words of Institution, whereas Calvin's exhortation succeeds them. For further discussion, see Chapter 8 below.

221 Thompson, Liturgies, 207.
power of the Holy Spirit" in his pastoral and polemical expositions on the Lord's Supper, he simply does not do so in his liturgical one. This fact is striking, even disconcerting in a way. One might suppose that the omission of the Spirit is a simple oversight, attributable not so much to Calvin as to his sources, given that neither Farel nor Bucer mention the Holy Spirit in their forms. In reality, however, Calvin's exhortation on the meaning of the sacrament is distinct enough from theirs to make one puzzle all the more. Calvin's liturgical exposition is theologically rich as it is, but why is his otherwise vital emphasis on the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit with regard to the communication and reception of Christ left completely aside?

In 1545, *La Forme de prières et chantz ecclésiastiques* was republished in Strasbourg. The liturgy itself is largely unchanged, though a short, pastoral "Essay on the Lord's Supper" is printed along with the form for the celebration of the sacrament. As in the liturgy, the Holy Spirit is not mentioned, not even once. God the Father and God the Son are the only two persons of the Trinity appealed to with respect to the "economy" of the Lord's Supper, a fact that is strikingly captured in the ultimate sentence of the treatise: "This [the sacrament's mystery] the heavenly Father grants us through Christ." The refrain that sounds throughout the treatise is that, as it is put in the penultimate sentence of the treatise, "the principal thing about the sacrament's mystery is that we might live in Christ and he in us." This exposition is theologically rich, but again one puzzles as to why, supposing Calvin is its author, his emphasis on

---


the vital role of the Holy Spirit with respect to this very "economy" of the mystery is left aside.\textsuperscript{224}

In the midst of generating these pastoral works, Calvin was also preparing a fresh edition of his \textit{Institutio}. Released in 1543, this edition contains but two new references to the Holy Spirit relevant to this study. The first has already been explored above, given the explanatory help it provides for that unique passage in the 1541 \textit{Petit traicté} in which Calvin speaks of the power of the Holy Spirit conjoined with the sacrament.\textsuperscript{225} The second is found a little on from the first. Here Calvin elucidates his doctrine of "presence" with an appeal to Augustine. Augustine, as Calvin reads him, "conceives of Christ as present among us in three ways: in majesty, in providence, and in ineffable grace."\textsuperscript{226} Interpreting Augustine for his own purpose, Calvin writes:

Under grace I include that marvelous communion [\textit{communionem}] of his body and blood provided we understand that it takes place by the power of the Holy Spirit [\textit{modo spiritus sancti virtute fieri intelligamus}], not by that feigned inclusion of the body itself under the element, indeed, our Lord testified that he had flesh and bones, which could be felt and seen.\textsuperscript{227}

Once again Calvin's signature explanation appears: believers' communion with Christ is effected by the \textit{virtus} of the Holy Spirit; the Spirit figures as the agent of

\textsuperscript{224} Given this omission, one wonders whether Calvin is in fact the author of this essay. Also, this pattern of speech of "Christ living in us and we in him," which is often repeated in this treatise, is not a "pet phrase" of Calvin's. Furthermore, the author of this treatise formally and forthrightly refers to the sacrament as "the Eucharist," which also is not Calvin's habit. Again, for all these reasons, one might legitimately wonder whether Calvin is the author of this little exposition, or if its author might be, say, his Strasbourg colleague, friend, and superior Martin Bucer. Consider, for instance, the emphasis in Bucer's liturgy on "he might ever live in us" (Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 172-73). This question remains for a future scholarly study, as it lies beyond the scope of this study.

\textsuperscript{225} \textit{Tracts and Treatises} 2:174.


\textsuperscript{227} 1543 \textit{Institutio}, as in \textit{Inst.} 1559 LCC 4.17.26. \textit{CO} 1:1009.
communication. Calvin's appeal to Augustine has a certain significance here given that the 1543 *Institutio* demonstrates generally Calvin's increased reading and appropriation of the fathers.\(^{228}\) However, it must be duly noted that the appeal to the work of the Holy Spirit here is Calvin's own, not Augustine's.

One more discussion rounds out those stemming from the early years of Calvin's return to Geneva, a discussion found in his 1546 *Commentarii in priorem Epistolam Pauli ad Corinthios*.\(^{229}\) With respect to his discipline as a biblical commentator, Calvin's general method is simply to exegete scripture texts in his commentaries, compiling in his *Institutio* the theological loci that these texts might inform; in the *Institutio*, then, he might include scripture references with respect to various loci, these scripture references directing the reader to his commentaries in order that one might cross-reference the two genres of discourse, exegetical and systematic.\(^{230}\) In the midst of his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11, however, Calvin takes Paul's instruction on the Lord's Supper as a point of departure for his own instruction, thereby including a theological digression, a comprehensive, summary exposition on the *locus* of the Lord's Supper in the context of his commentary. Within this digression, Calvin mentions the Holy Spirit on three occasions, each of which emphasizes that Christ, his body and blood, are truly


\(^{229}\) *CO* 49:293-574.

communicated in the sacrament, and that the reception thereof by believers is afforded only by the "secret work of the Holy Spirit." Calvin is clear on both of these points.

These three mentions are preceded, however, by similar claims offered in his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 10. In commenting on 10:3, where Paul says that the "fathers ate the same spiritual meat," Paul, says Calvin, "shows that the old sacraments of the law had the same power as ours have today," that is, that their signs were not empty even as ours are not empty:

For if manna was spiritual, it follows that bare forms (figuras nudas) are not exhibited to us in the sacraments, but the reality figured is truly given at the same time (rem figuratam simul vere dari). For God is not so deceitful as to nourish us on empty appearances (figmentis). A sign (signum) is indeed a sign, and retains its own substance (substantiam). But just as the Papists, on the one hand, are ridiculously dreaming of some sort of transformation, so, on the other hand, we have no right to separate the reality and the figure (veritatem et figuram) which God has joined together.²³¹

In short, Calvin affirms, as he puts it later, the "nature" of a sign.²³² In so doing, he implicitly affirms, too, that the sacrament is an instrument.

But all this raises "another question," Calvin admits at the conclusion of his commentary on 10:1-4: "Since we now eat the body and drink the blood of Christ, how were the Jews partakers of the same spiritual meat and drink, when the flesh of Christ was not yet in existence for them to eat?" Acquiescence to mystery and the work of the Holy Spirit is the best response to such a question, says Calvin:

---


²³² See discussion in Chapter 1.
To that I reply that although the flesh did not yet exist, it was food for them all the same. And that is not a piece of useless sophistry; for their salvation depended on the benefit of the death and resurrection, and for that reason on the flesh and blood, of Christ. Therefore it was necessary for them to receive the flesh and blood of Christ, so that they might share in the blessing of redemption. The receiving of it was the secret work of the Holy Spirit, who was active in such a way that the flesh of Christ, even if it was not yet created, might be efficacious in them. He means, however, that they ate in their own way, which was different from ours, and, as I have said already, that Christ is now conveyed to us more fully, because of the greater degree of revelation. For in our day the eating is substantial (*substantialis est manducatio*), something which was not yet possible in their time. In other words, Christ feeds us with his flesh, which was sacrificed for us, and which was appointed to be our food, and from this we draw our life.\(^\text{233}\)

In his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11, where one finds his excursus on the locus of the Lord's Supper, Calvin builds on this emphasis. The "implication of the words" of the account of Christ's instituting the Supper, says Calvin, is that "Christ does not offer us only the benefit of his death and resurrection, but the self-same body in which He suffered and rose again." So my conclusion about the sacrament, says Calvin, is that the body of Christ is really (*realiter*), to use the usual word, i.e., truly (*vere*) given to us in the Supper,\(^\text{234}\) so that it may be health-giving food for our souls. I am adopting the usual terms, but I mean that our souls are fed by the substance of His body, so that we are truly (*vere*) made one with Him; or, what amounts to the same thing, that a life-giving power from the flesh of Christ (*vim ex Christi carne vivificam*) is poured into us through the medium of the Spirit

---


\(^{234}\) Notice Calvin's emphatic "in the Supper," which indicates that Calvin is talking about something that transpires distinct from the perpetual union/communion believers enjoy with Christ.
Within the same paragraph, Calvin reiterates his position with respect to both the significance of what transpires in the Supper and the role of the Holy Spirit therewith:

But the sharing in the Lord's body, which, I maintain, is offered to us in the Supper, demands neither a local presence, nor the descent of Christ, nor an infinite extension of His body, nor anything of that sort; for, in view of the fact that the Supper is a heavenly act, there is nothing absurd about saying that Christ remains in heaven and is yet received by us. For the way in which He imparts himself to us is by the secret power of the Holy Spirit (id fit arcanae spiritus sancti virtute), a power which is able not only to bring together, but also to join together, things which are separated by distance, and by a great distance at that. . . . Be quite sure that the Lord will really carry out what you understand the words to mean: that His body, which you do not see at all, is spiritual food for you. It seems unbelievable that we are fed by the flesh of Christ, which is so far away from us. Let us remember that it is a secret and wonderful work done by the Holy Spirit (memineris arcanum ac mirificum esse spiritus sancti opus), and it would be sinful of you to measure it by the little standard of your own understanding.236

In these passages from his commentary, Calvin upholds the Spirit as the "agent" of both the reception of Christ, his body and blood, and their communication. In the

235 First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, trans. John W. Fraser, CNTC 9:246.
"Concludo, realiter (ut vulgo loquantur), hoc est, vere nobis in coena dari Christi corpus, ut sit animis nostris in cibum salutarem. Loquor vulgari more: sed intelligo, substantia corporis pasci animas nostras, ut vere unum efficiamur cum eo : vel, quod idem valet, vim ex Christi carne vivificam in nos per spiritum diffundi, quamvis longe a nobis distet, nec misceatur nobiscum" (CO 49:487, italics not added).

same, he also emphatically affirms the "nature" of a sign: "the reality figured is truly given at the same time" as the sign, the sign being not nudas, naked or bare.

To this point in the development of his thought, Calvin's work reveals a shift in his conception of sacraments as instruments. He first speaks of the sacraments as instruments that convey a "testimony of God's good will toward us." While he never abandons this view, he also seemingly advances it, eventually speaking of, e.g., the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as an instrument by which Christ nourishes souls with his very body and blood, by which Christ "distributes" this spiritual food for the spiritual journey. As an instrument of this sort then, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper communicates, really and truly, the very body and blood of Christ, a mystery which transpires only, says Calvin emphatically and repeatedly, by the secret, miraculous, and incomprehensible virtus spiritus sancti, who is the bond of believers' union with Christ.

Calvin's conception, as ameliorating as he might have hoped it to be, roused the suspicions of detractors from the followers of Luther and Zwingli alike. When Calvin speaks of the Lord's Supper in the late 1540's and beyond, his theological accent seems to get somewhat inflected according to his audience\(^\text{237}\) in order that—ultimately—he might maintain the theological and sacramental best that each, e.g., the Germans and the Swiss, have to offer.\(^\text{238}\) What remains consistent, however, theologically and

\(^{237}\) See Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 52ff, in which he "compares Calvin's exegeses of the consecration words according to 1 Corinthians and the synoptic gospels before and after 1549. . . . Before 1549 he wrote his Commentary on 1 Corinthians (1546; French version 1547); for the time after 1549 we have his nineteen Sermons sur le dixieme et onzieme chpatre de la premiere Epistre de sainct Paul aux Corinthisiens (1558, preached from 1555) and the Commentary on the Harmony of the Gospels of 1555."
sacramentally, is Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit: on the virtue of the Holy Spirit, on the Spirit as the *vinculum* of believers' union with Christ.

2.5 1546-1551: Geneva

In the same year that Calvin's commentary on 1 Corinthians appeared, Heinrich Bullinger, of Zurich, acquiesced to Calvin's repeated overtures for dialogue, and engaged in what was to become half a decade's long correspondence with Calvin on the topic of the Lord's Supper. Ultimately their exchange gave rise to the publication of a joint declaration on the Lord's Supper, a declaration meant to bring the Swiss churches into agreement for political as much as theological reasons.239 That agreement is, according to its complete title, the *Consensio mutua in re sacramentaria ministrorum Tigurinae ecclesiae, et D. Ioannis Calvini ministri Genevensis ecclesiae, iam nunc ab ipsis autoribus edita,*240 drawn up in May 1549, edited in August 1549, and finally printed in February or March 1551.

Given that the *Consensio mutua* is just that, a statement of *consensus*, one should not—and cannot—expect to glean from it Calvin's complete doctrine of the

---


Lord's Supper. In affirming that "the Consensus does not fully represent Calvin's views on the Lord's Supper," Davis goes so far as to suggest that "the Consensus Tigerinus appears to be the extent to which Calvin was willing to bend his eucharistic opinions in favor of peace among the churches of Switzerland," and that the Consensio mutua "became a reality because of Calvin's willingness to omit formulations objectionable to Bullinger." In his study, Davis further demonstrates that in Calvin's subsequent defenses of the Consensio mutua and of his association with it, Calvin takes the liberty of interpreting its articles according to his doctrine. Davis and Janse imply what Rorem declares outright: that the correspondence Calvin extends to Bullinger prior to the drafting and adoption of the Consensio mutua is representative of his doctrine whereas the Consensio mutua itself is not.

241 This is a point made by e.g., Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 46; Davis, Clearest Promises, "Chapter 2: The Consensus Tigerinus and the Task of Interpretation," 29-68; and Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 25. Davis offers an extended presentation of especially nineteenth and twentieth century scholars who in fact took the Consensio to be a tight and thorough sum of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

242 Davis, Clearest Promises, 30.

243 Davis, Clearest Promises, 40. Here Davis points out that the following "key concepts in Calvin's eucharistic thought" are absent in the Consensus: "there is no reference to the function of the eucharistic action as exhibiting and giving what is signified; the Eucharist is never referred to by the word instrumentum; and the Supper is never expressly viewed as an act through which God confers grace" (citing Paul Rorem, "Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper," The Lutheran Quarterly 3 [Summer 1988], 376). On the Consensio mutua not being a compromise document, see also Christopher Elwood, The Body Broken: The Calvinist Doctrine of the Eucharist and the Symbolization of Power in Sixteenth-century France (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 82; Gerrish, "Sign and Reality," 124. For his part, Stephens sees the Consensio as "neither Bullingerian nor Calvinian" (Stephens, "The Sacraments in the Confessions," 7).

244 See Davis, Clearest Promises, 41ff.

245 Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 31. See also Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 41. For surveys of the correspondence, along with Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, and Davis, Clearest Promises, see e.g., Ernst Bizer, Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlstreits im 16. Jahrhundert (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962), 243-270; and Ulrich Gäbler, "Das Zustandekommen des Consensus Tigurium im Jahre 1549," Theologische Literaturzeitung 104-105 (1979), 321-332.
The nub of disagreement between Calvin and Bullinger is whether the sacraments may be considered instruments, and if they may, then what sort of instruments are they? What is their nature, and what is it they effect?

According to Calvin, sacraments are indeed instruments,246 and by them God effects by the virtus of the Holy Spirit that which the sacraments themselves figure.247 In 1549, well into his correspondence with Bullinger, Calvin culminates his ongoing claim saying, as Rorem cites him, "the Spirit's proper work of making us partakers of Christ is done per sacramenta, 'through the sacraments, as through instruments . . . . the Spirit is the author, the sacrament is the instrument used.'"248 According to Calvin, the sacraments are more than mere signs or testimonies of the Spirit's immediate action upon the soul (which is as Bullinger—and Zwingli—would have them249); as Calvin

246 Letter 1039, 6 July 1548: "Atqui docemus, sacramenta gratiae Dei esse instrumenta. Nempe quum in certum finem institute sint, usum ipsorum quails esse debe esse otiosum negamus Quod ergo illic figuratur dicimus electis exhiberi, ne Deus fallacy spectaculo oculos deludere credatur" (CO 12: 727-28). Translated by Rorem: "We teach, however, that the sacraments are instruments of the grace of God; for, as they were instituted in view of a certain end, we refuse to allow that they have no proper use. We therefore say, that what is represented in them, is offered to the elect, for God does not delude the eyes by a fallacious representation" (Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 31). See also Calvin to Bullinger, Letter 880, 25 February 1547: "You especially object to our saying that in the strict sense of the word it is God alone who exhibits, but by the signs and by his ministers" (trans. Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 44). "Nam id nominatim impugnas quod solum Deum dicimus proprie exhibere, sed per signa et per suos ministros" (CO 12:486).

247 See e.g., Calvin to Bullinger, Letter 880, 25 February 1547, CO 12:482, 484, 485, 487-87; Letter 1039, 6 July 1548, CO 12: 727; Correspondence, January 1549, CO 7:703, 704, 707.

248 Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 33; from the Calvini responsio ad annotationes Bullingeri scripta mense Ianuariio 1549: "Officium spiritus esse fateror, Christi et omnium eius bonorum nos facere participes. Sed minime absurdum est, ut, quod propria virtute in nobis efficit, per sacramenta quoque, velut instrumenta, efficiat. . . . Spiritus autor est, sacramentum vero instrumentum quo utitur" (CO 7:701-02).

249 CO 7:711 and 713. See Janse, "Calvin's Eucharist Theology," 43.
sees it, God has deigned to use the sacraments as a medium for communicating Christ and all his benefits, for "exhibiting" this communion, by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Already in his first piece of correspondence with Bullinger, Calvin recognizes this sharp difference in their conceptions of the sacraments, and identifies it bluntly. "Mihi non penitus satisfacit definitio unionis, quam ponis, signi cum re signata," says Calvin; your explanation is simply too "ieiuna." Yes, the sacraments function analogically, but not merely analogically. God's truthfulness is at stake. And so says Calvin, "There is a union complementary with the thing figured, lest the sign be empty, because that which the Lord represents in a sign he effects at the same time, and executes in us by the power of his Spirit." Rorem asserts that "here Calvin introduces two themes which will reappear often in his dialogue with Bullinger," but in fact there

---

250 CO 7: 701, 702. Calvin's use of *exhibere* is repeated in his correspondence with Bullinger, but it is not returned in Bullinger's with Calvin. E.g., Letter 880, CO 12: 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488; Letter 1039, CO 12: 728, cited below.

251 This correspondence was occasioned by Bullinger himself, though Calvin had already been soliciting it. In 1545 Bullinger composed a *libellus* on the Lord's Supper. He gave a copy to Calvin in 1547 and solicited Calvin's reaction to it (see Rorem *Calvin and Bullinger*, 21). Rorem's study is an excellent, thorough entry into Calvin and Bullinger's exchange, as well as its outcome.

252 Rorem supplies an apt summary of the sharp difference in Calvin and Bullinger's views: "At this point in early 1548, the outlook for agreement must have seemed bleak, although Bullinger's [lost] letter could shed different light on the situation. A genuine difference in sacramental theology had been acknowledged on both sides. Calvin considered the Lord's Supper to be an instrument of God's grace, whereby believers commune in the body and blood of Christ. Bullinger explicitly rejected such 'instrumentalism' and considered the Supper to be a testimony to or an analogy of God's grace, whereby God testified to the believers, through the analogy of bread and wine nourishing and invigorating our bodies, concerning the salvation and nourishment won in Christ's body and blood, received in faith. The contrast between the sacrament as an instrument or as a testimony was a substantial difference, fully acknowledged on both sides. To summarize it baldly, Calvin proposed and Bullinger opposed the language of instrument (*instrumentum*) and implement (*organum*)" (Rorem, *Calvin and Bullinger*, 34-35; see also his analysis of "article 7" of the annotations, and his summary thereof at 36-37).

253 CO 12:482. Calvin is commenting on the eighth chapter.

are three: "that the signs are not empty, and that what God represents God also effects at the same time (simul)," and that this is owing to the virtus of the Spirit. Because of the virtus of the Spirit, in the Supper, the souls of the faithful are truly fed by the body and blood of Christ. Bullinger admits the significance of the Holy Spirit, but repeatedly with respect to faith, never with respect to the media of the sacraments themselves as Calvin does. So, says Bullinger,

> I acknowledge that Christ communicates himself totally to us in his Spirit, by faith, insofar as this is necessary for our salvation, and for us to live faithfully. This is what is signified to us in the sacraments and is sealed to us in a manner appropriate to sacraments, . . .

To illustrate his point, Bullinger (it may be understood, given a "mirror" reading of Calvin's response to Bullinger) compared the sacraments to, as Calvin puts it, "profanis imaginibus." Bullinger apparently offers the example of "Caesar on a coin." Taking some umbrage with Bullinger's illustration, Calvin writes: "Where is the Spirit in the image of Caesar? Who in any way vivifies it? How is it efficacious in our hearts?"

---

255 Rorem, *Calvin and Bullinger*, 23. For evidence of the three points, see also CO 12: 484, 485, 487, and 488.

256 Concerning Christ's "presence" in heaven and with respect to the Supper: "Abest enim Christus a coena quoad oculos, quoad omnes corporis sensus, quoad locum. Nam in coelo est eius corpus. Coena peragitur in terries. Longa distantia. Sed adest piis animis per spiritus sui virtutem, quia non impedit Christi distantia, quominus suos mirabiliter pascat. . . . And CO 12:482, concerning the "analogy" of the Supper: In coena anologia est quam describis inter panem ac corpus Christi, inter sanguinem et vinum. Unio est spiritualis nostra cum Christo, qua fit ut vere ipso animae nostrae pascantur" (CO 12:481; see also CO 12:488).

257 E.g., for Calvin, see reference to CO 7:701-02 above.


Working this same thought some years hence, when composing his second defense of the *Consensio mutua*, Calvin avers "the sacraments are not empty figures, but true pledges of spiritual grace, and living organs of the Holy Spirit," which offer nothing to the eyes that God does not efficaciously effect within."

Calvin defends his instrumental view in his ensuing correspondence with Bullinger, all the while reaching toward conciliation for political as much as theological gain. Upon receiving a long reply to his critique of Bullinger's little book, Calvin writes back to Bullinger,

> I responded at your request . . . . [I]n whatever way I may affirm greater communication of Christ in the Sacraments than you express in words, let us not on that account, cease to hold the same Christ, and to be one in him. Someday, perhaps, it will be given us to unite in fuller harmony of opinion."\(^{263}\)

An expression of unity, the *Consensio mutua* itself, did eventually come about, but it was devoid of Calvin's robust view of the "communicatio Christi in sacramentis."\(^{264}\) Although Calvin preferred calling the sacraments *instrumenta*, he

---


261 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:307 to this point (emphasis added), but my translation to the end of this quote. Beveridge's translation omits the last line for some reason. The full Latin text is: "sacramenta non inanes esse figures, sed vera spiritualis gratiae pignora, vivaque spiritus sancti organa, quae nihil oculis offerunt, quod non intus efficaciter Deus praestet" (*CO* 9:91).

262 Regrettably, this reply is not extant.


264 See Rorem, *Calvin and Bullinger*, 41ff; Davis, *Clearest Promises*, e.g., 49-50; Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology." 41. Upon receiving Bucer's negative assessment of the *Consensio*, which Calvin had sent to Bucer along with his newly proposed texts, Calvin wrote to his kindred spirit now exiled in England, "You devoutly and prudently desire that the effect of the sacraments and what the Lord confers to us through (*per*) them be explicated more clearly and more fully than many allow. Indeed it was not my fault that these items were not fuller. Let us therefore bear with a sigh that which cannot be corrected"
seemingly conceded the use of the term *organa*, a term more palatable to Bullinger.\footnote{Rorem, *Calvin and Bullinger*, 49: “Calvin's comments to Bucer [see note above] argue against the alternative hypothesis that the substitute of 'implement' for 'instrument' was actually a victory for Calvin's instrumentalism.” Indeed. See also Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 55.}

Exhibere, or a derivative thereof, appears but once in the treatise, and then only in one of the articles Calvin proposed later, and not specifically with reference to the sacraments themselves. Throughout the treatise, the Holy Spirit is confessed as operative, not with respect to faith and the sacraments as Calvin would have it, but with respect to faith alone, as Bullinger would. These, along with the sacraments "figuring" rather than "exhibiting,"\footnote{E.g., in the *Ultima admonitio* against Westphal (1557), Calvin says of the Lord's Supper that "Christ works effectually by its means" (*Tracts and Treatises* 2:374). "Christum, qui coenam instituit, efficaciter per eam operari" (*CO* 9:162).} are concessions Calvin himself articulates in the twenty-third article:

> When it is said that Christ, by our eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, which are here figured, feeds our souls through faith by the agency of the Holy Spirit, we are not to understand it as if any mingling or transfusion of substance took place, but that we draw life from the flesh once offered in sacrifice and the blood shed in expiation.\footnote{Tracts and Treatises 2:219. From Calvin's letter to Bullinger, 6 July 1549. "Quod autem carnis suae esu et sanguinis potione quae hic figurantur Christus animas nostras per fidem spiritus sui virtute pascit, id non perinde accipiendum quasi aliqua fieret substantiae vel commixtio vel transfusion, sed quoniam ex carne semel in sacrificium oblate et ex sanguine in expiationem effuso vitam hauriamus" (*CO* 13:306, emphasis added).}

But again, looking on Calvin's correspondence with Bullinger, with its robust expressions of the instrumentality of the sacrament, and then on his second refutation of Westphal, in which Calvin declares that the sacraments are "living organs of the Holy Spirit, which offer nothing to the eyes that God does not efficaciously effect within"— with such claims is Calvin anticipating his eventual claim that "through the agency of..."
the Spirit there is a present exhibition" of Christ's body? That the Holy Spirit is not only the agent of the communion, or communication, of Christ's body and blood, but the agent of its very exhibition in the Supper? It seems so.

2.6 1550-1559: Geneva

From this point on, Calvin's expression concerning the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to believers' participation in the Lord's Supper takes on a relatively predictable consistency.

Given that faith is the instrument by which Christ and his benefits are appropriated, and that faith itself is wholly a gift of the Holy Spirit,

---

268 Whether Calvin's doctrine as a whole "takes on a relatively predictable consistency" is debatable. His intended rapprochement with Lutherans and with Zwinglians, and the two with one another, inclines him to speak with both Zwinglian and Lutheran rhetoric. So while he makes several, clearly non-Zwinglian pronouncements about the sacraments (i.e., that the sacraments are instruments and means of grace, his primary emphasis being on what those at the table receive rather than what they do (Lane, "Was Calvin a Crypto-Zwinglian?" 24), other of his pronouncements (i.e., about "perpetual eating") leave one wondering whether Calvin was really a "crypto-Zwinglian." For his part, Lane concludes: How one reads Calvin "may to some extent depend on the hermeneutic employed" in reading him. "Those employing a 'hermeneutic of suspicion' are likely to decide against Calvin [i.e., "He is a crypto-Zwinglian!"]'; those sympathetic to him are more likely to take his side [i.e., "He is not a crypto-Zwinglian!"]. But some points can be agreed by all. Calvin clearly wished to go beyond Zwinglianism and thought he had. But he was pulled in two directions. His heart was more Lutheran, which explains why he made such use of 'Lutheran rhetoric.' But his head was more Zwinglian and thus the content of his theology came closer to Zwingli than he wished or was prepared to admit." In the same article, Lane identifies e.g., François Wendel, Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought, trans. Philip Mairet (London: Collins, 1963) and Kilian McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967) as being "against" Calvin; and e.g., Heiko Oberman, "The 'Extra' Dimension in the Theology of Calvin" in his The Dawn of the Reformation (Edinburgh, 1986) and Brian Gerrish, The Old Protestantism and the New: Essay on the Reformation Heritage (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1982) and Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) as being "for" Calvin. Like Lane, Gerrish wrestles with these vacillations in Calvin's rhetoric: "In actual fact, the clarity and consistency of his teaching, not least on the Lord's Supper, can be exaggerated. In his own opinion, a merit of his position, over against the views of his rivals, was indeed its superior clarity. But whether or not a claim for Calvin's relative clarity could be sustained, it still remains true that his language is complex; it could lead in more than one direction, and it is not easy to harmonize all his different assertions" (Gerrish, "Gospel and Eucharist: John Calvin on the Lord's Supper,"106). Janse identifies such vacillations as a demonstration of Calvin's "capacity for bucerize." Of "Calvinus bucerizans," says Janse, "I use the terms bucerize not in the contemporary pejorative sense of disingenuously pursuing conformity, but in the sense of phrasing flexibly, following in the footsteps of 'the great theologian of dialogue' (Martin Greschat)(sic)" (Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 51-52).
Spirit still figures as the "agent" of the reception of what is offered in the sacrament. However, the overwhelming emphasis of Calvin's expression falls on the Spirit as the "agent of communication": at the Table, owing to the secret and incomprehensible virtus of the Spirit, Christ nourishes the souls of believers with his body and blood.

Given this relative predictability, a detailed survey citing each of Calvin's references to the Holy Spirit in the treatises he composed between the time of his correspondence with Bullinger (where this chapter has just left off) and the time of his editing the last edition of the *Institutio* (where the first chapter picks up) would be unfruitful given the scope and intent of this study. Even so, the following references to the work of the Spirit may be briefly noted:

In his 1555 *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de sacramentis*, Calvin echoes claims made in the 1541 *Petit traicté* and the 1543 *Institutio* (both cited above), affirming that "the signs (signa) are not devoid of the things (rebus), as God conjoins (coniungat) the effectual working (efficaciam) of his Spirit with them," and again, that "the efficacy of the Spirit is conjoined (coniunctam) with [the sacraments'] outward representation, lest they should be empty pictures." In short, "we say," says Calvin,

---


270 The primary works of this period are: *In Evangelium secundum Iohannem, Commentarius* (1553), *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de sacramentis* (1555), *Secunda defensio . . . contra Ioachimi Westphali calumnias* (1556), and *Ultima admonistio . . . ad Ioachimum Westphalum* (1557).

271 The complete title is *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de sacramentis eorumque natura vi fine usui et fructu, quam pastores et ministri Tigurinae ecclesiae et Genevensis antehac brevi consensionis mutuae formula complexi sunt tuns cum refutatione probrorum quibus eam indocti et clamosi nonimes infamant* (CO 9:5-16). Calvin published a French translation in 1555 (de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 191.n5).

272 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:225; CO 9:19.
"that lest the bread and wine should deceive our senses, the true effect is conjoined with the external figure, so that believers receive the body and blood of Christ." In his 
Second Defense against Westphal, published in 1556, Calvin writes, in direct response to Westphal's charges:

I am said to defame those who hold that the true flesh of Christ is distributed in the Supper: as if I did not uniformly declare, in distinct terms, that nourishment from the true flesh of Christ is set before us in the Supper. What, then, does he gain by employing the mists of lies to darken the light which clearly removes all difficulty from the case? If any sincerely and distinctly teach that the flesh of Christ is set before (proponi) us to be eaten by us, I, too, am of the number: I only explain the manner, viz., that Christ overcomes the distance of space by employing the agency of his Spirit to inspire (inspirandam) life into us from his flesh. 

Here Calvin clearly takes the Spirit to be the "agent" by whom Christ "communicates" that which he offers.

In 1557 Calvin published his Ultima admonitio contra Westphal. As one would expect, the Spirit figures prominently as "the bond" of believers' union with Christ, and as the one by whose virtus Christ gives, or communicates, his flesh and blood for spiritual nourishment. Among his emphases about the Lord's Supper, Calvin brings to the fore his understanding of the objective "nature of the Sacrament." At the Table, Christ himself truly invites those who approach to partake of his body and blood, he

---

273 Tracts and Treatises 2:227.

274 Tracts and Treatises 2:225; CO 9:19.

275 Tracts and Treatises 2:287; CO 9:77.


277 E.g., Tracts and Treatises 2:384 and 413. CO 9:170 and 191.
truly fulfils what he figures, he truly exhibits what he promises. Occasioned by discussion of *manducatio indignorum*, Calvin writes,

we [assert] that the blood and flesh of Christ are offered to all, and yet that believers alone enjoy the inestimable treasure. Yet though unbelief precludes the entrance of Christ, and deprives those who approach the Supper impurely of any benefit from it, we deny that anything is lost to the nature of the Sacrament, inasmuch as the bread is always a true pledge of the flesh of Christ, and the wine of his blood, and *there is always a true exhibition of both on the part of God*.

Here, *Christ* is the one who exhibits, and *God* is the guarantor of a "true exhibition" of the flesh and blood. In 1561 Calvin speaks of the Spirit in this regard. In his *Dilucida explicatio*, Calvin strikingly, unequivocally—and, given its context, *vehemently*—declares that Heshusius must desist from asserting that I leave nothing in the Supper but a right to a thing that is absent, seeing I uniformly maintain, that *through the agency of the Spirit there is a present exhibition of the thing (asseram praesentem in spiritus virtute exhibitionem rei)*, though it is absent in respect of place.

As noted in the first chapter, "it" and "the thing" are clearly referents to Christ's body. That the Spirit, rather than Christ or "God," is the one who exhibits them or guarantees their exhibition, is fresh. That is to say, the locution is fresh, even if—as suggested above—not unanticipated by Calvin's claims about the Spirit and the efficacy of the sacrament as an instrument.

---


279 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:402, emphasis added; *CO* 9:183.


2.7 Conclusion

As this chapter's study has unveiled, the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper subtly shifts in Calvin's thought. First spoken of primarily with respect to illumination and reception, very early on the Spirit is spoken of with respect to the communication of what Christ offers in the Supper. Very early on Calvin identifies the Spirit as "the bond" of believers' union with Christ, of their participation of Christ and all his benefits. As the bond, the Spirit affords the very communicatio of Christ, of his body and blood, of food for the soul. Soon Calvin introduces the phrase "virtus of the Spirit," as in "by" or "through" the "virtus of the Spirit," Christ communicates his body and blood to his own. He thereby implies something of a "coordinated agency" with respect to the roles of the Christ and the Spirit in the nourishing of souls.

It remains to be asked, What is the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Spirit with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Can it be accounted for? As noted before, one could never attain to discerning and disquisiting on Calvin's moment of "epiphany," particularly since no such moment likely occurred. Still, one can explore Calvin's context at the time that these expressions emerge, and thereby plausibly theorize general dimensions of the provenance of his emphasis. To this end, Calvin's intellectual milieu, particularly through the late 1530s, is taken up in the succeeding chapter.
CHAPTER 3

A NARRATIVE, BIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF
CALVIN'S EARLY INTELLECTUAL MILIEU

The previous chapter demonstrates that Calvin's first expressions of the Holy Spirit as the one by whom Christ's life-giving flesh and blood is communicated to believers in the Supper emerge early in his discussions of the sacrament. As shown there, it first appears in late 1536, in the midst of the Lausanne Disputation, when he speaks of the Spirit as the bond between believers and the ascended Christ; and again shortly after, in his first catechism for Geneva; and then again, more robustly, with patristic and biblical reference, in the 1539 revision of his *Institutio*. Then, also in his 1539 *Institutio*, Calvin's preferred inflection with respect to the Holy Spirit and the Lord's Supper emerges, namely, that in the Supper, Christ "feeds his own people with his own body, the communion of which he bestows upon them by the power (*virtus*) of his Spirit." The primary question at the fore of this thesis concerns the *provenance* of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. With the elucidations of the emergences of these mutually informing expressions, now such a question can be pursued.

As has been noted before—taking heed of the warnings of so many circumspect scholars of late—seeking the *source* of a dimension of Calvin's thought is a risky
academic enterprise. However, this does not nullify the exercise of attempting to discern what might have been the resources of Calvin's thought, as Oberman puts it. Theological "novelty" simply was not countenanced in the sixteenth century, by Roman Catholics or Reformers, by scholastics or humanists. All saw themselves—even if they did not always see each other—as bearers of the church's tradition, Calvin included. So again, the question may be raised, What in the tradition and availed of Calvin might have given rise to this significant emphasis and its specific inflection in his doctrine? Was it something he read in the tradition? Or something that occurred to him as he undertook his exegetical and theological work? Did this come to him by way of a contemporary?

Calvin, according to one present-day scholar, is one who "learned his theology in the act of writing it over the course of decades." His theology "must be read in its development in dialogue with the past and with his contemporaries." What becomes primary, then, in understanding any development or nuance in Calvin's theology is the pursuit of those with whom Calvin was "in dialogue" up to and especially at the time of that nuance's emergence in his work. And when Calvin is imagined to be "in dialogue"

---


284 For example, Servetus, whose doctrine of the Trinity "was a rather unique teaching easily identifiable as Servetus's own," was everyone's enemy (Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 7).

285 These, of course, are the questions to be addressed in the second half of this study.

286 Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 13.
with another, one must not simply imagine him to be in dialogue with a living contemporary, but even a long-deceased predecessor whose work was "living" in any of various venues: an edition of extant works; an anthology, or florilegium, of patristic or medieval citations; a reference of some sort in a contemporary's—or some other intermediary's—discourse, whether theological, polemical, or exegetical.

The aim of this chapter, then, is to explore—to the extent that it can be appropriately discerned—those with whom Calvin had to do, his "intellectual milieu," early on and "immediately," as a means to discern where the derivation of his emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper might be sounded, as with a line and plummet. What will be determined is that, by the time of 1536-1539, when this emphasis first appears in his discussions, Calvin has emerged as a reformer, schooled not as a "scholastic," but groomed as a "humanist," bent on an ultimately exegetical calling. 287

3.1 Paris When Calvin Arrived

In October 1523, the queen mother of France, Louise of Savoy, sent a Franciscan envoy to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris to solicit advice on two related matters: how Luther's doctrine and influence might be eradicated in France, and how persons of high position unjustly accused of countenancing Luther's

287 In general, principal sources for the foregoing biography include de Greef, "Overview of Calvin's Life," in Writings of John Calvin, 17-82; Randall C. Zachman, "The Life and Work of John Calvin," in John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian: The Shape of His Writings and Thought (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 15-28; Ganoczy, Young Calvin; Bruce Gordon, Calvin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).
doctrine might be cleared of suspicion. The Faculty—the so-called "Sorbonne"—replied immediately at the hand of its syndic, Noël Beda. With regard to the first matter, Beda "informed the queen mother about the Faculty and the University's daily labors to eliminate Lutheranism and complained that few public officials had paid any attention to this." His advice? That the king and queen mother circulate letters throughout France calling for the manifest enforcement of previous laws against Luther's works and their promulgation in the kingdom; accordingly, his books and any books presenting his theology favorably should be burned. With regard to the second matter, Beda reiterated his frustration over the immunity certain persons of high position had secured for Lutherans and humanists while at the same time suppressing anti-Lutheran writings, such as those by Jerome de Hangest and Lambert Campester. Such actions, said Beda, simply foil every effort of the Faculty "to eliminate Lutheranism."

Such was the atmosphere of Paris (and disseminated from Paris throughout France) at the time Calvin arrived there to continue his education. The exchange between Louise of Savoy and the Faculty occurred in October 1523. Calvin had arrived in August. By that time, the Faculty and the Parlement had already well-proved their disdain of Luther and the "'Lutheran' party." By early 1519, "the intellectual elite of

---

288 James K. Farge, "The Name 'Sorbonne': A Misnomer," in *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500-1543* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 3-4. Muller explains an interesting and important difference in Calvin's use of the epithets "theologians of the Sorbonne" and "scholastics" in his discourse: "while 'scholastici' can occasionally function as a neutral term, "théologiens Sorbonniques' is invariably a term of reproach" (Muller, *Unaccommodated*, 51).

289 Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 131.

290 Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 131.

291 No doubt this was an indirect means to refer to the King himself and his court, who had a history of granting such immunity. See Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 169.

292 This is the spelling employed by Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, and Gordon, *Calvin*. 
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Paris were reading, appreciating, and discussing the works of Martin Luther which were arriving by the hundreds from the printing presses of Basle.\textsuperscript{293} By 1523, "there was clearly in France a 'Lutheran' party which attracted sympathizers at every level of society," however, that party "remained outside the pale of orthodoxy because the teaching of pope, council, bishops, and the Paris Faculty of Theology kept it there."\textsuperscript{294} At that time, from the perspective of most folk in France—including bishops and clerics, university faculty and members of Parlement—"orthodoxy in France had very much to do with the way the Faculty of Theology of Paris saw it"\textsuperscript{295}; and as the Faculty, or at least its fervid syndic, Beda, saw it, anyone committed to humanist studies or even suspected of sympathizing with Luther's ideas was a heretic.\textsuperscript{296}

Such an attitude was evident already in 1520/1521, given the \textit{Determinatio} against Luther and the subsequent call for the censorship of books published in France.\textsuperscript{297} It escalated in 1523. In June, Pierre Lizet, \textit{avocat du roi} and future \textit{premier président} of the Parlement, solicited the Faculty's help in extirpating heresy at Meaux.\textsuperscript{298} Accordingly, the Faculty went after Lefèvre d'Etaples, the "leading Paris

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{293} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 49. Also Gilmont, \textit{Calvin and the Printed Book}, 180, who notes that when Calvin first arrived in Basel in 1535 he stayed in the home of Conrad Resch, who was "one of the first booksellers to send Lutheran books into France." See also Charles Partee, "Farel's Influence on Calvin: A Prolusion," \textit{Actes du Colloque Guillaume Farel 1980}, Tome 1 (Geneva: Revue de theologie et de philosophie, 1983), 174, with numerous references; and Gordon, \textit{Calvin}, 37.

\textsuperscript{294} Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy and Reform}, 162; emphasis added.

\textsuperscript{295} Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy and Reform}, 162.

\textsuperscript{296} Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy and Reform}, 170 and 171.

\textsuperscript{297} Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy and Reform}, 128 and 166; Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 49ff.

\textsuperscript{298} Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy and Reform}, 171.
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humanist," who, with his coterie, had retreated to Meaux in 1521, into the refuge of Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet and, ultimately, the king's sister, Marguerite d'Angoulême. Within a month, Beda informed the Faculty that the king had removed Lefèvre's case from the Parlement's jurisdiction, and thus their own, reserving it to his Grand Conseil. Such a move was "tantamount to dismissing the case." On three separate occasions that summer, the Faculty pressed its case against Lefèvre with the Grand Conseil, the king, the queen mother, and the chancellor. As James Farge puts it, "This continuing remonstration was to show that circulation of the commentaries and translations of Lefèvre and Louis de Berquin in the name of the faith and under the protection of the king was 'seriously pernicious' to the kingdom, since these were 'clearly favorable to the condemned heresies of Martin Luther.'" Louis de Berquin—who by 1523 had translated works by Luther, Melanchthon, and Karlstadt, and composed several of his own in the reformist vein—was indeed another of the Faculty's principal targets in its campaign against "the Lutheran party." In June and July 1523, the

299 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 170. See also Gordon, Calvin, 13.

300 According to Ganoczy, this circle included Guillaume Briçonnet, Guillaume Farel, Gérard Roussel, Michel d'Arnaude, Martial Mazurier, Pierre Caroli, François Vatable, and Josse Clichtove. According to Ganoczy, "All were zealous priests who desired reform" (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 51). For more about Meaux, see also Gordon, Calvin, 14ff.

301 "Lefèvre and the circle of Meaux enjoyed in the person of the King's sister, Marguerite d'Angoulême, Duchess of Alençon, a protector who was faithful as well as highly positioned. A cultivated woman with a mystical soul, the princess intervened on many occasions before her brother, Francis I, to block the denunciations made by the Sorbonne. She subsidized the publications of Lefèvre and his friends, secured prohibited books for them, and until 1521 was in constant correspondence with Briçonnet. And later, when pressured from the conservative traditionalists became more and more serious, she opened her home to the persecuted reformers" (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 52). See also Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, throughout.

302 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 172.

303 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 172.
Faculty and Parliament censured Berquin, and in August, imprisoned him. Again, the king, by way of his Grand Council, freed Berquin, forbidding the Faculty to examine him or his works.\(^{304}\) During this same time, the Faculty pursued other members of the Meaux circle, including Gérard Roussel, Pierre Caroli, and Martial Mazurier; others of the circle, Guillaume Farel and Michel d'Arande, retreated further, beyond France's borders. Well into the 1530s and 40s, the Faculty relentlessly pursued the "heretics" of the "Lutheran sect," their influence waxing and waning even as the influence of their predominantly humanist opponents waned and waxed.

Such was the environment in Paris when Calvin arrived to further his education there. He ventured into Paris at a time when "representatives of a scholastic theology strongly colored by nominalism wanted to prevent the renovators of biblical and patristic theology from making their voices heard.\(^{305}\)

He set sail on an intellectual sea that was swelling and heaving as proponents of "scholasticism" and proponents of "humanism\(^{306}\) clashed over ecclesial issues such as due reverence for Scripture,\(^{307}\) sound doctrine,\(^{308}\) popular piety,\(^{309}\) and clerical reform.

\(^{304}\) Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 174.

\(^{305}\) Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 57.

\(^{306}\) Scholars such as Muller (e.g., *Unaccommodated Calvin*) and Oberman repeatedly warn against the pitfalls of viewing scholasticism as "monolithic" and of making hasty generalizations about distinctions between scholasticism and humanism.

\(^{307}\) See e.g., Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 170 and 177ff.

\(^{308}\) On doctrines such as the Assumption of Mary. See Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 173.

\(^{309}\) For excellent discussion, see Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 173.
3.2 Early Beginnings

Prior to his arrival in Paris, "Jean Cauvin" had been reared in a devout, Roman Catholic home in Noyon of Picardy. He was first educated in a boys' school run by the cathedral chapter, the Collège des Capettes, and later tutored in the home of Louis de Hangest, lord of Montmor. The de Hangest family, whose fold included the bishop in Noyon, Charles, "were devoted to moderate reform." When he was eleven, Calvin's father, Gérard Cauvin, secured a benefice for him, which he was awarded May 19, 1521. Gérard expected Jean would become a priest.

In August 1523, Calvin and some of the boys in the de Hangest family moved to Paris to further their education. Calvin was just fourteen at the time. He first stayed at the home of his Uncle Richard, but soon settled into studies at the University of Paris' Collège de La Marche, a college "imbued with a humanistic spirit." Although Calvin studied there but a matter of months, his instructor in Latin, Mathurin Cordier, proved to have had a profound and lasting influence on him. Cordier is renowned not only for his skill in Latin and grammar, but also as an "heir of biblical humanism and of the

---

310 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 57.

311 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 57; also de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 19. There is some debate as to whether Calvin arrived in Paris in 1521 or 1523, and whether he studied with Cordier having formally enrolled at the Collège de La Marche or simply as a private tutee. For example, one of Calvin's first biographer, Nicolas Colladon suggests the former, while Alister McGrath presses the latter (McGrath, *Life of John Calvin*, 21-27).

312 In his dedication of his commentary of 1 Thessalonians, Calvin wrote of Cordier: "When my father sent me as a boy to Paris I had done only the rudiments of Latin. For a short time, however, you were an instructor sent to me by God to teach me the true method of learning, so that I might afterwards be a little more proficient" (*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, trans. R. MacKenzie, *CNTC* 8:331, cited in Zachman, "The Life and Work of John Calvin," in *John Calvin as Teacher*, 16). Also, in 1562, at Calvin's behest, Cordier moved to Geneva to teach (de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 19). See also Gordon, *Calvin*, 6.
devotio moderna" who longed for his students "to be initiated not only in grammar but
at the same time in piety and in love of Christ, his word and his laws."\textsuperscript{313}

Before the year turned, the tutor of the de Hangest family withdrew Calvin from
the Collège de La Marche and enrolled him in the Collège de Montaigu, where Erasmus
and Rabelais themselves had once studied. As an academic institution, Montaigu
possessed "a very solid reputation as an austere and demanding ecclesiastical school."\textsuperscript{314}
In the late 15th century, Jan Standonck saw to the school's reform, making it "a vital
center of clerical development,"\textsuperscript{315} though this particular vitality flagged under the
leadership of Standonck's immediate successors, Noël Beda (1504-1513) and Pierre
Tempête (1513-1528). According to Ganoczy, Beda and Tempête "preserved the
severity of Standonck, but they did not inherit his greatness of soul."\textsuperscript{316}

While at the Collège de Montaigu from 1524-1528, Calvin was enrolled to attain
the licencié en arts, a preparatory degree required for pursuing a doctorate in Theology,
Canon Law, or Medicine.\textsuperscript{317} During his time there, Calvin, as a student of the arts,
would have attended lectures, or courses, in "logic, metaphysics, ethics, the 'sciences,'
and rhetoric."\textsuperscript{318} According to historical documents and scholars who have pored over
them, "it is quite likely that Calvin studied only scholastic philosophy at Montaigu and

\textsuperscript{313} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 57. See also de Greef, \textit{Writings of John Calvin}, 19.

\textsuperscript{314} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 57. See also Gordon, \textit{Calvin}, 7-8.

\textsuperscript{315} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 58.

\textsuperscript{316} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 60. See also de Greef, \textit{Writings of John Calvin}, 20. During Calvin's
term at Montaigu, Tempête was ascribed the nickname \textit{horrida tempestas}.

\textsuperscript{317} Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy}, 11-12; Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 60, 66, 173-177.

\textsuperscript{318} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 59-60.
that he had no real contact with theology as such."\textsuperscript{319} So while Calvin was schooled in scholastic \textit{philosophy}, taught with a nominalist (i.e., terminist) bent prevalent at Montaigu at the time, he was never schooled in scholastic \textit{theology}.\textsuperscript{320} To suggest that he was schooled in scholastic theology, writes Ganoczy, one "would have to prove that Calvin, between the ages of fourteen and seventeen, departed from the ordinary regimen of the strictest Parisian school to take courses reserved for older students of the Faculty of Theology, instead of—or in addition to—lessons in grammar, philosophy, and science."\textsuperscript{321} While it is true that Calvin's father first directed him on a course toward the formal study of theology, it is also true that just at the point when Calvin would have undertaken such study, his father withdrew him from the Collège de Montaigu to redirect him to the formal study of law.\textsuperscript{322}

\textsuperscript{319} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 174.

\textsuperscript{320} W. F. Dankbaar "points out that Calvin acquired the greater part of his theological knowledge as a self-taught man, for apart from a few lessons on scholastic thinkers and the Fathers, he was never a student in a theological school" (Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 174n43, with reference to W. F. Dankbaar, \textit{Calvin, sein Weg und sein Werk} [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1959], 26). Endnote 43 contains the direct quote from Dankbaar, with Ganoczy's emphasis added: "It should also be noted that he acquired his very extensive theological knowledge for the most part through self-study. Apart from his readings in some works of the scholastics and Church Fathers, he in fact neither attended theological lectures nor attained an academic degree in that faculty" (Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 354). Since the mid-20th century, scholars have argued over this point arduously. Ganoczy provides an excellent analysis in his study in Chapter 16: "Scholastic Theology," 168-78. For further summaries, discussions, and arguments allaying with Ganoczy's strong conclusion, see Lane, \textit{Student of the Church Fathers}, 16-25; Muller, \textit{Unaccommodated Calvin}, 44ff.; and Oberman, "\textit{Initia Calvini}," 117ff. That Calvin was not schooled in scholasticism distinguishes him from both Luther and Zwingli, who were schooled in \textit{via moderna} and \textit{via antiqua} respectively. According to Oberman, this is one, dominant reason why they simply could not help but talk past each other. See Heiko Oberman, \textit{"Via antiqua und Via moderna: Late Medieval Prolegomena to Early Reformation Thought"}, in \textit{From Ockham to Wyclif}, ed. A. Hudson and M. Wilks, Studies in Church History, vol. 5 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987), 445-463.

\textsuperscript{321} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 177: Alternatively, one would have to "establish that the masters of Montaigu did not follow the program, or at least from time to time commented on the Sentences for the younger students instead of or in addition to the treatises of Aristotle and other manuals of the 'liberal arts.'" This passage, and Ganoczy's discussion as a whole, is cited approvingly by Lane, Muller, and Oberman, to name a few.
Beyond the foregoing detail, little can be said for what specifically might have "influenced" Calvin during this period of his education. It cannot—and should not—be "squeezed for more information than it could yield," as Oberman puts it.\(^{323}\) So one wonders, as Ganoczy does, what ideas about contemporary religious questions Calvin encountered, countenanced, and even defended. Were they "the fiercely antireformist and anti-Lutheran traditional ideas of his educators? Had he adopted these ideas for his own? Or did he accept the ideas of some friends who read Erasmus, Lefèvre, and Luther?" Did he have access to their works, and did he avail himself of them? To what influential end? One simply cannot say.\(^{324}\) Nor can one say much about Calvin's immediate circle of friends, though scholars surmise it included Joachim, Yves, and Claude de Hangest, with whom he was tutored in Noyon;\(^{325}\) Nicholas Cop and his family, Guillaume Cop being the court physician to King Francis through whom Calvin may have been introduced to various humanistic and reform-minded ideas and circles;\(^{326}\) and likely his (that is, Calvin's) cousin, Pierre Robert Olivétan, who was also studying in Paris at the time.\(^{327}\)

---

\(^{322}\) Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 174. See also Gordon, *Calvin*, 18.

\(^{323}\) Oberman, "*Initia Calvini*,"117. Also Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 61-63.


\(^{325}\) Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 61.

\(^{326}\) De Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 20.

\(^{327}\) Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 61; de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 20. Of Olivetan's relation with him, Ganoczy writes: "He [Olivétan] was from Noyon, and a lawyer's son. He was living in Paris at the time his relative [Calvin] was studying at Montaigu, and then they found themselves together again at Orléans, at least for a time, at the same university. He must have concentrated on classical languages, including Greek and Hebrew, early in his studies in order to accomplish his demanding enterprise of translating the Bible from the original texts. For this French Bible, published in 1535, Calvin wrote a Latin preface in which Olivétan is described as a 'relative' of the author and an
3.3 Turning from Theology to Law, to Humanism, to Reform

In 1527, when Calvin had attained his licencié en arts, his father redirected him educationally and vocationally from theology to law. Rather than taking up such study in Paris, Calvin relocated in early 1528 to Orléans. There he became a student of the distinguished jurist Pierre de l'Estoile, an ecclesial and theological conservative who had no small part in the attempt to stem the tide of Luther's influence in France.

Ganoczy observes that "if the young Calvin had been truly 'converted' at this time, or at least on the road of 'pure religion,' he doubtless would have disapproved of the attitude of his professor. But what do we find? The respectful and fervent devotion of a good student to his master." Some four years later, in 1531, such devotion was roused to the defense of de l'Estoile against the sharp attacks of the Italian jurist and humanist Andreas Alciati, with whom Calvin was studying at that time.

Others with whom Calvin consorted in Orléans all demonstrated avid interest in the studia humanitatis. Melchior Wolmar, a distinguished instructor of Greek and a

---

328 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 63; de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 21. The absolute reason for this change is not discernible, though it may have had something to do with Gerard's quarrels with Calvin's patrons back in Noyon.

329 According to Ganoczy, de l'Estoile sat on the Council of Sens in 1528, which set itself against the "Lutherans" and other "heretics," such as translators, printers, editors, and readers of the French Bible (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 64). See also Gordon, Calvin, 19-20.

330 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 66.

331 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 66.
"brilliant classical scholar"\textsuperscript{332} originally from Württemberg, initiated Calvin "into the rudiments of Greek and no doubt other humanist learning,"\textsuperscript{333} says Ganoczy. Whether Wolmar, who spoke of reform openly and with a Lutheran accent, influenced Calvin in this particular regard is much debated.\textsuperscript{334} François Wendel, whom Ganoczy cites approvingly on this point, wrote that Calvin has not "left one line that alludes to any such influence . . . we have to confess that nothing justifies the hypotheses that are constructed to show that the conversion of Calvin began during his stay at Orléans and was due principally to Wolmar."\textsuperscript{335} In any case, according to Calvin's first biographer, Theodore Beza, in these months, Calvin worked himself hard enough in the study of law with de l'Estoile and classical literature with Wolmar to jeopardize his health for his lifetime.\textsuperscript{336} Calvin's other close companions in Orléans—François Daniel, Nicholas Duchemin, and François de Connan—imbibed humanist thought, too, particularly through the writings of Rabelais, Erasmus, and Lefèvre. None, however, turned to "radical" reform, as Calvin eventually did.

In 1529, Calvin was on the move again, this time to Bourges. There he would sit at the feet of the Italian humanist and jurist Andreas Alciati, who approached the study

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{332} Steinmetz, \textit{Calvin in Context}, 7.

\textsuperscript{333} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 68. Ganoczy further discusses the ongoing scholarly debate over the extent to which Wolmar influenced Calvin with Lutheran ideas. In the dedication of his commentary on 2 Corinthians (which Calvin dedicated to Wolmar), Calvin himself attests to Wolmar's introducing him to Greek. See also Gordon, \textit{Calvin}, 19.

\textsuperscript{334} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 68.


\end{footnotesize}
of law with a textual critical, historical method, and whose teaching was riddled with criticism of Calvin's most recent teacher, Pierre de l'Estoile. Whereas Orléans was a locale where reformist ideas and humanist learning would be looked on with suspicion or even contempt, in Bourges such views might be freely expressed and explored, not least because Bourges had recently come under the patronage, i.e., protection, of the newly appointed Queen of Navarre and Duchess of Berry, Marguerite d'Angoulême. According to Ganoczy, at this point in his life, Calvin "no doubt began to number himself" among "Christian humanists." And indeed, he soon left Bourges, in the spring of 1531, to return to Paris, his compass set on the studia humanitatis.

Upon returning to Paris, Calvin took up studies at the newly founded Collège Royale (later the Collège de France). According to Farge, since 1517, Guillaume Budé, the king's librarian, and other humanists "had been urging the establishment of

337 Steinmetz, Calvin in Context, 7. See also Gordon, Calvin, 20.
338 De Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 22.
339 See above. See also Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 69; Steinmetz, Calvin in Context, 7. According to Steinmetz, Calvin learned from Alciati "an approach to the explication of a legal text that could, with certain modifications, be employed in the exposition of Scripture."
340 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 69.
341 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 70.
342 Calvin was drawn away to Noyon briefly, to attend to his father's declining health and death. Steinmetz surmises of this event: "While Calvin mourned his father's death, he also experienced it as a liberation from the obligation to practice law. He returned to Paris to the Collège de France, where he studied Greek with Danès and Hebrew with Vatable. He was now free to put his legal books on the shelf and to devote himself to humanist studies." Steinmetz, Calvin in Context, 7. See also Gordon, Calvin, 31ff.
343 Interestingly, Farge does not mention this "Collège" by such names, but seemingly refers to this group, or institution, as simply "royal lecturers" or "the king's lecturers in the three languages" (see Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 49 and 205, and the index p 305). He also does not mention the 1530 Determinatio Facultatis against the royal readers.
royally endowed lectures in the 'three languages' to promote literary as well as
exegetical studies, and in 1530 their efforts were rewarded. Among those appointed
were Budé, François Vatable (Hebrew), Pierre Danès (Greek), and Nicholas Cop, all of
whom were devotees of Lefèvre. Though appointed to their posts by King Francis
himself, they were not immune to the sharp attacks of the Faculty of Theology of Paris,
particularly Beda, who "accused them of undermining the Vulgate Bible by accenting
differences between it and certain Greek and Hebrew manuscripts. Already in the
same year as their founding (1530), the royal readers were formally censured by the
Faculty in a Determinatio. No doubt Calvin was aware of these circumstances, yet he
affiliated with this college of royal readers despite them—a sign, shall we say, of the
measure of his determination, of his commitment to the studia humanitatis. According to Ganoczy, "the lessons of the royal readers brought him [Calvin] into
profound and prolonged contact with the humanism of Erasmus and Lefèvre." No

344 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 49.
345 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 205.
346 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 69. Ganoczy elaborates: "Two propositions condemned by the Faculty were expressed in these words: 'First proposition: Holy Scripture cannot be understood properly without Greek, Hebrew, and other similar languages. Censura: this proposition is imprudent and scandalous. Second proposition: no preacher can explain the truth of an epistle or Gospel without the aforementioned languages. Censura: this proposition is false, impious, and prevents in a pernicious manner Christian people from hearing the Word of God. Moreover, the authors of these assertions are strongly suspected of Lutheranism" (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 69-70, citing A. Lefranc, Histoire du Collège de France, 122).
347 Regarding Calvin and his favorable estimation of Guillaume Budé and his long-standing relationship with the Budé family, see Randall C. Zachman, John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian: The Shape of His Writings and Thought (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 16-17, and Jeannine E. Olson, "The Friends of John Calvin: the Budé Family," Calvin Studies Society Papers 1995 and 1997 (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, CRC Product Services, 1998), 159-166, respectively.
348 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 70.
doubt they also whet his appetite for his lifelong, principal calling in the exegesis of Scripture.

Not even a year had passed since Calvin began to study the *lettres humaines* in earnest and already he was publishing his first work in this vein, his commentary on the *De clementia* of Seneca. Dedicated to Claude de Hangest of Noyon, the work's introduction declares the author's intent to point out a few details formerly missed by Erasmus. As a whole the work demonstrates that Calvin "knows his Greek and Roman classics quite well, along with Augustine's *City of God.*"\(^{349}\) He demonstrates knowledge of other of the church fathers too, though "the patristic citations in his commentary on *De clementia* are drawn heavily from the *Decretum Gratiani*."\(^{350}\) Calvin's commentary on *De clementia*—published at his own expense and with great financial anxiety\(^{351}\)—marked his debut as a humanist, as a Christian humanist.\(^{352}\)

\(^{349}\) Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 73.

\(^{350}\) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 48, with favorable reference to F. L. Battles, "The Sources of Calvin's Seneca Commentary" in G. E. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay, 1966), 56. Lane notes here that "in his early years, Calvin made use of two compendia: the *Decretum Gratiani* and Lombard's *Sententiae.*"

\(^{351}\) Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 84 and 180. According to Gilmont, Calvin asked some of his friends to use the work in teaching their university courses, in order to boost its sales.

\(^{352}\) On the question of Calvin's relation to Renaissance humanism, Oberman writes: "If dedication to the *studia humanitatis* is to be the sole criterion for evaluation, then Calvin fills the bill in every respect. The evidence of his Ciceronian ideal of matching clarity with brevity; his mastery of the variety of rhetorical rules applying to Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; his discerning use of classical historiography; and his first-hand knowledge of the chief authors of classical moral philosophy is already displayed in his commentary on Seneca's *De clementia*. His classical training provided him with an arsenal of knowledge which allowed him in the remaining thirty years of his life to apply the whole range of humanistic sophistication to his remarkably historical textual exegesis. Calvin was a *homo trilinguus*, fully committed to the liberal arts and in this sense a true humanist, a man who stood consciously – and critically! – in the tradition reaching from Plato to Seneca and from Erasmus to Budé" (Heiko A. Oberman, "The Pursuit of Happiness: Calvin between Humanism and Reformation," in *Humanity and Divinity in Renaissance and Reformation: Essays in Honor of Charles Trinkhaus*, ed. J. W. O'Malley, T. M. Isbicki, and G. Christianson (New York: Brill, 1993), 274-75; see also Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 180).
In May 1532, Calvin returned to Orléans for nearly a year and a half in order to attain his *licencié en loi*. Little else is known of Calvin in this period, except that he made a brief trip to Noyon in August in 1533 and to Paris in early October. At the end of this period, Calvin returned to Paris seemingly to stay for some time. The ongoing quarrel between the Faculty of Theology and the "humanists," or so-called "Lutherans," was at its apex: In May, the King had exiled Beda for having criticized the Lenten sermons of Gérard Roussel, preached before the King of France and the Queen of Navarre. In October, the Faculty censured the Queen's *Le miroire de l'âme pécheresse*, though an inquiry taken up by the rector of the university, Nicholas Cop, at the behest of the King failed to ratify the Faculty's action. At nearly the same time, students of the Collège de Navarre staged a comedy, a harmful parody directed at the Queen of Navarre and her chaplain, Roussel. Calvin recounted each of these last two events in a letter sent to his friend Daniel in Orléans. Upon examining this letter thoroughly, Ganoczy concludes that its author "appears to be aligned with the party of Marguerite, Roussel, and Cop. This is why he speaks ironically regarding certain doctors of the Faculty, the antireformists of the Collège de Navarre, and the rector [of Saint-André], [Nicolas] Le Clerc, who wished to defend the King against the 'sinister' supporters of Erasmus and Lefèvre." Though it "speaks ironically" of some doctors of the Faculty, who are referred to as "certain factious theologians," the letter, according to Ganoczy, does not yet betray "a single indication of anticlericalism or anti-Roman sentiment." Its author is a Christian humanist, committed to ideas of Lefèvre, Erasmus, Luther, and

---

353 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 79.
Melanchthon (and seemingly indiscriminately so), but not yet "converted" to radical
reform.354

Suspicion of such "conversion" mounted quickly in November of 1533, however. On All Saints' Day, the rector of the University of Paris, Nicolas Cop, delivered an address—355—a custom marking the beginning of the academic year. Though Cop was not a theologian, he delivered something of a sermon on the beatitudes found in Matthew 5 working favorably off Erasmus' Paraclesis and Luther's Kirchenpostillen.356 The Faculty reacted strongly, to say the least. Cop was charged with heresy, first by the Faculty, then by Parlement. The King himself was readily inclined to order the "strict prosecution of 'this damnable Lutheran sect which is infesting' the city of Paris."357 Some of Cop's associates were arrested, including Roussel. Calvin, too, was targeted, but was warned in time to flee Paris; his room at the Collège Fortet was searched and his papers confiscated. Cop himself fled to Basel, Parlement having put a bounty on his head.358 With respect to this incident, Farge

354 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 79-80.

355 Since there is a fragment of this speech in Calvin's hand, it was once conjectured that Calvin prepared this speech. This conjecture has been proved false. See Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 80-82. Ganoczy also provides a summary of the speech.

356 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 80. Luther's Kirchenpostillen had been translated into Latin by Bucer in 1530. Ganoczy notes: "This discourse could serve as the 'party manifesto' of Lefèvre and Erasmus" (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 165, with reference to Mann, Erasme et les débuts de la réforme française, 165). Cop also employed Erasmus' Latin New Testament (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 329n14). Ganoczy further notes: "To the Catholic theologian of today, nothing would appear heterodox about this proclamation. The author certainly quotes entire passages from Luther, but the passages contain what is essentially Catholic doctrine" (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 82).

357 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 204, citing AN X1A 1537, fols 28v-29r; see also A. L. Herminjard, Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française (Geneva and Paris, 1866), 3: Letter 440.

358 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 82-83; see also de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 23.
writes: "Like most of the humanists and reformers, Cop and Calvin had misjudged the climate for reform in Paris," even if the "parti intransigéant' was on the defensive." Following this incident, "the Faculty of Theology relentlessly continued its prosecution of heretics."

Calvin wandered briefly and eventually found sanctuary in Saintonge at the home of his friend Louis du Tillet, canon of Angoulême and rector of Claix. Du Tillet's family was well-off and interested in the humanities: they had amassed a library of several thousand volumes in Angoulême, which would no doubt have been at Calvin's disposal during his brief time there. Calvin—or "Charles d'Espeville" as he identified himself during this time—would also have been introduced to du Tillet's reformist circle.

359 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 204.

360 Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform, 204. See also Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 89. Here Ganoczy is recounting Calvin's first letter to Bucer in Strasbourg, a letter in which Calvin aims to defend a friend recently come to Strasbourg and falsely accused there of being Anabaptist. Ganoczy quotes Calvin's letter and comments on it accordingly: "'Nevertheless, when he was no longer able to risk his life in that voluntary servitude which we bear even now, he emigrated to you, with no hope of returning.' One can easily guess the circumstances to which he [Calvin] alludes. For some time, but especially since Cop's discourse and the imprisonment of Gérard Roussel, the Fabrisian reformists and the Lutherans groaned under the pressure of their adversaries, who had a very powerful and repressive apparatus at their disposal. The partisans of Church reform were no longer able to speak freely. It was certainly a bondage for them, but a voluntary bondage, for if they wanted, they could be free by leaving for another country."

361 Steinmetz ("Introduction to Calvin," in Calvin in Context, 9) writes: "During the next few months Calvin's movements are difficult to trace. He returned briefly to Paris, where he was granted an audience with the king's sister, Marguerite d'Angoulême, who had established herself as patron of French reformist movements." Steinmetz does not cite a source noting the occurrence of this visit. Interestingly, it is not corroborated by Ganoczy, Young Calvin, or de Greef, "Overview of Calvin's Life," in Writings of John Calvin.

362 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 84, citing Florimond de Raemond, Histoire de la naissance, progrès et décadence de l'hérésie de ce siècle (Paris, 1605, and Rouen, 1623), 885.

363 De Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 23.

364 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 84.
Calvin left Saintonge sometime in the spring of 1534. He is reported to have visited Lefèvre at the chateau of Nérac, where the eminent humanist received the hospitality of the Queen of Navarre, and Roussel, who lived in the abbey at Clairac. Soon after he returned to Noyon to resign his benefice.365

By way of Paris,366 Calvin returned again to Orléans. During this stay he composed the first version of his first theological treatise, the Psychopannychia. Some scholars, including Ganoczy, suggest this treatise is a door to what Calvin was reading in the church fathers in 1532-33.367 Others, such as Anthony Lane, are appropriately cautious, pointing out that the text of the 1534 Psychopannychia is "uncertain," as it was revised in 1536 and not finally published until 1542368:

There is no certainty that Calvin added no further material in the 1542 published edition. Patristic citations are precisely the sort of material that can easily be added at a later date to strengthen an argument. . . . We cannot be sure, therefore, that all of the patristic material from 1542 dates from 1536 or earlier, though that is a real possibility.

As Lane notes, there is the possibility that the patristic citations of the 1542 edition of the Psychopannychia date as far back as the first edition of 1534. Since this

365 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 85. According to Ganoczy, in the Noyon archives one can find a document dated 4 May 1534 which attests that the chaplaincy of John Calvin was given to a new beneficiary. For more on Calvin's resignation, voluntary or involuntary, see Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 85-86.

366 While in Paris, Calvin is believed to have stayed with Etienne de la Forge (Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 86). He is also reported to have set up a meeting with Servetus which Servetus failed to attend.


368 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 31. In 1542, this treatise was published under the title Vivere apud Christu non dormire animis sanctis. In 1545, a second, enlarged edition was published in 1545, this time under the title Psychopannychia.
possibility exists, to which fathers does Calvin seem to have been introduced—in some fashion—already in the early 1530s given his reference to them? Lane notes these fathers, though with important caveats: Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* (which Calvin cites already in the 1534 preface); Polycarp and Melito (both by way of Eusebius); Origen (perhaps by way of a secondary source); Basil, *Hexaemeron* (though Calvin is known to have acquired a copy of a 1540 edition of Basil and was reading it come 1542, so these references may be from the 1540s); Hilary; Augustine (also by way of the *Decretum Gratiani*\(^{369}\)); Chrystostom (though Calvin is known to have acquired a copy of the 1536 edition of Chrysostom and that he was studying it come 1539, so these references may have been added between 1536 and 1542); Cyril of Alexandria, commentary on John; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* (though Calvin is known to have read Irenaeus seriously in the early 1540s, so these references, too, may be later additions).\(^{370}\)

In November 1533, Cop's discourse piqued the ire of the Faculty, Parlement, and the King toward any who spoke with a reformist accent. Eleven months later, in October 1534, another incident raised their ire: the *affaire des placards*. As Farge succinctly describes and assesses it,

> On the night of October 17-18, satirical broadsheets criticizing the Mass appeared in Paris and in several provincial cities (including Amboise, where the king was staying). These posters, entitled 'Articles veritables sur les horribles grandz la sainct Cene de Jesus Christ,' infuriated the king. He ordered a series of repressive measures against the reformers. For three months both king and

---

\(^{369}\) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 157n42. Lane is referring to Augustine's *De haeresibus*, which "Calvin mentions... in the 1534 preface to his *Psyhopannychia* (CO 5:170f.), but gives the *Decretum Gratiani* as an intermediate source."

\(^{370}\) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 72-73.
Parlement issued warrants, seizures, arrests, and condemnation. At least twenty-four alleged heretics were executed. Francis even issued an edict on 13 January prohibiting the printing of all books, an order which he rescinded in part two weeks later by limiting printing in Paris to twenty-four printers. His anger began to abate only after a solemn procession of expiation on 21 January 1535. . . . . Historians agree that the cause of both humanism and reformation was irreparably hurt by the *placards*. On the one hand, reformism was never again as reputable as it was before; on the other, those who had opposed reform now enjoyed greater favor.\(^{371}\)

3.4 Escape to Basel and a Period of Sojourn

In the midst of the mounting threat of persecution, Calvin, along with his friend du Tillet, fled for their lives to Basel by way of Strasbourg.\(^{372}\) It was January 1535. Nicholas Cop had arrived in the same city a year earlier, in his second flight from France, and Erasmus\(^{373}\) would return there some six months later, remaining there until his death in 1536. That humanists such as Cop and Erasmus would seek asylum in Basel is not surprising given that it was a center of humanist thought by this time in the sixteenth century. This cultural identity was due not to its University, the "significance" of which should not be "overestimated," but to the thriving printing industry there,\(^{374}\)


\(^{372}\) Regarding Calvin in Basel, see also Gordon, Chapter Four: "Exile in a Hidden Corner," in *Calvin*, 47-62.

\(^{373}\) Erasmus had first arrived in 1514, intending to stop only briefly as he made way to Italy. He stayed more than a year, attracted by the intellectuals of the "Sodalitas Basiliensis" and especially the Froben printing house. Taken by its Greek types, he decided to have the Greek New Testament published there, its first edition in 1516, its second in 1518, and its third in 1521. Hans R. Guggisberg, *Basel in the Sixteenth Century: Aspects of the City Republic Before, During, and After the Reformation* (St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1982), 14-15.

\(^{374}\) Guggisberg, *Basel in the Sixteenth Century*, 9. See 9ff for elaboration on the "various factors [that] had made it possible for the 'black art' to come to Basel so early" (1460s) and prosperously. The
which offered scholars opportunities for publishing.\textsuperscript{375} Scholars were also attracted by the voluminous, accessible libraries of the Carthusian and Dominican monasteries in Basel.\textsuperscript{376} According to one prominent scholar on the history of Basel, Hans R. Guggisberg, one important characteristic of the humanist movement in Basel in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is its Christian, biblical, and ethical orientation. The Basel movement never went through a phase of paganism and it was never dominated by national or nationalistic ideas. From the beginning its main interest was directed toward the sources of Christianity. Editing Holy Scriptures and the works of the Church fathers in their original versions was its great aim even before the arrival of Erasmus of Rotterdam. The striving for the renewal of Christian life also began long before Luther's writings\textsuperscript{377} became known, and we must not overlook the fact that the desire to become acquainted with the sources of Christianity was widespread not only among clerics but also among educated laymen. The chief and general concern was the expansion of knowledge and the deepening of the understanding of Christian ethics.\textsuperscript{378}

Such emphases allowed for the emergence of the Reformation in this free imperial city, however fitfully the movement actually took hold. Already in 1518 Luther's works were beginning to appear, mostly from the printing house of Adam Petri. In this and years to come, Petri published the "popular" works not only of Luther but

---

\textsuperscript{375} Guggisberg, \textit{Basel in the Sixteenth Century}, 10.

\textsuperscript{376} Guggisberg, \textit{Basel in the Sixteenth Century}, 11 and 8.

\textsuperscript{377} Elsewhere Guggisberg notes: "In 1518 the first Basel editions of Luther's writings were published. From then on their number increased constantly until the early 1520s. At that time the city on the Rhine became the center of distribution of Luther's works not only for Southwestern Germany and Switzerland but at least temporarily for the whole of Western Europe." Ganoczy notes on the first page of his text that Luther's works were flowing heavily into France in the late 15-teens, from the printing houses of Basel (Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 26). Could this be also what drew Calvin there?

\textsuperscript{378} Guggisberg, \textit{Basel in the Sixteenth Century}, 11.
also of other "Protestant propagandists," all in the vernacular.\textsuperscript{379} Zwingli's works soon circulated in the city as well, and, in fact, it was his thought that eventually came to predominate.\textsuperscript{380} In November 1522, Johann Oecolampadius—an associate of Johannes Reuchlin, Melanchthon,\textsuperscript{381} Wolfgang Capito, and Erasmus—\textsuperscript{382} had arrived, taking up duties as an editor of patristic texts for Cratander, lecturer at the University, and preacher at St. Martin's. In these latter two roles in particular Oecolampadius found an outlet for reformist ideas, some compatible with Luther's, some with Zwingli's, and some more independent. Following years of politico-theological strife, in 1528 "it became more and more obvious that the progress of the Reformation could not be stopped,"\textsuperscript{383} and in April 1529 a new church order was established by the city council, the so-called Reformationsordnung.\textsuperscript{384} In the wake of the Reformation's success in Basel, the majority of the university faculty and students left the city, as did some prominent humanists, including Erasmus. The city—and university—gradually recouped its identity, and already in the mid 1530s, printing and the arrival of foreign scholars once again flourished after their brief decline in the early 1530s. Upon

\textsuperscript{379} Guggisberg, \textit{Basel in the Sixteenth Century}, 21.

\textsuperscript{380} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 93.


\textsuperscript{382} In 1515-1526, Oecolampadius assisted Erasmus and his printer, Froben, in the production of the Greek New Testament.

\textsuperscript{383} It should be duly noted that Oecolampadius was not "acting alone" in the reform of Basel, nor was he ever the dominant figure in Basel in the way that Zwingli was in Zürich. Several evangelical parish priests, former monks, and other theologians of humanist training (e.g., Marx Bertschi, Wolfgang Wissenburg, Johann Lüthart, and Thomas Girfält) ushered the movement along in their own way. See Guggisberg, \textit{Basel in the Sixteenth Century}, 34ff.

\textsuperscript{384} Guggisberg, \textit{Basel in the Sixteenth Century}, 25.
Oecolampadius' death in 1531 (just months after Zwingli's), Oswald Myconius was appointed to succeed him as Antistes, or head of the church.\textsuperscript{385}

So there is little wonder why Calvin, a budding Christian humanist of reformist disposition, would have sought refuge in Basel.\textsuperscript{386} Here he could avail himself of newly printed editions of the fathers and newly minted pamphlets on ecclesial reform, and surely here he could find a printer for the work he himself was gestating, namely, the first edition of his \textit{Institutio Christinae religionis}.

Probably begun either during his stay at the home of du Tillet in Angoulême (1534), or during his last stay in Orléans, Calvin likely finished his "\textit{breve enchiridion}" (as he called it) in August 1535, the date inscribed on the dedicatory letter.\textsuperscript{387} Calvin's own comments about the work indicate "that Calvin had begun to compose the \textit{Institutes} as a catechetical manual some time before his decision to address the volume to Francis I and that the apologetic thrust of the address was in fact secondary to the original intention of the document."\textsuperscript{388}


\textsuperscript{386} He arrived and lived in Basel under the pseudonym "Martinus Lucianus" (Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 93), seeking a life of solitude and study, perhaps intending to fill a "a role in the rapidly changing religious world similar to that played by Erasmus prior to his death"—through books and correspondence (Gilmont, \textit{Calvin and the Printed Book}, 11).

\textsuperscript{387} Gilmont, \textit{Calvin and the Printed Book}, 40.

As has often been observed, the form of Calvin's initial *Institutio* "is very close to the form of Luther's *Small* and *Large Catechism*, although, even from a purely formal perspective, the catechetical model was readily available to Calvin from other sources, and he chose it, arguably, because it was a standard and not a revolutionary form."  

For his part, Ganoczy asserts and defends the thesis that, among his contemporaries, the *principal* influences on Calvin's theological thought as evidenced in the 1536 *Institutio* include: first and foremost, Luther, particularly by way of his *Small Catechism*, the *Babylonian Captivity*, *On Christian Liberty*, and two sermons on the Eucharist, the *Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi und von den Bruderschaften* and the *Sermon von dem Sakrament des Leibes und Blutes Christi wider die Schwarmgeister*; Melanchthon, particularly by way of his *Loci*...
communes theologici, the first edition of which appeared in 1521 and the second in 1535/36/37; Zwingli, particularly by way of his *De vera et falsa religione commentarius*; and finally Bucer, particularly by way of his *Enarrationes perpetuae in sacra quatuor evangelia*, which appeared in its second edition in 1530. Ganoczy's conclusions in this regard have been generally accepted and built upon by scholars since.

---

395 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 146-51. Ganoczy is convinced that Melanchthon's definition of *"sacrament"* was appropriated by Calvin. Melanchthon, says Ganoczy, "describes the sacramental sign in these terms: 'For in the Scriptures, *signs are added to the promises*, as if they were seals; while they remind us of the promise, they also are certain testimonies of the divine will toward us. They testify that we shall certainly receive what God has promised'" (Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 148; italics Ganoczy's). For his part, Ganoczy finds direct parallels between Melanchthon's expression and Calvin's regarding these italicized terms, though including "seal," or *sphragis* (see Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 149). Muller in particular emphasizes the influence of Melanchthon's theological tome on the order and structure of the *Institutio*, beginning with its second edition in 1539 (Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, e.g., 125-126).

396 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 151ff. Zwingli wrote this work in 1525 at the behest of several Frenchmen of reformist disposition, and he dedicated it to Francis I. According to Ganoczy, "Within the circle of Lefèvre d'Etaples and Gérard Roussel, with which Calvin was associated, this book was certainly known and read" (citing the introduction to the edition of Zwingli's *Commentary in the Corpus Reformatorum* 90:590-91). So Calvin may have become familiar with it in France, or perhaps more likely in Basel, which is Ganoczy's conclusion (Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 93). According to Ganoczy, regarding the relation between Calvin and Zwingli on sacramental thought: "It is well known that Calvin especially rejects the symbolism with which Zwingli explains the sign of the sacrament: 'only a sign and figure of the body'" (Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 151). Also, Calvin uses terms that Zwingli uses but in a different cast (for discussion, see Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 153f). See also Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 84-85, noting that Davis follows Ganoczy's lead. Muller emphasizes and explores the influence of Zwingli's thought on Calvin's *second* edition of the *Institutio*, 1539 (Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 124-125).

397 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 159. The first edition appeared in 1527. In part, Ganoczy works off the prior scholarship of A. Lang and R. Seeberg to demonstrate Bucer's influence as it is evidenced in the first edition of the *Institutio*. According to Ganoczy, "the most interesting traces of Bucer's thought are found in passages of the *Institutes* that deal with the Church (the community of the elect and the kingdom of God), the Lord's Prayer, and the power of the keys" (pg 159). Further according to Ganoczy—and of particular interest to the study at hand—"Bucer constantly stressed the primary role of the Spirit in the Church" (Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 161). For Ganoczy's sources see Augustus Lang, "Die Quellen der *Institutio* von 1536," *Evangelische Theologie* 3 (1936), 100-12; and Reinhold Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed., Vol 4/2 (Basle, 1954).
The above influences, of course, concern Calvin's contemporaries. But what of the influence of medieval and patristic sources? Concerning scholastic influence, Ganoczy's work has been seminal, and approvingly received by such scholars as Heiko Oberman,398 Anthony Lane,399 and Richard Muller after him. Indeed, Muller writes:

According to Ganoczy's measured conclusions, 'the first edition of the Institutes reveals only a very limited and superficial knowledge of scholastic theologians,' . . . . At an early stage in his development, Calvin evidences no knowledge of major scholastic theologians like Aquinas, Scotus, Occam, Gregory of Rimini, or Pierre d'Ailly and, indeed, no knowledge of the thought of John Major. Ganoczy also argues that, both in style and in content, Calvin's references to Lombard and Gratian can be traced to his study of Luther, particularly of the German Reformer's Babylonian Captivity of the Church, rather than to a detailed study of the medieval writers. At an early stage in his thought, Calvin probably 'assimilated—without knowing it—diverse elements of the scholastic system' through his reading of Luther.400

Scholars agree that Calvin, "a self-taught theologian" (not unlike Melanchthon),401 eventually took up and read medieval theology, but not before 1536402; and even after 1536, "we may hypothesize, he read more fully in the work of biblical commentators like Nicholas of Lyra and Denis the Carthusian than he did in the dogmatic writings of the period."403


399 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 16-25. Anthony Lane also cites a study of Oliviet Millet in which Millet "doubts whether Calvin studied scholastic dialectic and philosophy under Major" (Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 23n61, citing Oliviet Millet, Calvin et la Dynamique de la Parole. Étude de rhétorique d réformée [Paris: Honoré Champion, 1992], 33).

400 Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 44, with reference to Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 168-178.

401 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 177. Muller writes: "Between Calvin and Melanchthon there was, on the one side, an intellectual bond grounded in the methodological dialogue in which the two engaged, during the decades in which both men, trained in humanist rhetoric and philology, learned theology on the fly, as each engaged in the work of the commentator and the compiler of theological loci" (Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 125).

402 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 168ff; Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 45.
What of patristic influence? Lane takes up a very careful assessment of Calvin's employment of the Greek fathers in his first edition of the *Institutio*. Greek fathers are cited on fifteen occasions. Two of these are drawn from Rufinus' Latin translation of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*, and six from Cassiodore's *Historia tripartite*, an early translation of the histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. These eight references reflect "Calvin's interest in early church history rather than in the Greek fathers," says Lane. One reference is from Theophylact, likely drawn from Erasmus' *Annotationes*; one from Eiphianius, drawn from Jerome; one from Origen, *Homilies on Exodus*; and one from Chrysostom, his letter to Innocent. Three are references to pseudo-Chrysostom: two from the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, a Latin work, and one by way of Lombard, whom Calvin "accuses . . . of using delirious monastic writings falsely circulating under the names of Chrysostom and others." With respect to fathers of the East, Lane writes in sum:

So far we have found evidence for Calvin's knowledge of Eusebius and Cassiodore . . . . Given his ongoing use of these writers it is likely that this reflects his study of them early in his career. The . . . citations of Chrysostom

---

403 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 45: "This last hypothesis arises both from the character of Calvin's own work as primarily exegetical and from the indication of a greater interest in scholastic distinctions in relation to particular texts of Scripture (as evidenced by Calvin's commentaries) than in relation to the writing of the theological *loci* and *disputationes* (as found in the *Institutes*)."

404 See Lane, "Calvin's Knowledge of the Greek Fathers," in *Student of the Church Fathers*, 70-72.

405 Irena Backus, "Calvin's Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An Analysis," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991), 425f. Here Backus demonstrates that Calvin read Eusebius in Rufinus' translation. Eusebius was published in Greek for the first time in 1544 and there is evidence that Calvin corresponded with François Baudouin in 1545 about a copy (*CO* 12:231).

406 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 71.

407 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 71. This also demonstrates Calvin's penchant regarding the authenticity of patristic works, a penchant Lane notes (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 27).
are also likely to reflect early study of one who was to become Calvin's most cited Greek father, exceeded only by Augustine and Jerome.\footnote{Lane, \textit{Student of the Church Fathers}, 72. Lane is actually writing this summary with respect to the \textit{Institutio} 1536 and the \textit{Psychopannychia}. See above. Lane elsewhere appropriately notes that Calvin most often cites Chrysostom for his biblical exegesis, not his theology, and of his biblical exegesis, particularly of the New Testament (Lane, \textit{Student of the Church Fathers}, 39 and 41).}

But, of course, Calvin was indulging his humanist interest with writings of the Western fathers as well, even preeminently.\footnote{Lane, \textit{Student of the Church Fathers}, 41.} Among them, Augustine figures the most prominently and approvingly,\footnote{Lane, \textit{Student of the Church Fathers}, 38; Smits, \textit{Saint-Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin}.} though Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, Leo, Hilary, Gregory and (eventually) Bernard also receive his attention.\footnote{Lane, \textit{Student of the Church Fathers}, 41z42, 43; Mooi, \textit{Het Kerk- en Dogmahistorisch Element}, 311.}

At the same time that Calvin was generating his \textit{Institutio}, he was also generating two important prefaces, both to Olivetan's Bible (published in Neufchâtel, 1535).\footnote{That is to say, the foreword to the entire volume is in Calvin's hand, "and a second foreword preceding the New Testament has been attributed to Calvin since 1545" (de Greef, \textit{Writings of John Calvin}, 26 and 91).} The one—\textit{Ioannes Calvinus Caesaribus, regibus, principibus, gentibusque omnibus Christi imperio subditis salutem}—is a foreword for the entire volume; the other—\textit{A tous amateurs de Iésus Christ, et de son S. Evangile}—is a foreword to the New Testament in particular. In their own way, these two works further reveal Calvin's inclination as a biblical humanist of reformist disposition. In the first, endorsement of a vernacular translation of Scripture is enough of a statement on its own, but so is his
open repudiation of the "papist" inclination to withhold Scripture from the people and his urging, with a threefold appeal to Chrysostom, to put it in their hands. In their introduction to the preface to the New Testament, Irena Backus and Claire Chimelli note that in form it resembles the Latin foreword to the Vulgate published by Robert Estienne in 1532, and that in content it is akin to a treatise on the covenant by Heinrich Bullinger.415

While he was in Basel, with whom did Calvin personally associate? Myconius? "Nicolas Cop? Olivétan? It is possible. Simon Grynaeus?416 Wolfgang Capito? Henri Bullinger? Pierre Viret? Guillaume Farel? It is probable," says Ganoczy. In any case, Beza, Calvin's first biographer, tells us that in Basel "he had as his best friends several men such as Simon Grynaeus and Wolgang Capito."417 Gilmont notes that Calvin built long-standing contacts with a group of printers as well: Balthasar Lasius, Thomas Platter, Robert Winter, and Johannes Oporinus, Platter and Oporinus themselves scholars.418

415 See also de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 91; and Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 23. The work of Heinrich Bullinger to which Backus and Chimelli refer is, De testamento seu foedere Dei unico et aeterna . . . . brevis exposicio (Zürich: Froschauer, 1534). Like Bullinger, Calvin emphasizes the unity of the two testaments given the person and work of Christ as mediator. Muller notes that it is "not without significance that the sole explicit biblical reference in the letter is to Paul's Epistle to the Romans . . . . We have, thus, from Calvin's earliest major preface, a glimpse of the significant direction that his thought would take and, probably, a pointer toward his first choice of a biblical book for major expository consideration: Calvin's emphasis on the fullness of salvation-history adumbrates his lifelong task as an expositor of nearly the whole of Scripture" (Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 23).

416 Grynaeus was an instructor in Greek. In a few years Calvin would dedicate his commentary on Romans to him, noting their mutual interest in the proper method and expression of biblical exegesis.

417 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 92.

418 Gilmont, Calvin and the Printed Book, 180. One page later, Gilmont notes that while Platter and Lasius appear on the title page of the first edition of the Institutio, "Oporinus in fact did most of the work" in bringing this text to print.
Having been in Basel about fifteen months, Calvin took leave of this intellectual haven to visit another: Ferrara, Italy. Recently married into the role of Duchess of Ferrara, Renée of France—who was very like her cousin Marguerite d'Angoulême with respect to humanism and reformist ideas—had fashioned a refuge for French exiles there. Later correspondence demonstrates that Calvin established some long-standing relationships with those he met there, including the Duchess herself. But all were forced to flee on Good Friday, 1536, when her circle was found out.  

Calvin returned to Basel only briefly, en route to Paris, and perhaps Noyon. Amnesty had been declared for all exiles, allowing them to return to France, and to remain if within six months they renounced their heresies. This afforded Calvin the opportunity to return, settle legal affairs in France, and leave his country of origin for good. His brother Antoine and half-sister Marie accompanied him. On 15 July 1536 they set out for Strasbourg, forced to take a less-than-direct route because of the French and imperial military buildup in the region. They traveled by way of Geneva.

### 3.5 Geneva

While Calvin was in Basel, he had to have known of the ongoing strife for reform in this free republic. As Ganoczy succinctly describes it, from his "vantage point in Basle," Calvin observed the troubles in the church in Geneva, namely, the poisoning of Viret and several other ministers, the theological disputation organized by Farel which ended in an easy victory for the evangelicals against the representatives of the Roman clergy, the occupation of

---

419 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 105.

420 A stop in Noyon is not referenced in Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, though it is in Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 135.
the churches and the destruction of sacred images by the followers of Farel, and
finally the prohibition of the Mass by vote of the Council of Two Hundred on
10 August 1535. He also followed with great anguish the campaign undertaken
by the Duke of Savoy to conquer Geneva and to reinstate the exiled bishop. The
campaign failed and in January 1536 ended with victory for the troops of Berne,
who came to help the besieged city.\footnote{Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 103.}

So reform was a fresh and volatile experiment in Geneva when Calvin arrived in
August 1536. As is so well known, Calvin intended to stay in Geneva but one night.
However Farel, who had been pioneering the reform movement there since 1532,
prevailed upon him to consider otherwise. As Calvin writes some twenty years later in
the preface to his commentary on the Psalms, "when he [Farel] realized that I was
determined to study in privacy in some obscure place, and saw that he gained nothing
by entreaty, he descended to cursing, and said God would surely curse my peace if I
held back from giving help at a time of such great need."\footnote{Cited in Steinmetz,
\textit{Calvin in Context}, 11.} Calvin stayed.

Without delay, Calvin was employed in the "official" work of the reforming
church in Geneva:

In September 1536 Calvin assumed his appointed role as a "reader in Holy
Scripture," or \textit{sacrarum literarum doctor}, at the Cathedral of Saint Pierre.\footnote{De Greef,
\textit{Writings of John Calvin}, 29; Gilmont, \textit{Calvin and the Printed Book}, 28 and 45;
Steinmetz, \textit{Calvin in Context}, 11; Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 109; T. H. L. Parker, "Introduction" to
Exegetica Veteris et Novi Testamenti}, Series 2 of \textit{Ioannis Calvini Opera Omnia} (Genève: Librairie Droz,
1999), xiii..} He began
with the Pauline epistles. Beyond this, the exact cursus of his exegetical instruction at
this time is not known, but scholars surmise it began with the book of Romans, the very book on which Calvin would prepare his first commentary for print.

In October 1536, Farel and Viret invited Calvin to accompany them to the disputation at Lausanne. There, some evangelical preachers and local Roman Catholic clergy challenged each other on ten articles drawn up by Farel concerning justification, the mediation of Christ, the nature of the Church, ministry, and the sacraments. Both sides vied for the allegiance of the Canton of Vaud. Being unofficially invited and an unknown, Calvin was no doubt expected and inclined simply to observe; but when, on the fourth day of the colloquy, during a discussion on the "presence of Christ in the eucharist," the evangelicals were accused of despising antiquity and rejecting the fathers' teaching, Calvin was "stung into action." He denounced the charge and

424 Gilmont, Calvin and the Printed Book, 46; Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 145. See also the note above about Calvin's preface to Olivétan's Bible and the single reference to Romans. In the argument that prefaces his commentary on Romans, Calvin declares that this epistle of Paul affords the best entry into the gospel. This was Melanchthon's assessment as well. (See Muller.)

425 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 109, and de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 151, both with reference to CO 9:701-02, Les articles de Lausanne.

426 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 25; Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, 137ff. Bruening provides an excellent socio-political backdrop to these events.

427 This expression is de Greef's. See de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 151.

428 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 26. Lane includes a quotation of the accusation from Piaget, Les actes de la dispute de Lausanne, 1536, 204f. See also de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 151; Gilmont, Calvin and the Printed Book, 12.

429 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 26. See also Johannes van Oort, "John Calvin and the Church Fathers," in The Reception of the Fathers in the West, Vol. 2 (New York: E. J. Brill, 1997), 672, where van Oort employs precisely the same locution "stung into action," presumably taking up Lane's expression. Bruening suggests the significance of Calvin's role in the Disputation has been "blown out of proportion by some scholars" (Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, 141, with e.g. reference to Alister McGrath, A Life of John Calvin, 96-97, and Francis Higman, La Dispute de Lausanne, ed. Junod, 34-35). Says Bruening: "If, however, Calvin's intervention on October 5 boosted his profile and self-confidence to such an extent, and if it marked a 'chaging of the guard,' one must wonder why he spoke
defended the evangelical position, revealing "himself as one who had diligently studied the early fathers." In sum, he presented—from memory—a series of lengthy quotations from the fathers, citing specific passages in works of Cyprian, Tertullian, and the "unfinished commentaries on Matthew which are attributed to John Chrysostom," and six specific passages in six different works of Augustine. In the midst of this same discourse, which concerns the Lord's Supper, Calvin first speaks of the Holy Spirit as the one by whom, or through whom, Christ himself effects the very communion by which believers are made "truly participant of his body and blood." This communion is manifested not "naturally," but "spiritually," that is, "by the bond of his Spirit," "par le lien de son esprit."  

On the return trip to Geneva, Calvin accompanied Farel and Viret to Bern for a synodical meeting of nearly three-hundred Swiss ministers. They had gathered to

only once more, and briefly, during the remaining three days of the disputation" (Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, 141n29).

Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 26; also 72. Lane further writes: "Here we see many of the hallmarks of Calvin's use of the fathers throughout his life. He does not simply make remarks about them or make sweeping claims about their teaching but he quotes them at length. The power of his memory is evidenced by the detail that he is able to include . . . . He endeavors to distinguish genuine from pseudonymous writings, a concern by no means universal among his contemporaries . . . . He takes care to set each passage in its context in the writing from which it is taken and the circumstances of that writing. Calvin's scholarly standards would not satisfy twentieth-century criteria but by the standards of sixteenth-century polemics they were thorough" (Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 27-28).

As noted in the previous chapter, Lane writes: "In keeping with the humanist principle of ad fontes Calvin read widely in the works of the fathers themselves. Examination of his quotations at Lausanne makes it clear that this was already his practice by that stage. They are placed in context and their position within specific homilies is given, clearly indicating that Calvin had read the originals. There is no serious doubt that Calvin's knowledge of the fathers came overwhelmingly from his own reading of their writings" (Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 47, with reference to Todd, Function of the Patristic Writings, 128-30; and Hughes Oliphant Old, The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship, PhD thesis (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975), 153.

For further discussion in this study of the two discourses, Chapter 2 above. The accounts of Calvin's orations themselves were not published until sometime in 1537, under the title Deux discours de Calvin au colloque de Lausanne (see CO 9:877-86). For an English translation, see Calvin: Theological Treatises, 38-46.
deliberate on the Wittenberg Concord and the First Helvetic Confession. According to de Greef, "What Calvin's contribution to the synod was is not clear."

In late 1536 and early 1537, Farel and Calvin (now appointed, though never formally ordained, a pastor of the church of Geneva) were all engaged in formulating confessions and ecclesial ordinances for the church of Geneva. These included the Confession de la foy, the Articles concernant l'organisation de l'église . . . à Genève, and the Instruction et confession de foy don't on use en l'église de Genève. It is entirely likely that Calvin was reading Melanchthon's 1535/36 edition of the Loci communes at this time, a reading which may have borne influence on his 1537/38 Instruction as much as on his 1539 Institutio.

In September 1537, a company of Swiss ministers gathered again in Bern. Prevailed upon by him, the Bern ministers granted Bucer another hearing regarding a theological rapprochement between the Wittenberg Concord and the First Helvetic Confession. Interestingly, it was "Bucer's actions in Bern in the fall of 1537 that led

---

433 See Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, 79. Discussed were the Formula Concordia, or Wittenberg Concord, drawn up by Melanchthon in May and signed 29 May 1536 by Melanchthon and Luther, among others from Augsburg, and by Bucer and Capito, among other South German ministers excepting the minister of Constance; and the First Helvetic Confession, also known as the Second Confession of Basel, drafted in Basel in January 1536; Bucer and Capito had significant influence in the writing of its articles on the sacraments. See also Hastings Eells, Martin Bucer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931), 203ff.

434 De Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 29.

435 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 111-112.

436 Recall from the previous chapter that this catechism is significant for this study given its expression of the "bond of the Spirit" in relation to communion with Christ in the Lord's Supper.

437 Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 187.

438 Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, 82ff.
to his complete vilification by the Swiss,\textsuperscript{439} at least among the Bernese and the Zurichers; among the Genevans, it was at this time that Calvin, Farel, and Viret presented—at least to Bucer and Capito—the \textit{Confessio fidei de eucharistia}.\textsuperscript{440} As noted in the previous chapter, this is the first of "Calvin's" confessions to speak of Christ's Spirit as "the bond of our participation in him, [such that] he really feeds us with the substance of the body and blood of the Lord to everlasting life, and vivifies us by participation in them."\textsuperscript{441} Bucer and Capito subscribed to this confession, with Bucer adding his own brief commentary.\textsuperscript{442}

In January 1538, Calvin addressed a letter to Bucer that reveals his increasing interest in and familiarity with Bucer's work. Already in his 1536 \textit{Institutio}, Calvin betrays the influence of Bucer's commentary on the gospels (1527 and 1530) on his thought, given a few theological inflections expressed there.\textsuperscript{443} In early 1538, writes Gilmont, Calvin penned a long letter to Bucer "encouraging him to calm tensions over the doctrine of the Lord's Supper."\textsuperscript{444} In the midst of that letter, Calvin declares himself familiar with several of Bucer's works, including "the 1529 Commentary on the Psalms,

\textsuperscript{439} Bruening, \textit{Calvinism's First Battleground}, 83.

\textsuperscript{440} As noted in the previous chapter, "one must be cautious to claim Calvin, Farel, or Viret as the sole author of this consensus statement. Furthermore, since it is a consensus statement, one must also be cautious about claiming it as a comprehensive summary of any one subscriber's entire doctrine of the Lord's Supper."

\textsuperscript{441} Bruening, \textit{Calvinism's First Battleground}, 83. The bracketed portion is a modification of Reid's translation (\textit{Calvin: Theological Treatises}, 168). "Ergo spiritum eius vinculum esse nostrae cum ipso participationis agnoscemus, sed ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini substantia vere ad immortalitatem pascat, et eorum participacione vivificet" (CO 9:711).

\textsuperscript{442} For more, see Chapter 2 above and Chapter 6 below.

\textsuperscript{443} Ganoczy, \textit{Young Calvin}, 159ff. Also Gilmont, \textit{Calvin and the Printed Book}, 172, with reference to Ganoczy.

\textsuperscript{444} Gilmont, \textit{Calvin and the Printed Book}, 172.
the refutation of Robert Cenaeu, the *Defensio adversus axioma catholicum* of 1534, and 'everything you have published since then.'"\(^{445}\) By "everything" Calvin can mean only that which was published in Latin or French, given that he did not read German. Given this, if Calvin is being *honest* about "everything," such material he is likely to have read includes Bucer's *retractationes* in the third edition of his commentary on the gospels, now published as *In sacra quatuor evangelia, ennarationes perpetuae* (1536).\(^{446}\)

Finally, likely by this time, if not as early as 1536, Calvin had drafted his *Petit traicté de la saincte cène de nostre Seignur Iésus Christ* at the request of "aucun bon personages."\(^{447}\) As noted in the previous chapter, this treatise is significant with respect to Calvin's pneumatology of the Lord's Supper given that he reemphasizes the Spirit as the bond of our being "truly made partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ" in the sacrament.\(^{448}\) It is also significant in that here Calvin speaks explicitly of the sacraments as instruments, an expression which, for his part, Janse attributes to the influence of Bucer.\(^{449}\) Calvin is clear, however, that this efficacy

---


\(^{446}\) The full title is *In sacra quatuor evangelia, ennarationes perpetuae, secundum recognitae, in quibus praeterea habes synceriors theologiae locos communes supra centum, ad scripturarum fidem simpliciter, & nullus cum insectatione tractatos, adiectis etiam aliquot locorum retractationibus*. The "retractions" concern the sacraments, and are passages in which Bucer dissociates his teaching from that of Zwingli in keeping with his rapprochement with Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg in May 1536. *Retractationes* are found in the front-matter of the commentary, and following his exegesis of Matthew 26:26 and John 6:63 (see Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times*, trans. Stephen E. Buckwalter (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 141; Irena Backus, ed., "Introduction" to *Ennaratio in evangelion Iohannis* (New York: Brill, 1988). For more about the historical context and political ramifications of the retractions, see Bruening, *Calvinism's First Battleground*, 79.

\(^{447}\) See discussion in Chapter 2 above.

\(^{448}\) *Tracts and Treatises* 2:197-98.

\(^{449}\) Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 68.
is wholly due to "the secret and miraculous power of God," and "the virtue of the Holy Spirit" "conjoined with" the sacraments. Given that this work was prepared as a pastoral exposition on the Lord's Supper for lay folk put-off by the recent "diverses opinions et disputes contentieuses," Calvin does not appeal to patristic or medieval authorities with respect to his assertions. Indeed, he does not even cite Scripture. The "influence" of his current reading and environment is therefore that much more implicit.

By early 1538, Calvin was, of course, deeply immersed in not only his duties to the church of Geneva, but also its woes. Strife ensued on especially two fronts, one without and one within. The foe without was one Pierre Caroli, a rather mercurial figure who had been a member of the Circle of Meaux, seemingly disposed toward reform but inconsistently so. At the culmination of a series of events, Caroli summarily accused Farel and Calvin of Arianism. A debate over terms, confessions, and subscription to certain terms and confessions ensued, in response to which Calvin presented his

\textit{Confessio de Trinitate propter calumnias P. Caroli} at a synod in Lausanne, 14 May.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item[450] Tracts and Treatises 2:198 and 169 respectively.
\item[451] CO 5: 433. On this intent, see Calvin: Theological Treatises, 140, and de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 134. According to de Greef, des Gallers published a Latin translation of the work in 1545: Libellus de coena Domini (see de Greef, 134n25).
\item[452] Ganocy, Young Calvin, 114-115. See also Robert D. Linder, "Brothers in Christ: Pierre Viret and John Calvin as Soul-mates and Co-laborers in the Work of the Reformation," in Calvin and His Contemporaries: Colleagues, Friends, and Conflicts, Calvin Studies Society Papers 1997 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: CRC Product Services, 1998), 146; Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 52; Steinmetz, Calvin in Context, 12; and de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 172-73, where one can find an account of Caroli's back and forth movement between circles of reform and the Roman Catholic church, and the persistence of the debate between he and Farel and Calvin well into the 1540s. For this reason Calvin prepared his \textit{Confessio de Trinitate propter calumnias P. Caroli}, 14 May 1536 (CO 9:703-10) and \textit{Pro Farello et colleges eius adversus Petri Caroli calumnias defensio Nicolai Gallasi}, 1545 (CO 7:289-340).
\end{itemize}
1538. In this same month, Caroli was deposed by synods at Lausanne and Bern, but his entanglement with Farel and Calvin persisted until well into the 1540s.

The foes from within were largely the civic officials and citizens of Geneva none to keen on Calvin and Farel's fervid manner of reform. Some questioned their political motives, given that both were from France. Having introduced an obligatory confession of faith a year or more before, come January 1538, Calvin and Farel intended to keep from the Lord's Table any who had not subscribed to it. The city's Council of Two Hundred intervened, forbidding the excommunication, and then generated more tension by "adopting the ritual of Bern." Unwilling to comply, not least because they took this civil body to be meddling in ecclesial affairs, Calvin and Farel were immediately banished from the city.

Calvin was chastened by and contrite with respect to his experience in Geneva. "After their expulsion," writes Ganoczy, "Calvin and Farel went to Bern, where the authorities were prepared to attempt a reconciliation. But the attempt failed. . . Realizing that there was no longer any hope, Calvin went to Basle, probably with the

453 For more, see Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 114ff.
454 De Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 171-73. See also Lane, who discusses the later treatise and correspondence in light of Calvin's references to Athanasius within (Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 78-79). Upon leaving Lausanne, Caroli returned to the Roman Catholic fold, only to reconvert to Protestantism soon after. Steinmetz gives an account of Caroli's arrival in Strasbourg soon after Calvin himself arrived there in 1538 (Steinmetz, Calvin in Context, 13).
455 Steinmetz, Calvin in Context, 12.
456 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 117-118, 120.
457 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 122, citing Calvin's correspondence, particularly with Farel, to whom he writes "Before God and his people let us confess that partly by our inexperience, carelessness, negligence, and error the Church committed to us so sadly declined" (citing CO 10/b, 246, letter dated September 1538).
intention of devoting himself once again to theological studies." He found shelter in the Latin school in Basel, headed by his good friend, the scholar and printing entrepreneur Oporinus.

He appears to have traveled light, leaving behind with his brother, Antoine, the substantial collection of books he had acquired during his brief stay in Geneva. No doubt he bore with him, however, his revised (or being revised) edition of his *Institutio*.

While in Basel in 1535-36, Calvin did not have the financial means to acquire books. Besides, volumes of patristic and medieval works, and perhaps even more recently written theological treatises, would likely have been available to him in the printing houses of his friends. That he had amassed a good-sized library during his first stay in Geneva is indicated by the fact that he intended to live off the proceeds of the sale of his books left behind. Indeed, Calvin continued to live off such means

---


459 Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 181. It was Oporinus who pressed Calvin to rework and reprint the *Institutio* already in 1537 (Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 40.) In Basel, Calvin would have again had access to Oporinus’ well-stocked library (Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 137).

460 Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 40, 137, and 181. As noted in Chapter 2 above, Lane suggests that this revision took place not in Geneva, but after Calvin had left there, so perhaps in Basel and Strasbourg. Gilmont, while suggesting the revision took place already in Geneva, concedes that much revision may have taken place in Basel.


462 Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 136; Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 117, citing E. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin. Les hommes et les choses de son temps*, Vol. 2 (Lausanne: Bridel, 1902), 455-57; J. Pannier, ‘Calvin à Strasbourg,’ *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 4 (1924), 509f. Lane includes the following note: "Doumergue argues that while Calvin certainly sold the books that he had inherited from Olivétan and also sold copies of his own works, there is no explicit reference to Calvin's selling from his own library while at Strassburg (2:457n1). But absence of evidence is not
even upon arriving in Strasbourg in 1538: Antoine rejoined him seeming not to have brought "any books from Calvin's Geneva collection with him to Strasbourg," and, when he inherited seventy volumes from his cousin Olivétan's library in 1539, Calvin instructed the executor, Fabri, to sell the books, except for a Hebrew Bible that he wanted to retain for his own use. Due to his poverty, Calvin did not acquire many, if any, books during his tenure in Strasbourg.

In the midst of these circumstances—in Basel and Strasbourg—Calvin revised his first edition of the *Institutio*, transforming his work from a lay-person's catechetical handbook of Christian doctrine and life to "the repository of the *loci communes* and *disputations* that might otherwise [appear] in the commentaries." According to the scrupulous research of Lane, and those on whose research he builds, it appears that Calvin availed himself of at least the following patristic authors in modifying the work: Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose.

---

463 Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 136. Apparently the remainder of Calvin's books were eventually sent to Farel (December 1539), and Calvin instructed Farel "to sell what he could in Neuchâtel and to send the remainder to Basel at the first opportunity" (Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 137).


466 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 119. See Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 106 and 119-120 for a fuller description of this shift in genre.

467 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 12, 72-73, 177, and 223. The edition Calvin owned is *Divi Chrysostomi Archeepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opera, quatenus hunc diem Latio donate noscuntur, omnia*, ed. Desiderius Erasmus (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Apud Claudium Chevallonium, 1536). See the study A. Ganoczy and K. Müller, *Calvins Handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1981). Lane notes that Calvin cites Chrysostom's "Genesis homilies seven times in the 1539 *Institutio*, explicitly naming them five times," and that these citations occur in 2.2.4.
Among medievals: Calvin cites Thomas Aquinas twice in the 1539 *Institutio*, but given the evidence, Lane writes, "it is possible that Calvin never read Thomas for himself and

(3x), 2.5.3, 3.4.38, 3.15.2, and 3.16.3 of the 1539 *Institutio* (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 73n39; 223). Lane writes, since we know "that Calvin acquired the 1536 edition of Chrysostom and that he studied it for the 1539 and 1543 editions of his *Institutio*. . . ." Presumably then, Calvin acquired this edition of Chrysostom soon after it was published and read it immediately, seemingly while he was still in Geneva amassing his first library, and, as Gilmont would have it, reworking his *Institutio*. If this were the case, then it would seem that he likely left his Chrysostom volume in Geneva and perhaps sold it, along with the rest of his library. Or perhaps he carried this one volume with him, given its recent acquisition and his inclination to consult it not only for the 1539 *Institutio* but also for his project of translating some of Chrysostom's sermons, and perhaps for his commentary on Romans. This would, however, complicate his claim to Pighius that he had only a borrowed copy of Augustine at hand when he revised, if only portions of, the 1539 *Institutio*. Or, perhaps Calvin actually acquired the volume while he was in Basel or Strasbourg, 1538-41, even though, given his meager means, he was selling off his library. In this case he would have had the volume at hand while he was preparing his Romans commentary, which was nearly completed in August 1539 (Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 46). Without citation, Gilmont suggests that Calvin's substantive encounter with Chrysostom's works probably took place during his stay in Strasbourg (Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 161), but this would seem to conflict with his previous suggestion that Calvin revised his *Institutio* already in Geneva, that is, it would conflict with Lane's observation about the importance of Chrysostom's Genesis commentaries in that revision. In any case and in relation to the initial point of this footnote, in the mid-twentieth century, Alexander Ganoczy discovered Calvin's very copy of Chrysostom and, with Klaus Müller, published a study of Calvin's underlinings and meager marginalia. Fifty seven passages in the *In Genesim homiliae* are marked in Calvin's hand. See Ganoczy and Müller, *Calvins Handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1981), 51-92, 157-159.

468 Indeed, Calvin quotes a passage from Gregory Nazianzan *in Greek*, though Calvin is known to have read even the Greek fathers almost exclusively in Latin translation. Upon his careful study of this citation, Lane has concluded that it "may well be taken from the 1516 edition of Gregory's *Orations* or from some other printing of them" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 83). As it also appears in the 1543 edition, prepared while Calvin was still in Strasbourg, Lane concludes "The most likely scenario is that Calvin read a Greek edition of the orations in time for the 1539 *Institutio* and remembered this reading when preparing the 1543 revision" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 84).

469 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 176 and 155: *Confessiones*, *De civitate dei*, *Ennarationes in Psalmos*, and *In evangelium Johannis tractatus*, and the *Enchiridion*.

470 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 177: *Adversus Jovinianum*, *Dialogi contra Pelagianos epistolae*, and *Hebraica quaestiones in Genesim*. Also Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 165. Calvin probably consulted either the 1529 Claude Chevallon or (identical) 1539 Gervase Chevallon edition available, if not now, then when he was preparing his 1543 *Defensio . . . adversus Albertus Pighius* (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 167 and 11).

471 In assessing the patristic citations in Calvin's 1543 *Defensio . . . adversus calumnias Albertus Pighii*, Lane writes: "Pighius quotes from Ambrose's *De Jacob et vita beata*. Calvin discusses Pighius's quotations and then adds two short (three-line) quotations of his own. As he had twice cited this general passage in the 1539 *Institutio* [*Inst*. 2:7:7, 2:16:18], it is clear that he was already familiar with it. Whether he was now quoting from memory or turned again to the text is not clear, though there is a clue that implies that he did have the work at hand [in 1542]. He notes that he is quoting 'ex eadem pagina, ex qua sumpsit Pighius quod adducit'" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 164-65).
that the two citations in the *Institutio* are derived from intermediate sources."\(^{472}\) He also cites Bernard, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, \(^{473}\) and Lombard, *Sententia*. \(^{474}\) As Lane notes, by way of scrutinizing Calvin's reference to Bernard, Calvin *may* have been reading Biel, or perhaps some work written in Biel's intellectual tradition, such as Johann Altenstaig's *Vocabularius theologie*. \(^{475}\) Which of the works of his contemporaries Calvin had at hand is more difficult—if not impossible—to determine, though the influence of Melanchthon appears to be particularly prominent, not so much over against, but as a strong supplement to, the apparent influence of Zwingli and Bullinger. \(^{476}\) According to Muller, "scholars have often deemphasized the influence,

\(^{472}\) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 45, citing an unpublished paper of Arvin Vos, "Calvin's Knowledge of Aquinas," "which carefully analyses the citations in the *Institutio*. He concludes that 'it appears that Calvin knew Aquinas only second hand.' He also examines the references to Thomas in the footnotes of LCC 20-21 and finds there no evidence of a direct link between Calvin and Aquinas" (n242).

\(^{473}\) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 177. After scrutiny, Lane concludes that, given that this reference to Bernard is negative (and incorrect) with respect to Bernard's teaching on the freedom of the will (i.e., expounding Bernard as semi-Pelagian or very nearly so), this quotation was drawn either from Gabriel Biel, most likely his commentary on Lombard's *Sentences*, or from Johann Altenstaig's *Vocabularius theologie*, which drew heavily upon Biel, or from some other author's work that followed the tradition of Biel (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 137 and 143). According to Lane, as discussed below, Calvin began reading Bernard in earnest for himself sometime in time for the 1543 *Institutio*, and then again in the 1550s: "Thus Calvin read Bernard especially during his time at Strassburg and during the final decade or so of his life at Geneva, each time in an *Opera omnia*" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 144).

\(^{474}\) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 177.

\(^{475}\) See note above. Emphasis added, given Lane's following caveat: The article in which Lane makes this suggestion was first published in 1976. When Lane revisited the article in 1999 for the anthology of his articles, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*, he wrote in its introduction: "Twenty-five years of further study in the area have led to two significant changes. A wider search has revealed considerably more partial overlaps between Calvin's citations and other works. But at the same time I am persuaded that in 1976 *I gave too much weight to such alternative sources, and that the evidence is stronger than I then claimed that, with minor exceptions, Calvin's source for Bernard was the *Opera omnia*" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 115). So in another article he suggests that, with respect to his citation already in 1539, Calvin "appears to be drawing upon the memory of earlier reading" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 163).
whether positive or negative, of Melanchthon's *Loci communes* on Calvin.\(^477\) His own study shows that "Melanchthon's various prefaces to the *Loci communes theologici* and several exegetical approaches to Romans offer a series of clues to Calvin's arrangement of topics in the *Institutes*,\(^478\) that is, the topics are in a "fundamentally Pauline order," not unlike Melanchthon's in his *Loci*. Like Melanchthon, Calvin held the exegesis of Romans to be the foundation for theological disquisition.\(^479\)

It was also in the midst of these circumstances, sometime between 1538 and 1541, whether in Basel or Strasbourg, that Calvin undertook a unique project, namely, the translation of several of Chrysostom's homilies into French.\(^480\) Though we do not

---

\(^{476}\) This with regard to Zwingli, *De vera et falsa religione commentarius*, on the opening juxtaposition of knowledge of God and knowledge of [man] (Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 124, with reference to Büsser), and also on Law and Gospel and covenant (Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 126).

\(^{477}\) Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 125-126, with reference to the scholarship of August Lang, François Wendel, Jacques Pannier, Emil Doumergue, Benjamin Warfield, Jean-Daniel Benoit, and Julius Köstlin (242n45). Also, Melanchthon's *Loci* was published first in 1521 and again, revised, in 1536. According to Muller, we may surmise Calvin availed himself of both (Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 128).

\(^{478}\) Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 127ff.

\(^{479}\) Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 127 and 128. Here, not to be overlooked is the fact that Calvin's *Argumentum* at the outset of the commentary, and certain aspects of his exegesis, indicate "a positive use of Melanchthon's *Dispositio orations in Epist. Pauli ad Romanos* (1529/30). Also, Melanchthon's *Theologica institution in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (1519). For more on the relationship between Calvn's *Commentarius* and Melanchthon's *Dispositio*, Muller refers readers to his article in *Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560) and the Commentary*, ed. by Timothy J. Wengert and M. Patrick Graham (Sheffield: University of Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); also Joel Edward Kok, "The Influence of Martin Bucer on Calvin's Interpretation of Romans: A Comparative Case Study," (Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1993), 168, 171-73. According to Kok, at times Calvin's interpretation is closer to Melanchthon's than Bucer's.

\(^{480}\) The intention to translate the homilies into French is merely implicit, by virtue of the fact that Calvin himself refers to the project as "unconventional" and that he gives a lengthy defense of his project. There is some debate about whether Calvin truly intended to translate the homilies into French over against Latin, especially since the preface is written in Latin. Indeed, Latin is a language, notes Hazlett, that could "still be referred to as a vernacular." Still, French seems most likely given Calvin's statement of intent. See W. Ian P. Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface to His Proposed French Edition of Chrysostom's Homilies: Translation and Commentary," in *Humanism and Reform: The Church in Europe, England, and Scotland, 1400-1643: Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron*, ed. J. Kirk (Oxford: Blackwell
have notes about which homilies Calvin intended to translate, we do have his charter for the project: a lengthy, albeit incomplete, Latin preface for the collection. In the midst of this preface, Calvin demonstrates his awareness of early Christian exegetical works: He notes that few or no complete commentaries of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory [of Nazianzen], Tertullian, Cyprian, or Hilary are extant, and he proceeds to demonstrate his familiarity with—whether first-hand or by way of intermediary

Publishers, 1991), 129-150, esp. 130; Irena Backus, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers," 254f.; and Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 31 and 70.


482 While there has been some scholarly debate about when Calvin drafted this preface, consensus of late considers Ian Hazlett's arguments to be the most persuasive. Lane details the discussion and Hazlett's arguments: In 1964 W. N. Todd and in 1975 H. O. Old, perhaps taking R. J. Mooi's lead, asserted that Calvin put this piece together in 1535 (Mooi, Het Kerk- en Dogmahistorisch Element. Lane notes that Mooi gives no argument or evidence for his claim (Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 70; also Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 132f; Todd, Function of the Patristic Writings, in Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 31.n113; and Old, Patristic Roots, 146.). Ten years later, John R. Walchenbach asserted it was composed in 1559 (John R. Walchenbach, "John Calvin as Biblical Commentator: An Investigation into Calvin's Use of Chrysostom as an Exegetical Tutor," Ph.D. dissertation (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1974), 210ff. Hazlett confutes both assertions with a convincingly argued theory of his own: First, when "Calvin refers to 'our age, when [Scripture] has begun once again to be circulated,'" Calvin must mean "the mid- to late thirties, when modern translations of the whole Bible became available" (Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface,' 132). In the sentence prior he aptly refers to the Bible translations of Lefèvre and Olivétan. Second, Calvin's mention of the "'generation twenty years ago,' when most people were ignorant of Christ, that is the Bible" most likely refers to the period before 1522, which is "when Luther's German New Testament appeared" (Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 132; see also CO 9:831-32, as also in Hazlett's translation on page 140). Third, paleographic and forensic evidence betray an approximate date by virtue of the facts that Calvin's s in the handwritten preface matches the s in Calvin's letters from Strasbourg, and that this stylistic nuance disappears sometime in 1540 (Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 133). Also, the watermark on the paper matches the watermark in the paper, again, of Calvin's Strasbourg letters, while a different watermark appears in the paper of his Genevan letters. Finally, Hazlett (citing Ganoczy and Müller) notes that the content of the material that Calvin underlined in his 1536 edition of Chrysostom's Opera omnia is not so much exegetical as it is didactic, concerning "moral instruction . . . relating to the Christian life of the individual and the ecclesial body" (Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 133). This, suggests Hazlett, suits well Calvin's "mission" in Strasbourg to shape a loose community of French Reformed exiles into a thriving congregation (Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 133; also Backus, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers," 254). In short, Hazlett's fastidious research veritably proves his theory: that Calvin wrote his Chrysostom praefatio sometime between 1538 and 1540, while he was in Strasbourg (Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 31.n113 and 70; see also Backus, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers," 254).

483 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 78. See Hazlett's translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 144 and 145.
sources—the exegesis of Origen, Cyril, Theophylact, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and Chrysostom. To Calvin, Chrysostom is the quintessential preacher: a rhetor and a pastor, erudite and accessible. In the early church, says Calvin, Chrysostom is unparalleled as an interpreter of Scripture, especially of the New Testament.

As noted before, when Calvin was appointed in 1536 as a *sacrarium literarum* doctor in Geneva, he immediately took up instruction in the epistles of Paul, likely beginning with the book of Romans. Perhaps already then, but certainly upon arriving

---

484 Calvin says Origen "obsures very much the plain meaning of Scripture with constant allegories" (translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 132, 144). Lane writes of Calvin's reading of Origen: "Calvin's use of Origen prior to 1543 was not excessive, but wide enough to suggest that Calvin had read his works" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 164, with reference to Mooi, *Het Kerk-en Dogmahistorisch Element*, 209-12).

485 Calvin identifies Cyril as "an outstanding exegete indeed, and someone who among the Greeks can be rated second to Chrysostom" (translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 144).

486 Calvin says of Theophylact that he "cannot be better assessed that with the observation that anything commendable he has he took from Chrystosom" (translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 144-45).

487 Of Jerome, Calvin writes: "What Jerome wrote on the Old Testament has deservedly very little reputation among scholars. For he is almost completely bogged down in allegories, by which he distorts Scripture with too much license. [His] commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew and on two Epistles of Paul are tolerable, except that they savour of a man not sufficiently experienced in church affairs" (translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 145).

488 Calvin speaks of Ambrose as 'better' than Jerome, but laconic (Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 145).

489 Of Augustine, Calvin writes: "It is beyond dispute that Augustine does surpass everyone in dogmatics. He is also a very scrupulous biblical commentator of the first rank. But he is far too ingenious. This results in him being less sound and reliable" (translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 145).

490 Calvin (*CO* 9:834), in translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 144. In the preface, Calvin writes: "The chief merit of our Chrysostom is this: he took great pains everywhere not to deviate in the slightest from the genuine plain meaning of Scripture, and not to indulge in any licence [sic] of twisting the straightforward sense of the words" (translation in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," 145-46; *CO* 9:835). See also Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 39.
in Strasbourg at Bucer and Wolfgang Capito's urging in 1538, Calvin nurtured his work into a publishable commentary. According to the introductory letter *ad Lectori* for the 1539 *Institutio*, dated August of that year, Calvin had nearly completed his commentary on the epistle by that time, too. Given that they were formulated in the same period, the 1539 *Institutio* and the 1540 *Commentarii in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* must be read and studied as unique companion pieces, not least because in their respective prefaces Calvin explains their relation and reveals his intended, lifelong program of writing. Muller warrants being quoted at length on this point:

Calvin's prefaces to the two major editions of the *Institutes* (Latin, 1539; French 1541) and to the commentary on Romans (1540) should be regarded as an interrelated set of statements concerning not only the method he chose to follow in his work but also the program of writing that he began with the 1539 *Institutes* and the Romans commentary—the program that he followed, with little alteration, for the remainder of his life. The relationship between Calvin's letter to the reader from the 1539 *Institutio* and the preface to his 1540 Romans commentary is particularly significant: in the latter Calvin argued forcefully the rectitude of his adoption of the form of a running commentary on the text of the Bible without recourse to the logical and methodological device of identifying the *loci* or *topoi* addressed by the biblical authors in the course of their argument, while in the former, he noted that his *Institutes*, as recast in 1539, was to be constructed in such a way as to relieve him of the necessity of developing either *loci communes* or *disputationes* as part of his approach to the text in his commentaries. Given, moreover, his critique of Bucer and Bullinger for

---


492 Already in March 1537, Oporinus wrote to Calvin: "I understand that you are commenting on the Epistles of St. Paul, to the praise and benefit of all. Thus I ask you to not hesitate to ensure that through us one day we can transmit to others all that you have commented." Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 46-47, citing Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, 4:208; CO 10/b:91.

493 He composed its dedicatory letter, addressed to Grænaeus, on 18 October 1539. The commentary itself was released in March 1540.

494 On Calvin's critique of these contemporaries, see also Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 106, citing T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries* (London: SCM/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,
placing *loci* into their commentaries after they had provided a running exegesis of the text and his critique of Melanchthon for offering only the *loci* and not the running commentary, the thrust of the two prefaces is not to disparage the work of gathering *loci* as part of the process of biblical interpretation but rather [to] promote the establishment of a proper division of labor.\textsuperscript{495}

Such a method, according to Muller, has, for Calvin, roots in both his humanist training and the medieval tradition; its gestures are both classical and scholastic. On the one hand, classical and humanist values are exhibited by his "strict observance of the boundaries of literary genre,"\textsuperscript{496} by his penchant for "'perspicuous brevity' (*perspicua brevitas*) and 'ease' or 'smoothness of exposition' (*facilitas*),\textsuperscript{497} and by a "Renaissance modification of dialectic and rhetoric" in the use of the *locus* or *topos*, which

\textsuperscript{495}Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 28; also 102ff, and 177. See also Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context*, 13-14. So, as Elsie Anne McKee has demonstrated, most often the biblical references in the *Institutio* ought to be taken as "cross-references" to Calvin's own commentaries, or, as Muller asserts, perhaps "viewed as references to the exegetical tradition and not as 'proof-texts' . . . ." (respectively, McKee, "Exegesis, Theology, and Development in Calvin's *Institutio*: A Methodological Suggestion," 156; and Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 107, with reference to the discussion *dicta probantia* in Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics. II. Holy Scripture: The Cognitive Foundation of Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1993], 525-40. Elsewhere Muller asserts "Once it is recognized that the *Institutes* must be read in a developmental relationship with Calvin's exegetical and interpretive work, the issue of Calvin's relationship to the history of exegesis rises in importance as a key to the understanding of his theology. As scholars like Steinmetz, Schriener, and Thompson have shown, Calvin's exegetical theology frequently reflects the older tradition: Calvin not only studied the exegetical works of contemporaries like Bucer, Bullinger, and Oecolampadius; he also read carefully in the commentaries of fathers like Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom and quite possible of medieval exegetes like Niclas of Lyra and Denis the Carthusian" [Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 116]).

\textsuperscript{496}Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 29.

\textsuperscript{497}Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 112, citing a letter of Calvin to Grynaeus (CO 10: 402-03). In his note, Muller writes, "These often cited terms, *brevitas* and *facilitas*, must be understood, contra the view of Battles and Gamble, as stylistic or rhetorical and methodological rather than as hermeneutical principles" that rule out the 'allegorical' exegesis of Origen or Augustine." Muller cites one work of Ford Lewis Battles, and three articles of Richard Gamble. Muller also notes that these values reflect those of Lefèvre and his circle. See also Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context*, 14.
themselves have medieval roots. On the other hand, Calvin still engaged in the
scholastic discipline of *disputatio*, reserving this to his collection of exegetically derived
*loci* in his *Institutio*. There "the pattern of argument . . . reflects a fairly strict
observation of the form of scholastic disputation, moving from the initial statement of a
point to various objections and replies to objections." Furthermore, in dealing with
"difficulties and even potential contradictions in the text of Scripture," Calvin (like
many of his humanist contemporaries) employed the scholastic *distinctiones* as a device
for resolving them. Even deriving *loci* from one's interpretation of Scripture and
ordering them according to the articles of the creed, or more or less soteriologically
from God and creation to the church and the last things, is a method that runs the course
of the church's history, from Augustine to John of Damascus to Lombard to Calvin and
his contemporaries. So, as Muller measures Calvin's invective with respect to
*scolastici* and *théologiens Sorboniques*, humanism, including Calvin's humanism,
"was not posed against all things scholastic. It was posed against scholastic problems,
notably the absence of a refined use of classical languages and rhetoric that was rooted
in the absence of sound philological training, and against excessively speculative
theological argument." There is, as Muller argues throughout his work, a

498 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 179. Some paragraphs on, Muller writes: "it was Calvin's
humanist training in rhetoric that he brought ot bear on the nominally scholastic task of constructing
disputations" (Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 181).

499 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 45, 113, and 181 among others.

500 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 46; also 179.

501 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 178-79, 113-14, and 57.

502 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 44.
"confluence" of humanistic and scholastic methods in Calvin's work, even as in others'.

3.6 1538-1541: Strasbourg

When Calvin first arrived in Strasbourg, he was appointed pastor to the congregation of French refugees there. Eventually, in May 1539, he was appointed to lecture on the New Testament as well. As noted before, his financial means were meager. Other of his professional engagements there included responding to Jacopo Cardinal Sadoleto on behalf of the church of Geneva regarding Sadoleto's "invitation" to them to return to the Roman fold (1539) and attending religious colloquies as a representative of the church of Strasbourg, including Hagenau (June 1540), Worms (October-January 1540-41), and Regensburg (June 1541). At his own initiative Calvin went to Frankfurt in 1539 for a convocation, the Frankfurter Bestand, between

---


506 According to De Greef, the basis for discussion at this session would be the *Confessio Augustana*, or Augsburg Confession (de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 154). Calvin gives accounts of these proceedings in letters to Farel: CO 11:135-40, 145-47.

507 These three colloquies were really a series of one convened by the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, in order to seek theological agreement between Catholic delegates and delegates of the reform movement. See Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context*, 14. At Regensburg, discussion centered not on the *Confessio Augustana*, but the *Regensburger Buch* (for text see CO 5:516), drawn up in private discussion in Worms by Johann Gropper (Roman Catholic) and Bucer (de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 156). Calvin's account of proceedings at Regensburg were published along with the acts of Regensburg, *Les Actes de la journée imperiale, tenue en la cité de Regespourg* (CO 5:509-684). According to Gilmont, Bucer saw to a Latin report of the meeting, while Calvin provided this "French version for his compatriots" (Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 117).
Charles V and the German princes concerning the reform of Germany; while there he
met Melanchthon and discussed twelve articles concerning the Lord's Supper drafted by
Calvin and previously presented to the German reformer by Bucer in 1538. \(^{508}\) Calvin's
principal associates in Strasbourg included Bucer and Wolfgang Capito, as well as the
scholar-printer Wendelin Rihel. \(^{509}\) He also came into contact with the Bohemian
Brethren, who demonstrated familiarity with his works, and with "a certain Guillaume
de Fürstenberg, a count from South Germany, for whom he drafted a couple of
apologetic works." \(^{510}\) At the colloquies he engaged in dialogue with other reformers
such as Capito, Sturm, Bucer, and Melanchthon, and he at least encountered prominent
Catholics such as Johann Van Eck, Gasparo Contarini, \(^{511}\) and Albertus Pighius, and the
emperor, Charles V. By way of correspondence, Calvin maintained his relations with
Farel, Viret, and many others. More personally, it was while Calvin was in Strasbourg
that he married Idelette de Bure, a widow and mother of two whose first husband was
Anabaptist.

---

\(^{508}\) De Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 34. According to de Greef, "in their conversation the
twelve articles that Calvin had drafted concerning the Lord's Supper and had sent along with Bucer when
he went to Wittenberg in October 1538 (the relevant letter has been lost) came up for discussion.
Melanchthon agreed with the articles, but he pointed out that there were Lutherans who thought "more
crudely" about the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper and that therefore the articles were not suitable
for an attempt to unify Wittenberg and Zurich." Regrettably, de Greef offers no citation.

\(^{509}\) Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 14, 181-82. Because of Robert Winter's slowness in
publishing Calvin's works in Basel, Calvin entrusted the printing of his revised *Institutio*, reply to
Sadoletto, and commentary on Romans to this Strasbourg printer. Even after he returned to Geneva,
Calvin sent work to Rihel for a time.

\(^{510}\) De Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 32; see also 203-04. Also Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed
Book*, 14.

\(^{511}\) The papal envoy to the diet of Regensburg.
And, of course, Calvin seems to have maintained his usual, heavy schedule of reading while he was in Strasbourg. Among his patristic and medieval forebears, it appears Calvin deepened his acquaintance with Cyprian, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Chrysostom. According to Gilmont, some of his familiarity with the early church may have been enhanced by a reading of Bucer's *Florilegium patristicum*, a compilation of quotations sorted by theme, prepared by Bucer between 1530 and 1538. Of Melanchthon's works, Calvin wrote to Farel in 1539, "If you have not yet read Philip's *De authoritate Ecclesiae*, I recommend that you do so." Presumably Calvin himself had just encountered it.

One of Calvin's works gives insight into some of Calvin's reading during his stay in Strasbourg: his second revision of the *Institutio*, eventually published in 1543. According to Lane, this work evidences Calvin's recent reading of especially Chrysostom and Bernard. In one of his studies, Lane notes that the passages marked in

---

512 This according to Gilmont based on Anette Zillenbiller, *Die Einheit der katholischen Kirche: Calvins Cyprianrezeption in seinen ekklesiologischen Schriften* (Mainz: P. Zabern, 1993).

513 Lane, *Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*, 10. Lane notes that Calvin's explicit use of Bernard at this time is "still minimal and inaccurate," therefore caution must be exercised concerning what he had actually read, what he actually knew.

514 See discussion above about Calvin's preparation in Latin of a preface for a publication of some of Chrysostom's sermons translated into French.


517 According to Lane, this revision was "mostly written at Strassburg" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 117; see also Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 42).
the edition of Chrysostom that Calvin owned \(^ {518} \) appear especially in the 1543 *Institutio*. \(^ {519} \) Since the 1539 *Institutio* itself reveals something of Calvin's reading of Chrysostom, it would seem that Calvin was simply broadening his exposure to the early father's work and appropriating it accordingly. In other of his careful studies, Lane examines Calvin's use of Bernard. \(^ {520} \) According to Lane, "The extent and the nature of the 1539 citations do not encourage the view that Calvin was profoundly influenced by Bernard at this stage. In the next edition of the *Institutio*, published in 1543, all has changed." \(^ {521} \) Indeed, it appears Calvin had read a significant quantity of Bernard's corpus while in Strasbourg. He quotes Bernard's work at length, at times interpolating these passages with material already included in the 1539 *Institutio*. \(^ {522} \) It is possible Bucer encouraged Calvin to take up Bernard, but, as Lane puts it, "Bucer's use of Bernard is slight compared with Calvin's and Bucer's role would have been no more than to point Calvin in the direction of Bernard." \(^ {523} \) The works to which Calvin

\(^ {518} \) See discussion above.

\(^ {519} \) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 168; see also 74.

\(^ {520} \) See Lane, "Calvin's Use of Bernard of Clairvaux" and "Calvin's Sources of Bernard of Clairvaux," in *Student of the Church Fathers*, 87-150. Lane took up his studies in response to the conclusions of Karl Reuter, who sees Bernard as one of the major early influences on Calvin. "He reaches this conclusion," says Lane, "by relying heavily upon speculation and upon a comparison of the thought of Calvin and Bernard. Very different results are reached by carefully examining Calvin's citations of Bernard." See Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 8, 10, and 87ff, for his further critique of Reuter's method and conclusions.

\(^ {521} \) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 93. In a followup study, Lane writes: "The volume of the quotations in the 1543 *Institutio* shows that Calvin had been studying Bernard's works for himself" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 138; also 143). Elsewhere he writes: "The 1543 citations are clearly the fruit of Calvin's reading of Bernard while at Strassburg, from 1539 to 1541. The volume that he used there does not appear to have found a place in his luggage as he returned to Geneva . . ." (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 5).

\(^ {522} \) Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 93.
specifically refers include Bernard's *Sermo in dedicatione ecclesiae, De gratia et libero arbitrio, De consideratione, Sermo super Cantico Canticorum*, and *Sermo super psalmum Qui habitat.*

### 3.7 Return to Geneva

In the fall of 1541, Calvin returned to Geneva at the behest of the Genevan council itself. By the end of the calendar year, he had proposed a new church order and prepared a new catechism for the churches, *Le Catéchisme de l'église de Genève, c'est a dire le Formulaire d'instruire les enfants en la chrestienté* (1542). As with his *Petit traicté*, this work is pastoral; Calvin exposits doctrine simply in this catechism, and without reference to ecclesial authorities such as the fathers, so it seemingly gives little insight into Calvin's reading and circles of influence at the time. However, as noted in the previous chapter, it is in this catechism that Calvin approaches what will soon become for him a regular pattern of speech to emphasize a reality that he refuses to take for granted, namely, that it is because of "the secret and incomprehensible *virtus* of the Holy Spirit" that believers partake of Christ and all his benefits *in the Supper*, that they are nourished by his body and blood, quickened by its lifegiving vigor.

Soon after he returned to Geneva, Calvin began rebuilding his library. Lane notes that this acquisition—or at least consultation—of other important works increased

---

523 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 95; also 138.

524 See Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 102-103 and 105ff, for specific citation of the Bernard material in Calvin's 1543 *Institutio* as well as other works.

even as his dependence on the *Decretum Gratiani* and Lombard's *Sententiae*
deceased.526 Because of his citations of various councils in the 1540s, Lane suggests,
"it would appear that Calvin had acquired a copy of Peter Crabbe's 1538 *Concilia omnia*
and read it in the next few years." 527 It also appears that Calvin had acquired and had
begun reading in earnest an edition of Basil,528 as well as the works of Irenaeus529 and
Cyril. Conspicuously, Calvin betrays no evidence of his having read Ratramnus' *De
Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, an edition of which was published in 1541 in Geneva.530


527 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 11. Later Lane cites this more specifically as Peter
Crabbe's two volume *Concilia omnia*, published by Peter Quentel at Cologne in 1538. See also Lane,
*Student of the Church Fathers*, 167.

528 Translation by Cornarius, published in Basel by Froben, 1540 (Lane, *Student of the Church
Fathers*, 74, 82, and 164). Lane's discussion on Calvin's reading of Basil in the early 1540s is a bit
puzzling. As just cited, on the one hand, he suggests Calvin acquired a copy of the Froben edition soon
after returning to Geneva in 1541. However: elsewhere he writes: "Basil is mentioned three times in the
1543 *Institutio*, probably in part at least the fruit of Calvin's reading of the 1540 edition," a translation by
Cornarius (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 82); and yet elsewhere Lane asserts, as does Gilmont,
that the 1543 edition of the *Institutio* was prepared already in Strasbourg, before Calvin returned to
Geneva. So were the revisions with respect to Basil's works made upon Calvin's return to Geneva? How
likely does this seem? Elsewhere, Lane notes that even in the 1543 *Institutio* Calvin's references to Basil
are "rare and extremely brief. It is likely that Calvin was at round this time [mid-late 1542] beginning his
first serious reading of Basil" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 170).

529 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 73. "There is no reason to doubt that Calvin was reading
Irenaeus for himself by 1542" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 76). The 1572 Genevan Library
catalogue includes mention of a 1528 edition of Irenaeus that Calvin is known to have used (Lane,
*Student of the Church Fathers*, 76 and 77). It is bound together with a 1526 edition of pseudo-Clement,
which Calvin is presumed to have used (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 77 and 166).

530 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 45-56. As Lane writes, "This work can, at the very
least, be made to appear to support Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and a number of modern writers
have felt that 'Ratramnus was the precursor of Calvin.' It is therefore remarkable both that Calvin never
once refers to Ratramnus and that this work was not to be found in the Genevan library [1572]." A.
Barclay avers "we have not been able to find any reference to it in Calvin's works, but such a reader as he
could not be ignorant of it" (Barclay, *Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* [Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie,
& Co., 1927] 292, cited by Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 45). Perhaps, says Lane, but it's equally
plausible that "had he known it he could not have failed to quote it." According to Lane, there are three
possible reasons why Calvin could have known but not cited Ratramnus' work: 1) some of his Roman
Catholic contemporaries considered the work spurious; 2) "while Augustine's authority was unassailable,
Ratramnus could be written off as a heretic"; 3) Calvin is not interested in medieval support for his
doctrine, but patristic, i.e., Augustinian (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 45-46). Lane also notes that
By now, an emphasis on the Holy Spirit has become expectable in Calvin's discussions of the Lord's Supper. So, for the purposes of setting up a study of the prospective provenance of that emphasis and its developing inflection, this survey of Calvin's intellectual inclination and that of his intellectual circles of influence, living and not, is sufficiently pursued.

3.8 Conclusion

As was suggested at the outset of this chapter, at this point in Calvin's life, we encounter a reformer, not schooled in "scholastic theology," but groomed to be a "humanist." As Ganoczy puts it, "a whole series of documents from 1532 to 1535 present us with a Calvin who is obviously a 'Fabrist' or, if one wants a more comprehensive description, a Christian humanist devoted to moderate reform."\(^{531}\) According to David Steinmetz, Calvin's "studies in humanities and law provided him with a high-caliber humanist training, which shaped his entire relationship with the written text."\(^{532}\) So, as Muller would have it, already by the early 1540s, more than a mere shadow of the so-called mature Calvin emerges, a Calvin who was born Catholic, whose theology was learned primarily in and through his work as a commentator and Reformer, whose work evidences the impact of humanist philology and rhetoric, of patristic study, but also, both positively and negatively, of the categories of medieval scholastic thought. 

\(^{531}\) Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 129.


\(^{533}\) Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 14.
And indeed, Calvin's early works do, in fact, demonstrate the breadth of his exposure to histories, treatises, commentaries, and homilies of the early church. They reveal his penchant for a philological and so-called historical-critical approach to texts, especially that of Scripture. These humanist values bear significantly upon Calvin's writings, and especially on his lifelong program of writing: publishing Scripture commentaries with simple, verse-by-verse exposition along with a volume of theological topics, derived from the exegetical task and relatively soteriologically ordered.

Still, as Muller and numerous other scholars caution, one cannot caricature "humanism" and "scholasticism," nor those who would seemingly be readily identified with one or the other. Muller writes:

As much recent scholarship has shown, moreover, the relationship of the Reformation to the eras immediately preceding and immediately following it cannot be reduced to a simple contrast between scholasticism and reform or scholasticism and humanism. The Reformation should not be reductionistically described as a humanistic phenomenon. Scholasticism or, more precisely, aspects of scholastic thought should not be viewed as incapable of rapprochement with aspects of humanist methods or, indeed, as contributing to the theological and methodological assumptions of an individual trained in the humanistic philology and dialectical method. . . . In Calvin's case, there is no absolute contradiction between his use of humanistic method and his appropriation of elements of scholastic theology, nor are his attacks on the scholastics to be taken as creating a clear dichotomy between "humanism" and "scholasticism."\(^{534}\)

But, while even Calvin's early work may exhibit some debt to the medieval theological tradition, this likely found its way into his own works by way of intermediary sources, particularly those of Luther and Bucer and Zwingli, who were schooled in these

---

534 Muller, "Scholasticism in Calvin: A Question of Relation and Disjunction," in *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 39; see also 14-15 in Chapter 1 of this work, "An Approach to Calvin: On Overcoming Modern Accommodations."
traditions, rather than by way of his own reading. Muller notes, following on the invaluable work of Ganoczy and Lane, the "relatively late development of Calvin's knowledge of medieval theology." So the relatively late development of his knowledge of medieval theology stands in rather stark contrast with the early development of his knowledge of patristic theology.

It would seem, then, that in pursuing the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit regarding believers' participation in the Lord's Supper, that a prospectively fruitful route would be to follow where Calvin leads, as Calvin leads, theologically, in relation to his contemporaries and his predecessors.

---

535 Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 12. As with Ganoczy and Lane, this conclusion stands opposite "the overly optimistic assumption, characteristic of the work of Reuter and of Torrance, that, from the beginning of his career, Calvin had a profound and detailed acquaintance with the medieval tradition," an assumption which is now "to be set aside" (Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 12-13, with reference to Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 173ff., and Karl Reuter, Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche, Bd. 15 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963], and Reuter, Vom Scholaren bis zum jungen Reformator [Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1981], and Thomas F. Torrance, The Hermeneutics of John Calvin [Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988]).
CHAPTER 4

A SURVEY OF PAST RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION AT HAND
AND A PROPOSAL FOR THE WAY FORWARD

An account of Calvin's early intellectual milieu, such as presented in the
previous chapter, allows for further consideration of the primary resources of Calvin's
early doctrinal expositions on the Lord's Supper. His humanist disposition, his
sympathy for the reform movement, his emerging exegetical and theological interests,
his interaction with the thought of his contemporaries and the tradition—such things
press for consideration when the published expositions of the 1530s and 40s are
examined and the provenance of their expression discerned. Appeals to such things
have been varied among past scholars.

In light of this and of the agenda of this study as a whole, the aim of this chapter
is twofold: to look back and to glance ahead. To look back is to survey previous
scholarship related to the specific question that drives this study. In this chapter, such a
survey is developed chronologically, that is, following the chronology of Calvin's works
and scholars' relevant observations therewith. Following a statement about the general
tenor of several previous studies on Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the chapter
takes up previous studies that attend to Calvin's earliest expression of his doctrine of the
Lord's Supper (in the 1536 *Institutio*) followed by previous studies that attend to his
subsequent early expressions (prepared 1536-1540). To glance ahead is to propose—
briefly—a way forward for discerning the provenance in Calvin's thought of this
particular emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to believers' participation
in the Lord's Supper, and especially in what Christ himself offers there.

4.1 A Look Back

Previous Scholarship on Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: The last one-
hundred some years have seen a spate of scholarship on Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's
Supper. As has been asserted by some recent scholars, authors of the majority of these
works take Calvin to have been consistent in the expression of his doctrine throughout
his lifetime. Finding development in Calvin's thought and expression is a task either (at
best) beyond the purpose of their discussion, or (at worst) seemingly lost on them. The
works of such authors, then, present Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper as if the
1559 Institutio is simply Calvin's fully elaborated summa on the topic of the Lord's
Supper, his doctrine of the sacrament having been essentially fully-formed and posited
already in 1536.536

536 For surveys referencing the works cited below, see Davis, Chapter 1: "The Foundations of the
Modern Interpretation of Calvin's Teaching on the Eucharist," Clearest Promises, 15-27; Muller, "From
Zürich or from Wittenberg?" forthcoming; and Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," with reference to
Davis. McDonnell, cited below, declares on the first page of the introduction to his study that "It is
universally acknowledged among Calvin researchers that there is little development in his eucharistic
of the Holy Eucharist (Philadelphia: J. B. Lipincott, 1846); Joachim Beckmann, Vom Sakrament bei
Calvin: Die Sakramentslehre Calvins in ihren Beziehungen zu Augustin. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, [Paul
Siebeck], 1926); Wilhelm Niesel, Calvins Lehre vom Abendmahl im Lichte seiner letzeten Antwort an
Westphal, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus, Third series, vol. 3 (Munich: Chr.
Kaiser Verlag, 1930), and The Theology of Calvin, trans. Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth, 1956),
211-228; Willem Frederik Dankbaar, De sacramentsleer van Calvijn, (Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1941);
(Montpellier: Faculté de théologie protestante, 1951); Joachim Rogge, Virtus und Res: Um die
Abendmahlsvirklichkeit bei Calvin (Stuttgart: 1965); Kilian McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church, and the
Although his study concerns Martin Luther and his understanding of "real presence," Herman Sasse's take on Calvin in the context of this study ultimately falls into this category of Calvin literature. From among such literature, Sasse's statement is succinct and clear, particularly in its relevance to the study at hand. Given its immediate relevance to the study at hand, his observation is quoted here, as it was in the introduction above:

The origin of the idea of the Holy Spirit as the transporteur who brings the body of Christ to us is unknown. Perhaps Calvin was influenced in this respect by one of the Greek Fathers for whom the invocation of the Holy Spirit effects the Real Presence. In the liturgy of Geneva there is no trace of an invocation of the Spirit.\footnote{Sasse, \textit{This Is My Body}, 264.}

\textit{Previous Scholarship on Calvin's Earliest Doctrine of the Lord's Supper,} \textit{Expressed in the 1536 \textit{Institutio}:} Beginning in especially the 1950s and 1960s, certain scholars attended to Calvin's earliest doctrine of the Lord's Supper, recognizing, even if not thoroughly expositing, some difference between the early doctrine Calvin expressed in the 1536 edition of the \textit{Institutio} and that in the 1559. Some of these scholars paid little or no attention to the influence of Calvin's predecessors and/or contemporaries with respect to the formation of his thought. Though they recognized that Calvin's early doctrine is distinguishable from his later doctrine, they offered little or no speculation on the sources or resources of such doctrine.\footnote{To be fair, it must be noted that while scholars cited in the section just above have not been keen to discern development within Calvin's thought, still, some have been keen to consider general...}

distinguished Calvin's earliest instruction on the Lord's Supper from Luther's developed doctrine, he offered, in Muller's words, "a primarily topical analysis of Calvin's thought without much attention to its antecedents and connections."\[^{539}\]

Other of these scholars did in fact speculate about the intellectual and theological influences on Calvin at the time when he penned his earliest doctrine of the Lord's Supper, each identifying such influences with greater or lesser degrees of specificity. For his part, François Wendel, in *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*,\[^{540}\] asserts that the Lord's Supper doctrine of 1536 *Institutio Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae* (1520), his *Sermon upon the true and sacred body of Christ* (1519)\[^{541}\] , and his sermon on *Confession and the Sacrament* (1524),\[^{542}\] along with

\[^{539}\] Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming, commenting on G. P. Harvelt, *Corpus Verum: een studie over een central hoofdstuk uit de avondmaalsleer van Calvijn* (Delft: W. D. Meinema, 1960).


\[^{541}\] Wendel suggests Calvin 'borrowed his ideas upon union with Christ" from this sermon (Wendel, *Calvin: Origins and Development*, 330-331.)

---

"influences" on Calvin's thought broadly taken. This is especially notable in, for example, the work of McDonnell, "I. The Intellectual Pre-History," in *John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist*, 7-39. Though not convinced of development, he is convinced of "influence," and so offers as the first chapter of his study this "intellectual pre-history" to Calvin's thought. The chapter consists of a survey of the Scotist tradition; the Scotist revival in Thomas Bradwardine, Gregory of Rimini, and John Major; nominalism and William of Occam; the mystical tradition; *devotio moderna*; humanism; the Platonic renewal; and the thought of some of Calvin's contemporaries. In the introduction to his study, McDonnell declares that "the purpose in sketching the broader currents such as the Scotist revival and nominalism is not, in every instance, to indicate a direct relationship, much less a dependence, but to indicate the intellectual and theological atmosphere in which Calvin grew up and worked" (4). And yet, repeatedly in his surveys, McDonnell opts for direct or near-direct influence in asserting that Calvin was a student of John Major in Paris at the College of the Montaigu, and that under Major's major influence Calvin was exposed, directly, to the theology of Bradwardine (7, 12ff, 27), Gregory of Rimini (7, 16ff, 27), Duns Scotus (7, 10, 11, 27), Occam, and Biel (9, 19ff, ). As indicated in Chapter 3 above, claims that Calvin studied under Major, much less that he was ever formally a student of scholastic theology, have proven to be less than plausible.
the influence of Bucer, especially his *Evangelical Commentary*, and of Zwingli, especially his *De vera et falsa religione* (1525). In his *The Young Calvin*, Alexander Ganoczy corroborates Wendel's assertions, though with a more thoroughgoing examination. He further suggests the influence of other early reformers. Regarding Calvin's discussion of the sacraments generally and the Lord's Supper particularly in the 1536 *Institutio*, Ganoczy demonstrates the influence of Luther (the *Babylonian Captivity*, the 1519 *Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi und von den Bruderschaften*, published in Latin in 1524, and the 1526 *Sermon von dem Sakramnet des Leibes und Blutes Christi wider die Schwarmgeister*, published in Latin in 1527), Zwingli (especially *De vera et falsa religione*, though in a "highly nuanced" fashion), and Bucer (*Ennarationes perpetuae in sacra quatuor evangelia*, published in its second edition in 1530; Calvin seems to have drawn on especially the discussions pertaining to the church, not the sacraments) as well as Melanchthon (*Loci Communes* on "the nature of the


543 Wendel, *Calvin: Origins and Development*, 332. Wendel speaks of "the parallel that is drawn between the receiving of the elements and the nourishment of the soul by the body of Christ." He cites the relevant passage from Calvin's 1536 *Inst*, and cites his (i.e., Wendel's) avenue to Bucer, namely, the work of Augustus Lang, *Der Evangeliienkommentar Martin Butzers und die Grundzüge seiner Theologie* (Leipzig: Dietrich, 1900), 435.


545 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 140ff.

546 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 153

547 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 158ff.
sacraments" as seals of promises). Boniface Meyer opens his dissertation, *John Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: An Essay in Historical Development*, with a chapter entitled "Some Patristic and Medieval Precedents," in which he affirms the general "influence" of Augustine and Scotus on Calvin's theology. When he takes up discussion of the 1536 *Institutio* in particular, however, he gives little indication as to any primary influence or influences on Calvin's explication of the Lord's Supper. Regarding Calvin's 1536 *Institutio*, Joseph Tylenda, in his essay of the early 1980s, "The Ecumenical Intention of Calvin's Early Eucharistic Teaching," takes Calvin to have been influenced—both positively and negatively—by Luther and Zwingli alike, in an attempt "to achieve a unified doctrine on the Supper" expressive of "the simple truth of the Word." Tylenda speaks of such influence, however, merely generally. Uniquely, Tylenda notes that, already in the 1536 *Institutio*, in its dedicatory letter to Francis I, Calvin "marshals patristic evidence to support his claims" about the Lord's Supper.

---

548 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 148f.

549 Boniface Meyer, "John Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: An Essay in Historical Development" (PhD Thesis for the University of Iowa, 1967), regarding Augustine, 13, regarding Scotus, 29, where he writes: "Scotism had more disciples in the schools between 1350 and 1650 than Thomism. Calvin was exposed to Scotus' teaching on the sovereignty of God and on the Eucharist while in school at Montaigu. Calvin admired this teaching and was considerably influenced by Scotus' thought." Again, such influence on Calvin's thought at that stage of his life has been demonstrated to be implausible. See discussion in Chapter 3 above.

550 Meyer, "John Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," 88-119. See also Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming.

551 Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention," 28 and 32.

552 Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention," see *pauci*.

553 Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention," 31. Tylenda's full reference: "In his dedicatory letter to Francis I, introducing the 1536 *Institutio*, he marshalls [sic] patristic evidence to support this claims, e.g.,
Much more recently, three scholars in particular have attended closely to Calvin's earliest doctrine of the Lord's Supper, though only one has delved deliberately into the prospective influences on that doctrine. Thomas Davis, whose *The Clearest Promises of God* has already been noted in this study, argues convincingly that one simply cannot take Calvin's doctrine to have been expressed consistently throughout his entire lifetime, already fully-formed at the time he wrote the 1536 *Institutio*.\textsuperscript{554} Though Davis plumbs Calvin's thought on the Lord's Supper, including its earliest expression in 1536, he does not plumb the provenance of such thought with respect to Calvin's predecessors and/or contemporaries. While he makes references, as so many scholars do, to the "influence" of Luther and Zwingli, he does so generally.\textsuperscript{555} Extensive specificity of "provenance" or "influence" is—understandably—beyond the scope of his intent, which is, in its essence, to prove "development" in Calvin's expression. The same may be said of Wim Janse's essay "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology: Three Dogma-Historical Observations," the point of which is similar to Davis', namely, to demonstrate

\begin{quote}
'It was one of the fathers who said that the true body was not in the sacrament of the Supper, but only the mystery of the body . . . . Therefore they overstep the bounds when they make it real and substantial.'
\end{quote}

Ford Lewis Battles, in his translation of the 1536 *Institutio*, determines this reference is to the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaem*, Hom 11, on Matthew 5:22, and then cites the patristic passage in full (see *Inst.* 1536, 238, entry on "word"). Notice Calvin's appeal to this very passage again at the Lausanne Disputation, at which Calvin acknowledges that this text is spuriously attributed to Chrysostom. In any case, here Tylenda well applies what Lane will eventually declare a methodological principle: Calvin "marshals" patristic resources as authorities in support of his view. Certainly Tylenda is on to something here, assessing Calvin's use of patristic thought differently than Niesel and McDonnell after him, who claim Calvin discovered the Spirit in Chrysostom (Niesel, *Calvins Lehre vom Abendmahl*, 91-92).\textsuperscript{554}

\begin{quote}
554 Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 1 and 3.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
555 Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 84-85, working off the studies of especially Wendel, *Origins and Development*, and Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*. In a footnote, Davis writes regarding the 1537 *Confessio*: "The emphasis on the Christian's relation to Christ's body and blood, and Calvin's appropriation of this concept in his later work, may well have come from the influence of Bucer and the way he (Bucer) appropriated Luther's thought (Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 92n35). See Ganoczy, *The Young Calvin*, 118.
\end{quote}
that "a static view of the eucharistic theology of Calvin is a-historical."\textsuperscript{556} Janse deals little with Calvin's 1536 \textit{Institutio}, except to note its "Zwinglianizing" tendencies, particularly on "sacramental instrumentality."\textsuperscript{557} Finally and most recently, Richard Muller, in a piece entitled "From Zürich or from Wittenberg? An Examination of Calvin's Early Eucharistic Thought,"\textsuperscript{558} examines Calvin's earliest expression of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper for the purpose of discerning its "provenance," and concludes that the expression is "distinctly Melanchthonian."\textsuperscript{559}

The 1536 \textit{Institutio} documents Calvin's earliest composed expression of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The point of the survey above is not to set up yet another study of the sources or resources of that specific expression, since that pursuit lies beyond the scope of this study. Rather, the point of the survey above is a) to offer a glimpse of prominent relevant scholarship on Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper to date, and b) (less pedantically) to provide a small field from which to glean possible resources for the specific expression or aspect of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper that is at the center of this study, namely, his emphasis on the Holy Spirit as the one by whom Christ's body and blood are communicated and received. As is noted in Chapter 2 of this study, an emphasis on the Spirit's role regarding "reception" is already present in

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 40, emphasis Janse's.}
\footnote{Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 38.}
\footnote{Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" \textit{Calvin Theological Journal}, forthcoming.}
\footnote{Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" \textit{Calvin Theological Journal}, forthcoming. The opening sentences of his closing section, entitled "Some Conclusions," read: Calvin's earliest thought ought not to be described either as ambiguous or as Zwinglian. Nor is it taken from Luther. Rather it is distinctly Melanchthonian." In coming to this conclusion, Muller relies on the comparability of Melanchthon and Calvin's Christology as well as their uses of \textit{exhibere}, demonstrating this from especially Melanchthon's \textit{Apologia confessionis} of 1531, but also his \textit{Ennaratio epistolae Pauli ad Colossenses}.}
\end{footnotes}
the first edition of his *Institutio* (1536), and an emphasis on the Spirit's role regarding communication emerges in Calvin's expression very soon after. So the resources of Calvin's 1536 *Institutio* cannot be overlooked as possible resources for this inflection in his expression. The survey of secondary literature above, then, suggests that works—even some specific works—of especially Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, and Melanchthon must be taken into consideration in some fashion.

This is not to suggest, however, that looking at the works of Calvin's contemporaries alone is sufficient. The third chapter of this study has demonstrated that Calvin was reading the fathers concurrent with his reading of prominent reformers' published writings. He was reading the fathers, and thus in effect reading them in conversation with one another and in conversation with the writings of his contemporaries. As one scholar put it, Calvin quickly assimilated what he read such that it fast became part of his own theological thought and vocabulary. Apart from Tylenda's explicit though non-elaborated reference to Calvin's patristic reference in the dedicatory letter that prefaces the 1536 *Institutio*, seemingly little consideration is given by these authors of this fact. So, as with the contemporaries already mentioned, what is known of Calvin's patristic and medieval reading must also be taken into account.

Again, the primary interest of this study is with the emergence—very soon after the publication of the 1536 *Institutio*—of Calvin's appeal to the role of the Holy Spirit concerning the true communication (and reception) of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, as well as, eventually, its very exhibitio. Thus attention now turns to a brief survey of previous scholars' awareness of development in Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's

---

560 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 75.
Supper between the publication of the first and second editions of his *Institutio* (1536 and 1539 respectively), and to any suggestions of influence such scholars might provide. Here, too, the point is twofold: a) to assess these references and suggestions in order to distinguish this study's intent in relation to them; and b) to garner leads to resources that might account for the development of the pneumatological nuance in Calvin's thought.

**Previous Scholarly Gestures Concerning Influence on the Early Development of Calvin's Doctrine, 1536-1539:** As with the 1536 *Institutio*, so with the writings up to and including the 1539 *Institutes*: previous scholars have exhibited varying degrees of attention to influences on Calvin's thought at this time. This may be said of Calvin's thought in general as well his thought more specifically. Here, of course, the concern is with the development of his thought on the Lord's Supper and, even more specifically, the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to that sacrament.

For his part, Thomas Davis—whose work, again, centers on this theme of development in Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper—notes the emergence of references to the Holy Spirit in Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper as Calvin expressed it already in late-1536 at the Lausanne Disputation, but Davis does not offer any suggestion regarding what might have been the provenance, or derivation, of this theological point for Calvin. In his discussion of the 1539 *Institutio*, Davis again acknowledges the emergence of an emphasis on the Holy Spirit saying, "We have seen

---

561 For more on the Lausanne Disputation, see discussions in previous chapters.

how this emphasis developed from Calvin's 1537 pastoral work." In making this claim, Davis is referring to his discussion of the "pastoral" pieces Calvin wrote, or at least helped formulate, in Geneva in 1537 and 1538, works such as his first catechism, the ecclesiastical articles, and a confession of faith. Davis' discussion of these pieces, however, seems to demonstrate more that this emphasis (which emerged already at the Lausanne Disputation in 1536) persists, not so much how it developed, much less whence it developed.

Regarding the 1539 *Institutio* in particular, Davis cites the following seminal passage from chapter twelve in that edition:

> the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of Christ, with whom [Christ] we are joined in unity, and is like a channel [the Spirit] through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us. For if we see that the sun, shedding its beams upon the earth, casts its substance in some measure upon it in order to beget, nourish, and give growth to its offspring — why should the radiance of Christ's Spirit be less in order to impart to us the communion of his flesh and blood? On this account, Scripture, in speaking of our participation with Christ, relates its whole power to the Spirit.

---


564 See Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 100. These works are *Articles concernant l'organisation de l'église . . . à Genève, Confession de la foy*, and *Instruction et confession de foy*. Interestingly, Davis actually discusses the *Articles*, "probably not written by Calvin," and the *Instruction*, but not the *Confession*. This confession was also likely written not by Calvin, but by Farel. For further discussion concerning the authorship of this confession, see Chapter 2 above.

565 1539 *Institutio*, as in *Inst*. 1559 LCC 4.17.12. *CO* 1: 1003-1004 and *CO* 2: 1011, respectively. Calvin never edited this passage after its introduction in 1539. Davis provides his own translation: "[The] Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit, that we may be made one body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond, therefore, of this connection is the Spirit of the Lord, with whom we are joined by being bound together. This is like a channel through which all Christ is and has is distributed to us. For if we see that the sun projecting its beams upon the earth, casting its substance in a manner upon it in order to beget, nourish, and give growth to its offspring, why should the radiance of Christ's Spirit be less in order to convey to us the communion of his flesh and blood. Because of this, Scripture, where it speaks of our participation with Christ, refers its entire power to the Spirit" (Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 109).
Davis continues just a little on:

One sees . . . that the biblical basis for this position has been developed by Calvin in the Romans commentary. Calvin, in fact, refers the reader of the 1539 Institutes to Paul's letter to the Romans immediately after the quote given above. What one finds in Calvin's treatment of Paul is a well-cultivated notion of the work of the Spirit as it joins the Christian and Christ One can find extended treatment of this work of the Spirit in many places throughout the Romans commentary, but two are especially important.566

Surely Davis is on to something here. His survey seemingly renders some part of the "provenance" picture in pointing up Calvin's reference to Romans. At the time he was revising the Institutio for its second edition, Calvin was, in fact, concurrently working up commentary on the book of Romans for presentation (if not actual publication), and Calvin does, in fact, as Davis points out, "[refer] the reader of the 1539 Institutio to Paul's letter to the Romans immediately after the quote given above." Indeed, Calvin refers the reader to Romans 8 in particular, though Davis seems to overlook this and turns instead to Calvin's commentary on Romans 6:5. Where Davis takes up the second of the two treatments of the work of the Spirit is unclear. Also, in the margin beside the very passage Davis quotes from the 1539 Institutio (quoted above), in the 1539 Institutio and in every edition after, Calvin inserts a marginal reference to a sermon "on the Holy Spirit of John Chrysostom."567 Interestingly, Davis makes no mention of this. So Davis' survey—given its emphasis on Calvin's

566 Davis, Clearest Promises, 109.

567 The text appears as follows in the 1539 Institutio:

\[\ldots quando hoc beneficii per spiritum suum nobis Dominus lar-
\]gitur, ut unum corpore, spiritus, & anima, secum fiamus. Vinculum ergo
istius coniunctionis est spiritus Domini, cuius nexu copulamur: & qui-
dam veluti canalis, per quem quidquid Christus et est habet ad nos de
rivatur. Nam si solem conspicimus radiis in terram emicantem ad gene-
randos, fovendos, vegetandos eius foetus, suam quodammodo substanti-
am \ldots \]
Commentary on Romans—perhaps offers some clue to the question of provenance, but it is not a complete picture, and it cannot be expected of his study to be, since the question of provenance is not at the fore of his work; overall development in Calvin's thought is.

If Davis makes nothing of Calvin's patristic reference, there are other scholars who make much of it—perhaps too much. The works of Meyer, Wendel, and Niesel may be considered in this light. Succeeding his discussion of the 1536 Institutio, Boniface Meyer simply cites pieces Calvin wrote between the releases of the 1536 and 1539 Institutio.\footnote{Boniface Meyer, "Calvin's Eucharistic Doctrine: 1536-39," in \textit{Journal of Ecumenical Studies} (1967), 62.} In relation to these pieces, he discusses neither doctrinal development nor the emergence of an emphasis on the Holy Spirit at all. When he takes up the 1539 Institutio, Meyer declares it to be a "much more coherent and systematic exposition" of Calvin's doctrine.\footnote{Meyer, "Calvin's Eucharistic Doctrine: 1536-39," 59.} Regarding Calvin's chapter entitled \textit{De Coena domini}, he asserts that "analysis . . . reveals only four pertinent emendations in comparison with the contents of the first edition."\footnote{Meyer, "Calvin's Eucharistic Doctrine: 1536-39," 60.} In presenting the first emendation, regarding "the manner of Christ's presence," Meyer discusses Calvin's resolution to the question (as Meyer puts it) 'How is the infinite distance between Christ and the faithful communicant to be bridged?\footnote{Meyer, "Calvin's Eucharistic Doctrine: 1536-39," 62.}\textit{"At once Calvin invokes his appeal to the Holy Spirit to supply this bridge. Erasmus had taken the idea from a sermon of John }
Chrysostom and published it in one of his works in 1530. Calvin now uses it for the first time and reinforces it with this beautiful analogy: . . . ." Meyer follows this claim with a lengthy quotation of the 1539 *Institutio*, which comprises the very text Davis quotes, as cited above.

Meyer's presentation of Calvin's resolution is puzzling, particularly regarding the provenance of Calvin's thought: "Erasmus had taken the idea from a sermon of John Chrysostom and published it in one of his works in 1530. Calvin now uses it for the first time . . . ." Meyer seems to suggest that Erasmus had actually engaged "the idea" of the Holy Spirit as the bridge between Christ and the communicant, appropriated "the idea" to his own theological thought, and then published "the idea" in one of his own original treatises in 1530. What Erasmus did in fact publish in 1530 were five tomes comprising Chrysostom's *opera*, the third and fifth tomes of which include one sermon each entitled "On the Holy Spirit." Presumably, Calvin's marginal note is referring the reader to the second of these sermons. So Calvin didn't get the idea from Erasmus per se, as Meyer's expression may be taken to read here, though Erasmus did publish, in his edition of Chrysostom's works, a sermon bearing a similar idea. Presumably this is what Meyer means, though his actual expression is misleading.

---


573 *D. Ioannis Chrsostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opera, quae hactenus versa sunt omnia, ad Graecum codicum collationem multis in locis per utriusque linguae peritos emendate*, ed. Erasmus Desiderius (Basileae: In Officina Frobeniana, 1530), and *Divi Chrysostomi Archeepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opera, quatenusin hunc diem Latio donate noscuntur, omnia*, ed. Desiderius Erasmus (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Apud Claudium Chevallonium, 1536).


575 Calvin's reference to Chrysostom is discussed in Chapter 7 below.
Interestingly, Meyer keeps cadence with others who have deduced that this very
sermon is the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Spirit. The scholar
who seems to have set the cadence is Wilhelm Niesel. In his *Calvins Lehre vom
Abendmahl*, Niesel writes of Calvin's appeal to the work of the Holy Spirit:


Niesel's observations are astute, inasmuch as he acknowledges that Calvin does not
speak specifically of the Spirit in this way in the 1536 *Institutio*, that this concept
emerges already in the 1537 *Confessio*, and that surely the expression in the 1539
*Institutio* echoes that made already in 1537.

Niesel suggests a strong connection between the patristic sermon and Calvin's
text, perhaps too strong, since one might infer from Niesel's presentation that Calvin
derived his emphasis on the role of the Spirit directly and solely from this sermon.
Niesel's presentation reads as if an encounter with this patristic sermon was for Calvin
an epiphany. Several have taken Niesel's meaning in just this way, and, in their own
scholarship write of it conclusively, as, for example, Wendel does:

---

576 Niesel, *Calvins Lehre vom Abendmahl*, 91-92. As no standard English translation is available, the text is presented in its original language.
It was in a sermon which Erasmus had attributed to St John Chrysostom and had included in the edition of his works published at Basle in 1530, that Calvin found the idea that the Holy Spirit is the bond of our union with Christ. He had made use of this for the first time, it seems, in a passage in the Institutes of 1539 . . . . 577

Calvin's reference to this sermon attributed to Chrysostom is indeed significant. As with Calvin's reference to Romans, it perhaps points us in the direction of a more complete picture of the provenance of the distinctive pneumatological inflection in Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. But to imply that this sermon is the origin of Calvin's doctrine is too strong. Calvin's reference and how it ought to be understood shall be taken up in a forthcoming chapter.

Martin Bucer is perhaps the principal contemporary to whom scholars point as having had significant influence on Calvin during the period being discussed, the period between the publication of the first and second editions of the Institutio. 578 The measure of Bucer's influence has long been debated. 579 Some who affirm his influence point

---

577 Wendel, Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought, 351 (emphasis added). See also Dankbaar, De Sakramentsleer van Calvijn, 13. Wendel's footnote reads "Cf. Niesel, op. cit., p. 92." Though McDonnell cites Niesel in precisely the same way and does not acknowledge Wendel, surely Wendel's conclusive phrasing was in mind when he wrote: "Calvin found the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the bond of our union with Christ in the Eucharist in a sermon Erasmus attributed to John Chrysostom, which Erasmus inserted into an edition of Chrysostom's works published at Basel in 1530" (Wendel, John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist, 257). To be fair, however, it must be observed that McDonnell's expression is perhaps less suggestive regarding Chrysostom's sermon as the "provenance" for such thought, or whether it merely gave "warrant" to Calvin's thought. That is, McDonnell's immediate concern is that Calvin was not "an innovator in this matter" (i.e., with respect to this pneumatological doctrine).


579 See McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist, 75ff. For an excellent survey on recent scholarly opinion, see Kök, "The Influence of Martin Bucer on John Calvin's Interpretation," 5-19.
specifically to the richness of both reformers' pneumatology, even their pneumatology of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. So, for example, Willem van't Spijker writes:

Both have been rightfully been called theologians of the Holy Spirit. It is at this crucial point in their theology that they were most analogous. The Confessio Fidei de Eucharistia, drafted by Calvin and co-signed by Bucer and Capito, may illustrate that. In it, Calvin offers an explanation of the mystery of the Lord's Supper which Bucer wholeheartedly endorsed. Calvin wrote that spiritual life is communicated to us through Christ. By his Spirit, he makes us share in the power of his life-giving flesh in heaven. This is how the 'communio' which unites us with him originates. The Spirit is the bond of that fellowship which is determinative for the church. Both men found each other at this central point in their theology. Did Bucer influence Calvin in that? No doubt.

Beyond this, proof of Bucer's influence is not given (at least not in this essay), so this claim of influence—and others like it—might fall under a category of "general assumption." A similar sort of statement might be said of Wendel's observation of the relation of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and Bucer's in 1537, at the time when the former presented and the latter co-signed, the Confessio Fidei de Eucharistia. Wendel writes:

At the Synod of Bern in 1537, to which Bucer and Capiton had come in order to vindicate the approach to Luther which the signing of the Concord of Wittenberg had implied, Calvin submitted to the two Strasbourg reformers a confession of faith in the Eucharist which reproduced Bucer's point of view. In this he affirmed communion in the body and the blood of Christ as well as in his spirit, and the reality of this communion, while rejecting the local presence of the body of the Christ in the Eucharistic elements.

---

580 Both have been declared "theologians of the Holy Spirit." See Krusche, Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes nach Calvin (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1957), 12, with reference to Lang, Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers, 154 and 120. See also Willem van't Spijker, "Bucer's Influence on Calvin: Church and Community," in Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community, ed. D. F. Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 33.

581 Van't Spijker, "Bucer's Influence on Calvin," 33, emphasis added.

Like van't Spijker, Wendel claims direct correspondence, implying influence, but without proof, that is, without demonstrating Bucer's expression from Bucer's works and then drawing out its appropriation by Calvin into his.

McDonnell also considers the influence of Calvin's Strasbourg contemporary on Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but in a seemingly more cautious and discerning manner.\(^{583}\) He writes:

Bucer, too, has a eucharistic doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which however has a different character from Calvin's. For Calvin the Holy Spirit effects the presence of the body of Christ, though that body remains at a distance in heaven. Bucer's doctrine is not directed so much to the body of Christ as to the heart of the believer.\(^{584}\)

A few points regarding McDonnell's observation: McDonnell does not make a claim regarding the influence of the elder reformer upon the younger. Indeed, he highlights a difference in their doctrine, which would seemingly suggest a lack of influence. In presenting this difference between Bucer and Calvin's eucharistic doctrines of the Holy

\(^{583}\) Perhaps bearing in mind the assessment of Wendel, who—along with the statement about the apparent synergy between Bucer and Calvin's views in 1537—also wrote immediately prior to that observation: "... the problem of the influence of the Strasbourg reformers was not even satisfactorily stated with regard to Bucer, until Lang took it up in 1900 (Augustus Lang, Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers und die Grundzuge seiner Theologie [Leipzig: Dietrich, 1900]). Since then, further contacts have been discovered, and the thesis of Calvin's dependence on Bucer has found a number of defenders. It must be admitted that some of them, in the enthusiasm of their discoveries, yielded to a temptation to ascribe too much to Bucer, and tried to find the germ of most of Calvin's teachings in him. ... But with all these reservations, of which more systematic study might lengthen the list, it is now well established that the part played by Bucer in the formation of Calvinist theology remains extremely important" (Wendel, Calvin: Origins and Development, 137). As "defenders," Wendel cites continental scholars Friedrich Loofs, Paul Wernle, Otto Ritschl, Jacques Pannier, Henri Strohl, Jacques Courvoisier, and their works.

\(^{584}\) McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist, 84. This seems right, and is perhaps corroborated by Bucer's Censura of Cranmer's liturgy. Regarding the Prayer of Consecration, Bucer "proposed to remove the words: 'Blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes, ...' and to supply a new formula: 'Bless us and sanctify us by the Holy Spirit and word, tht by true faith we may perceive in these mysteries the body and blood of they Son" (Thompson, Liturgies, 240). (Would that such a document had been solicited from Calvin—for the sake of a strict comparison between Bucer and Calvin's assessment of such a prayer.
Spirit, McDonnell—taken simply at his word in these three sentences—seemingly overlooks an apparent similarity in Calvin and Bucer's doctrine regarding the role of the Holy Spirit and "the heart of the believer." That is to say, in the second chapter of this study, it was demonstrated that Calvin seemingly intimates a three-fold role of the Holy Spirit in the occasion of a believer's participation in the Lord's Supper. One role concerns the "reception" of Christ, that is, it is to the Spirit to "soften the heart that the sacrament might enter in," which is the understanding of the Spirit's role McDonnell here attributes not at all to Calvin but to Bucer, taking this to be the extent of the Spirit's role as Bucer conceives of it. The other two roles concern the communicatio of Christ's body, even its very exhibitio with respect to the aliments of the sacrament, akin to McDonnell's expression of Calvin's understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament. So ultimately, there may be both similarity and difference in the conceptions of Calvin and Bucer on the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and where there is similarity, the possibility of influence is not precluded. As has been suggested, however, it has not been fastidiously demonstrated.

A final point regarding McDonnell's statement: Earlier McDonnell was noted as having declared that "Calvin found the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the bond of our union with Christ in the Eucharist in a sermon [of] John Chrysostom." Such a doctrine is not unrelated to a conception of the Spirit's work "in the heart of the believer." So McDonnell's two claims—about Calvin and Bucer, and Calvin and Chrysostom—are not, ultimately, in contradiction, but they do, in their own way, point

585 See Chapter 2 above.
586 McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist, 257.
up again the question of the provenance of Calvin's doctrine of the Holy Spirit with respect to the communication, reception, and even *exhibitio*, of Christ's body and blood in the Supper.

Indeed such an observation may be made of all the works that have been reviewed: Inasmuch as they make general claims and assumptions about influences on Calvin with respect to the provenance or derivation of an emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to the Lord's Supper in Calvin's thought, they offer only facile conclusions to the question, not thoroughly investigated, fully elaborated conclusions. In this way, they in fact point up the question taken up by this study, which might here be put this way: How might the derivation of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit best be construed? In pursuing an answer to this question, might the proposals, or assumptions, of the past be corroborated, or perhaps coalesced into a more coherent whole?

4.2 A Glance Ahead

Ultimately, the answer is Yes. That is, an "answer" to the question of the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit with regard to believers' participation in the Lord's Supper is to be derived as a composite of various resources. The studies surveyed above identify such resources to pursue, as does Calvin's "Sitz im Leben" (as it were) in the latter 1530's, already explored in Chapter 3 above.\(^{587}\) Accordingly, in the remainder of this study, an answer, that is, a *composite answer* to the question at hand shall be derived from 1) Calvin's developing theological thought

\(^{587}\) See Chapter 3 above.
regarding the Trinity, the persons and work of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; 2) the "influence" of his contemporaries and their thought, considered with respect to their general expression as well as their specific locutions as compared to Calvin's; 3) the "influence" of his predecessors, though the concept of "influence" might better be expressed as "ground," given that based on their expressions, Calvin founds, or gives warrant, for his own. These three are best taken as a whole, even if they are parsed in forthcoming chapters for the sake of facilitating their pursuit.

The former studies surveyed above lend contributions to especially the second and third of these pursuits. Even if these former discussions of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper do not wholly answer the question of the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to the Lord's Supper, they do point to resources for pursuing an answer to that question, particularly resources among the writings of Calvin's contemporaries and predecessors.
ASSIMILATION: CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

Chapter 2, above, features a chronological survey of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, a survey focused specifically on his mention of the person and work of the Holy Spirit in relation to the sacrament and believers' participation therein. There it is noted that Calvin's understanding, as expressed in the 1539 edition of his *Institutio*, seems to have advanced significantly as compared to that expressed in the 1536 edition. In the second edition, the Spirit figures much more prominently in Calvin's discussion and in two ways: first, Calvin readily speaks of the Spirit as *the bond* of believers' communion with Christ and, second, he readily affirms that Christ "feeds his people with his own body, the communion of which he bestows upon them by the power of his Spirit (spiritus sui virtus)." These two expressions—so characteristic of Calvin's so-called mature doctrine of the Lord's Supper—are conspicuous by their absence in the 1536 edition of the *Institutio*.

The question of this study as a whole is, to state it again, Whence? Whence does this emphasis arise? What is its impetus?

When considering Calvin's emphasis on the Holy Spirit in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, one cannot overlook his corollary emphasis on the Holy Spirit in his doctrine of the Trinity. Indeed, as shall be shown in this chapter, Calvin's robustly
pneumatological doctrine of the Trinity may, in fact, from a *theological perspective*, be considered the provenance or impetus of his robustly pneumatological doctrine of the sacrament. This is especially evident when one compares Calvin's discussion of God Triune and his discussion of the sacraments in the 1536 edition of the *Institutio* with such discussions in the 1539 edition. While Calvin's overall theological expression is richly Trinitarian already in the 1536 *Institutio*, such richness does not bear the fruit of pneumatological expression in his doctrine of the sacraments there. As noted just above and in Chapter 2, in the 1539 edition, that fruit is ripening, if not fully ripened.

Following brief, general observations about Calvin's approach to the doctrine of the Trinity and building on the work of Chapter 2, the work of this chapter shall be to consider the Trinitarian development of Calvin's thought in the first two editions of his *Institutio*, particularly as this development bears on his expressed pneumatology of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Evidence of this development shall be garnered and examined from a few other of Calvin's works prepared in the mid to late 1530s as well. The intent, again, is to demonstrate that, from a theological perspective, Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity may be taken to be the theological provenance, or impetus, if you will, of his robust pneumatology of the sacrament.

### 5.1 Calvin's Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity

One recent scholar pithily observes that while Calvin "has a great deal to say about God revealed as Father, Son, and Spirit, [he] has remarkably little to say about the doctrine of the Trinity as such." His point—which is not unique to him—is that...
when Calvin concerns himself with "the most holy Trinity," he is less concerned with an erudite exposition of God in se than a well-thought exposition of God pro nobis. As another scholar puts it, Calvin reflects a "fundamentally soteriological concern" in his doctrine of God, a "soteriological concern that leads him inevitably to speak of God in trinitarian terms." Or, to express it in the terms of twentieth and twenty-first century theological parlance, Calvin's emphasis in his discourse about God falls not so much on the "immanent" Trinity as on the "economic" Trinity, though his expressions seemingly demonstrate an innate realization that these two approaches cannot be wholly extricated one from the other.

Such a description of Calvin's thought is not meant to dislocate it from his sixteenth century context, to impose upon his thought modern theological categories, concerns, and terms. Rather, it is to affirm that Calvin derives his discussion of God scripturally, or exegetically, not philosophically. His motivation is the promise and story of salvation, the realization of grace and faith. While Calvin readily and deliberately employed the extra-biblical, patristic terms ousia and hypostaseis,

---


590 As he puts it in Inst. 1536, 57.

591 Butin, Revelation, 12. In this work, a revision of his Ph. D. dissertation defended at Duke University, Butin provides an excellent survey of literature on Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity.

592 Butin, Revelation, 39ff; Letham, Holy Trinity, 252; Ganoczy, "Observations," 96-97; Partee, The Theology of John Calvin, 64ff; and Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 153ff, who discusses Calvin's commentaries and the evidence of Calvin's philosophical concerns regarding the divine attributes and divine causality there.
substance and subsistencies, to approach the mystery of God's one-ness and three-ness, ultimately he dwells on this as mystery. In a compelling passage found in every edition of the *Institutio*, 1536 on, Calvin affirms the consubstantiality and co-eternity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as "there are three distinct persons, but one essence," and then immediately avers: "As these are deep and hidden mysteries, they ought rather to be adored than investigated, inasmuch as neither our intelligence nor our tongue—by nature or capacity—ought, or is able, to encompass these mysteries." ⁵⁹³

5.2 God Triune in the 1536 *Institutio*

Calvin generated his first summary exposition of Christian doctrine in the mid-1530s. At the outset, his *Institutio* was intended to be a catechetical work, though, with a dedicatory letter addressed to the King of France appended as a preface, it became an apologetical work as well. ⁵⁹⁴ That it had a catechetical intent is evident from its content and structure: not unlike antecedent catechetical works, historic and contemporaneous, Calvin's *Institutio* includes expositions of the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed,

---

⁵⁹³ *Inst.* 1536, 57. This is not unlike Calvin's confession of the mystery of what transpires in the sacraments. See 1559 *Institutio* 4.17.7, a passage that first appeared in the 1539 edition. Calvin's emphasis on wonder and experience ought not be marshaled to suggest Calvin would condone an anti-intellectual approach to God or devotion to God. The volume and tenor of Calvin's writings speak for themselves, as does Calvin's reflection, at least regarding the Lord's Supper, that while the communion of the Lord's Supper itself, and all that it signifies, is a mystery, it is a mystery "deserving of contemplation." It is fitting to consider, among other things, "in what way (quo modo) Christ can give us his body and blood for meat and drink" (*Tracts and Treatises* 2:516). Such are not the words of an anti-intellectual. (I am indebted to Laura Smit for this point.)

⁵⁹⁴ As noted before in Chapter 3, Calvin's own comments about the work indicate that he "had begun to compose the *Institutio* as a catechetical manual some time before his decision to address the volume to Francis I and that the apologetic thrust of the address was in fact secondary to the original intention of the document" (Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 26, with reference to Parker, *John Calvin: A Biography*, 33). See also Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 102ff and 120; Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 11; and Randall C. Zachman, *John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian*, 134.
the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments. Calvin's exposition of the creed is located in the second chapter under the heading *De Fide*.

In a relatively lengthy preamble to his exposition of the creed, Calvin broaches the theological locus of God Triune. In this discussion, he "takes pains to lay out an understanding of the Trinity that avoids the heretical alternative extremes of Arianism and Sabellianism." In doing so, Calvin affirms the traditional terms of "the ancient orthodox fathers," relating the one *ousia* and the three *hypostaseis*, the one substance and the three subsistencies. He distinguishes the divine *hypostaseis* from the divine attributes, declaring that the latter 'show what God is like' while the former 'declare who God truly is.' Beyond this, however, Calvin does not dwell on the classical attributes and the "intra-Trinitarian relations," whether here or in his exposition of the creed, and instead dwells on the roles ascribed to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in scripture in relation to creation, humankind and their salvation. Indeed, Calvin concludes his preamble (and therefore immediately precedes his exposition of the creed) with the following relatively abstract yet soteriologically significant, biblically-motivated statement:

. . . when we hear 'one' we are to understand unity of substance; . . . when we hear 'three' we are to distinguish in this one essence, nevertheless, three properties. Indeed Scripture so distinguishes these as to attribute to the Father the beginning of acting and the fountain and source of all things; to assign to the

---


598 See discussion in Partee, *The Theology of John Calvin*, 64ff.
Son the wisdom and plan of acting; to refer to the Spirit the power and effective working of action (ad Spiritum, virtutem efficaciamque actionis referat).\textsuperscript{599}

For the exposition of the creed, Calvin takes up each of its four articles in turn, the length of his treatments of "God the Father," "Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord," and "the Holy Spirit" corresponding to the imbalanced length of their treatment in the creed itself. What is most important to note, however, is that an "economic," or soteriological, concern holds sway throughout his exposition, even as it had in the preamble.

Under the first article, concerning "God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth," Calvin's accent falls on the Father's activity with regard to creation, that is, the creation "of ourselves and of absolutely all things that have been created." God the Father has "established" them "by the Word, his eternal Wisdom (who is the Son) and by his Power (\textit{virtute}) (who is the Holy Spirit),"\textsuperscript{600} and now "sustains, nourishes, activates, [and] preserves" all such things that they might not "immediately collapse and fall into nothingness."\textsuperscript{601} At the conclusion of his brief exposition of this equally brief article, Calvin turns from creation to salvation: Aware of God the Father's attention to

\textsuperscript{599} \textit{Inst.} 1536, 48. "... cum unum audimus, intelligendum esse substantiae unitatem, cum tres audimus, in una hac essentia distinguendas tamen tres proprietates. Siquidem ita eas scriptura distinguuit, ut patri principium agendi, rerumque omnium fontem et originem attribuat, Filio, sapientiam et consilium agendi assignet, ad Spiritum, virtutem efficaciamque actionis referat" (\textit{CO} 1:62).

\textsuperscript{600} \textit{Inst.} 1536, 49. "... quas verbo et aeterna sua sapientia (qui filius est) et sua virtute (qui spiritus sanctus est) condidit (Psal. 33. Psal. 104. Act. 17. Hebr. 1) ita nunc sustinere, fovere, agere, conservare, bonitate ac virtute sua, citra quam omnia statim collapsura essent et in nihilum abitura" (\textit{CO} 1:63).

\textsuperscript{601} \textit{Inst.} 1536, 49. \textit{CO} 1:63.
creation, "we are never to doubt or lose faith that we have in him a propitious and benevolent Father, and no less are to await salvation from him."\(^{602}\)

Such salvation comes to us in "Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord," the subject of the second article of the creed. Here Calvin affirms that Christ is "begotten of the Father from all eternity," and therefore is God "by nature," that is, "he is God, he is one God with the Father, of the same nature and substance or essence."\(^{603}\) Within such affirmation Calvin immediately turns to the mission of the Son, "sent by the Father out of divine kindness and mercy, descended to us for our sake to release us from the devil's tyranny, ... from the bonds of sin, ... from the bondage of death, ... from eternal punishment."\(^{604}\) He "descended to us to take on our flesh, which he joined to his divinity," ... "since it was not in us to ascend" to God.\(^{605}\) Thus Christ is the Mediator, who accomplishes "no common thing": "to make children of God out of children of men; out of heirs of Gehenna to make heirs of the heavenly kingdom."

Who could have done this had not the Son of 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? This therefore is our hope, that we are [children] of God, for God's natural son fashioned for himself a body from our body, flesh from our flesh, bones from our bones, that he might be one with us. What was ours, he willed to belong to himself, so that what was his might belong to us, and thus to be both Son of God and Son of man in common with us.\(^{606}\)


\(^{606}\) *Inst.* 1536, 51. *CO* 1:65. Here Calvin speaks of what he calls in his discussion of the Lord's Supper (already in 1536) the "wonderful exchange" between Christ and Christ's own for the sake of their salvation. Luther speaks of this, too, most notably with respect to the interest of this study in his 1519 *Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi und von den*
The work of the Spirit with respect to Christ enters in on Calvin's discussion of Christ's incarnation and ministry. Indeed, in this very context Calvin broaches the work of the person of the Spirit also with respect to believers, given their partaking of Christ through faith. We believe Christ "to have been conceived a man for us by the wonderful and unspeakable power of the Holy Spirit (spiritus sancti virtute)." Then, God the Father having "called" Christ to his ministry by "a heavenly oracle," "Christ himself was sprinkled with all the graces of the Holy Spirit": "as the Spirit has rested upon him, and has poured itself out wholly upon him, in order that we all may receive from his fullness (that is, whoever of us are partners and partakers of him through faith)."

The work of the Spirit is elaborated in the third article of the creed, and hence in Calvin's exposition thereof. Opening with an approving nod to traditional formulation, Calvin declares "we confess that we believe in the Holy Spirit, but that He is with the Father and the Son, the third person of the most holy Trinity, consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father and the Son." Thus, even as we "repose" in God the Father and God the Son, "so ought we to have the same trust in the Holy Spirit. Indeed he is our God, one with the Father and the Son." Synthesizing his soteriologically-driven discussions of the Father and the Son, Calvin writes here with respect to the Holy Spirit:

---

607 Inst. 1536, 54-55. CO 1:69. This exact phrase is not retained in the 1539 edition, but the concept certainly is. The parallel passage is found at CO 1:523.

608 Inst. 1536, 54, with reference to Isaiah 11.1-5, 61.1-3; and John 1.16. This exact phrasing not retained in succeeding editions.

609 Inst. 1536, 57. CO 1:71.
We are persuaded that there is for us no other guide and leader to the Father than the Holy Spirit, just as there is no other way than Christ; and that there is no grace from God, save through the Holy Spirit. Grace is itself the power and action of the Spirit: through grace God the Father, in the Son, accomplishes whatever good there is; [through grace, He empowers and sustains all things, causes them to grow, and quickens them;] through grace, He justifies, sanctifies, and cleanses us, calls and draws us to himself, that we may attain salvation [Romans 8.11-17; Eph 2.18; 1 Cor 12.12-13].

The Spirit, "dwelling in us," "illumines us with his light, in order that we may learn and plainly recognize what an enormous wealth of divine goodness we possess in Christ."611

In the foregoing discussion of his exposition of the Apostles' Creed in the 1536 edition of the *Institutio*, Calvin's emphasis on the Trinity is plain. Further, his inclination to speak of the Trinity preeminently scripturally, with respect to the promise and story of salvation, and in this sense with respect to soteriology, is likewise plain. In this regard, his depiction of the soteriological exchange—of all that is Christ's becoming ours, and all that is ours becoming Christ's—figures prominently. Such expressions broach the soteriological category of "union with Christ," a category that is famously prominent in Calvin's theology, especially as expressed in Book 3 of his last edition of the *Institutio*. Interestingly, this category is simply *not* so prominent in the first edition of the work. Further, where there are glimpses of the doctrine of "union with Christ" in

---

610 *Inst.* 1536, 57. This text is modified slightly: The text in brackets is a translation of a line that Battles seems to have overlooked as it is omitted in his translation of the 1536 *Institutio*. Thus, the phrase is translated according to Battles' rendering of the same phrase in Calvin's 1538 Catechism, for which Calvin appropriates much of this very passage from the *Institutio*. The Latin text of the 1536 *Institutio* is as follows: "Persuasi, non alium esse nobis ad patrem ductorem ac directorem, quam spiritum sanctum, quemadmodum non alia est via quam Christus, nihil nobis gratiae a Deo esse, quam per spiritum sanctum; cum gratia, ipsa sit spiritus virtus atque actio, per quam Deus pater, in filio, quidquid usquam est boni, operatur, per quam agit, sustinet, vegetat, ac vivificat omnia, per quam nos justificat, sanctificat, expurgat, ad sese vocat ac trahit, ut salutem consequamur (Rom. 8. Eph. 2. 1 Cor. 12)" (*CO* 1:71-72). Recall that in the preamble to his discussion of the creed, Calvin says the Spirit is the power and efficacy. See *Inst.* 1536, 48 and 49.

611 *Inst.* 1536, 57. In an earlier discussion, Calvin speaks of Christ "dwelling in us" (*Inst.* 1536, 35).
the 1536 *Institutio*, most often suggested with the words *communio* and *participatio*, Calvin's emphasis on the work of the Spirit is conspicuously absent.\(^{612}\) This would seem surprising, given Calvin's emphasis on the Spirit as the "power" and "efficacy" of grace elsewise.

When one turns to Calvin's expositions of the sacraments in the 1536 edition of the *Institutio*, one discovers that his doctrine of the Trinity is not carried forward to enrich his discussion or, seemingly, even his understanding.\(^{613}\) As has already been noted in Chapter 2, this is particularly the case with respect to the work of the Holy Spirit and the "efficacy" of the sacrament. Calvin does in fact speak of the Holy Spirit with respect to faith, the instrument by which that which is offered in the sacrament is received, an instrument which itself is increased in the celebration of the sacraments.

For Calvin, "the power and work" of the Holy Spirit

is to begin, sustain, and consummate faith. . . . faith is the proper and entire work of the Holy Spirit, illumined by whom we recognize God and the treasures of his kindness, and without whose light our mind is so blinded that it can see nothing; so dull that it can sense nothing of spiritual things. . . . [F]irst, the Lord teaches and instructs us by his Word. Secondly, he confirms it by the sacraments. Finally, he illumines our minds by the light of his Holy Spirit and opens our hearts for the Word and sacraments to enter in, which would otherwise only strike our ears and appear before our eyes, but not at all affect us within.\(^{614}\)

\(^{612}\) Regarding *communio*, see *CO* 1:31, 74, 126, 127, 135, and 163; *Inst.* 1536, 18, 60, 109, 110, 118, and 145 respectively. Regarding *participatio*, see *CO* 1:116, 124, 126, and 150; *Inst.* 1536, 100, 107, 109, and 132 respectively. The most interesting of these is at *CO* 1:31 (*Inst.* 1536, 18) which reads: "If we partake of Christ, in Him we shall possess all the heavenly treasures and gift of the Holy Spirit, which lead us into life and salvation." Here Calvin speaks of the Holy Spirit as one of the benefits of participation in Christ, but not as the *virtus*, "agent," "efficacy," or "bond" of that very participation.

\(^{613}\) Obviously one must be careful in claiming what Calvin did or did not understand, particularly when discussing what he omits. Is the omission a genuine demonstration of his (lack of) understanding? Or did it just not come to expression—for whatever reason? However, given the prevalence and prominence of his appeals to the work of the Spirit in later discourse about the Lord's Supper, it does indeed seem that Calvin's thought actually "developed"—rapidly—in this regard in the mid-late 1530s.
Here, the "efficacy" of the Spirit concerns the capacity of the believer to receive that which is offered in the sacrament, and in 1536, for Calvin, that which is offered in the sacraments, whether baptism or the Lord's Supper, is preeminently a testimony or attestation of God's good will toward us. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as a testimony and attestation, is an image or mirror of that which transpires *apart from* the celebration of the sacrament: namely, the nourishment of our souls by the gifts of Christ's body and blood.615 That Christ "works effectually by its means" (as he puts it in the 1550s and 60s),616 and therefore *in the Lord's Supper* "truly communicates" his "true body and blood" is given but a hint, and a slight hint at that, when Calvin says in his discourse about the Lord's Supper that "the body of Christ is offered to us *in the sacrament* . . . truly and effectively"617 and that "the Lord so communicates his body to us *there* that he is made completely one with us and we with him."618 In relation to these hints is nary a whisper of the Spirit.619

---

614 *Inst.* 1536, 89. As noted in Chapter 2 above, this is said contra Zwingli, who simply could not countenance sacraments as instruments.

615 Calvin makes this point in his discussion of the Lord's Supper (*Inst.* 1536, 103). He speaks of the sacraments as metaphors in his discussion of sacraments generally considered (*Battles* *Inst.* 1536, 88).


617 *Inst.* 1536, 104-105. *CO* 1:121. "Thus in 1536 Calvin views the holy Supper of the Lord as a witness and proof of the promise of our engrafting in Christ so that all that is ours is his, and all that is his is ours, and also as the remembrance of Christ's death as being our life. It exhibits Christ to us as though he stood before us, but it does not offer what it represents, even though Calvin says that it offers the body of Christ truly and effectively" (*Zachman, Image and Word*, 332).

618 *Inst.* 1536, 109. *CO* 1:126. Here Calvin demonstrates his ever and anon emphasis that the sacrament is a *communal* celebration. Calvin never conceives of believers' union with Christ in terms of the individual. Always, as here, his turn is to the *communion*, or we might put it *common-union*, of the faithful in Christ. This passage in every edition of the *Institutio* reads: "Thirdly, the Lord also intended the Supper to be a kind of exhortation for us, which can more forcefully than any means quicken and inspire us to love, peace, and concord. For the Lord so communicates his body to us there that he is made
The same may be said of Calvin's discussion of baptism. Baptism, too, is a testimony of a particularly granted, but not sacramentally bestowed, reality. It is a "sure testimony to us that we are not only engrafted into the death and life of Christ, but so united and joined to Christ himself that we become sharers in all his blessings." Again, the essential work of the Spirit in manifesting this uniting and joining is unexpressed, and therefore seemingly overlooked.

In the 1539 edition of the *Institutio*, however, these apparent pneumatological oversights become pneumatological highlights.

### 5.3 God Triune in the 1539 *Institutio*

The 1539 *Institutio* is a revision and radical expansion of the 1536 edition. The expansions of Calvin's discussions of God Triune and of the sacraments, and such expansions in relation to one another, are noteworthy. Again, they suggest that the *theological* provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit regarding believers' participation in the Lord's Supper is his doctrine of the Trinity.

Overall, the 1539 edition of the *Institutio* retains the same catechetical divisions as the 1536 edition (law, faith, prayer, sacraments, and civil duty), although they are further dispersed and interspersed with additional chapters. The discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity, again falling at the outset of the exposition of the Apostles' Creed in a chapter again entitled *De fide*, expands to more than twice its previous

---

619 See footnotes 617 and 618 above.


621 Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 120-121.
length. While the doctrine of the Trinity is "pervasively implicit" in the first edition of the *Institutio*, in succeeding editions (perhaps especially the 1539), it becomes more "clearly explicit," still motivated by scripture, still grounded in soteriology.\textsuperscript{622}

In his expanded preamble of the creed, Calvin works in a fresh discussion of the construction of the creed, the conclusion of which emphasizes God's love shown to us in Christ, the wellspring of grace, which we receive through the power of the Spirit:

Alterum eorum quae nobis observanda diximus est symboli partitio: cuius tria membra patris, filii, et spiritus descriptionem, unde totum redemptionis nostrae mysterium dependet, comprehendunt; quartum, quibus in rebus sita sit nostra salus, commemorat. Id quidem non negligenda dispositione. Siquidem, ut in salutis notitiam veniamus, haec primum tria, in quibus totum negotium vertitur, consideranda sunt: patris indulgentissima bonitas et effusissima in humanum genus dilectio; quae in hoc apparuit, dum proprio filio non pepercit, quin pro nobis omnibus illum traderet in mortem, quo nos in vitam restitueret (Ioan. 3, 16. Rom. 8, 32); filii obedientia, quae est divinae misericordiae in peragenda nostra salute complementum; spiritus potentia, per quam fructus divinae in Christo bonitatis nobis communicatur. Atque huc respicit illud Pauli (2 Cor. 13, 13), dum Corinthiis Dei caritatem, Christi gratiam, et spiritus communionem comprercatur. \textit{Nam a Dei caritate quidquid boni est nobis profluit; in Christo, ceu universae gratiae fonte, exhibetur; per spiritus virtutem eorum quae a Dei clementia nobis offeruntur simus participes.}\textsuperscript{623}

Near the conclusion of the 1539 preamble, Calvin reasserts, with slight alteration, the Trinitarian formulation with which he concludes the 1536 preamble:

\begin{quote}
it is not fitting to suppress the distinction that we observe to be expressed in Scripture. It is this: to the Father is attributed the beginning of activity, and the fountain and wellspring of all things; to the Son, wisdom, counsel, and the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{622} Butin, *Revelation*, 32. Aside from the expectable expansion that the revision of a work would naturally incur, at least some of the newly extended discourse on the Trinity in the 1539 *Institutes* may well be taken as a response by Calvin to the charge of Arianism leveled against him and his Genevan colleagues by Pierre Caroli in early 1537 (Butin, *Revelation*, 29-32; and Zachman, *Calvin as Teacher*, 138).

\textsuperscript{623} \textit{CO} 1:479, emphasis added. As no standard English translation is available, the text is presented in its original language.
ordered disposition of all things; but to the Spirit is assigned the power and efficacy of that activity.\textsuperscript{624}

The context of this passage is significantly enhanced, with marginal references to Romans seemingly betraying the extent to which Calvin's exegetical labors on Paul's epistle had enriched his reflection.\textsuperscript{625}

In the midst of his article on the Holy Spirit, Calvin slightly modifies his confession of what God the Father in the Son accomplishes through the Spirit. His 1539 text reads:

\begin{quote}
Proinde fidei in patrem et filium rite fides in spiritum subsectitur, per quem et divinae misericordiae et salutis in filio complectae fructus nobis obsignatur. Ubi autem spiritus nomen audimus, in memoriam revocare convenit quaecunque illi in scripturis tribuuntur officia, atque exspectare quae inde beneficia ad nos emanare dicuntur. Nam quidquid est gratiae Dei, virtus est spiritus atque actio, quemadmodum scriptura docet. Quando Deus pater per ipsum in filio omnia operatur; per ipsum creat, sustinet, movet, vivificat, vegetat, conservat omnia; per ipsum fideles suos vocat ad se ac trahit, regenerat in novam vitam, justificat, sanctificat, variis gratiarum formis locupletat, coelesti robore fortificat, donec ad ultimam salutis metam pertingant.\textsuperscript{626}
\end{quote}

Calvin's confession is highly Trinitarian, just as in the 1536 edition, though he parses the work of God the Father—accomplished in the Son through the Spirit—with respect to creation and, now, with respect to "the faithful" as well.

\textsuperscript{624} \textit{Institutio} 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 1.13.18. "Quam tamen scripturis notatam distinctionem animadverimus, subticeri non convenit. Ea autem est, quod patri principium agendi, rerumque omnium fons et scaturigo attribuitur; filio sapientia, consilium, ipsaque in rebus agendis dispensatio; quod spiritui virtus et efficacia assignatur actionis" (CO 1:490).

\textsuperscript{625} Recall that in 1536 Calvin had been appointed \textit{sacrarum litterarum doctor} at the Cathedral of St. Pierre in Geneva, and that he began his tenure as such likely with the Paul's epistle to the Romans. His commentary on Romans, printed in 1540, is likely the product of this early exegetical work. See Calvin, \textit{Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos}, ed. T. H. L. Parker, vol. 13 of \textit{Ioannis Calvinii Opera Exegetica} (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1999), xiii. Calvin would have also been taking up a revision of his \textit{Institutio} concurrent with this appointment. For this reason the commentary on Romans and the 1539 \textit{Institutio} are best understood as companion pieces (Muller, \textit{Unaccommodated Calvin}, 28).

\textsuperscript{626} CO 1:536. As no standard English translation is available, the text is presented in its original language.
Calvin's Trinitarian conception of the sacraments, implicit in the first edition of the *Institutio*, becomes more clearly explicit in the second. His doctrine of the Trinity, with its due emphasis on the person and work of the Holy Spirit, is more clearly and more richly extrapolated into his doctrine of the sacraments in the 1539 *Institutio* than in the 1536. In order that Calvin might, as it were, present this fact for himself, passages of the 1539 *Institutio* are quoted at length—even great length—in the discussion below.

Calvin's discourse on sacraments in general exhibits this Trinitarian enrichment given its increased emphasis on the action and efficacy, the work and power of the Spirit. This is especially evident in Chapter 10 of the 1539 *Institutio*, in which Calvin justifies his assigning the "particular ministry" of "the confirmation and increase of faith" "to the sacraments."

His discussion is an elaboration of the following claim made already in the 1536 edition:

> [F]irst, the Lord teaches and instructs us by his Word. Secondly, he confirms it by the sacraments. Finally, he illumines our minds by the light of his Holy Spirit and opens our hearts for the Word and sacraments to enter in, which would otherwise only strike our ears and appear before our eyes, but not at all affect us within.

In the 1539 elaboration, Calvin focuses on the work of the Holy Spirit "within," as the "inward teacher" "by whose power hearts are penetrated and affections moved and our souls opened for the sacraments to enter in." It is not the sacraments *of themselves* that confirm and increase faith, as if "some secret force or other [were] perpetually

---


628 *Inst.* 1536, 89. CO 1:104.

seated in them." Rather, one must consider "the work of the Holy Spirit in our hearts," "the power" and "efficacy" of the Spirit to "transmit" "outward words and sacraments from our ears to our soul." As noted already in Chapter 2 above, Calvin's concern here is the efficacious work of the Spirit with respect to the reception of what is proffered in the sacrament. Faith, as he said already in the 1536 Institutio, is the proper and entire work of the Spirit, and it is by faith that that which is proffered is received. However, for Calvin, the Spirit is also the efficacious agent of the proffering itself. That is, God in Christ by the Spirit—or by the secret and incomprehensible power of the Spirit (as Calvin eventually puts it)—truly exhibits, truly communicates, Christ's body and blood as spiritual food for the spiritual journey, as the only aliment of the soul. This economy of the sacrament is for Calvin parallel to the economy of salvation. The two stand in "explicit continuity." Such continuity is first evident in the 1539 edition of the Institutio in Calvin's discussion of baptism. Early on in his chapter De baptismo, Calvin inserts the sacramental version, if you will, of the Trinitarian formulation that summarized his earlier discussion of God Triune, a Trinitarian formulation perfectly expressive of the "economy of salvation." The formulation is given below in its context, quoted at some length:

---


633 See footnote 599 above, with its referent.
… our faith receives from baptism the advantage of its sure testimony to us that we are not only engrafted into the death and life of Christ, but so united to Christ himself that we become sharers in all his blessings. For he dedicated and sanctified baptism in his own body [Matthew 3] in order that he might have it in common with us as the firmest bond of the union and fellowship which he has deigned to form with us. Hence, Paul proves that we are children of God from the fact that we put on Christ in baptism [Galatians 3]. Thus we see that the fulfillment of baptism is in Christ, whom also for this reason we call the proper object of baptism. Consequently, it is not strange that the apostles are reported to have baptized in his name, although they had also been bidden to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Spirit. For all the gifts of God proffered in baptism are found in Christ alone. Yet this cannot take place unless he who baptizes in Christ invokes also the names of the Father and the Spirit. For we are cleansed by his blood because our merciful Father, wishing to receive us into grace in accordance with his incomparable kindness, has set this Mediator among us to gain favor for us in his sight. But we obtain regeneration by Christ's death and resurrection only if we are sanctified by the Spirit and imbued with a new and spiritual nature. For this reason we obtain and, so to speak, clearly discern in the Father the cause, in the Son the matter, and in the Spirit the effect, of our purgation and our regeneration. 634

Calvin's expression of God Triune pro nobis—of God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, soteriologically understood—is tight here, and is spoken of specifically with respect to the promise of baptism. In his explication of the Lord's Supper, Calvin makes precisely the same theological move, though in a comparatively protracted fashion. In the midst of reflecting substantively on the nature of the sacrament and yet resigning himself utterly to its mystery, 635 Calvin builds his argument on a reading of John 6. His

634 Institutio 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 4.15.6, emphasis added. The opening portion ("... our faith" to "[Galatians 3]") appeared in the 1536 edition; the remainder is an elaboration inserted in the 1539 edition. Oberman also notes the significance of this passage (Heiko A. Oberman, "The 'Extra' Dimension in the Theology of Calvin," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 21, No. 1 (January 1970), 54.

635 See Institutio 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.5, and 7, in which these passages are retained: "Now here we ought to guard against two faults. First we should not, by too little regard for the signs, divorce them from their mysteries, to which they are so to speak attached. Secondly, we should not, by extolling them immoderately, seem to obscure somewhat the mystery themselves." And what is this mystery? That Christ's flesh and blood is the food of our souls partaken of by faith. "We admit . . . that this is no eating that than of faith . . . But here is a difference between my words and theirs: for them to eat is only to believe; I say that we eat Christ's flesh in believing, because it is made ours by faith, and that this eating is the result and effect of faith. Or if you want it said more clearly, for them eating is faith;
overall point here in 1539 is that the very life-giving flesh and blood of Christ must be communicated to believers if they are to share in the life that is Christ's, and that this quickening communication of that body and blood is the work of God Triune. With text italicized and the persons of the Trinity uniquely identified as a guide for reading, Calvin's work is cited extensively so that Calvin himself might present his argument:

First of all, we are taught from the Scriptures that Christ was from the beginning that life-giving Word of the Father, the spring and source of life, from which all things have always received their capacity to live. Therefore, John sometimes calls him 'the Word of life,' sometimes writes that 'in him was life,' meaning that he, flowing even into all creatures, instilled in them the power to breathe and live. . . .

But the flesh of Christ does not of itself have a power so great as to quicken us, for in its first condition it was subject to mortality; and now, endowed with immortality, it does not live through itself. Nevertheless, since it is pervaded with fullness of life to be transmitted to us, it is rightly called life-giving/vivifying. In this sense I interpret with Cyril that saying of Christ's, As the FATHER has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself. For there he is properly speaking not of those gifts which he had in the Father's presence from the beginning, but of those with which he was adorned in that very flesh wherein he appeared. Accordingly, he shows that in his humanity there also dwells fullness of life, so that whoever has partaken of his flesh and blood may at the same time enjoy participation in life. We can explain the nature of this by a familiar example. Water is sometimes drunk from a spring, sometimes drawn, sometimes led by channels to water the fields, yet it does not flow forth from itself for so many uses, but from the very source, which by unceasing flow supplies and serves it. In like manner, the flesh of CHRIST is like a rich and inexhaustible fountain that pours into us the life springing forth from

for me it seems rather to follow from faith." "Moreover, I am not satisfied with those persons who, recognizing that we have some communion with Christ, when they would show what it is, make us partakers of the Spirit only, omitting mention of flesh and blood. As though all these things were said in vain: that his flesh is truly food, that his blood is truly drink; that none have life except those who eat his flesh and drink his blood. . . . although my mind can think beyond what my tongue can utter, yet even my mind is conquered and overwhelmed by the greatness of [this] thing. Therefore, nothing remains but to break forth in wonder at this mystery, which plainly neither the mind is able to conceive nor the tongue to express" (CO 1:999 and 1000).

Because of later interpolations and the significant rearrangement of some of his material in later editions of the Institutio, the flow of Calvin's argument is not as clear in the 1559 edition as in the 1539 edition. For this study, I examined the 1539 edition found online at the website of The John a Lasco Bibliotek, a library in Emden which houses (and has made available through online digital images) the yet extant, complete library of the sixteenth-century northern-European reformer Albert Hardenberg.
the Godhead into itself. Now who does not see that communion of Christ's flesh and blood is necessary for all who aspire to heavenly life? This is the purport of the apostle's statements: The church is the body of Christ, and the fullness of him, but he is the head from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by joints makes bodily growth Ephesians 1 and 4. Our bodies are members of Christ 1 Cor 6. We understand that all these things could not be brought about otherwise than by his cleaving to us wholly in spirit and body. But Paul graced with a still more glorious title that intimate fellowship in which we are joined with his flesh when he said, We are members of his body, of his bones and of his flesh. Finally, to witness to this thing greater than all words, he ends his discourse with an exclamation: This is a great mystery. It would be extreme madness to recognize no communion of believers with the flesh and blood of the Lord, which the apostle declares to be so great that he prefers to marvel at it rather than to explain it.

And we must not dream of such a presence of Christ in the Sacrament as the school of sophists have fashioned, as if the body of Christ, by a local presence, were put there to be touched by the hands, to be chewed by the teeth, and to be swallowed by the mouth. For as we do not doubt that Christ's body is limited by the general characteristics common to all human bodies, and is contained in heaven (where it was once for all received) until Christ return in judgments, so we deem it utterly unlawful to draw it back under these corruptible elements or to imagine it to be present everywhere. And there is no need of this for us to enjoy a participation in it, since the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of the Lord, with whom we are joined in unity, and is like a channel through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us. For if we see that the sun, shedding its beams upon the earth, casts its substance in some measure upon it in order to beget, nourish, and give growth to its offspring, why should the radiance of Christ's Spirit be less in order to impart to us the communion of his flesh and blood? On this account, Scripture, in speaking of our participation with Christ, relates its whole power to the Spirit. But one passage will suffice for many. For Paul, in the eighth chapter of Romans, states that Christ dwells in us only through his Spirit. Yet he does not take away that communion of his flesh and blood which we are now discussing, but teaches that the Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ completely and have him dwelling in us. Now, that sacred communication of his flesh and blood the Lord testifies in the Supper, and offers and exhibits it to all who sit at that spiritual banquet, although it is received with benefit by believers alone, who accept such great generosity with true faith and gratefulness of heart. In this manner the apostle said, The bread which we break is a participation in the body of Christ; the cup which we consecrate to this by word and prayers is a participation in his blood. . . .
Calvin's concern here is soteriological: The flesh of Christ has been endowed with the life of the Godhead, the source of that life being ultimately God the Father. So endowed, the very flesh of Christ becomes an instrument by which life is communicated to believers, and the efficacy of that communication—whether within the sacramental celebration or without—is the Spirit. Or, to render Calvin's metaphor banally, the Father is the font or source of the water, the Son the water itself, and the Spirit the channel through which that water flows. Though not in so few words, Calvin is declaring here with respect to the promise of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper that which he declared earlier with respect to the promise of the sacrament of baptism: "we clearly discern in the Father the cause, in the Son the matter, and in the Spirit the effect" of our quickening. Or, as he put it in the preamble to the exposition of the creed: "to the Father is attributed the beginning of activity, and the fountain and wellspring of all things; to the Son, wisdom, counsel, and the ordered disposition of all things; but to the Spirit is assigned the power and efficacy of that activity." Again, these soteriological and sacramental claims stand in "explicit continuity."

---

637 *Institutio* 1539, as in *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17.8-12, though the 1559 edition presents a rearrangement of this text. Italicized text in the quotation above offers a guide for reading, highlighting the metaphor of a spring (*fons*) and the Trinitarian movement of Calvin's thought. Battles' insertions of Biblical citations that Calvin himself did not include are omitted and paragraph breaks are set according to the 1539 edition.

638 Davis suggests that Calvin's concept of the "instrumentality of Christ's flesh" doesn't develop until the 1550s, at the time Calvin published his commentary on the Gospel of John (1553) (*Davis, Clearest Promises*, 170-173). But does not this passage in the 1539 *Institutio* suggest Calvin has already then a clear conception of the "instrumentality of Christ's flesh"?

639 *Institutio* 1539, as in *Inst.* 1559 LCC 1.13.18. "Quam tamen scripturis notatam distinctionem animadvertimus, subtici non convenit. Ea autem est, quod patri principium agendi, rerumque omnium fons et scaturigo attribuitur; filio sapientia, consilium, ipsaque in rebus agendis dispensatio; at spiritui virtus et efficacia assignatur actionis" (*CO* 1:490).
As noted in Chapter 2, Calvin interpolates a key reference to the Spirit elsewhere in his 1539 discourse on the Lord's Supper. When reflecting on the "manner" in which "the body and blood of Christ are shown (exhibere) to us in the sacrament" such that "under the symbol of bread we shall be fed by his body and under the symbol of wine we shall drink his blood, to enjoy him at last in his wholeness," Calvin restricts his thought, or at least his expression, to the power, or virtus, of Christ. In the 1539 edition he inserts, "In short, he [Christ] feeds his people with his own body, the communion of which he bestows upon them by the power (virtus) of his Spirit." In essence he is reiterating the point made above at length: Christ is the matter and the Spirit the efficacy of the sacrament.

A feature in Calvin's economy of the sacrament remains, however. For Calvin, the Spirit is its efficacy, with respect to reception (faith) and communicatio, not least because the Spirit is the bond—the vinculum—of believers' connection—coniunctionis—with Christ. For this reason, Calvin writes in the midst of his discourse on the Lord's Supper:

the Lord bestows this benefit [of participation in his body and blood] upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of the Lord, with whom we are joined in unity, and is like a channel through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us.

In the 1559 edition of the Institutio, the expression of the Spirit as "the bond" figures prominently in Calvin's discourse on "union with Christ" at the outset of Book 3. As

---

640 For another development of this point, see Garcia, Chapter Four: "Christ and the Spirit: Sacraments, Salvation, and the Strata of Union with Christ," in Life in Christ, 149-195.


642 Institutio 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.12. CO 1:1003.
noted above, this concept of "the Spirit as bond" is broached in Calvin's earlier editions of the *Institutio*, but is not given so clear or robust an expression outside of his discussion of the Lord's Supper until 1559. This makes Calvin's mention of this concept in the context of early sacramental discourse all the more important, particularly since this concept of the Spirit's role is itself seemingly an extrapolation of Calvin's understanding of God Triune: "Christ dwells in us only through his Spirit."\(^{643}\)

In this regard, Calvin's Christology is not to be overlooked.\(^{644}\) The Son of God became the Son of Man, as he put it in the 1536 *Institutio*; "God's natural son fashioned for himself a body from our body, flesh from our flesh, bones from our bones, that he might be one with us."\(^{645}\) This body that Christ fashioned—it's flesh and bones, its veins and sinews—Christ has taken to heaven. Christ became incarnate and is incarnate even as he once was, but now in heaven. This is clear in Calvin's declaring:

> For as we do not doubt that Christ's body is limited by the general characteristics common to all human bodies, and is contained in heaven (where it was once for all received) until Christ return in judgments, so we deem it utterly unlawful to draw it back under these corruptible elements or to imagine it to be present everywhere. And there is no need of this for us to enjoy a participation in it, since the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of the Lord, with whom we are joined in unity, and is like a channel through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us.\(^{646}\)

---


\(^{644}\) Obviously there are points of convergence between Calvin's Christology and Zwingli's. However, it is is not necessary to ascribe Calvin's thought to his encounter with Zwingli's. Oecolampadius works these same Christological conclusions in his writings, as does Farel. Discerning the provenance of Calvin's Christology lies beyond the scope of this study, though it is admittedly not unrelated. It is thus only latently pursued given the pneumatological focus of this project.

\(^{645}\) See footnote 606 above.

Calvin broaches the conception of distance here. Though this concept is unexpressed in the 1536 *Institutio*, it comes to expression already in the 1537 *Instruction et confession*: "For, although Christ, being elevated to heaven, has left his abode on earth in which we are still pilgrims, yet no distance can dissolve his power of nourishing his own with himself." In Calvin's understanding, God is transcendent, as is Christ incarnate: it seems a great distance separates Christ and his own, and yet that distance is as nothing because of his Spirit, the Holy Spirit.

This brief survey of the 1536 and 1539 *Institutio* demonstrates that, for Calvin, the theological provenance of his pneumatology of the sacraments, including specifically that of the Lord's Supper, is his doctrine of the Trinity, his *soteriological* doctrine of the Trinity. As his thought on the doctrine of "most holy Trinity" deepens and his expression broadens, so also does its relevance to his expressed doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

5.4 God Triune in Works of the Intervening Period, 1536-1539

This translation of emphasis, or expression, may be seen in other of Calvin's early works, prepared, if not published, in the period between the releases of his first

---

647 Other than in the passage above, the concept of distance remains implicit in the *Institutio* until 1559. See *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17.10, 24, 28.

648 *Instruction in Faith*, trans. Fuhrmann, 68. "Les signes sont le pain et le vin, soubz lesquelz le Seigneur nous presente la vraye communication de son corps et de song sang, mais spirituelle: laquelle contente du lien de son esprit ne requiert point une presence enclose ou de la chair soubz le pain ou du sang soubz le vin. Car combine que Christ esleve au ciel a laisse l'habitation de la terre en laquelle nous sommes encorez pellerins, toutesfois nulle distance ne pault dissouldre sa vertu quil ne repaisse de soy mesmes les siens" (*CO* 5:350). "Symbola sunt, panis et vinum, sub quibus veram corporis ac sanguinis sui communicationem Dominus exhibet: sed spiritualem, quae scilicet vinculo spiritus eius contenta, praesentiam aut carnis sub pane, aut sanguinis sub calice conclusam et circumscriptam minime requirat. Tametsi enim ipse in coelum sublatus residere in terra desiit, in qua nos adhuc peregrinamur, nullum tamen intervallum eius virtutem solvere potest, quin fideles semetipso pascat, ac efficiat ut loco absentes, tamen praeuentissima sui communicatione fruantur" (*CO* 22:69).
two editions of the *Institutio*. Few passages can be cited as evidence, though this does not diminish their significance. Calvin's discourses at the Lausanne Disputation, his first catechism, and his commentary on Romans (prepared in the late 1530s and published in 1540) all bear points of interest regarding the explicit continuity of his economic understanding of God Triune and his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Soon after arriving in Geneva in 1536, Calvin accompanied Farel and Viret to a theological disputation held in Lausanne. As noted in Chapter 2, this occasion is the first in which Calvin speaks explicitly and unequivocally of "the bond of the Spirit" as that by which Christ communicates his body and blood to believers in the Supper:

> . . . it is not the natural body of our Lord Jesus nor his natural blood which is given to us in his Holy Supper. We affirm that it is a spiritual communication, by which in virtue and in power he makes us participant of all that we are able to receive of grace in his body and blood; or again, to declare better the dignity of this mystery, it is a spiritual communication by which he makes us truly participant of his body and his blood, but wholly spiritually, that is by the bond of his Spirit.  

At the disputation, Calvin spoke up in direct response to an accusation that the reformers had abandoned the teaching of the church fathers regarding the Lord's Supper. Since Calvin's aim is to refute this charge, he cites numerous fathers with regard to the Lord's Supper but does not, in his own brief discourse, introduce the theological locus of God Triune, so the inference of parallel emphases between that locus and that of the Lord's Supper remains just that, an inference. However, it cannot be overlooked that in this passage Calvin explicitly qualifies "spiritual communication"

---

649 *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 44. Mais que c'est une communication spirituelle par laquelle in vertu et in efficace il nous fait participans de tout ce que pouvons recevoir de grace en son corps et son sang, ou encore, pour mieux declarer la dignite de ce mystere, par laquelle il nous fait vrayement participans de son corps et son sang, mais le tout spirituellement cest a dire par le lien de son esprit (CO 9:844).
with respect to the person and work of the Christ's Spirit, the Holy Spirit. This is not merely "non-corporeal" communication, but a "truly participant" communication of Christ's body and blood effected by the person and work of the Holy Spirit at the behest, if you will, of "our Lord Jesus."  

650 This sentence is packed densely with words and concepts previously introduced in the *Institutio* (1536) in relation to the Father and the Son, all centered on the activity of the Spirit: *virtus, efficacia, and gratia*, to which is now added *bond*, i.e., *lien* or *vinculum*.

Other of Calvin's works prepared in this intervening period may be read to ratify the inference taken in Calvin's first discourse at Lausanne, that is, the inference of parallel emphases in Calvin's doctrine of God and doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Already in Chapter 2 we encountered Calvin's first catechism for the church of Geneva, published first in Geneva in French in 1537, then in Basel in Latin in 1538.  

651 Very much in accord with his statement at the Lausanne Disputation, Calvin avers in this catechism that the promise added to the mystery of the Supper is that the body and blood of the Lord was once offered in such a way for us "as to now be ours, and also forever to be so."  

652 "The symbols are bread and wine," he continues, under which the Lord exhibits the true communication of his body and blood— but a spiritual one which, obviously content with the bond of his Spirit, does not require an enclosed or circumscribed presence either of the flesh under the bread or of the blood under the cup. For although Christ, having ascended into heaven, ceases to reside on earth (on which we are as yet wayfarers) still no distance can prevent his power from feeding his believers on himself and bringing it about

---

650 See also Garcia, *Life in Christ*, 165 and 170. Garcia notes that while for Calvin the Spirit is the bond, "the Spirit is not the only one Personally active, as though it is in reality the Spirit's and not Christ's Supper. . . . the union with Christ effected by the Spirit is indeed a union with Christ . . . ." (165).


652 *Instruction in Faith*, trans. Fuhrmann, 68.
that they still enjoy ever-present communication with him, though he is absent from that place.\textsuperscript{653} As noted in Chapter 2, Calvin here affirms—again—that the Spirit is "the bond"—the \textit{lien}, or \textit{vinculum}—of believers' union with Christ, and that therefore the Spirit \textit{effects} the true communication of Christ's body and blood.

Such a claim resonates with claims expressed earlier in the catechism in article 20. The article is long, as it comprises in introduction to the Apostles' Creed and an exposition of the creed itself. Since the 1537/1538 catechism is something of an "abridgement" of the 1536 \textit{Institutio}, it is not surprising that his setup and exposition of the creed is so similar to that found in the first edition of the \textit{Institutio}. As there, here too, Calvin declares regarding Father, Son, and Spirit:

When we name Father, Son, and Spirit we are not fashioning three Gods, but in the simplest unity of God and Scripture and the very experience of godliness we are showing ourselves God the Father, his Son, and Spirit. Our understanding cannot conceive of the Father without including the Son at that same time, in whom his living image shines; and the Spirit in whom his might [\textit{potentia}] and power [\textit{virtus}] are visible. Let us cleave with the total concentration of our mind upon the one God; yet in the meantime let us contemplate the Father with his Son and Spirit.\textsuperscript{654}


\textsuperscript{654} \textit{Catechismus, sive Christianae religionis institutio} 1538, as in Hesselink, \textit{Calvin's First Catechism}, 21-22. "Dum Patrem, Filium, ac Spiritum nominamus, non tres deos nobis fingimus, sed in simplicissima Dei unitate, et scriptura, et ipsa pietatis experientia Deumpatrem, eius Filium ac Spiritum nobis ostendunt. Ut concipere intelligentia nostra Patrem nequeat, quin et Filium simul complectatur, in
In his exposition of the confession "I believe in the Holy Spirit," Calvin's expression follows on that of the 1536 *Institutio*, but even more strikingly anticipates his expression found in the 1539 *Institutio*. This is particularly so with regard to all that God accomplishes "through the power of the Spirit," since here, as in 1539, Calvin parses what is accomplished with respect to creation and what is accomplished with respect "to us"—"the faithful" as he puts it in the 1539 *Institutio*. What is accomplished remains the same: Calvin's verbs are appropriated verbatim. However, unlike in the 1536 and 1539 *Institutio*, in the 1537/1538 catechism it is not "God the Father in the Son" who accomplishes "all that is good," but rather *Christ himself*, through the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Latin catechism reads:

While we are taught to believe in the Holy Spirit, we are also enjoined to await from him whatever is attributed to him in the Scriptures. For *Christ accomplishes* whatever good there is *through the power of his Spirit* (*per spiritus sui virtutem*). Through that power he empowers and sustains all things, causes them to grow and quickens them; through it he justifies, sanctifies, and cleanses us, calls and draws us to himself, that we may attain salvation. Therefore the Holy Spirit, while dwelling in us in this manner, illumines us with his light in order that we may learn and plainly recognize what an enormous wealth of divine goodness we possess in Christ.

---

655 Muller also frequently notes the degree to which the 1537 French and 1538 Latin catechisms not only reflect the edition of the *Institutio* Calvin had already published in 1536, but also anticipate the edition he was about to publish in 1539, though his comments generally concern content and its arrangement. (See e.g., Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 123.)

656 *Catechismus, sive Christianae religionis institutio* 1538, as in Hesselink, *Calvin's First Catechism*, 25, emphasis added. "Dum in spiritum sanctum docemur credere, simul etiam exspectare inde iubemur, quod illi in scripturis tribuitur. Nam Christus per spiritus sui virtutem quidquid usquam est boni..."
Calvin's thought on Christ, his power, and the identity of his power with the power of the Holy Spirit here perfectly accords with what he says of Christ and the Spirit in his exposition of the article "sits at the Father's right hand" and in his exposition of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Calvin's exposition of "he sits at the Father's right hand" is found, of course, just lines above his exposition of "I believe in the Holy Spirit," given their proximity in the Apostles' Creed. The statement that 'He sits at the Father's right hand' means," says Calvin, "that he has been appointed and declared King, Judge, and Lord over all, in order that by his power [virtus] he may preserve and govern us . . . . Therefore, although lifted up into heaven, he has removed his bodily presence from our sight; yet he does not refuse to be present with his believers in help and might, and to show the manifest power [virtus] of his presence."

---

657 *Catechismus, sive Christianae religionis institutio* 1538, as in Hesselink, *Calvin's First Catechism*, 24. "Quod autem sedere ad pateris dexteram dicitur, significatur constitutum ac declaratum regem, arbitrum ac dominum super omnia, quo nos sua virtute conservat ac moderetur: . . . . Itaque quanquam in coelum sublatus, corporis sui praeexistentia et conspectu nostro sustulit, non tamen auxilio ac potential desinit adesse suis fideliibus manifestaque praeexistentiae suae virtutem ostendere (Ephes. 4, 8 ss.); quod etiam policitus est" (CO 5:340). Obviously Calvin is expressing what in the Protestant Scholasticism of the late 16th and 17th centuries becomes the so-called *extra calvinisticum*. Since that label does not suit the mid-sixteenth century and therefore Calvin's doctrine itself, I am not using it nor further expounding it in my dissertation. My interest is merely in Calvin's *Trinitarian* conception and expression of the "economy" of the sacraments given his Trinitarian conception and expression of the economy of God's "activity," creative and redemptive. However, to touch *briefly* on the *extra*...
So Christ, the Son, is appointed by the Father to accomplish good by his power, and the Son in turn accomplishes that good through (per) the power of the Holy Spirit, who, as Calvin identified before, is the one to whom the power and efficacy of God Triune is referred. Calvin extrapolates this thought, then, into his understanding and discussion of the Lord's Supper. There, as already cited above, he confesses that "although Christ, having ascended into heaven, ceases to reside on earth (on which we are as yet wayfarers) still no distance can prevent his power of feeding his believers on himself and bringing it about that they still enjoy an ever-present communication with him, though he is absent from that place." Hence, in the sacrament, "the Lord exhibits the

calvinisticum, given its prominence in Reformed thought, Richard A. Muller's tight, erudite exposition of this term is offered here from his Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 111: extra calvinisticum: the Calvinistic extra; a term used by the Lutherans to refer to the Reformed insistence on the utter transcendence of the human nature of Christ by the Second Person of the Trinity in and during the incarnation. The Reformed argued that the Word is fully united to but never totally contained within the human nature and, therefore, even in incarnation is to be conceived of as beyond or outside of (extra) the human nature. In response to the Calvinistic extra, the Lutherans taught the maxim, Logos non extra carnem. It is clear that the so-called extra calvinisticum is not the invention of Calvinists but is a christological concept, safeguarding both the transcendence of Christ's divinity and the integrity of Christ's humanity, known to and used by the fathers of the first five centuries, including Athanasius and Augustine. It is also clear (1) that Reformed emphasis on the concept arose out of the tendency of Reformed christology to teach a communicatio idiomatum in concreto over against the perceived Lutheran emphasis upon a communicatio idiomatum in abstracto and (2) that the polarization of Lutheran and Reformed Christologies owed much to the debate over the mode of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper, in which the Lutherans emphasized the real but illocal presence of Christ's body and blood by reason of the communicated omnipresence of the Logos and the Reformed emphasized the transcendence of the divine and the heavenly location of Christ's body. Against the Lutherans, the Reformed interpreted the extra calvinisticum in terms of the maxim Finitum non capax infiniti, the finite in incapable of the infinite. In other words, the finite humanity of Christ is incapable of receiving or grasping the infinite attributes such as omnipresence, omnipotence, or omniscience." (Muller's cross-referenced entries are omitted).

658 Inst. 1536, 57. Institutio 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 1.13.18. See above for both.

659 Catechismus, sive Christianae religionis institutio 1538, as in Hesselink, Calvin's First Catechism, 35. "Symbola sunt, panis et vinum, sub quibus veram corporis ac sanguinis sui communicacionem Dominus exhibet: sed spirituallem, quae scilicet vinculo spiritus eius contenta, praesentiam aut carnis sub pane, aut sanguinis sub calicis conclusam et circumscriptam minime requirat. Tametsi enim ipse in coelum sublatus residere in terra desit, in qua nos adhuc peregrinamur, nullum tamen intervallum eius virtutem solvere potest, quin fideles semetipso pascat, ac efficient ut loco absentes, tamen praesentissima sui communicacione fruantur" (CO 5:350). Instruction et confession 1537: "Les
true communication of his body and blood," a communication "content with the bond of his Spirit." As spoken of in Chapter 2 above, Christ's and the Spirit's are a "coordinated agency," by which God accomplishes "all that is good," soteriologically or sacramentally. As Mark A. Garcia puts it, this is a "sine qua non of Calvin's thought: in their functional or economic identity, Christ must not be separated from his Spirit." Calvin's first catechism then—first published in French and then in Latin, though likely prepared in Latin, perhaps as early as late 1536—demonstrates that Calvin's emphasis on the Spirit in his discussion of the Lord's Supper is an extension, if you will, of his understanding of the Spirit with respect to God Triune. The "economy" of God's good will toward us, in creation and in salvation, is precisely that which is attested in the sacrament, and so the Spirit, who effects that economy, is spoken of prominently there. As demonstrated in Chapter 2, already by 1540, Calvin adopts and expresses a more clearly, strongly instrumental view of the sacrament, such that the sacrament is not only a testament to the true communication of Christ's body and blood by the power of the Holy Spirit, but also an occasion—the sacramental occasion—when that true communication truly transpires, by the power of the Holy Spirit, who is the bond of believers' union with Christ. Calvin's language does not change, but its referents shift. So in the 1539 *Institutio* Calvin writes: "But if it is true that a visible sign is given

signes sont le pain et le vin, soubz lesquelz le Seigneur nous presente la vraye communication de son corps et de song sang, mais spirituelle: laquelle contente du lien de son esprit ne requiert point une presence enclose ou de la chair soubz le pain ou du sang soubz le vin. Car combine que Christ esleve au ciel a laisse l'habitation de la terre en laquelle nous sommes encore pellerins, toutesfois nulle distance ne pault dissouldre sa vertu quil ne repaisse de soy mesmes les siens" (*CO* 22:69).

660 *Catechismus, sive Christianae religionis institutio* 1538, as in Hesselink, *Calvin's First Catechism*, 35.

661 Garcia, *Life in Christ*, 172; see also 175, 176, and 194. See also Ganoczy, "Observations," 98.
us to seal the gift of a thing invisible, when we have received the symbol of the body, let us no less surely trust that the body itself is also given to us.\footnote{Institutio 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.10. "Quod si verum est praeberi nobis signum visibile, ad obsignandam invisibilis rei donationem, accepto corporis symbolo, non minus corpus etiam ipsum nobis dari certo confidamus" (CO 1:1002-1003). See Zachman, Image and Word, 333-34, for discussion of this shift.}

Likewise in his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11 (1546) he writes, "the body of Christ is really (\textit{realiter}), to use the usual word, i.e., truly (\textit{vere}) given to us in the Supper, so that it may be health-giving food for our souls.\footnote{First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, trans. John W. Fraser, CNTC 9:246. CO 49:487. For discussion see Chapter 2 above; Zachman, Image and Word, 338-39, and Davis, Clearest Promises, 155-63.} In these instances, it is still the case that Calvin's emphasis on the Spirit in his discussion of the Lord's Supper is something of an extrapolation, or extension, of his understanding of the Spirit with respect to God Triune. The "economy" of God's good will toward believers, in creation and in salvation, explicates for Calvin the very instrumental economy of the sacrament itself: thus, for Calvin, \textit{in the Supper} Christ offers by the power of the Holy Spirit, at the hand of the minister, the aliments of his body and blood under the gifts of bread and wine as spiritual food for the spiritual journey.

Regarding the early "extrapolation" from Trinity to Lord's Supper, however, Calvin's commentary on Romans—published in Strasbourg in 1540, though its "contents are probably a revised summary of lectures he had given in Geneva from 1536 to 1538\footnote{De Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 94. But see also especially T. H. L. Parker's detailed argument in this regard in his introduction to his critical edition of the Romans commentary text: Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos, ed. T. H. L. Parker, vol. 13 of Ioannis Calvini Opera Exegetica (Genève: Librarie Droz, 1999), xvi-xxi.}—yet warrants attention, not least because of Calvin's explicit reference to Romans 8 in the midst of a critical passage newly introduced to his discussion of the
Lord's Supper in the 1539 *Institutio*.

Though that passage has already been quoted at length in this chapter, along with its context, it is quoted at some length again here:

> we deem it utterly unlawful to draw it [Christ's body] back under these corruptible elements or to imagine it to be present everywhere. And there is no need of this for us to enjoy a participation in it, since the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of the Lord, with whom we are joined in unity, and is like a channel through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us. For if we see that the sun, shedding its beams upon the earth, casts its substance in some measure upon it in order to beget, nourish, and give growth to its offspring, why should the radiance of Christ's Spirit be less in order to impart to us the communion of his flesh and blood? On this account, Scripture, in speaking of our participation with Christ, relates its whole power to the Spirit. But one passage will suffice for many. For Paul, in the eighth chapter of Romans, states that Christ dwells in us only through his Spirit. Yet he does not take away that communion of his flesh and blood which we are now discussing, but teaches that the Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ completely and have him dwelling in us. Now, that sacred communication of his flesh and blood the Lord testifies in the Supper, and offers and exhibits it to all who sit at that spiritual banquet, although it is received with benefit by believers alone, who accept such great generosity with true faith and gratefulness of heart.

In this passage, Calvin is speaking of a profound, perpetual reality, of a reality that always obtains for believers. Once they are united to Christ, they are always united to Christ and are always enriched by "all that Christ himself is and has." And it is the Spirit who, as the bond of believers' union with Christ, is then the "channel" through whom, or by whom, these good gifts are granted: "Through God the Spirit, the grace of Christ has efficacy *in nobis.*" Through the Spirit, Christ dwells in believers—Christ

---

665 Muller notes that already beginning with his commentary on Romans and the first revision of his *Institutio*, Calvin defines for himself his life-long theological task: to comment upon scripture in one genre of literature, the commentary, and to collect theological loci or topoi occasioned by such commentary in the *Institutio*, thus developing complementary exegetical and theological texts. See e.g., *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 35 and 38, 104 and 106, 124.

himself, not the Spirit, but Christ himself through the Spirit—that they might enjoy perpetual communion with Christ and be perpetually nourished by his body and blood: "the Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ completely." This is the profound, perpetual reality to which the sacrament of the Lord's Supper points, though saying as much does not reduce the sacrament to a "mere testimony" for Calvin. Calvin declares: "Yet [Christ] does not take away that communion of his flesh and blood which we are now discussing," namely, the sacramental communion of his very flesh and blood. That communion Christ offers and exhibits (exhibere—as in to proffer, or to hand over), here and now, in the Supper. From this, again, it may be seen that Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Spirit in his discourse about the Lord's Supper stems from his understanding of the Trinitarian soteriological "economy" of Christ pro nobis, of Christ in nobis.

Calvin explicitly refers his readers to Romans 8. As one might expect, his exegesis of this chapter in his 1540 commentary on Romans affords some insight into his understanding of the soteriological dimension of the Spirit's work, even as it relates to the Supper, though the Supper is not specifically mentioned there. In his exegesis of Roman 8:4, Calvin speaks of the soteriological exchange whereby all that Christ is and has is rendered to believers, in order that they might be accounted righteous. His explication in the first two editions of the commentary (1540 and 1551) is completely

---

667 Butin, Revelation, 80.
668 Garcia, Life in Christ, 163.
669 See discussion in Chapter 2 above.
670 See also Garcia, Life in Christ, 172ff.
replaced in the third (i.e., final) edition of his commentary (1556). In the 1556 edition, Calvin straightforwardly declares (in the midst of his discussion about "the law" and the "imputation" of Christ's obedience to the law to believers): "Christ communicates His righteousness only to those whom He joins to Himself by the bond of His Spirit." In the first two editions, Calvin likewise speaks of the vinculo Spiritus:

\[
\text{Iustitiam vocat, obedientiam Christi: quae in carne nostra exhibita, nobis imputatur: ut, eius beneficio, pro iustis censeamur. sed eam obtinemus tum demum, cum in Christi consortium recepti sumus: vinculo Spiritu, illi sociati. ubi autem Spiritus, illic regeneration. Ideoque addit particulam: Qui non secundum carnem, etc. Qua desginat, ut prius, effectum eius societatis perpetuum: ac finem simul indicat, cur Christo coniuncgamur, esse vitam spiritalem: ne putetur esse peccati minister Christus.}
\]

Though Calvin later replaces his first exposition of 1540, even in 1540 he demonstrates that the Spirit—as the bond—is the efficacy of the Trinitarian economy of salvation, i.e., the economy of granting to believers "all that Christ has and is," as he puts it in the 1539 *Institutio* in the midst of his discourse on the Lord's Supper.

That this is Calvin's understanding is also laid out in his explication of the remainder of Romans 8, particularly verses 9-11. Taking his cues from Paul's text, Calvin dwells on the dwelling of Christ in believers, that is, the indwelling of Christ by the indwelling of his Spirit: "Paul now applies his previous remarks concerning the Spirit to Christ, in order to signify the manner of Christ's dwelling in us. For as by the

---

671 Parker's recent critical edition of Calvin's commentary on Romans (Droz, 1999) is invaluable in discerning the development of this commentary in its three editions.


673 *Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos*, ed. T. H. L. Parker, 156, apparatus note j-k. As no standard English translation is available, the text is presented in its original language.
Spirit He consecrates us as temples to Himself, so by the same Spirit He dwells in us." To Calvin, the word "Spirit" indicates "the Spirit of regeneration," which is called "life, not only because He lives and flourishes in us, but also because He quickens us by His power, until He destroys our mortal flesh and at last renews us perfectly."  

In his *Institutio*, from 1539 on, Calvin avers that this is precisely the reality to which the sacrament of the Lord's Supper points. Namely, that through the Spirit, Christ communicates his very life-giving flesh—his body and blood—in order that they may be possessed by believers as the only food of their souls. Thus, for Calvin, whoever partakes of Christ's flesh and blood at the same enjoys participation in life—in immortal life, in Christ's life, in the divine life of the Godhead. In the 1539 edition of his *Institutio*, Calvin speaks of this eloquently and at length in the passage quoted above. Not surprisingly, it is that same passage that includes Calvin's cross-reference to chapter 8 of Paul's letter to the Romans.

As noted above, Calvin's argument in this passage in the 1539 *Institutio* is richly Trinitarian. Interestingly, in the 1540 edition of his commentary, Calvin does not detail this richly Trinitarian context in the midst of his discussion of Romans 8. In the 1556 edition, however, he inserts:

> Our readers should note here that the Spirit is sometimes referred to as the Spirit of God the Father, and sometimes as the Spirit of Christ without distinction. This is not only because His whole fullness was poured on Christ as our

---


676 See footnote 637 above and its referent.
Mediator and Head, so that each one of us might receive from Him his own portion, but also because the same Spirit is common to the Father and the Son, who have one essence, and the same eternal deity. Because, however, we have no communication with God except by Christ, the apostle wisely descends from the Father, who seems to be at a greater distance, to Christ.  

Given the flow of his text, in his 1556 edition Calvin implies a further "descent," namely, to that of the Spirit, by whom "He [Christ] dwells in us," by whom "quickening" "power" accrues to believers to "absorb [their] immortality." Already in the 1540 edition he speaks of the Spirit in just this way, but again, without the explicitly Trinitarian setup. However, the exposition of this text, from 1540 on, concludes with an allusion to his elsewhere expressions of the Trinitarian economy: "Paul takes confirmation" on this point "from the efficient cause, in the following manner: 'If Christ was raised by the power of the Spirit of God, and if the Spirit retains eternal power, He will also exert that power in us,' because, as Paul puts it, the Spirit "dwells in you."

Even though the explicitly Trinitarian setup to the exposition about Christ's indwelling through the Spirit is not inserted until the 1556 edition of the commentary, Calvin's commentary taken as a whole provides that Trinitarian soteriological context.

---

677 The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians, trans. R. MacKenzie, CNC 8:164-65. "Iam vero hic observent lectores j promiscue spiritum nunc Dei patris, nunc Christi vocari: non modo quia in Christum, quatenus mediator noster est et caput, effusa est tota illius plenitudo, ut inde sua in quemque nostrum portio deflueret: sed quoniam idem spiritus patris et filii communis est, quorum una est essentia, et eadem aeterna deitas. Quia tamen nulla nolis nisi per Christum communicatio est cum Deo, prudenter apostolus a patre, qui longius abesse videtur, ad Christum descendit" (CO 49:145).


This is evident from Calvin's prefatory *Argumentum in Epistolam ad Romanos*,\textsuperscript{680} which proceeds from the mercy of God the Father as the beginning of our salvation, to righteousness in Christ the Son,\textsuperscript{681} to the indwelling of Christ by the Holy Spirit, whose power quickens us even as it quickened Christ from the dead. This is how Paul's letter itself proceeds, so this is how Calvin's argument, and his arguments within the argument proceed.

5.5 Conclusion

Early on in his career, Calvin was confronted with a harsh charge. His mercurial associate, Caroli, accused his doctrine of being Arian. In some treatises, he consciously addresses such a charge directly, defending the orthodoxy of his doctrine concerning especially God the Son.\textsuperscript{682} In other treatises, including expositions of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it seems that Calvin, perhaps only subconsciously, likewise raises the profile of God Triune, and of each member, or person, of God Triune, never isolating their profile from the revelation of Scripture.\textsuperscript{683} Examining this suggests that Calvin's

\textsuperscript{680} *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, trans. R. MacKenzie, *CNTC* 8:5-11. Calvin's "humanistic training pressed him to understand that the preliminary identification of the *argumentum*, *dispositio*, *scopus*, or *methodus* of a text was integral to the work of interpretation" (Muller, *Unaccommodated*, 29).

\textsuperscript{681} *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, trans. R. MacKenzie, *CNTC* 8:5. "In the *argumentum* of the commentary on Romans, "Calvin indicates that 'the subject' of chapters 1-5 is 'that man's only righteousness is through the mercy of God in Christ, which being offered by the Gospel is apprehended by faith' and then summarizes the remaining chapters as developments of this theme, which, among other things, record and answer objections to the Apostle's basic argument" (Muller, *Unaccommodated*, 70).

\textsuperscript{682} *Confessio de Trinitate propter calumnias P. Caroli*, 14 May 1536 (CO 9:703-10) and *Pro Farello et collegiae eius adversus Petri Caroli calumnias defension Nicolai Gallasii*, 1545 (CO 7:289-340).

\textsuperscript{683} Regarding the increase of the *Institutio* in light of this see, e.g., Butin, *Revelation*, 29-32; and Zachman, *Calvin as Teacher*, 138.
robustly pneumatological doctrine of the Trinity may, in fact, from a *theological perspective*, be considered the provenance or impetus of his robustly pneumatological doctrine of the sacrament. As demonstrated in this chapter, this is evident just from a comparison of Calvin's discussions of the Trinity and of the sacraments in the 1536 *Institutio* and the 1539 *Institutio*, as well as works of the intervening period.
CHAPTER 6

ASSIMILATION: THE THOUGHT OF CONTEMPORARIES

John Calvin was a second generation reformer. By the time he left Noyon to take up his studies in Paris in 1523, Luther and those whom Luther would later decry as fanatics were already parting ways. By the time he attained his degree in law and had returned to Paris in 1531, the so-called first eucharistic controversy of the Reformation had already come to a head at the Marburg Colloquy (1529). Its divisions were sealed some months later at the Diet of Augsburg (1530): There it was apparent that the catholic church of the West had irreparably fractured; there it was apparent, too, that the Protestant side of that division was fracturing further, precisely over disagreement about the sacrament of unity, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By the time Calvin had published his first exposition on the Lord's Supper in 1536, Bucer and Melanchthon, along with some of their colleagues, had refreshed hope of reconciliation between the two factions, preparing and promoting the Wittenberg Concord.

So, by the time Calvin issued his first word on the Lord's Supper, reformers had already issued countless words on the topic, in publications, disputations,

---

684 Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 140. Wandel puts it this way: "Calvin came to the question of the Eucharist from a life that differed from Luther's in the large and in the small. Calvin was twenty-five years younger than Luther and in those twenty-five years, a familiar world had been lost, other, strange, worlds, found." See also Zachman, *John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian*, 27.
correspondence, sermons, formal and even informal conversations. His words on the
Lord's Supper follow on their words. His doctrine is derivative. With respect to the
sacraments, Luther's *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520) and Zwingli's *An
Attack of the Canon of the Mass* (1523) are vanguard expressions of the reformation
movement. Contextually considered, Calvin's expositions clearly are not. To say this is
not to diminish Calvin's doctrine; it is simply to dispel any notion that Calvin's doctrine
of the Lord's Supper is somehow *fundamentally* novel.  

His doctrine is, to say it again, derivative, generated from his earnest reflection on scripture, the tradition of the church, and the thought of his contemporaries, each source informing the other. Furthermore, his doctrine comes to expression in that period of Reformation history when Protestants were allying their doctrine with or distinguishing it from that of other Protestants as much as from that of the Roman Catholic Church.

Calvin's theological debt to his contemporaries is great and diverse. As noted in chapter three, Calvin was widely read already early in his career, and he was a quick study. "Calvin was certainly not a reader like others," says Ganoczy. "What he read he assimilated very rapidly. . . ." Furthermore, Calvin was a "self-taught, independent thinker who made judgments for himself. He was more a passionate seeker for truth than the disciple of a man or school. . . . [T]he works . . . he read moved him to

---

685 As note before, neither Calvin nor any of his contemporaries, Roman Catholic or Protestant, was interested in being doctrinally novel. They saw themselves—even if they did not always see each other—as bearers of the church's tradition.

686 Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*, 75.

687 See also Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 125.
integrate his ideas into a powerful synthesis." In 1541, in the conclusion to his Petit Traicté, Calvin demonstrated his awareness of the differences between Luther's view of the Lord's Supper and that of Zwingli and Oecolampadius. Furthermore, he expressed his dissatisfaction with both in such a way as to position his own view of the sacrament as being neither too crass, as he takes the Lutheran view to be, nor merely empty and void, as he takes Zwingli's view to be. In Tylenda's estimation, Calvin's positioning of his own view in just this way was deliberate; this was his "ecumenical intention."

Putting this in crudely economic terms, one might say there was a market of doctrinal ideas afloat in Calvin's day, and Calvin strove to capitalize on, and to assimilate into one coherent doctrine, those ideas that he found compelling and true according to the sound exegesis of Scripture and the trust of the tradition.

All of this must be born in mind when one takes up the writings of Calvin's contemporaries to ascertain doctrinal resonance between his thought and theirs. This is the intent of this chapter: to consider the thought of some of Calvin's contemporaries, particularly (thought not exclusively) as it is derived from their treatments of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in order to discern whether and to what extent their...

688 Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 133.
689 Muller writes that, regarding the topic of the Lord's Supper, "a review of Calvin's approach to the Reformers of the previous generation tends to identify a separation between his thought and that of Zwingli; a respect and sometimes reliance, if not always an utter affinity, for Luther's; and a genuine proximity to work of the framers of the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, not only Bucer but also Melanchthon. / Calvin's subsequent discussion and debates over the doctrine of the Lord's Supper evidence an attempt to find a middle ground, akin to that of the Wittenberg Concord from which he could maintain a common ground with both the Lutheran and the Zwinglian sides of the Reformation—indeed, enunciate a common ground on which all might stand" (Muller, "Calvin on Sacramental Presence 148-49).

690 Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention." See also Muller, "Calvin on Sacramental Presence," as well as e.g., Sasse, This Is My Body, 240-41, 260ff; Gilmont, Calvin and the Printed Book, 103ff.
thought and expression about the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament may have been taken up by Calvin in his own thought and expression about the same. Emphasis admittedly falls on may in this claim, given the appropriate caveats previous scholars have issued about the prospect of finding the sources of any one historical figure's thought. In the end, it shall be shown that Calvin's expression appears to be fresh, but not so fresh as not to be considered an assimilation of the thought of his contemporaries in as much as he understood their thought to be a faithful reflection of Scripture and tradition.

6.1 Martin Luther (1483-1546)

Throughout his lifetime, Calvin proved himself a "critical disciple" of Luther. As noted before, Luther's works were circulating widely in learned communities in France by the time Calvin advanced in his academic pursuits in Paris, Orleans, and

---


692 See e.g., Ganoczy, The Young Calvin, 134.

693 Brian Gerrish, "John Calvin on Luther," in Interpreters of Luther: Essays in Honor of Wilhelm Pauck, ed. by Jaroslav Pelikan (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 69-70. This is the point of Gerrish's article. It is also his take on Calvin in his book length treatment of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993). Gerrish's presentation in this work inclined at least one reviewer to suggest that he makes Calvin out to be more of a Lutheran than he actually is (Tony Lane, review of Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, in Evangelical Quarterly 68 [July 1996], 251-252). On the point of Calvin being a "disciple" of Luther, see also Ganoczy, The Young Calvin, 135, 137ff; and Robert D. Linder, "The Early Calvinists and Martin Luther: A Study in Evangelical Solidarity," Regnum, Religio et Ratio: Essays Presented to Robert M. Kingdon, ed. Jerome Friedman, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, Volume VIII (Kirkville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1987), 103-116. "... after the divisive eucharistic controversy of the 1540s, ... Calvin, Viret, and Beza all maintained a basically friendly attitude toward Luther, disagreeing with his position on the Lord's Supper but revering him as a godly man and a pioneer in the restoration of the Gospel. Calvin continued to seek Luther's advice on matters concerning the French Protestants. ..." (Linder, "The Early Calvinists," 103; regarding the Lord's Supper, see 105).
Bourges. So it is not unlikely, though it cannot be definitively proven, that he was exposed to some of Luther's writings already early on. The first edition of the *Institutio* suggests that, come 1536, Calvin "was deeply indebted to Luther" in many theological and ecclesiological respects: as Brian Gerrish puts it, Calvin "borrowed freely from the fund of Lutheran ideas, not least on the Lord's Supper." Calvin and Luther never met, nor could Calvin read German, so his knowledge of Luther's thought would have been mediated by secondary sources.

---

694 See above, Chapter 3, citing Ganoczy, *Young Calvin*; Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*; and Gordon, *Calvin*.

695 Gerrish, "John Calvin on Luther," 71. According to Gerrish, in 1536, Calvin's "basic understanding of what a sacrament is unmistakably echoed the classic treatment in Luther's *Babylonian Captivity,*" where a sacrament is expressed to be "a sign which confirms a divine promise" (Gerrish, "John Calvin on Luther," 71-72). Ganoczy also acknowledges Calvin's early, theological indebtedness to Luther. Regarding Calvin's discussion of the sacraments in the 1536 *Institutio,* Ganoczy suggests Calvin's "paragraph dedicated to the doctrine of the sacraments in general," in which Calvin betrays the influence of Melanchthon as well, "only summarizes and rearranges Luther's thought" (Ganoczy, *The Young Calvin*, 140). Ganoczy follows this claim with details about Calvin's apparent debt to Luther regarding his understanding of the nature of a sacrament, of the sacraments of the Old and New Covenants, and descriptions of the sacraments of baptism and the Mass. Calvin also seems to have been indebted to Luther regarding the concept of the miraculous "exchange" that transpires between Christ and his own, such that all that is Christ's become theirs, and all that is theirs becomes Christ's, to their salvific good. Regarding this "exchange," among secondary sources, on Luther see, e.g., Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*, trans. and ed. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 225-26 and 313; on Calvin appropriating this thought from Luther, see e.g., Willem Van't Spijker, "The Influence of Luther on Calvin According to the *Institutes,*" in *John Calvin's Institutes: His Opus Magnum,* ed. B. van der Walt (Potchesfstroom: Institute for Reformational Studies, 1986), 90 and 103-04, with reference to Calvin's 1536 *Institutio.* In primary sources, see Luther, "Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi*," in *LW 35:* esp. 51, 52, and 59; and compare this to Calvin, *Inst.* 1536, 103. In the 1539 edition of the *Institutio,* Calvin introduces another mention of this exchange immediately in association with the work of the Holy Spirit, who is the "channel." This passage, elaborated on in the previous chapter, reads as follows: the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of the Lord, with whom we are joined in unity, and is like a channel through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us" (*Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17.12). In his sermon, cited above, Luther never refers to the Holy Spirit in this regard. For other claims about Calvin's indebtedness to Luther, see also, e.g., Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers,* 30, *pauci*; Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention," 27-47.

696 When, in the midst of the second eucharistic controversy of the 1550s, Calvin persisted in presenting himself a champion of Luther's thought, the pastors of Zurich chided Calvin for his enthusiasm, and attributed his enthusiasm to his ignorance of German: "Possibly you do not know, dear brother, how crassly and barbarously Doctor Luther thought and wrote concerning this spiritual feast."
come by way of Luther's publications as they appeared either in Latin, or in Latin or French translation, or by way of second- or third-hand oral or print resources.

So what of Calvin and Luther on the Lord's Supper—particularly with respect to their appeals to the work of the Holy Spirit and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Is their thought resonant?

On the one hand, it might be said that there is no resonance between the thought of these two reformers. On the one hand, it might be said that Luther resolves discussion of Christ's presence and the communication of his flesh and blood so according to the person of Christ in his glorified humanity as to leave aside the person of the Spirit. Perhaps this is so in part because of his aversion to the claims of those whom he, Luther, identifies as "spiritualists," "fanatics" who allegedly spurn the corporality of Christ and the real communication of his body and blood. To Luther, they seemingly dissociate revelation received of the Spirit from revelation received of Christ incarnate.

697 Lohse, Martin Luther's Theology, 230. "Luther's idea of the total person is also basic to the further development of his Christology that is best known to us, that is, his doctrine of ubiquity, the idea of Christ's exalted human nature as everywhere present. He was led to develop this view in his dispute with Zwingli. . . . If Luther first expressed his view of the omnipresence of Jesus' exalted human nature without giving reason for it, he saw himself forced to do so by Zwingli's criticism. He referred to reflections in Occam and Biel, who had already distinguished a circumscriptive esse in loco (the spatial presence of an object) from a definitive esse in loco (e.g., the presence of the soul in the body). Biel had gone beyond to reckon with the possibility of a repleitive precise (the presence of an object outside itself). The divine ubiquity involved such a presence" (Lohse, Martin Luther's Theology, 230, with reference to Luther's sermon "The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ against the Fanatics," LW 36:342; WA 19:491). See also Steinmetz, "Calvin and His Lutheran Critics," in Calvin in Context.
Luther's own doctrine of the Lord's Supper developed between 1518 and 1530. At the outset of his discussion of Luther's doctrine of the sacrament, which he presents according to its development, Paul Althaus writes: "In discussing Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper we cannot avoid distinguishing the different forms through which it passed before reaching its final form. The controversies with Karlstadt, the Swiss, and Schwenckfeld led Luther far beyond his earlier teaching on the Lord's Supper." According to Althaus, it is not so much that Luther wholly abandoned themes of his early teaching, but that these themes "receded into the background," some to the point of having "lost their place in his total theology of the Lord's Supper." For his part, Ralph Quere suggests that in this period of development Luther began with an "Augustinian model of a sign pointing to (and participating in) the thing signified (res significata)," the sign being Christ's body and blood in and under the bread and wine eaten and drunk, the thing signified being "the benefits in the Word"; but that by its end, Luther "dismantle[s] the Augustinian model," such that the sacrament is no longer a sign but a "vehicle," "the eucharistic bread-body and wine-blood [being] a vessel in which forgiveness is contained and distributed." With Althaus, Quere affirms that

---


699 Althaus, "The Lord's Supper," 275. See also Ralph Quere, "Changes and Constants."


701 Quere, "Changes and Constants," 72, emphasis Quere's.
Luther's christology and eucharistic theology develop in tandem, the most significant development being his understanding of ubiquity. As Quere puts it, the concept of ubiquity "serves to facilitate, not to replace the eucharistic mode of presence." Luther's doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's human nature facilitates his doctrine of the eucharistic real presence, which, as Althaus articulates it, "means that Christ is bodily present." So for Luther, the referent of "real presence" is "the bodily presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the bread and wine." Since Christ is bodily present, Christ is also bodily received in and with the elements of the sacrament. The communion is a corporal communion. As Locher puts it, "Luther expects, in the Lord's Supper, the bodily union of the receivers with the body of Christ (in the elements)."

---

702 Quere, "Changes and Constants," 73-74, emphasis Quere's.

703 Althaus, "The Lord's Supper," 382: "The christological concepts with which he [Luther] tried to make the real presence of the body of Christ understandable in his great polemical writings were first developed in answer to the objections of his opponents."

704 Quere, "Changes and Constants," 74.


706 This is also grounded in his reading of "This is my body," and the sacramental function of the Words of Institution within the context of the celebration of the sacrament. See, e.g., Quere, "Changes and Constants," 56, 73, 74.

707 Althaus, "The Lord's Supper," 393.

708 Althaus, "The Lord's Supper," 399, also 385.

709 So, e.g., Lohse, Martin Luther's Theology, 237. "[I]t is important to note that for Luther the Spirit always makes use of the means of Word and Sacrament. The Spirit encounters persons not directly but always mediately" (Lohse, Martin Luther's Theology, 237). Calvin's thought is not far off, lest the sacraments be rendered useless, futile. Calvin affirms, as noted previously, that the Spirit uses the sacraments as "instruments." See also Ian Hazlett, "The Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Its Historical and Theological Context 1523-1534," (Inaugural-Dissertation, Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität zu Münster, 1975), 104, surveying Luther's Wider die himmlischen Propheten 1524.
Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, with its emphasis on the bodily communication and reception of Christ "in and under" the bread and wine of the sacrament, rests heavily on his doctrine of Christ. In its development, mention of the Spirit is scant, though in at least one place mention of the Spirit is a strong, memorable sound bite. What bearing might these few mentions have had on Calvin in the development of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, particularly given his interest to overcome the differences exposed in the 1520's in the so-called "first eucharistic controversy" among Protestants?²

Four items are of note:

1) The first is, in fact, the "sound bite," which appears in Luther's initial diatribe against the Roman Catholic sacramental system, *De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae*, "written in pungent Latin" and published in 1520. Clearly Calvin encountered the text

---

²Locher, "Discord Among Guests," in *Zwingli's Thought*, 325. With due caution and in the context of much more extended discussion about the thought of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, Locher provides the following summary "schematisation" of "some main lines of thought":

*Luther* expects, in the Lord's Supper, the *bodily* union of the receivers with the *body* of Christ (in the elements),

*Zwingli* expects, in the Lord's Supper, the union of the *soul* of the celebrators with the *divine nature* of Christ (present in the human nature through remembrance of his suffering),

*Calvin* expects, in the Lord's Supper, the union of the *soul* of the receivers with the *body* of Christ (in heaven).

Locher's takes on Zwingli and Calvin is taken up in discussion to come.

²¹ "Another fascinating constant in Luther's [doctrine] is the continued use of 'in and under' to describe the relation of Christ's body to the elements. His rejection of transubstantiation in *The Babylonian Captivity* in 1520 does not lead him to drop this traditional 'prepositional' description of the presence. Still, in 1529 in the Catechisms, 'in' and 'under' are used, occasionally joined in the late 1520s by the characteristically Melanchthonian 'with'" (Quere, "Changes and Constants," 75).

²² See Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention," 39 and 40. Tylenda asserts with respect to Calvin's *Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper*, 1541, that "Calvin undoubtedly felt that his teaching on the Supper was the solution; if it did not actually bring an end to the dispute, it could at least bring it calm until an agreed statement could be formulated. Calvin sincerely looked forward to such a future statement. . . . In the years following the *Short Treatise*, Calvin continued to labor towards eucharistic unity." See also, e.g., Sasse, *This Is My Body*, 240-41, 260ff.

prior to the preparation of his first edition of the *Institutio*. Concerning the Eucharist, Luther decries the scholastic concept transubstantiation:

> Let us not dabble too much in philosophy, however. . . . For my part, if I cannot fathom how the bread is the body of Christ, yet I will take my reason captive to the obedience of Christ [II Cor. 10:5], and clinging simply to his words, firmly believe not only that the body of Christ is in the bread, but that the bread is the body of Christ. . . . What does it matter if philosophy cannot fathom this? *The Holy Spirit is greater than Aristotle*. Does philosophy fathom their transubstantiation? Why, they themselves admit that here all philosophy breaks down. . . .

Calvin nowhere quotes Luther regarding the preeminence of the Spirit, though he shares with Luther an antipathy toward this particular scholastic philosophical explanation. Indeed, Calvin's distaste of scholasticism's definition of aspects of the Lord's Supper may have been whetted by Luther's distaste of the same. Ironically, it seems Luther eventually went back on his skepticism of scholastic philosophical conception, as he later relied on the categories of Occam and Biel to work out his doctrine of Christ so that it might be compatible with, and even facilitate (to use Quere's word), his doctrine of eucharistic real presence: In his *Confession Concerning Christ's* 

---

714 See discussion in Chapter 3 above.


716 This claim is based on a search of the digitized version of the *CO: Calvini Opera Database 1.0*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Apeldoorn: Institute voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2005).

717 David Steinmetz, "Scripture and the Lord's Supper in Luther's Theology," in *Luther in Context* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986). Steinmetz writes: Luther retained the doctrine of real presence but rejected the theory of transubstantiation which had been used to explain the manner of that presence. In part, Luther rejected the philosophical explanation because of a deeply held conviction that the use of Aristotelian philosophy by scholastic theologians had seriously impeded their efforts to understand the mind of the New Testament. . . . The pagan Aristotle was not only unbaptized but unbaptizable. Luther was therefore skeptical of any philosophical explanation of the eucharistic presence of Christ. His skepticism did not, however, prevent him from appealing to philosophy in his own later quarrel with Zwingli" (David Steinmetz, "Scripture and the Lord's Supper," 73).
Luther employs the three categories *localiter* or *circumscripтив*, *definitive*, and *repletive*, in order to exegete different "modes of presence," particularly modes of Christ's presence, including his sacramental presence.\(^{719}\)

For his part, Calvin ever eschewed philosophical categories and definitions with respect to the Lord's Supper, resigning questions of "how" wholly to the mystery of the "secret and incomprehensible *virtus* of the Holy Spirit."\(^{720}\) Might he have thought that in doing so, he was following the trajectory of Luther's early sound bite "The Holy Spirit is greater than Aristotle"?

2) In his sermon "The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ—Against the Fanatics" of 1526, published in Latin in 1527, Luther likewise speaks of the presence of Christ in the sacrament. Drawing an analogy between the coming of Christ into the womb of the Virgin Mary with the word of the angel Gabriel, Luther declares:

\[\text{As one cannot deny the fact that she thus becomes pregnant through the Word, and no one knows how it comes about, so it is in the sacrament also. For as soon as Christ says: "This is my body," his body is present through the Word and the power of the Holy Spirit (*Spiritus sancti virtute*). If the Word is not there, it is}\]

\(^{718}\) Upon reading this treatise, Martin Bucer wrote in a letter to John Comander: "As soon as Luther published his great confession on the holy Supper, I began to realize that he by no means taught a local inclusion of Christ in the bread, or any such conjoining of Christ with the elements, which would be unworthy of Christ either as true man or as reigning in heaven" (*LW* 37:158, with reference to *WA* 16:247). Bucer was never "won over" to Luther's view, but he did see in it opportunity for concord, an optimism which gave rise to the Marburg Colloquy of 1529. *LW* 37, 158, citing *WA* 26, 247.


\(^{720}\) For this, Calvin was caricatured by late-sixteenth century Lutherans, of which Oberman writes: "Though the drawing is executed with a wealth of 'loving' detail . . . its central statement is clear: Calvin audaciously stretches to grasp the mysteries of God; he even dares to seize the the Holy Spirit, a bird which vainly flaps its wings to escape his [Calvin's] arrogant grip" (Oberman, "Pursuit of Happiness," 255; with reference to a late-sixteenth century print "preserved in the Zwingli Museum in Zürich, and reproduced as the frontispiece in *Zwingliana* 2, no. 10 [1909], unnumbered, before 290, interpreted by Hermann Escher in that same issue, 309-316).
mere bread; but as soon as the words are added they bring with them that of which they speak.\footnote{721}

Again, Luther's reference to the Spirit is passing, but memorable, perhaps not least because it is Luther's only mention of the Spirit in the entire sermon specifically with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.\footnote{722}

3) Luther ever affirmed a spiritual eating of Christ by faith.\footnote{723} He never denied "spiritual eating," though he denied that this is the only eating that transpires in the sacrament, since in the sacrament, as has been noted, there is for him a bodily communication and reception of Christ's body and blood.\footnote{724} This is, of course, Luther's chief point of contention with those whom he called fanatics, and it hinges in part on his and their exegesis of John 6. Both affirm that Christ, in this discourse, is speaking of the spiritual eating of his flesh and blood that is faith:\footnote{725} For, say, Zwingli, this passage explicitly and exclusively pertains to the Lord's Supper, and is therefore the scriptural

\footnote{721}{"The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ—Against the Fanatics, 1526" (\textit{LW} 36:341; \textit{WA} 19:482-523. "Iam vero, quedammodum nemo negare potest, Virginem per Verbum ita factam esse gravidam, non secus feres quodquam habet in hoc Sacramento. Quam primum enim Christus dixerit, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM, dicto citius, Corpus suum praesto est, atqu'am hoc Verbi adminiculu et Spiritus sancti virtute atque potentia. Quod si Verbum absuerit, Panis est, accedentibus autem verbis, illud apportant quod loquuntur" (Martini Lutheri Sermo Elegantissimus, super Sacramento Corporis \[et\] Sanguinis Christi in quo respondetur obiter \[et\] eiusdem Sacramenti calumniatoribus [Hagaenoae: 1527], B3-v to B4-r).}

\footnote{722}{\textit{LW} 36:330-361. The first two sections of the sermon concern the Lord's Supper, the third concerns confession.}

\footnote{723}{"Early in his career, Luther had emphasized the necessity of a spiritual eating, appropriating this terminology from Jesus' word concerning the bread in John 6. Though he did not relate John 6 to the Lord's Supper and did not accept John 6:63 as evidence for disparaging bodily eating, he still adopted such figurative speech as identifies spiritual eating with faith. No evidence is needed from Luther's early period to prove his emphasis on faith as spiritual eating, but it is important to note that he held fast to this spiritual eating even after his dispute with Zwingli" (Lohse, \textit{Luther's Theology}, 309-310). Lohse then cites a sermon of Luther on John 6, delivered on a weekday in 1531, a sermon found in \textit{LW} 23:116; \textit{WA} 33:178. See also Lienhard, \textit{Luther: Witness}, 210; Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 46.}

\footnote{724}{See also Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 58.}

\footnote{725}{For Luther, see e.g., Lohse, \textit{Luther's Theology}, 310.}
proof that only a spiritual eating, which is faith,\textsuperscript{726} is availed of believers in the Supper. For Luther, Christ, in this discourse, is not speaking of the eating partaken of in sacrament, but explicitly of the eating partaken of \textit{apart from} the sacrament.\textsuperscript{727} So for both, spiritual eating is, so to speak, unreal in that it is non-corporeal, non-bodily. For Zwingli, this is the \textit{only} kind of eating believers experience, whether within or without the Supper; for Luther, it is the kind of eating partaken of by faith both within and without the Supper, though in the Supper it is afforded by the very bodily eating there experienced.\textsuperscript{728}

Calvin's view, however, falls somewhere between those of Luther and those whom Luther called fanatics. With Luther, Calvin avers that in John 6, Christ is not speaking explicitly and exclusively of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For Calvin, the sacrament is a seal of the promises Christ declares in this discourse, namely, that his flesh is meat and his blood is drink, and that his flesh and blood are truly communicated to believers in order that he, Christ, might be their life.\textsuperscript{729} For Zwingli, eating is faith, is believing,\textsuperscript{730} while for Calvin, eating follows from faith, follows from believing.\textsuperscript{731} So

\textsuperscript{726} For e.g., with reference to Augustine, Zwingli declares in his commentary "On True and False Religion" (1525): Augustine, therefore, thinks the same kind of eating is necesary (\textit{sic}) here, as far as the thing itself is concerned, that is treated in the sixth chapter of John. And this is to have faith in the Gospel word. We do not, therefore, according to his opinion, in any other way eat Christ than through faith, trusting in Him as the sure pledge of salvation" (\textit{LWZ} 3:247).

\textsuperscript{727} Steinmetz, "Scripture and the Lord's Supper," 76; Lohse, \textit{Luther's Theology}, 308, 309; Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 64.

\textsuperscript{728} Lohse, \textit{Luther's Theology}, 310-11, with helpful citation to Luther's \textit{That These Words of Christ . . . Still Stand Firm against the Fanatics} (1527) (\textit{LW} 37: 85, 93, and 101; \textit{WA} 23: 179, 191, and 205 respectively); also Lienhard, \textit{Luther: Witness}, 211.

\textsuperscript{729} \textit{The Gospel according to St. John} 1-10, \textit{CNTC} 4:170.
for Calvin, the spiritual nourishment availed of believers in the Supper—that is, the communication of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament—is not "unreal," as in a mere figment or illusion, but "true"—even "real," as he is inclined to put it in 1546—because of the "secret and incomprehensible power of the Holy Spirit" who effects the communication of Christ's body and blood as food for the soul. Thus for Calvin, this communication in the supper is not "corporeal," or "bodily," as Luther would have it, but neither is it "fictional," "imaginary," or "unreal," as a crude accounting of Zwingli's view has it.

Calvin, it seems, shares with Luther aspects of Luther's exegesis of John 6 and his understanding of "spiritual eating," even as he, Calvin, encountered the views of Zwingli and his followers of the same. Calvin shares with Luther an emphasis on the salvific significance of Christ's flesh and its very communication to believers. So it may well be asked, to what extent was Calvin striving to ameliorate the radical

---

730 So in his Fidei ratio, submitted to Charles V at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, Zwingli declares, following on an account of his reading of the church fathers: "... from these facts it becomes very evident that the ancients always spoke figuratively when they attributed so much to the eating of the body of Christ in the Supper; meaning, not that sacramental eating could cleanse the soul but faith in God through Jesus Christ, which is spiritual eating, whereof this external eating is but symbol and shadow" ("An Account of the Faith of Huldreich Zwingli," LWZ 3:55). In secondary literature, see, e.g., Lane, "Was Calvin a CryptozZwinglian?" 24; Locher, "Discord among Guests," 318-19.

731 See, e.g., The Gospel according to St. John 1-10, CNTC 4:166; Institutio 1539, as in Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.5.


733 Cf. Lienhard, Luther: Witness, 222, and Calvin, Institutio 1539 as in Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.7-9. Calvin's discussion begins in this telling way: "I am not satisfied with those persons who, recognizing that we have some communion with Christ, when they would show what it is, make us partakers of the Spirit only, omitting mention of flesh and blood. As though all these things were said in vain: that his flesh is truly food, that his blood is truly drink; that none have life except those who eat his flesh and drink his blood; and other passages pertaining to the same thing! Therefore, if it is certain that an integral communion of Christ reaches beyond their too narrow description of it, I shall proceed to deal with it briefly. ..." (Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.7).
bifurcation of these two views, not for the sake of mere conciliation, but for the sake of truth? The similarity of Luther and Calvin's view is semantic, and yet richer than merely semantic, is it not?

4) Building on the overall point of 3), it must be noted that for Luther "the bodily gift of the Supper is also 'spiritual.'"\(^7\)\(^3\)\(^4\) Luther's exegesis, and therefore association, of body/flesh and spirit was inconceivable to opponents such as Zwingli. For Zwingli and his like, spirit and flesh are diametrically opposed, the two realms being wholly distinct, never commingling. Not so for Luther, for whom, exegetically, "spirit is the opposite of flesh in the sense of sinfulness."\(^7\)\(^3\)\(^5\) Althaus may be quoted at length, even as he quotes Luther at length:

> For this reason, it is meaningless to consider the bodiliness in the sacrament unimportant and unworthy of God in order to assert the Spirit's interests. Bodily eating is itself a "spiritual" eating when it takes place in faith. For everything which is done in faith is spiritual. "Everything that comes from the Holy Spirit is spirit, spiritual, an object of the Spirit, in reality ad whether it is physical or material, outward or visible; similarly, everything which comes from the natural power of the flesh, without Spirit is flesh and fleshly no matter how inward and invisible it may be." Christ's flesh is therefore "spiritual" because it comes from the Spirit, and the bodily eating is spiritual because it is done in faith in God's word. To eat "spiritually" does not mean that we receive something that is merely spiritual; rather we receive a reality that comes from the Holy Spirit and that must be received and enjoyed in a spiritual way, that is, in faith."\(^7\)\(^3\)\(^6\)

As noted above, Calvin, like Luther, emphasizes the salvific necessity of participation in the *humanity* of Christ, in the *flesh* of Christ, and he emphasizes that such participation is not merely figured but actually granted in the Supper. With

\(^7\)\(^3\)\(^4\) Lohse, *Luther's Theology*, 234.

\(^7\)\(^3\)\(^5\) Althaus, "The Lord's Supper," 395; Lohse, *Luther's Theology*, 308.

Zwingli, Calvin denies that this is a bodily participation, as Luther and his followers define it. Even so, he does not countenance the radical dissociation of "spirit" and "body" as in the view of Zwingli and his followers. Thus Calvin is emphatic that the true (or even real as he is inclined to allow in 1546) communication and reception of Christ's body and blood in the Supper transpires by the power of the Holy Spirit. The remainder of Locher's cautious schematization of the views of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin is helpful at this point:

Luther expects, in the Lord's Supper, the bodily union of the receivers with the body of Christ (in the elements).

Zwingli expects, in the Lord's Supper, the union of the soul of the celebrators with the divine nature of Christ (present in the human nature through remembrance of his suffering),

Calvin expects, in the Lord's Supper, the union of the soul of the receivers with the body of Christ (in heaven).

So again, one might well ask, what bearing might Luther's mentions of the Spirit in his discussions of the Lord's Supper have had upon Calvin in the development of his own doctrine of the Lord's Supper, particularly given his apparently conciliatory inclination? Might Calvin have supposed that he was, as it is put above, following the trajectory of Luther's emphatic little claim "The Holy Spirit is greater than Aristotle"?

In light of this question, Gerrish's take on Calvin's own perception of his relation to Luther is most interesting:

---


738 See footnote 235 above and its referent.

739 Also Lienhard, Luther: Witness, 222-23.

740 Locher, "Discord among Guests," in Zwingli's Thought, 325.
The point is then, that although Calvin both regretted Luther's disposition and frankly dissented from some of his expressions, he considered this the legitimate right of an avowed disciple; for the disciple, unlike the epigone, is one who continues in the course begun by his master. Calvin insists, as usual, that the termi

us a quo for a genuine "Lutheran," as far as the Eucharist is concerned, is the efficacious character of sacramental signs. It is here that we have to begin, and not with those unfortunate exaggerations by which Luther himself advanced beyond the essential matter (ultra . . . progressum esse.) Dogmatic development, so it appears, is not always for the better (in melius, as Calvin wrote [elsewhere]). Indeed, Calvin elsewhere speaks of certain of Luther's opinions as reactionary—a failure to free himself from medievalism, or perhaps a temporary accommodation to the times. Therefore, not progress, but regress! The disciple's duty is to move on.741

6.2 Philip Melanchthon742 (1497-1560)

In the late 1520s and early 1530s, Melanchthon's works were circulating in France widely—perhaps even more widely than Luther's.743 Melanchthon's disposition

741 Gerrish, "John Calvin on Luther," 84-85, emphasis Gerrish's. Gerrish cites Calvin's "Second Defense against Westphal" CO 9: 70, 91, and 100. One page later, Gerrish writes of Calvin with respect to his three treatises contra Westphal (printed in 1550, 1556, and 1561): "Calvin wishes to claim for his reformation a continuity with the reformation of Martin Luther. But the claim of continuity is a claim of legitimate development, not of formal identity. In his own estimate, he does not merely transmit the heritage of Luther, but neither does he set his own reformation in opposition to Luther's."

742 Calvin's eventual, so-called "friendship" with Melanchthon is beyond the scope of this dissertation, as their interaction did not commence until late 1538, after Calvin had arrived in Strasbourg. See Timothy Wengert. "We Will Feast Together in Heaven Forever': The Epistolary Friendship of John Calvin and Philip Melanchthon," in Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence beyond Wittenberg, ed. Karin Maag (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999), 24. Wengert's thesis is that expressions between Calvin and Melanchthon of brotherly affection ought not be interpreted as expressions of "friendship" in the modern sense of that relational term. Rather, such expressions should be recognized for the literary and rhetorical devices that they are, typical of late-Renaissance "letter-writing etiquette." Says Wenger, "The relation between Clavin and Melanchthon . . . was what one might properly call an epistolary friendship, that is, a literary fiction imposed by the authors themselves, especially Calvin, onto a very complex web of interactions, not all of which were friendly" (Wengert, "We Will Feast." 22).

743 "When Calvin was preparing his compendium [the 1536 edition of the Institutio], the work of systematic theology that enjoyed the greatest authority among the evangelicals was without doubt Melanchthon's Loci Communes. In France, the fame of the 'Preceptor of Germany' was widespread. He was known as well as, in not better than, Luther since he was actively interested in the affairs of France" (Ganoczy, The Young Calvin, 146). "When presenting Melanchthon to a French readership in the translation of the Loci communes [1546], Calving specified that there was no need to introduce Melanchthon to those who knew Latin, 'because this author is better known than any other in the world in literary circles'

(Gilmont, Calvin and the Printed Book, 170).
was humanist; his inclination, toward reform; his expertise, in Greek and the literature of the early Christian era deriving from the Greek-speaking church. Given Calvin's maturing interests in the same, it is difficult to imagine that Calvin was not familiar with Melanchthon's works already early in life.

In his study of Calvin's first edition of the *Institutio* (1536), Ganozcy suggests that the influence of Melanchthon's 1521 *Loci Communes* appears in especially those passages concerning the Decalogue, faith, and the sacraments generally considered. 744

Concerning sacraments, Ganoczy asserts that Calvin's thought, and even his very expression, 745 conspicuously parallels Melanchthon's with respect to the definition of sacraments as "signs added to divine promises," as "testimonies" of "God's good will toward us," and as "seals" (*sphragis*, as taken from Romans 4.11). 746

More recently, Muller has expanded consideration of Melanchthon's "influence" on Calvin's early theological development, particularly with respect to the "influence" of Melanchthon's 1535/36 *Loci* on Calvin's 1539 *Institutio* and the organization of its theological topics. 747

In a recent essay on the subject, Muller explores the "clearly Melanchthonian" bent of Calvin's earliest eucharistic theology, 748 particularly given his use of *exhibere* 749 and given his claim that Christ "is truly and efficaciously held forth, not however

744 Ganozcy, *Young Calvin*, 146-48.

745 Ganozcy, *Young Calvin*, 146-48; also 151, where Ganoczy declares "a high degree of probability that there was a literary dependence between the *Institutes* and the *Loci.*"

746 Ganozcy, *Young Calvin*, 148-49.

747 See e.g., Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 186-87, and more.

748 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming. Also Muller, "Calvin on Sacramental Presence," 150ff.

749 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming.
naturally’—*vere et efficaciter exhiberi, non autem naturaliter.*  As evidence of Calvin's appropriation of Melanchthon's thought, Muller also notes Calvin's clear inclination early on to conceive of Christ's presence with respect to the sacrament wholly christologically rather than pneumatologically:

> [In the 1536 *Institutio*] Calvin argues that, given Christ's ascension to heaven, he cannot be corporeally present on earth; but, inasmuch as he now sits at the right hand of God, his kingdom and power extend everywhere and he can hold forth his body and blood to believers. Calvin's focus is on a presence understood christologically, not pneumatologically.  

Such a christological emphasis does indeed obtain in Melanchthon's doctrine of the sacrament. In his study of Melanchthon's eucharistic theology, Quere offers a detailed account of the development of Melanchthon's thought, tracing in particular the extent to which "Melanchthon's doctrine parallels and incorporates certain Oecolampadian emphases." Quere suggests that Melanchthon shares with the Swiss a

---


751 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming: "Calvin's reading of the creedal phrase contrasts with that of Zwingli: the right hand of God is a power transcending space. Calvin appears here to be arguing a Christological rather than a pneumatological ground of presence, akin to that implied by the Augsburg Confession: the ascension of Christ to the right hand of the Father indicates the eternal rule of Christ to the end that 'he might sanctify those who believe in him, by sending the Holy Spirit into their hearts' and the article on the Mass indicates the institution of the sacrament in order that faith 'might remember Christ, might remember and sense the benefits that are truly held forth to us.'"

752 Quere's thesis concerns, in part, the charge Melanchthon incurs as a "crypto-Calvinist." Says Quere in the introduction to his study: "The beginnings of [Melanchthon's] purported 'deviation' from Luther, well before Calvinism was an option, are a focus of this dissertation. . . . Melanchthon is neither Methodist nor Reformed (either proto-Calvinist or crypto-Calvinist). He is not the source of all Lutheran heterodoxy and it is an oversimplification to say that he is the father of Lutheran and/or Reformed orthodoxy" (Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 4, 5-6). See also David C. Steinmetz, "Philip Melanchthon," in *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayersberg to Theodore Beza*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
concern to ascribe the efficacy of a sacrament to God, not the signs. Unlike the Swiss, however—unlike Oecolampadius—Melanchthon "would focus the divine efficacy in the Eucharist on the Son and not the Spirit," says Quere, who continues: "To introduce the Spirit at this point seemed to the Lutherans an uncalled-for 'spiritualizing' of the Sacrament." As Quere notes, Melanchthon "argues that the Zwinglians 'wish presence to be understood only with respect to efficacy and the Holy Ghost. We, however, require not only the presence of the power but of the body.'" By 1535, however, Melanchthon's appropriation of certain "Oecolampadian emphases with respect to efficacy" comes to light. This is evident in the Loci. To quote Quere at length:

The emphasis on the Spirit's efficacy in the sacraments appears in Melanchthon's discussion of sacraments.

---

753 Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 346. Of Melanchthon and Oecolampadius' relationship, Amy Nelson Burnett notes, with reference to their correspondence: "Not long after his arrival in Wittenberg in 1519, Melanchthon wrote to Wolfgang Capito, at that time cathedral preacher in Basel. According to Melanchthon's letter, he was encouraged to seek Capito's friendship by Johannes Oecolampadius, an old friend from student days in Tübingen. A few months later Melanchthon attested to his friendship with Oecolampadius, who was at that time the cathedral preacher in Augsburg, by dedication his account of the Leipzig disputation to him, and the two continued to correspond after Oecolampadius' return to Basel in 1523" (Burnett, "Melanchthon's Reception in Basel," 69).


Therefore just as the word is an instrument through which the Holy Spirit is efficacious . . . thus through the sacraments, the Holy Spirit is efficacious, when indeed they are received in faith; for they remind and move toward believing, just as the word [does].

Melanchthon's new emphasis on the Spirit's efficacy does not get beyond his general discussions of the sacraments and baptism into his discussion of the Eucharist. This is undoubtedly because he is still leary of attempts to 'spiritualize' away Christ's presence. He does not exclude the Spirit but neither will he let the doctrine of the Holy Spirit be used to exclude the efficacious Christ.\(^{756}\)

Melanchthon's christological emphasis—or shall we say, lack of pneumatological emphasis—with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is borne out in the Augsburg Confession (both the invariata of 1530\(^{757}\) and the variata of 1540), his correspondence, and the Wittenberg Concord (1536). As noted above with reference to the work of Muller, in the first edition of the *Institutio*, Calvin seemingly appreciated this dimension of Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, to the point of appropriating it. As noted in chapters 2 and 5 above, Calvin speaks of the Spirit with respect to the sacraments in the first edition of the *Institutio*, but such discussion does not extend to his discussion of the Lord's Supper in particular. This is, it seems, not

\(^{756}\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 350 (emphasis and spelling are Quere's), citing Melanchthon's *Loci communes* 1535 (CR 21:468 – Quere sic ut verbum est instrumentum, per quod Spiritus sanctus efficax est; . . . ita per Sacramenta Spiritus sanctus est efficax, cum vide licet fide accipientur; admonent enim et movent ad credendum, sicut verbum.) See also Ralph W. Quere, "Christ's Efficacious Presence in the Lord's Supper: Directions in the Development of Melanchthon's Theology after Augsburg," *The Lutheran Quarterly* 29 (1977), 22-23, 25. Also Bierma, *Doctrine of the Sacraments in the Heidelberg Catechism*, 18. On the apparent chilling of Melanchthon and Oecolampadius' friendship given their theological differences with respect to the Lord's Supper, see Burnett, "Melanchthon's Reception in Basel," 71-72; Walther Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther: Ihre Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen, Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationgeschichte* 6 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1924), 799-804; Ernst Stachelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads, Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationgeschichte* 21 (Leipzig: Heinsius, 1939), 598-616; and Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 310ff.

\(^{757}\) Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation*, 110, with reference to Quere: The Augsburg Confession's "eucharistic formulations were carefully chosen to negotiate between the 'sacramentarianism' of Zwingli and the medieval conception of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice" (Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, especially 281-94).
unlike Melanchthon's own theological proceeding. Like Melanchthon, like the Swiss, Calvin demonstrates concern about ascribing efficacy not to the sacraments *per ipsa*, but to God. Perhaps attempting to mediate the then-to-fore opposition of christological and pneumatological emphases of the Lutherans and the Swiss respectively, Calvin speaks of what *Christ* by *his* Spirit accomplishes in the sacrament, namely, a nourishing of the soul and a strengthening of faith. That is to say, using the words of Quere, Calvin seemingly shares Melanchthon's concern that it be well understood that "*Christ*, not just the Spirit, is there, efficaciously giving his life to believers who participate in the Sacrament."\(^{758}\)

### 6.3 Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531)

Having died on the battlefield at Capel in 1531, Ulrich Zwingli, the champion of reform in Zurich, never met Calvin, though Calvin was met with his legacy. Exactly when Calvin engaged Zwingli's works is cause for some debate,\(^{759}\) not least because Calvin himself published in 1556 that "... when on beginning to emerge from the darkness of Papacy, and after receiving a slight taste of sound doctrine, I read in Luther that Zuinglius and Oecolompadius *sic* left nothing in the sacraments but bare and empty figures, I confess I took such a dislike for their writings that I long refrained from..."


\(^{759}\) Alexander Ganoczy, citing the editors of the *Calvini Opera* approvingly, alleges that Zwingli's *Commentary on True and False Religion* (1525), prepared at the request of several Frenchman and dedicated to Francis I, was certainly known and read within the circle of Lefèvre d'Etaples and Gérard Roussel, with which Calvin was associated in France (*Ganoczy, Young Calvin*, 151). So might Calvin have read it that early on? And to what extent would he have absorbed Zwingli's thought?
reading them. Given its context, Calvin's autobiographical claim may be as much a ploy of polemics as a reflection of truth, but he had declared earlier that Zwingli's teaching on the Lord's Supper is "a false and pernicious opinion," and seemingly accounted Zwingli a second-rate theologian. Throughout his career, Calvin was wont to distinguish and dissociate his teaching from Zwingli's, even when he attempted conciliation with Zwingli's successors.

Differences in their sacramental doctrines are real. As noted above in the discussion of Luther's doctrine, Calvin and Zwingli differ sharply in their conception of the sacraments: For Calvin the sacraments exhibit, that is, confer, what they signify, such that the body of Christ is truly proffered with the bread and wine, not merely symbolized by them. So for Calvin, the sacrament is a "means of grace" in the strong sense, such that the Lord's Supper is taken to be a means by which God in Christ truly

---

761 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" Calvin Theological Journal, forthcoming.
762 In a letter to André Zébédeé, a Zwinglian in Orbe, May 1539. CO 10:346.
763 Muller, "Calvin on Sacramental Presence," 148; Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" Calvin Theological Journal, forthcoming; Wendel, Calvin: Origins and Development, 135-36, 333-34; and Zachman, John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian, 20.
764 Muller, "Calvin on Sacramental Presence," 148ff. As Locher notes, "the whole discussion of the sacraments in the Catechism of Genoa presents one single debate with Zwinglianism" (Locher, "Discord among Guests," in Zwingli's Thought, 321n34 and 324n46).
765 The Consensio mutua in re sacramentaria, prepared with Bullinger. On the political context of the Consensio, see Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 5, and Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, 194-205. Rorem and Davis also emphasize that the Consensio reflects Bullinger's thought more than Calvin's (Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 45-55; Davis, Clearest Promises, 29-41). Davis goes on to demonstrate that after the publication of the Consensio, Calvin is perpetually interpreting it to accord with his own thought (Davis, 41-50).
766 Lane, "Was Calvin a Crypto-Zwinglian?" 39. For more on exhibere, see footnote 58 above.
nourishes the soul and increases faith. Such an instrumental conception of the sacrament contrasts Zwingli's instrumental conception: for Calvin, the sacraments are divine instruments, instruments of God; for Zwingli, they are human instruments, instruments of the participants, individually and collectively. Calvin (like Luther) emphasizes God's initiative and action in the Lord's Supper, while Zwingli emphasizes the believer's, the congregation's. Accordingly, Calvin's accent falls on what is given and received in the sacrament (i.e., Christ's body and blood as spiritual food for the spiritual journey), and Zwingli's on what is done (i.e., remembering Christ and his sacrifice, and offering a confession of faith in thanksgiving). Zwingli evidences

767 Regarding this contrast, see, e.g., Locher, "The Characteristic Features of Zwingli's Theology in Comparison with Luther and Calvin," in Zwingli's Thought, 226-28. Here, Locher sums Zwingli's thought in this way: "[I]f atonement has been made on the cross, then the comfort of the troubled soul cannot depend upon the celebration of the sacrament." See also Locher, "In Spirit and in Truth," in Zwingli's Thought, 21. This is contrary to Calvin's conception of the sacrament as an "instrument" which in fact "increases" faith, as a celebration that in fact grants solace and assurance, as medicine for sick souls (Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.8, and especially 4.17.42).

768 Locher demonstrates that for Zwingli the terms "pledge" and "seal" of grace were terms reserved for Christ himself alone; for Calvin they refer to the sacraments. The significance of this contrast is obvious. (Locher, "Characteristic Features," in Zwingli's Thought, 228n370; also "Discord among Guests," in Zwingli's Thought, 322-23).

769 See Locher, "Discord among Guests," in Zwingli's Thought, 317; Lane, "Was Calvin a Crypto-Zwinglian?" 24.

770 Locher demonstrates that "this 'remembrance' is not a merely intellectual process; . . . . Memoria, as understood by Augustine (like ανάµνησις in Plato) describes the soul's power of realization and of consciousness in general; . . . . According to this tradition, remembrance does not denote our ability to set ourselves back into the immediate or the remote past, but the way in which the past is brought into our present time, becoming contemporary with us and effective in us. Zwingli thinks in the categories of this Platonist-Augustian anthropology; though for him this power to 'render present' the death of Christ as our salvation does not lie within our soul, but in the Holy Spirit, on the basis of the eternal efficacy of the Lord's sacrifice; the organ by which it is received is faith, or rather the conscious contemplation of faith" (Locher, "Characteristic Features," in Zwingli's Thought, 223, with reference to primary sources; see also Locher, "Discord among Guests," in Zwingli's Thought, 314-15).

771 See Lane, "Was Calvin a Crypto-Zwinglian?" 24 and 40; Locher, "Characteristic Features," in Zwingli's Thought, 215, 221, 222. It must be said that Calvin does not deny that "remembering," "confessing," and "thanksgiving" transpire in the celebration of the sacrament on the part of those who participate, but he appreciates these aspects even in emphasizing that the sacrament is a meal in which
this view in his definition of the sacraments, given in his *Commentary on True and False Religion*, 1525:

The sacraments are, then, signs or ceremonial... by which a man proves to the Church that he either aims to be, or is, a soldier of Christ, and which inform the whole Church rather than yourself of your faith... [B]y the Lord's Supper we give proof that we trust in the death of Christ, glad and thankful to be in that company which gives thanks to the Lord for the blessing of redemption which He freely gave us by dying for us.\(^\text{772}\)

In contrast, Calvin ever affirms that God is the primary actor in the sacrament, and that God does in fact use the sacraments as a means by which to nourish the soul. For Calvin, sacraments are testimonies, but they are testimonies first of God's grace, not of a person's faith. In this regard, Calvin's thought is compatible with Luther's, and Melanchthon's definitions after him. In light of his encounter with Zwingli's view, in 1539 Calvin wrote to André Zébédée, a Zwinglian in Orbe, that "Zwingli had not grasped all the richness of what is *given* to the congregation in the Lord's Supper."\(^\text{773}\)

While these significant differences exist in the sacramental doctrines of Calvin and Zwingli, some aspects of their doctrines are undeniably compatible.\(^\text{774}\)

---

\(^{772}\) "On True and False Religion," *LWZ*, 184.

\(^{773}\) According to Locher, "In Spirit and in Truth," in *Zwingli's Thought*, 20, citing the letter of Calvin to André Zébédée, Strasbourg, May 19, 1939 (*CO* 10:346). Might Calvin have said this with an understanding, if only an inference, of Zwingli's assertion following on Augustine's classic definition of a sacrament: "I believe the sacrament to be the sign of a sacred thing, that is, of effectual grace"? For Zwingli's statement, see Locher, "Characteristic Features," in *Zwingli's Thought*, 215.

\(^{774}\) The forthcoming discussion does not mention "metonymy," a concept regarding symbols, their names and what they signify, that Zwingli introduces already in at least two works: *Amica exegesis, id est, expositio eucharistae negotii ad M. Lutherum* (1527), and *Ad illustriissimos Germaniae principes Augustae congregatos* (1530). Calvin also works favorably with this linguistic term and concept in his discussions of the Lord's Supper, but interestingly not until after his attempts toward rapprochement with Bullinger in the late 1540s. So presumably Calvin assimilated this term and concept into his discussion not from Zwingli, but from Zwingli's successor. Pursuing this discovery in further detail would be interesting, but lies beyond the scope of the project at hand.
1) For one, Calvin and Zwingli agree that it is the work of the Spirit to inwardly illumine the believer, to open the mind and heart, and "lead the way" for Word and Sacrament to enter in.\textsuperscript{775} However, one should not make too much of this toward an assumption that Zwingli influenced Calvin on this point, as this was a widely accepted patristic and medieval notion.\textsuperscript{776}

2) For another, both Zwingli and Calvin emphasize Christ's ascension, Christ's corporeal, local presence in heaven. As with the previous point, one must be careful with this one: For one thing, Oecolampadius emphasizes the same, prior to Zwingli, as does Farel; therefore if Calvin appropriated this "Swiss" notion, he may well have appropriated it from someone other than Zwingli. For another, a subtle distinction may be made between Zwingli and Calvin's appeals to Christ's ascension—regarding how they relate this interpretation of the ascension to their arguments concerning the Lord's Supper. In Muller's words, "Zwingli, characteristically, appeals to the ascension and \textit{sessio Christi ad dexteram Dei} as an argument for the absence of Christ's body from earth."\textsuperscript{777} So for Zwingli, the body of Christ is "present" or "near" in the sacrament "by

\textsuperscript{775} "[W]hen these things are contemplated the sacraments not only put them before our eyes, but even enable them to penetrate to the mind. But what leads the way? The Spirit" ("Letter to the Most Illustrious Princes of Germany Assembled at Augsburg," \textit{LWZ}, 111). "I certainly admit . . . that faith is the proper and entire work of the Holy Spirit, illumined by whom we recognize God and the treasures of his kindness, and without whose light our mind is so blinded that it can see nothing; so dull that it can sense nothing of spiritual things. . . . [The Lord] illumines our minds by the light of his Holy Spirit and opens our hearts for the Word and sacraments to enter in . . . ." (\textit{Inst.} 1536, 89).

\textsuperscript{776} In his discussion of "Pneumatology in the History of Protestantism," Yves Congar compares Luther and Calvin on precisely this point. Congar observes that "being enlightened by the Holy Spirit in order to understand Scripture" is "a classical datum in the writings of the Fathers and throughout the Middle Ages." See Yves Congar, \textit{The Holy Spirit in the 'Economy': Revelation and Experience of the Spirit}, Volume 1 of \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, trans. David Smith (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1997; repr. 2001), 140.
the contemplation of faith" (*adesse fidei contemplatione*), but present neither *per essentiam et realiter* or in "the natural body itself" (*corpus ipsum naturale*). While Calvin agrees with Zwingli that Christ is not present essentially or really in the sense that he is present naturally, his "denial of substantial or real presence is not intended to argue absence, but rather [to] forestall attempts to define 'how the now present body of Christ is present (*adsit*) in the bread.'

Muller's point is that Calvin's appropriation of this interpretation of Christ's ascension is not only not Zwinglian, but seemingly Melanchthonian. Like Melanchthon, Calvin – at least in the 1536 *Institutio* – asserts that given Christ's accession to the right hand of the Father, Christ can "exercise (*exerat*) his power, wherever it pleases him, in heaven and in earth, hold forth (*exhibeat*) his presence in power and influence, be always present to (*adsit*) those who

777 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming, citing Zwingli, *Fidei ratio* (1530).

778 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming. See "On True and False Religion," *LWZ* 3; "Letter to the Princes of Germany," *LWZ* 3:109, 112 and 113, 123 and 124: "I have never denied that Christ's body is present in the Supper sacramentally and mysteriously, both with a view to the contemplation of faith and to the whole working of the symbol, as I have said. . . . Since, therefore, this presence amounts to nothing without the contemplation of faith, it belongs to faith that the things are or become present, and not to the sacraments" (*LWZ* 3:112-13, emphasis added). "Et nos nunquam negavimus corpus Christi sacramentaliter ac in mysterio esse in coena, tum propter fidei contemplationem, tum propter symboli, ut diximus, totam actionem. . . . Cum igitur omnis ista praesentia, nihil sit sine fidei contemplatione, iam fidei est, ista esse aut fieri praesentia non sacramentorum" (*Epistola ad principes Germaniae principes Augustae congregatos*, in *Opera D. Huldrychi Zuinglii*, vigilantissimi Tigurinae ecclesiae antistitis, ed. R. Gowlther and L. Jud [Zurich: Froschauer, 1545], available digitally in *The Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts* [Alexander Street Press, L.L.C.]: alexanderstreet.com). Such claims are most unlike those of Calvin. (Notice that the English translator sometimes renders *contemplatio*- not as "contemplation" but as "eye," as in "eye of faith." See 123-24 especially.)

779 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming, citing *Inst.* 1536, *CO* 1:120, which reads "... quomodo in pane praesens adsit Christi corpus" – "taking note in the translation of both *praesens* and *adsit,*" observes Muller. Muller immediately follows up his observation with this: "Moreover, as pointed out by Tylenda, Calvin's similar objection to language of real and substantial presence in his prefatory letter to Francis I identifies this usage more as a critique of transubstantiation than as advocacy of a specifically Zwinglian position" (citing Tylenda, "Ecumenical Intention," 31).

780 Muller, "Calvin on Sacramental Presence," 150.
are his, live in them, sustain them, strengthen them, enliven them, just as if he were present in the body." As Muller puts it, "to press his point, Calvin continues, 'It is in this manner that the body and blood of Christ are held forth in the sacrament,' so that 'we say that he is truly and efficaciously (vere et efficaciter) held forth, not however naturally.'" As noted in Chapter 2 above, this is precisely the statement into which Calvin, in his 1539 edition of the *Institutio*, interpolates a seminal reference to the Holy Spirit:

This Kingdom is neither bounded by location in space nor circumscribed by any limits. Thus uncircumscribed, Christ can exert his power wherever he pleases, in heaven and on earth. He shows his presence in power and strength, is always among his own people, and lives in them, sustaining them, strengthening, quickening, keeping them, as if he were present in the body. In short, he feeds his people with his own body, the communion of which he bestows upon them by the power of his Spirit. In this manner, the body and blood of Christ are shown to us in the Sacrament.

3) This last point—regarding Zwingli's appropriation of his doctrine of Christ's accession as an argument for Christ's absence and Calvin's appropriation of this

---

781 *Inst.* 1536, CO 1:123, as translated by Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming. Here Muller suggests this is precisely Melanchthon's exegesis of Colossians 3:1. In "Calvin on Sacramental Presence," Muller asserts that one aspect of Calvin's "eucharistic theology in which he evidence a debt to Melanchthon" is "his christological assumption that Christ's ascension not only located Christ's body in heaven but also enabled Christ at the right hand of God to be present in power everywhere" ("Calvin on Sacramental Presence," 151, with further elaboration on 152).

782 Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming.

783 1539 *Inst.* Battles trans. of the 1559 *Inst.*, modified, given that Battles translates the second sentence in the negative ("Thus Christ is not prevented from exerting his power . . . .") in his translation of the 1559 edition, though there is no negative in the Latin; and given that this passage is only slightly further edited in succeeding editions of the *Institutio*. "Hoc regnum nec ullis locorum spatiiis limitatum, nec ullis dimensionibus circumscripturn, quin Christus virtutem suam, ubicumque placuerit, in coelo et in terra exserat; quin se praesentem potentia et virtute exhibeat; quin quis semper adsit, in iis vivat, eos sustineat, confirmet, vegetet, conservet, non secus ac si corpore addesset; quin denique suo ipsius corpor eos pascat, cuius communionem spiritus sui virtute in eos transfundit. Secundum hanc rationem corpus et sanguis Christi in sacramento nobis exhibetur . . . ." (CO 1:1009, emphasis added). Muller observes this interpolation in his article "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" *Calvin Theological Journal*, forthcoming, with reference to Davis, *Clearest Promises*, 81-84.
doctrine as an argument for Christ's presence—leads to the following observation:

Given Christ's ascension, both Zwingli and Calvin are inclined to emphasize the spiritual dynamic of the Lord's Supper, but for each "spiritual" has a seemingly different inflection, a different, predominant intention. For Zwingli, the predominant intention of spiritual seems to be "non-corporeal," "not carnal," "not bodily," as when he says:

My opponents say that the body of Christ is offered here. I also say the same thing. Where then is the difference? It is here. My opponents say the material and substantial body of Christ is offered, I say the sacramental. Hence the strife. Let them answer, therefore, whether they desire to understand physically or spiritually the words, 'This is my body,' that is, whether He offered His body to be eaten physically or spiritually. For between material or physical and spiritual there is no middle term. Though you put together everything there is, both creator and created things, you will have either spirit or body. To this combat, therefore, I challenge them, Did Christ offer His body to be eaten materially and physically or spiritually?784

For Calvin, the predominant intention of spiritual is to bring the person and work of the Spirit to the fore, because it is through, or by, the Spirit that Christ accomplishes his ends. So the divine person of the Spirit receives explicit mention in his discussions of the Lord's Supper with reference to what transpires in the Supper, in the celebration of the sacrament, in the communion, namely, the nourishing of believers' souls with Christ's body and blood as spiritual food for the spiritual journey.785 So Calvin explicitly qualifies his use of "spiritually," specifically clarifying that by this term he is referring


785 Lane, "Was Calvin a Crypto-Zwinglian?" 34, as cited below.
to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Already in his earliest works he makes this move, as he did at the Lausanne Disputation:

We affirm that it is a spiritual communication, by which in virtue and in power he makes us participant of all that we are able to receive of grace in his body and blood; or again, to declare better the dignity of this mystery, it is a spiritual communication by which he makes us truly participant of his body and his blood, but wholly spiritually, that is by the bond of his Spirit.\textsuperscript{786}

The final words of the \textit{Petit traicté} are equally demonstrative of this explicit qualification:

We all then confess with one mouth, that on receiving the sacrament in faith, according to the ordinance of the Lord, we are truly made partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. How that is done some may deduce better than others, and explain more clearly than others. Be this as it may, on the one hand, in order to exclude all carnal fancies, we must raise our hearts upwards to heaven, not thinking that our Lord Jesus is so debased as to be enclosed under some corruptible elements; and, on the other hand, not to impair the efficacy of this holy ordinance, we must hold that it is made effectual by the secret and miraculous power of God, and that the Spirit of God is the bond of participation, this being the reason why it is called spiritual.\textsuperscript{787}

In Zwingli's discussions of the Lord's Supper, this explicit and emphatic clarifying qualification simply does not occur, such that, again, his use of the term "spiritual" may often just as well be taken to mean "non-corporeal," "not carnally," "not

\textsuperscript{786} Calvin: Theological Treatises, 44. "Mais que c'est une communication spirituelle par laquelle in vertu et in efficace il nous fait participans de tout ce que pouvons recepvoir de grace en son corps et son sang, ou encore, pour mieux declairer la dignite de ce mystere, par laquelle il nous fait vrayement participans de son corps et son sang, mais le tout spirituellement cest a dire par le lien de son esprit" (CO 9:844).

\textsuperscript{787} Tracts and Treatises 2:197-198. "Nous confessons doncq tous d'une bouche, que en recevant en Foy le Sacrement, selon l'ordonnance du Seigneur, nous sommes vrayement faictz participans de la proper substance du corps et du sang de Jésus Christ. Comment cela se faict, les uns le peuvent mieux desduire et plus clairement exposer que les autres. Tant y a que d'une part il nous fault, pour, exclure toutes phantasies charnelles, elever les cueurs en hault au ciel, ne pensant pas que le Seigneur Jésus soit abaissé jusque là, de estre enclos souzbxz quelques elemens corruptibles. D'autre part, pour ne point amoindrir l'efficace de ce sainct mystere, il nous fault penser que cela se faict par la vertu secrete et miraculeuse de Dieu, et que l'Esprit de Dieu est le lien de ceste participation, pour laquelle cause elle est appellée spirituelle" (CO 5:460).
physically." This fact seemingly mitigates Locher's estimation that "compared with the other reformers [Luther and Calvin], it is Zwingli who has the strongest and most vital pneumatology."\textsuperscript{788} Rather, it seems Calvin has the strongest and most vital pneumatology, or at least the strongest and most vital \textit{sacramental} pneumatology, given his proclivity to qualify the term "spiritual" according to "the Holy Spirit" in his discussions of the Lord's Supper. Is this yet another way in which Calvin hedges his view of the Lord's Supper against that of Zwingli's? And is not Calvin's defense of Christ's presence being "true," even "real," related?\textsuperscript{789}—in that the Holy Spirit is "real" in the sense of truly existing, but not "real" in the sense of being physical, carnal, corporeal.

To further defend the claim above regarding Zwingli's use of "spirit" and "spiritual" in contrast to that of Calvin's, Zwingli's discussion of the sacraments generally considered and of the Eucharist in his \textit{Commentary on True and False Religion} provides an appropriate starting point, also given Calvin's presumed familiarity with this work.\textsuperscript{790} When he first speaks of the Holy Spirit, Zwingli speaks of "the action of the Holy Spirit"—\textit{spiritu sancto agente}—to change believers because they are made

\textsuperscript{788} Locher, "Characteristic Features," in \textit{Zwingli's Thought}, 231. Wim Janse perhaps hints at the same with his "favourite one-liner" summarizing Calvin's doctrine: "Calvin's pneumatological instrumentalism moved between the Scylla of Luther's sacramental realism and the Charybdis of Zwingli's spiritualistic symbolism" (Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 37). Likewise Peter Stephens regarding Zwingli's sacramental doctrine: "The sacraments are related somewhat ambiguously both to faith and to the Holy Spirit. Zwingli does not state that what is signified is offered to us regardless of our faith nor that the Holy Spirit uses the sacraments and makes them effective for us" (Stephens, "The Sacraments in the Confessions," 54). Calvin does in fact declare that what is signified is offered regardless of the faith of the recipient, and he does declare that the Holy Spirit uses the sacraments and makes them effective.

\textsuperscript{789} See further discussion of Calvin's exegesis of 1 Corinthians in Tylenda, "Calvin and Christ's Presence in the Supper—True or Real," 65-75.

\textsuperscript{790} See above.
new in Christ. Zwingli speaks, repeatedly, of his concern to defend "the liberty of the divine Spirit," lest the Spirit be "compelled to act within when we employ the signs externally," lest the Spirit "be absolutely bound by the signs." Related to this, Zwingli demonstrates his radical opposition of body and spirit, of bodily and spiritual or spiritually, as in this passage:

Nor do I think we have to listen to those who, seeing that the view mentioned is not only crude but even frivolous and impious, make this pronouncement: 'We eat, to be sure, the true and bodily flesh of Christ, but spiritually'; for they do not yet see that the two statements cannot stand, 'It is body' and 'It is eaten spiritually.' For body and spirit are such essentially different things that whichever one you take it cannot be the other. . . . Hence, to eat bodily flesh spiritually is simply to assert that to be body which is spirit.

If the editors and translators of his treatise have it right, in the midst of an exegesis of John 6:61-62, Zwingli assumes Jesus' identity and writes in the first person, as Jesus, interpreting Jesus's own words,

The thing of which I am speaking is a spiritual thing, and has nothing to do with bodily things. The Spirit teaches spirit. The Spirit of God, I say, deigns to draw the wretched spirit of man to itself, to unite and to bind it to itself, and wholly to transform it into itself. This thing feeds and rejoices the heart and assures it of salvation. What else is this than the food of the soul? . . . It is, therefore, spiritual food of which I am speaking, for only the Spirit gives it, since the Spirit alone draws the heart to itself and refreshes it.

---


792 *LWZ* 3:183.

793 "On True and False Religion," *LWZ* 3:214. It is unclear to me as yet exactly whose views Zwingli has in mind here. However, Brenz and Bucer, who might well have appropriated the idea from Brenz, employ similar formulations about this time. (See discussion below; also Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," appendix notes 36n154 and its referent.)

794 "On True and False Religion," *LWZ* 3:208. "Spiritalis res est de qua loquor, non geritur rebus corporaeis, sed spiritus spiritum docet: spiritus inquam dei miserum hominis spiritum dignatur ad se
He then proceeds to his exegetical stronghold of "the flesh profits nothing" (John 6:63).

Such is the extent of Zwingli's references to the Spirit and spiritually, and little of this is characteristic of Calvin's thought, even remotely so. While Calvin agrees that it is the work of the Spirit who makes us new in Christ, Calvin more readily speaks of the operatio- and virtu- of the Spirit in this regard. While Calvin does not deny the freedom of God and the Spirit to act when and where God wills, he also declares, already in his 1536 Institutio and clearly opposing a view such as Zwingli's, that "God uses means and instruments which he himself sees to be expedient," and using the means of the sacraments, God nourishes faith.  

Calvin does not share Zwingli's absolute disjunction of spirit and matter, of the work of the Spirit and the efficacy of the sacraments. Calvin's view, in fact, approaches the very view that Zwingli condemns, namely, that believers partake of the true body of Christ, but spiritually, that is, by the Spirit. This is evident both early and late in Calvin's career: At the conclusion of the Petit traicté, prepared in the late 1530s, Calvin declares:

Ea res mentem pascit, laetificat, certamque salutis reddit: quod quid aliud est quam animae cibus? . . . Spiritualis ergo cibus est, de quo loquor: solus enim spiritus cum dat, quam solus mentem ad se trahet & reficiat" (De vera et falsa religione, ed. R. Gowalther and L. Jud [Zurich: Froschauer, 1545], available digitally in The Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts [Alexander Street Press, L.L.C.]: alexanderstreet.com). The translator's use of "it" for spirit, even the Holy Spirit, is interesting given that the neuter implies thing rather than being, person.

For Zwingli, see "On True and False Religion," LWZ 3:214. This point is also suggested by Lane, with reference to Calvin's discussions in the 1559 Institutio and his responses to Westphal and Heshusius: "In these he [Calvin] repeatedly affirms that we do not merely receive the benefits won for us by Christ on the cross and the power that flows from his body and blood but that we receive these only after, as the fruit of, a real communion with his flesh and blood – 'after' in the sense of a logical consequence, not in the sense of a chronological delay. This is a spiritual communion, effected by the Holy Spirit, but the role of the Holy Spirit is to effect communion with the flesh and blood of Christ, not to replace it" (Lane, "Was Calvin and Crypto-Zwinglian?" 33-34, with reference to G. P. Hartvelt, Verum Corpus (Delft: W. D. Meinema, 1960), 191.
on receiving the sacrament in faith, according to the ordinance of the Lord, we are truly made partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. . . . [so as] not to impair the efficacy of this holy ordinance, we must hold that it is made effectual by the secret and miraculous power of God, and that the Spirit of God is the bond of participation, this being the reason why it is called spiritual. 797

Much later, in the *Dilucida explicatio* of 1561, he avers:

I say that although Christ is absent from the earth in respect of the flesh, yet in the Supper we truly feed on his body and blood—that owing to the secret agency of the Holy Spirit we enjoy the presence of both. I say that distance of place is no obstacle to prevent the flesh, which was once crucified, from being given to us for food. 798

Nor does Calvin speak of the Spirit as binding a believer to "itself," the person of the Spirit, but rather and emphatically *to Christ* 799: Christ unites and binds believers to himself by the Spirit, and thereby conforms believers to himself. As indicated before, this emphasis is evident already in Calvin's early writings: In his 1536 *Institutio* he speaks of baptism as a "sure testimony to us that we are not only engrafted into the death and life of Christ, but so united and joined to Christ himself that we become

---

797 *Tracts and Treatises* 2:197-198. "... en recevant en Foy le Sacrement, selon l'ordonnance du Seigneur, nous sommes vrayement faictz participans de la proper substance du corps et du sang de Jesus Christ. ... pour ne point amoindrir l'efficace de ce sainct mystere, il nous faut penser que cela se faict par la vertu secrete et miraculeuse de Dieu, et que l'Esprit de Dieu est le lien de ceste participation, pour laquelle cause elle est appelée spirituelle" (*CO* 5:460).


799 Granted, Zwingli is speaking "as" Jesus in the referent passage. Even so, if he were strongly convicted that the Spirit binds the believer to Christ, he could well have written in the first person, "The Spirit binds man to me." It is no wonder, then, that Luther took it that Zwingli's doctrine is dismissive of the humanity of Christ, even the person of Christ. And like Luther, Calvin, too: See, e.g., *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17.7 on John 6, from 1539; and the 1545 Geneva Catechism on the sacraments, which Locher declares is one long argument contra Zwingli (Locher, "Discord among Guests," in *Zwingli's Thought*, 321n34 and 324n46).
sharers in all his blessings." In the 1539 edition of the *Institutio*, Calvin follows this claim with emphasis on the efficacy of the Spirit. Finally, Calvin neither interprets Jesus' claim "the Spirit gives life—the flesh profits nothing" as Zwingli does, nor ever adopts it as a sacramental mantra about what is (or isn't) proffered in the sacrament, as Zwingli does.

With regard to the Holy Spirit and the Lord's Supper, Zwingli's subsequent principle writings on the sacrament do not diverge from the path he set early on. He continues to emphasize the absolute disjunction between the work of the Spirit and the sacraments, and to mention the role of the Spirit "to go before them." He conceives of a sacrament as "a sign of a sacred thing," but the sacred thing is "grace that has been given," not grace that is given now, by the Spirit. He persists in emphasizing spiritual eating but without qualifying this term as other than being opposed to physical, carnal, corporeal. As before, he emphasizes that, "in the holy Eucharist, i.e., the supper of thanksgiving, the true body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith"—an emphasis that stands in contrast to Calvin's persistent emphasis on "the virtus of the Holy Spirit." Finally, with respect to "the flesh profits nothing" (John 6:63): this is an

---

800 *Inst.* 1536, 99.

801 *Institutio* 1539, as in *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.15.6.


805 "Letter to the Princes," LWZ 3:120.

exegetical stronghold of Zwingli's with regard to the nature of the Lord's Supper, an
exegetical stronghold that, again, Calvin himself never claims with respect to the
sacrament, at least not on Zwingli's terms.

In brief conclusion, all of this demonstrates that any assumption that Calvin's
"spiritual" emphasis with regard to the Lord's Supper was appropriated from Zwingli
requires critical nuance. If Calvin is appropriating this from Zwingli, it seems to be
something of an "anti-appropriation." With respect to the Holy Spirit and the sacrament,
the tenor, emphases, direction, and speech patterns within Calvin's discussion ultimately
do not align with, but seemingly contrast, those of Zwingli's. It would seem then, that
the provenance of Calvin's emphases on the virtus of the Holy Spirit, and of the Holy
Spirit as the bond, or vinculum, binding Christ to believers, is not Zurich.807 So Calvin
does not assimilate Zwingli's thought, at least not directly and uncritically. Whether he
assimilates, or appears to assimilate, elements of Zwingli's thought by way of Zwingli's
peers and successors, given their doctrine's compatibility with or even critical
assimilation of Zwingli's doctrine, is another (complicated) matter.

6.4 Johannes Oecolampadius (1482-1531)

Calvin's thought, it would seem, is at least somewhat indebted to that of
Johannes Oecolampadius, a learned scholar of significant renown in the mid-sixteenth

807 Interestingly, in an albeit brief comparison of his own regarding the sacramental doctrine of
Zwingli and Calvin, Jaques Courvoisier never mentions the Holy Spirit, not even once (Jacques
Courvoisier, "Réflexions à propos de la doctrine eucharistique de Zwingli et de Calvin," in Festgabe
Oecolampadius had been a priest and a sometime monk. A humanist, he was a lifelong student of the church fathers. In lengthy periods of his life, he was a close associate of Melanchthon, Reuchlin, and Erasmus, the foremost humanist scholars of his day, though their relationships faltered as each of their theological dispositions emerged in the wake of reform, and the finer points of their doctrines diverged.

Oecolampadius is often associated with Zwingli such that they are breathlessly identified as holding an identical doctrine of the Lord's Supper. This is so not least because Luther himself had identified the views of the Zurich and Basel reformers. And yet, as Robert Walton puts it in his encyclopedia article about Oecolampadius, "At no time was he [Oecolampadius] merely a disciple of Zwingli." For instance, he "made his own way" in developing a "spiritual interpretation" of the Lord's Supper. Echoing

---


811 Wandel, *Eucharist in the Reformation*, 60. Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 141. Although elsewhere Quere writes of Melanchthon: "The careful professor of Greek and (as of January 1, 1526) theology did not regard Zwingli, much less Oecolampadius as one of the Schwarmgeister as Luther did" (Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 146). Calvin himself identified Zwingli and Oecolampadius in the closing discussion of his 1541 *Petit Traicté de la saincte cène* (CO 5:458; *Tracts and Treatises* 2:193), though he might have done so under the influence of reading Luther and/or Melanchthon, and/or as a means to position himself with respect to the ongoing controversy over the Lord's Supper. In 1525, Bucer was apparently likewise identifying Zwingli and Oecolampadius, if not specifically, then at least categorically (see Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 122, since here he notes Bucer's "tendency to prefer Oecolampadius' use of 'figura' in regard to the bread as compared to Zwingli's significative understanding of 'est'"). See Hazlett's discussion of Bucer's efforts to enhance Oecolampadius' credibility among the Swabians in 1525 (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 117) and his efforts to bolster Zwingli and Oecolampadius' adherents in the Palatinate (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 119).

this same conclusion, Thomas A. Fudge writes of Oecolampadius' *De genuina verborum domini* (1525), "Drawing upon his extensive knowledge of the Fathers, he defended the symbolic interpretation of the eucharist. In substance he appeared close to Zwingli but stood apart by insisting on a metaphor in the predicate rather than the verb." Fudge also declares, "Even before Zwingli, Oecolampadius set forth the idea of a localized body of Christ in one place." By 1527, says Fudge, Oecolampadius had come to the position that, in the Lord's Supper, "the partaking was spiritual, although not merely symbolic but encompassing the thing signified." Such a position is contrary to that of Zwingli's, since Zwingli could not countenance a remotely conjunctive relation between "sign" and "thing signified," lest the sacraments be construed as having some intrinsic power, of being a means of grace in a strong sense. In the presentation of his research comparing the thought of Oecolampadius and that of Melanchthon, Quere points up further distinctions between the doctrine of the Lord's Supper of Zwingli and that of Oecolampadius. Speaking of

---

813 Regarding Oecolampadius' reading, see also Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 145 and 241. Also Ian Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 112. According to Hazlett, though Oecolampadius speaks of the predicate, the bread, as figure, he also "holds the significative exegesis of 'est' to be equally valid" (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 112; also 122).

814 Fudge, "Icarus of Basel?" 273.

815 Fudge, "Icarus of Basel?" 274.

816 See, e.g., Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 137. See also discussion above.

Oecolampadius' treatment of the sacraments as means of grace, Quere writes (to quote his survey at length):\(^818\):

Whereas Zwingli rules this out completely, Oecolampadius is more mediating. He is careful to reject the notion that the elements are a carnal medium of grace whereby grace is transfused since "the elements are not so honored that they become one nature—united to that substance, nor naturally containing it."\(^819\) Oecolampadius compares attributing power, energy, or holiness to the elements with the superstition that attributes such things to trees.\(^820\) And when he does relate the divine power to the Sacrament, he is careful not to imply that the elements themselves have such power: "...the power, not that bread, makes or effects Christ's indwelling in us, thus not corporeally by which the bread would have natural or substantial union with the body of Christ..."\(^821\) The reason for Oecolampadius' caution is that he does not want to ascribe efficacy to anyone but the Holy Spirit. He has argued that the elements themselves are not capable of such power and when the Fathers seem to attribute it to them, they are really talking about the Holy Spirit by synecdoche, i.e., since the sacraments are his instruments (organa).\(^822\) At the outset of the Dialogue, he defended his views contending that he did not believe the sign to be "panem... nudem"\(^823\) but that it was efficacious "in a certain way," i.e., by the operation of the Holy Spirit.\(^824\) Hence, the only efficacy the Sacrament has belongs to the Spirit and not to the elements.\(^825\) Ministers administer the symbols but it is the Spirit of Christ who is

---

\(^818\) The following passage is from Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 342-44.

\(^819\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, citing Oecolampadius' *Dialogus* (1530), e 1\(^2\) B. (Quere's format for citing Oecolampadius' printed work is followed here. The Latin quotation in Quere is given here as is relevant to the study at hand.)

\(^820\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, citing Oecolampadius' *Dialogus*, g 6\(^1\) D.

\(^821\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, citing Oecolampadius' *Dialogus*, k 3\(^1\) D.

\(^822\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, citing Oecolampadius' *Dialogus*, k 3\(^1\) A. "... nisi forte sacramenti nominee simul conplectaris et organa illa spiritus, et spiritum sanctum ipsum, qua synecdoche et veteres usi sunt."

\(^823\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, citing Oecolampadius' *Dialogus*, e 1\(^1\) D.

\(^824\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, citing Oecolampadius' *Dialogus*, d 8\(^2\) D. "Icem non dicimus panem hunc nudum quidem segnum in coena, sed efficax quodammodo, operante spiritu sancto in fidelium coetu, ut fiat nobilium quoddam ac sanctius corpus, nobis Christo capiti in unum corpus coadunatis."

\(^825\) Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, citing Oecolampadius' *Dialogus*, g 7\(^2\) AB. "Ut nos in unum corpus cum Christo fiamus, et panis cum primitiis conspersionis unus efficiamur, solius divini spiritus est operatio: ut tantum, tamque efficax sacramentum sit, mirifica dei energia est. Quorum corda spiritus tangit, et aperit it tantis symbolis, dum deo operanti parent, mire proficient. Quorum vero pectoral obsedit luor, inexcitabilis socordia, superbia, hypocrisies, amor mundi insanus, malignitas,
efficacious. He vivifies, sanctifies, works internal holiness, unites us to Christ, and finally will raise our mortal bodies. The symbols serve to remind the mind of the Spirit's work.

Given Oecolampadius' association with Erasmus and his collaboration with Erasmus on his first and second editions of a Greek New Testament (1516 and 1519), it is not unlikely that Calvin was familiar with Oecolampadius' work as a scholar already early on. Oecolampadius himself had died in 1531, but his contribution to the discussion of the sacraments continued by way of especially his two primary printed works on the topic: his De genuina verborum domini, Hoc est corpus meum, iuxta vetustissimos authores, expositione liber (1525) and his Quid de Eucharistia Veteres tum Graeci tum Latini sensorint, Dialogus (1530). Indeed, it appears Melanchthon was so impressed with Oecolampadius' Dialogus, which was a response to his own Sententia veteran (1530), that he withheld his own work from being reprinted.

paruipendunt non modo signa, sed et beneficia Christi omnia, et sibupsis autores damnationis fiunt. Para quidem coena est, sed indigni ut ea fruantur, qui a spiritu sancto ut ea fruantur non efficiuntur idonei."

Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, citing Oecolampadius' Dialogus, l 7^1 C. "Nonne iam omnia illa duina sacerdotibus concedit, et quo non euehit illos? Sed bene locutus est, ministri sunt, operatio domini est, symbola corpori adhibentur, spiritus Christi efficax est."

Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, citing Oecolampadius' Dialogus, k 3^2 A.

Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, citing Oecolampadius' Dialogus, m 5^1 D.

This treatise was published in Strasbourg in September 1525 under the supervision of Wolfgang Capito and William Farel (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 111).

This treatise, published in 1530, is Oecolampadius' "answer" to Melanchthon's Sententiae veterum (March 1530), in which Melanchthon attempted to "bolster the Lutheran position from patristic sources" (Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 9). These treatises comprise each author's exegesis of the church fathers regarding the sacrament. Quere notes that the last portion of Oecolampadius' Dialogus "takes up author by author the patristic passages cited by Melanchthon." He declares that 'Oecolampadius' Dialogus represent the mature thought of a scholar whose command of the languages and content of the tradition grew out of years of studying, editing, and translating the Fathers" (Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 311).

Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 311.
The extent to which Calvin had accessed Oecolampadius' principal works on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper prior to his time in Basel in 1535 and then in Geneva just after is impossible to say, but interesting nuances in their thought and uses of patristic sources that parallel one another ought not be overlooked. This is true of several features in their sacramental doctrine, including that of the role of the Holy Spirit. Whether these parallels exist purely coincidentally, or because Calvin himself had read Oecolampadius or had received his thought by way of an intermediary, is not, ultimately, to be determined here. All such possibilities exist, uniquely or complementarily. The point is that these parallels exist, and therefore, in their own way, demonstrate that Calvin's thought is an assimilation of the thought of his contemporaries (or near contemporaries, as the case may be).

Upon culling Oecolampadius' works for references to the Holy Spirit, the following observations may be made:

In *De genuina verborum domini*, Oecolampadius presents a Christology akin to that of Zwingli inasmuch as he asserts that Christ's body is at the right hand, and that it, being a natural, human body, cannot be in many places at once. Not unlike Calvin

832 Including *sursum corda*, given that Christ sits at the right hand of God. Oecolampadius speaks of *sursum corda* in *De genuina verborum domini* on at least several occasions (see B 4v; D 3v, in connection with Chrysostom, as Calvin will in his 1557 *Ultima adomenitio* contra Westphal [Tracts and Treatises 2:443]; K 8b, in connection with Colossians 3, as Calvin would already in the *Institutio* 1536 [Inst. 1536, 108]. Incidentally, Oecolampadius' *sursum corda* discussions do not entail mentions of the Holy Spirit. If not Oecolampadius, Farel at least gave the *sursum corda* liturgical expression in his *La maniere et fasson* (533) (Thompson, Liturgies, 223). Clearly Calvin appropriated this expression to his Form for the Celebration of the Lord's Supper (Thompson, Liturgies, 207). See further discussion below in Chapter 8.

833 Much could be said about various, parallel aspects of their sacramental doctrine. The point here, however, is to focus on their appeals to the Holy Spirit in particular, since this is the focus of this study.
would at Lausanne, Oecolampadius appeals to Augustine's epistle ad Dardanum in this argument. Oecolampadius is specific, however, that Christ is therefore present in the Lord's Supper according to his divinity, that is, his virtue and grace are mediated to us by the omnipresent Spirit. Elsewhere, again citing patristic sources, he speaks frequently of Christ being in heaven yet working, or "operating," in the hearts of the faithful by the Holy Spirit, or by the invisibilia ministrorum or virtus of the Holy Spirit. Also, while the terminology is different in Calvin's work than in Oecolampadius', an expressed concept is the same, taken from Chrysostom in both cases: Were we incorporeal, then God's good gifts would be imparted incorporeally; but as we are comprised of bodies conjoined with souls, God's good gifts, even spiritual gifts, are communicated to us by way of sensible things.
Clearly Oecolampadius is concerned to think keenly about the Holy Spirit and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In his study of Oecolampadius' *Quid de Eucharistia Veteres tum Graeci tum Latini senserint, Dialogus*, which Oecolampadius prepared in 1530, Ian Hazlett notes that Oecolampadius speaks of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper even more than Bucer does. Whether he speaks of the Spirit more or less than Zwingli or Bullinger is not to be conjectured here, but what may be fruitfully conjectured is that he speaks of the Spirit *differently* than either Zwingli or Bullinger. For the Zurich reformers, that which is spiritual and that which is material are wholly and utterly distinct. That which is material, whether consecrated or not, simply cannot bear that which is spiritual. The Spirit's effect upon the soul is immediate, needing no "vehicle," as Zwingli puts it. Oecolampadius, however, seems less skittish about taking the sacraments to be *organae* – instruments, or implements – of the Holy Spirit. Like Zwingli and Bullinger, Bucer and Calvin, Oecolampadius

---

842 In 1530 Oecolampadius generated a response to friend and colleague Philip Melanchthon's study of patristic teachings about the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Oecolampadius prepared his response, *Quid de Eucharistia Veteres tum Graeci tum Latini senserint, Dialogus*, as a dialog between himself and a certain "Nathanael," a pseudonym for Melanchthon himself. Early on in the dialog, Oecolampadius inserts a series of letters: the first is an open letter composed by Melanchthon and addressed to Oecolampadius, first published in April 1529; the second, Oecolampadius' response; the third, a lengthy address of Melanchthon's to Myconius in which he, Melanchthon, rehearses his interpretation of several patristic sources.

843 "And the amazing thing is that Bucer speaks less of the presence of Christ in the Supper through the Spirit than Oecolampadius" (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 129. But is this so amazing? See discussion of Bucer below, which questions the assumption of the robustness of Bucer's sacramental pneumatology.

844 See discussion of Zwingli and Bullinger above.


846 See Oecolampadius, *Quid de eucharistia, Dialogus*, K 3r and 3v. See also Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 344, citing *Quid de eucharista, Dialogus*, D 8b, G 7b, and L 7a.
emphasizes that the sacraments do not have an intrinsic power. They are not efficacious of themselves, but their efficacy belongs to the Spirit, who may well use them as vehicula. In this sense, Oecolampadius, unlike Zwingli, allows for an "encounter with the reality signified" by the signs, signs which are emphatically non nudum. As Hazlett suggests, Oecolampadius bolsters this notion of an encounter with the reality signified with his emphasis on the sursum corda: the lifting up of hearts to heaven, where Christ is, incarnate, seated at the right hand of God.

847 See Oecolampadius, De genuina verborum domini, H 5r. See Oecolampadius, Quid de eucharistia, Dialogus, D 8b and K 2b.

848 See Oecolampadius, De genuina verborum domini, D 7v. See also Quere, Melanthon's Christum Cognoscere, 314, with reference to Oecolampadius, Quid de eucharistia, Dialogus, K 2b-3b. Also Quere, Melanthon's Christum Cognoscere, 343, with reference to K 3a. See also Oecolampadius, Antisyngramma ad Sueuos 1526(?), I 3b at A (file downloaded from Google Books via the "Post Reformation Digital Library" housed at the H. Henry Meeter Center for Calvin Studies website: www.calvin.edu/meeter). This is Oecolampadius' response to the Syngamma of Brenz and the Swabians, which Brenz prepared in 1525 as a response to his De genuina verborum domini.

849 See Oecolampadius, Quid de eucharistia, Dialogus, D 8v and E 1r. In his consideration of Oecolampadius, Quere writes: "Discussing Irenaeus' distinction of two things—earthly and heavenly—in the Sacrament, Oecolampadius again introduces his functional view of Christ's presence as (his) benefit. He even says that the body of Christ is 'included' [complectitur] in the bread—immediately modified by 'in a sacramental way,' just as the unity of the earthly and heavenly is qualified by 'somehow' [quoddam]" (Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 328, citing Oecolampadius, Quid de eucharistia, Dialogus, M 3b: Complectitur autem sacramentali modo, ita ut duo haec unum quoddam sint). This is also an emphasis of Bucer and Calvin.

850 See Oecolampadius, De genuina verborum domini, B 4r, D 3r (here with reference to Chrysostom), and K 7v-8v (here including reference to Colossians 3). Oecolampadius is seemingly the progenitor of this characteristically Reformed emphasis. Farel seemingly obtained it from Oecolampadius, and Calvin from Farel, though it could be that Calvin encountered this notion in Oecolampadius' works first, appreciated this emphasis, and therefore found it agreeable in Farel's liturgy such that he appropriated Farel's expression for his own liturgy in Strasbourg (1542) and Geneva (1545). Interestingly, Zwingli seemingly appears never to have adopted this liturgical expression or concept in his arguments for his view of the Lord's Supper, an observation made also by Peter Stephens, "The Sacraments in the Confessions," 57. Oecolampadius' emphasis on the lifting up of hearts and minds is also evident in a confession he had been sketching at the time of his death. The document was perfected by his successor as Antistes of Basel, Oswald Myconius, and ratified by Basel's council in January 1534 at The First Confession of Basel. See James T. Dennison, Jr., "The Lausanne Articles (1536)," Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation, Volume 1, 1523-52, compiled with introductions by James T. Dennison, Jr. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008), 287, and for the text of the confession 287-96.
Calvin's thought and expression is akin to Oecolampadius', given their mutual, similar emphasis specifically on the person and work of the Holy Spirit in their discussions of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Insofar as they have been searched for the purposes of this study, neither the primary nor secondary literature of Oecolampadius' works suggests that he ever speaks of the Holy Spirit as the *vinculum* between Christ and his own, who then affords the *communicatio* of his flesh and blood as spiritual food for the spiritual journey. Oecolampadius' works do bear reference—though scant reference—to the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament and its efficacy as *organanum*, *vehicula*. (In fact, in his use of these terms in proximity to one another, Oecolampadius' argument is not unlike Calvin's eventual argument presented to Bullinger in the 1540s.) While it would be imprudent to consider Oecolampadius' works as the *source* of Calvin's emphasis, it is seemingly not imprudent to consider them a *prospective resource* for some of Calvin's emphases. It could very well be that, to some extent, Calvin appropriated Oecolampadius' emphasis on the person and work of the Holy Spirit with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as his own. Calvin himself breathlessly identified the thought of Oecolampadius with that of Zwingli in the late 1530s and early 1540s in his *Petit traicté*. Could it be that this was a political identification—for the purpose of better positioning his own view of the sacrament among the "diverse opinions" he was commissioned to address? Since before him Luther and Bucer had identified the views of the Basel and Zurich reformers,

---

851 See Oecolampadius, *De genuina verborum domini*, D 7r. See also Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere*, 314, with reference to *Quid de eucharistia*, *Dialogus* K 2b-3b.

852 See discussion of Calvin and Bullinger in Chapters 2 and 8 of this study, especially of Calvin's letter to Bullinger: Letter 880, "Calvinus Bullingero," 25 February 1547 (CO 12:482).
overlooking the subtle but significant differences in their expressions, might Calvin have opted seemingly to do the same in the hope of attaining a fresher, and therefore fairer, hearing for his own view? In this connection, may anything be inferred from the fact (also noted above) that in his 1539 letter to André Zébédée Calvin wrote "Zwingli [not Zwingli and Oecolampadius] had not grasped all the richness of what is given to the congregation in the Lord's Supper"? Both Oecolampadius and Calvin emphasize the person of the Holy Spirit, specifying this member of the Godhead to qualify, as it were, any use of the word "spiritual" or "spiritually" with respect to the person and work of the Spirit, not with respect to the antithesis of "corporeal" or "corporeally," "carnal" or "carnally." This, it seems, should not be overlooked when considering the thought of Calvin's contemporaries and its relation to Calvin's expressed doctrine.

6.5 Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1574)

Bullinger is perhaps best known as Zwingli's successor as Antistes of the church in Zurich, a role he assumed in 1531. Though he felt, and therefore bore, a burden of

---

853 Locher, "In Spirit and in Truth," in Zwingli's Thought, 20, citing the letter of Calvin to André Zébédée, Strasbourg, May 19, 1939 (emphasis added). Calvin does not include Oecolampadius in this charge, which is interesting, especially given Zachman's depiction of Calvin's uneven estimation of Zwingli and Oecolampadius: "Throughout his life, Calvin demonstrated more respect for Oecolampadius than for Zwingli, viewing Oecolampadius as the more learned, moderate, sober, and diligent of the two reformers. When Osiander wrote against the Swiss, Calvin made this protest to Melanchthon: 'For what good purpose could it serve to assault the Zwinglians every third line, and to attack Zwingli himself in such an unmannerly style; and not even to spare Oecolampadius, that holy servant of God, whom I wish he resembled, even in being half as good, in which case he would certainly stand far higher in my esteem than he does?" (see Zachman, John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian, 20, with reference to a letter of Calvin to Melanchthon, 21 January 1545; CO 12:11; in The Letters of John Calvin, trans. Jules Bonnet [New York: Franklin, 1972], 1:437-38).

854 For an excellent entry into the life, work, and thought of Bullinger, see Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575, ed. Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2004). Recent, primary studies include: Fritz Büscher, Heinrich Bullinger: Leben, Werk und Wirkung, Bands I and II (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich,
faithfully defending his predecessor's thought and work,855 he was a formidable scholar and independent thinker in his own right.856 Indeed, when he first met Zwingli in 1524, "the twenty-year-old prodigy confronted the established Reformer with an independent view of the Lord's Supper, one which gave Zwingli pause."857 According to a seminal study by Hans Georg vom Berg, Bullinger's doctrine of the Lord's Supper differs from Zwingli's in at least this:

The subject in the Lord's Supper is not, as in Zwingli and Hoen, the faithful or the congregation, but the present Christ who gives himself as he gave himself up in his passion, and therewith unites God's love and eternal life as closely and as thoroughly as iron and fire are bound together. . . . The Lord's Supper is not only a rite of thanksgiving and remembrance, in which the congregation re-presents in faith the gracious offering of Christ, but also a sacramental act of dedication and re-presentation, still a spiritual commemoration in faith, but such that the faithful remembering congregation has the passive receptive role, and the self-giving Christ is alone the active subject.858


856 Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 14. From the age of 14 to the age of 22, Bullinger was at the University of Cologne, a "bastion of the via antiqua," according to Gordon: "Although he did not officially study theology, his time in Cologne brought him a strong familiarity with the Dominican tradition of Thomas Aquinas and other scholastic writers" (Gordon, "Introduction," Architect of Reformation, 18; see also in the same book, Kurt Jacob Rüetschi, "Bullinger and the Schools," 217).

857 Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 14. Rorem cites an entry in Bullinger's diary that reads: "On Septenmber 12th, Zwingli shared his thoughts with me, how he viewed the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord. And I in good faith expounded to him my views, which I drew from the writings of the Waldensian brethren and the books of Augustine." Rorem comments: "Notice that Bullinger is clear that he had independent sources for his thought and that the meeting was a true exchange of views, not a young man being influenced by his elder." See also Steinmetz, "Calvin and His Lutheran Critics," 179-94; Davis, Clearest Promises, 169-70, 173-77; Timothy George, "John Calvin and the Agreement of Zürich (1549)," Calvin Studies 4 (1988), 25-40; Stephens, "The Sacraments in the Confessions," 75, in which Stephens discusses strong differences between the view of Zwingli and Bullinger, including Bullinger's espousing a "more positive relation of the outward and the inward" aspects of sacraments.

In 1566, Bullinger composed what would become a preeminent confession among churches of the Reformed tradition, *The Second Helvetic Confession*. In his discussion of the sacraments, found in chapters 19, 20, and 21, he never refers to the sacraments as means, instruments, organs, or implements. In chapter 19, though, he follows a paragraph entitled *Signs Take Name of Things Signified* with a paragraph entitled *The Sacramental Union*. Here Bullinger confesses:

Therefore the signs acquire the names of things because they are mystical signs of sacred things, and because the signs and the things signified are sacramentally joined together; joined together, I say, or united by a mystical signification, and by the purpose or will of him who instituted the sacraments. For the water, bread, and wine are not common, but holy signs. And he that instituted water in baptism did not institute it with the will and intention that the faithful should only be sprinkled by the water of baptism; and he who commanded the bread to be eaten and the wine to be drunk in the supper did not want the faithful to receive only bread and wine without any mystery as they eat bread in their homes; but that they should spiritually partake of the things signified, and by faith be truly cleansed from their sins, and partake of Christ.  

Here, as in the remainder of his discussion of the sacraments generally considered and his discussion of baptism, Bullinger employs the word "spiritually" though without qualifying its referent. In his discussion of the Lord's Supper, however, such qualification appears, and with robust expression. At the outset of the fifteen topics discussed in this chapter on the Lord's Supper, Bullinger declares the sacrament is "usually called a supper . . . because in it the faithful are spiritually fed and given drink." Further on he writes that in the supper the Lord reminds us, among other things, that he, the Lord, "now feeds us with his flesh, and gives us his blood to drink,


which, being received spiritually by true faith, nourish us to eternal life.” In the immediately following paragraph, The Sign and Thing Signified, Bullinger says the same but with specific qualification:

Therefore the faithful receive what is given by the ministers of the Lord, and they eat the bread of the Lord and drink of the Lord's cup. At the same time by the work of Christ through the Holy Spirit they also inwardly receive the flesh and blood of the Lord, and are thereby nourished unto life eternal. For the flesh and blood of Christ is the true food and drink unto life eternal; and Christ himself, since he was given for us and is our Savior, is the principal thing in the Supper, and we do not permit anything else to be substituted in his place.

Bullinger bolsters this claim in the paragraphs that follow, on the topics Spiritual Eating of the Lord and Christ as Our Food Sustains Us in Life respectively:

There is also a spiritual eating of Christ's body; not such that we think that thereby the food itself is to be changed into spirit, but whereby the body and blood of the Lord, while remaining in their own essence and property, are spiritually communicated to us, certainly not in a corporeal but in a spiritual way, by the Holy Spirit, who applies and bestows upon us these things which have been prepared for us by the sacrifice of the Lord's body and blood for us, namely, the remission of sins, deliverance, and eternal life; so that Christ lives in us and we live in him, and he causes us to receive him by true faith to this end that he may become for us such spiritual food and drink, that is, our life.

For even as bodily food and drink not only refresh and strengthen our bodies, but also keeps them alive, so the flesh of Christ delivered for us, and his blood shed for us, not only refresh and strengthen our souls, but also preserve them alive, not in so far as they are corporeally eaten and drunken, but in so far as they are communicated unto us spiritually by the Spirit of God, as the Lord said: “The bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh” (John 6:51), and “the flesh” (namely what is eaten bodily) “is of no avail; it is the spirit that gives life” (v. 63). And: “The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.”

---

861 Cochrane, ed., Reformed Confessions, 284. Presumably Zwingli would not have sanctioned such a confession, given the understanding of something corporeal, Christ's flesh and blood, being received spiritually.

862 Cochrane, ed., Reformed Confessions, 284.

Presumably Zwingli would not have sanctioned such a confession, given the expressions that something corporeal, Christ's flesh and blood, is received spiritually, that is, "by the Holy Spirit." Furthermore, as vom Berg has noted, Bullinger maintains that Christ, not the congregation, is the active subject in the celebration of the sacrament, and the congregation is the passive recipient of what is offered. So by the 1560s, Bullinger's expression has moved well beyond Zwingli's and is, in fact, more like that of Calvin's, though, again, Bullinger stops short of declaring the sacrament an instrument, a means of grace in the strong sense.

In the mid 1540s, Calvin and Bullinger strove to formulate a statement of agreement on the Lord's Supper, as much for political as for theological reasons. The agreement, Consensio mutua in re sacramentaria ministrorum Tigurinae ecclesiae, et D. Ioannis Calvini ministri Genevensis ecclesiae, iam nunc ab ipsis autoribus edita, was drawn up in May 1549, edited in August 1549, and finally printed in February or March 1551. As noted in chapter two above, in their correspondence prior to the development of the actual articles of consensus, Calvin repeatedly asserts that the

---

864 See the discussion of Zwingli above.

865 All of this is consistent with Bullinger's expression in his 1556 Summa christenlicher Religion (Zurich). Gordon summarizes Bullinger's doctrine there in this way: In the meal, "[t]he believer receives the body of Christ in a spiritual manner, for although Christ had a human body and suffered physically on the cross, he, in the classic Zwinglian formulation, is now physically at the right hand of the Father. His presence in the world, therefore, cannot be through any visible form, but in the hearts of the faithful alone, to whom, through the Holy Spirit, he communicates all the benefits of his 'holy body' and suffering" (Gordon, "Bullinger's Vernacular Writings: Spirituality and the Christian Life," Architect of Reformation, 130).

sacraments, as signs of things signified, are instruments, and just as repeatedly points to the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit. In this regard, says Calvin, "There is a union complementary with the thing figured, lest the sign be empty, because that which the Lord represents in a sign he effects at the same time, and executes in us by the power of his Spirit." According to Calvin, because of the *virtus* of the Spirit, in the Supper, the souls of the faithful are truly fed by the body and blood of Christ. In his correspondence with Calvin, Bullinger admits the significance of the Holy Spirit, but persistently with respect to faith, not with respect to the media of the sacraments themselves as Calvin does. Also, he highlights "the self-sufficiency and autonomy of God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit via repeated uses solus and unus, tanquam and quodammodo when speaking of the efficacy of the sacraments." It appears, then, that there is perhaps some development in Bullinger's thought by the time he prepares *The Second Helvetic Confession* of 1566, and it appears that the development tends in the direction of Calvin's pneumatological expression.

---


868 *CO* 12: 481, concerning Christ's "presence" in heaven and with respect to the Supper: "Abest enim Christus a coena quoad oculos, quoad omnes corporis sensus, quoad locum. Nam in coelo est eius corpus. Coena peragitur in terries. Longa distantia. Sed est piis animis per spiritus sui virtutem, quia non impedit Christi distantia, quominus suos mirabiliter pascat..." And 482, concerning the "analogy" of the Supper: "In coena analogia est quam describis inter panem ac corpus Christi, inter sanguinem et vinum. Unio est spiritualis nostra cum Christo, qua fit ut vere ipso animae nostrae pascantur." See also *CO* 12: 488.

869 E.g., for Calvin, see reference to *CO* 7:701-02 above.

870 See also the discussion of Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 43.

871 Bierma (with reference to a study of Rohls), in his study of the Heidelberg Catechism, suggests that the pneumatology of the Lord's Supper expressed in the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) accords with Calvin's pneumatology, but "not in a manner unique to Calvin." He then proceeds to
The actual articles of agreement in the *Consensio mutua*, in their original and published versions, demonstrate the early contrast between Calvin and Bullinger's thought, and thus the apparent "development" of Bullinger's thought in the direction of Calvin's. That is to say, in the original articles, which were reflective of Bullinger's—or Zurich's—thought rather than Calvin's, the Holy Spirit is confessed as operative, not with respect to faith and the sacraments as Calvin would have it, but with respect to faith alone, as Bullinger would. As quoted above, *The Second Helvetic Confession* confesses the Spirit as operative, but not specifically in relation to faith—which is not to say that it confesses the Spirit operative apart from faith, but that it allows for a more "instrumental" understanding of the sacrament itself, given the work, or efficacy, of the Spirit. This is most clearly expressed in the paragraph *Christ as Our Food Sustains Us in Life*, as quoted above, though even here the degree to which Bullinger allows for an "instrumental" understanding of the sacrament is less than the degree to which Calvin in fact confesses it. Bullinger could not be brought to the use of the word *exhibere* with...
respect to the sacraments, at least not as Calvin and Bucer, much less Melanchthon, employed it.\footnote{873}{This is evident in Bullinger's 1534 commentary on 1 Corinthians as well, where the term does not appear in his discussion of 1 Corinthians 11, given the heading De Eucharistia. See also Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 49.}

Given that the trajectory of Bullinger's thought in the mid-1540s diverged from Calvin's at that time, and that Bullinger's thought in the mid-1560s prospectively allows for a view seemingly more compatible with that of Calvin, one cannot help but wonder if the "influence" of how to speak of the Spirit with respect to the sacrament flowed from Geneva to Zurich, rather than from Zurich to Geneva.\footnote{874}{This is not to bespeak the significance of research that has demonstrated the extent to which Bullinger was a formidable student of the church who developed his own view of the sacraments independent of interaction with Zwingli. When he was appointed Zwingli's successor, however, as Antistes of Zurich, he certainly felt compelled to uphold and defend Zwingli's view, at least for a time. See, e.g., Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger.}

Again, even in his correspondence with Calvin prior to the Consensio mutua, the accent of Bullinger's expressions regarding the Holy Spirit is different than Calvin's, perhaps bearing out this theory.

Calvin and Bullinger likely first met in Basel in 1536,\footnote{875}{Büsser, Heinrich Bullinger, 118.} at the time that The First Helvetic Confession was being formulated. Bullinger penned the majority of this confession. Though Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito are largely responsible for its articles on the sacraments,\footnote{876}{See below.} Bullinger certainly would have been party to their expression given his prominence in the Protestant church of the Swiss Confederation and his ownership of the confession otherwise. As indicated below, these articles bear not one mention of the Holy Spirit.

---

\footnote{873}{This is evident in Bullinger's 1534 commentary on 1 Corinthians as well, where the term does not appear in his discussion of 1 Corinthians 11, given the heading De Eucharistia. See also Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 49.}

\footnote{874}{This is not to bespeak the significance of research that has demonstrated the extent to which Bullinger was a formidable student of the church who developed his own view of the sacraments independent of interaction with Zwingli. When he was appointed Zwingli's successor, however, as Antistes of Zurich, he certainly felt compelled to uphold and defend Zwingli's view, at least for a time. See, e.g., Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger.}

\footnote{875}{Büsser, Heinrich Bullinger, 118.}

\footnote{876}{See below.}
Although Bullinger and Calvin may have met early on, it appears that they had little to do with one another until the mid-1540s, when correspondence ensued in anticipation of the *Consensio mutuae*. The two reformers exchanged letters but a few times in the mid-1530s, and then concerning the Genevan ministers' response to Caroli's charge of Arianism (48 and 52), the persecution of Protestants in France (53), the difficult situation in Geneva (61) and Calvin and Farel's departure (70 and 72). By the late 1530s, Calvin had availed of himself at least Bullinger's commentary on Romans, inspecting it if only for the sake of being able to compliment the work of his Zurich contemporary.

In 1534, Bullinger published a commentary on 1 Corinthians, which Calvin may or may not have perused. Given his and Bullinger's presence in Basel in 1536 at the time the *First Helvetic Confession* was prepared, perhaps Calvin did consult the section *De Eucharistia* in Bullinger's commentary, in hope of attaining a greater understanding of the sacramental views being accommodated in a single confession. Perhaps. In this discussion of 1 Corinthians 11, Bullinger does in fact appeal to the person and work of the Holy Spirit with regard to the sacrament, but, interestingly, most richly in a paragraph that opens with a reference to *Ioann. Oecolamp. in Dialogo*. In this context he emphasizes that the *efficacia* of the sacrament resides in the heart alone of the

---


believer, *operatio spiritu sancti*. As in his correspondence with Calvin a decade later, 
Bullinger stresses (along Zwingli's line) the *im*-mediate work of God the Spirit, that is, independent of any media, apart from anything material. Unlike Oecolampadius in his *Dialogus*, Bullinger does not refer to the sacraments as *vehicula*, not even *vehicula* of the Spirit.  

So, while there is some resonance to the terminology employed by Calvin and Bullinger, ultimately their "instrumental" take on the Lord's Supper begins and remains worlds apart. This, however, is not to suggest that Calvin's view of, or emphasis on, the person and work of the Holy Spirit could not be an assimilation of Bullinger's contemporaneous expressions. It could be. And yet it is not an exact assimilation, not conceptually anyway, since Calvin's end for his emphasis is a strongly instrumental understanding of the sacrament, and Bullinger's a non-instrumental one.

6.6 Martin Bucer (1491-1551) and Wolfgang Capito (c. 1478-1541)

Exactly where or when Calvin might have been introduced to the thought of Martin Bucer is impossible to say. It is certain, however, that the learned in Paris were attending to Bucer's writings by the late 1520s. In 1529 he dedicated his *Commentary on the Psalms* to the French Dauphin Francis de Valois—"the great hope of French reform-minded humanists and Protestants"—not least as a means of increasing its circulation in France and thus as a "discreet means of propagating evangelical ideas" there. By 1534 his ideas had attained such significance that he, Bucer, "suddenly

---

880 See the discussion above of Oecolampadius.
became an important piece on the chessboard of European diplomacy, especially as seen from the Île de Paris," important enough that the Bishop of Avranches in Normandy and Doctor of the so-called Sorbonne, Robert Ceneau, saw fit to publish a refutation of his ideas to assuage their influence.  

Scholars of the development of Bucer's doctrine of the Lord's Supper agree that his two primary writings of 1534—the *Bericht auss der Heyligen Geschriift* and the *Defensio adversus axioma catholicum*—mark the culmination of Bucer's gradual shift from a predominantly "Zwinglian" view of the sacrament to a "Bucerian" view, imbued with his thicker, intentionally conciliating expressions and rhetoric. According to Ian Hazlett, Bucer's initial expositions of the Lord's Supper, such as *De caena dominica* (1524), betray a heavy reliance on the thought of Luther, even as they reveal an early appropriation of the thought of Zwingli, as in *Grund und Ursach* of the same year.

---

881 Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 270. Hazlett notes that Bucer's discussions of the Lord's Supper are occasioned by psalms texts which mention sacrifice. Thus, questions of "real presence" and the interpretation of the Words of Institution do not figure in.

882 Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking." 384 and 387. According to Hazlett, that the Bishop of Avranches took on Bucer is "an indicator of the renown, or notoriety of Bucer among French Churchmen."

883 In BDS 5:119-258. The *Bericht* is ultimately a vindication of infant baptism, but includes sections on the Christian congregation as the body of Christ, on the sacraments generally considered, and on the Lord's Supper.


The Zwinglian, even "Karlstadtian," gloss of Bucer's thought in the mid-1520s\textsuperscript{888} inclined Luther to vilify Bucer with all whom he considered fanatics.\textsuperscript{889} In his response, \textit{Apologia} (1526), Bucer indicates how his own view is to be differentiated, even dissociated, from that of the Swiss, Zwingli in particular. According to Hazlett:

> While Bucer is still reluctant to integrate the sign and the reality signified, this concern to safeguard some form of actual encounter with the reality signified – again recalling Oecolampadius' 'sursum corda' idea – does stand in contrast to Zwingli, who, in his concern to have the sign and the thing signified be seen to be firmly held apart, located the reality almost exclusively on the Cross, lest the Sacrament be conceived as a means of grace.\textsuperscript{890}

Drawing perhaps on an expression of Johannes Brenz, a follower of Luther in Swabia, Bucer attempts his earliest formulas of conciliation: in the sacrament, while the mouth eats bread, "der geyst aber den leib christi durch den glauben."\textsuperscript{891} In these early

---

\textsuperscript{887} Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 83ff and 100ff. This document is really the collective publication of the Strasbourg ministers. Hazlett suggests Bucer "composed at least the sections on the Lord's Supper," given its style and patterns of expression. The document itself does not identify enumerated or categorized theological principles as some surveys suggest; so "the Holy Spirit" is not identified by the authors of \textit{Grund und Ursach} as a principle, though it is inferred as such by, e.g., Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 162; Ottomar Frederick Cypris, "Basic Principles: Translation and Commentary of Martin Bucer's \textit{Grund und Ursach}, 1524" (Th.D. thesis, Theological Seminary of New York, 1971), 39-40. Such inferences over-stretch Bucer's references to "spiritual" and "spiritually," which are not every qualified with specific reference to the third person of the Trinity.

\textsuperscript{888} Hazlett notes that Bucer had received Zwingli's letter to Matthew Alber in 1525, and this is likely the source of his Zwingianesque expressions. Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 99ff.


\textsuperscript{890} Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 137.

\textsuperscript{891} Stephens writes: "Bucer would adopt the phrase of Brenz 'the mouth of faith enjoys the body of Christ, the mouth of the body the bread'" (Stephens, \textit{Holy Spirit}, citing Pollet, ed., \textit{Martin Bucer: Études sur la Correspondance}, 2 vols. [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958] 1.140.26-31). These lines are from a document on the Lord's Supper prepared by the ministers of Strasbourg and sent to those of Augsburg, Luther in particular. It reads: "Zum dritten, das er die wort, mundlich und leiblich, behuhrhet und wil gebraucht haben, do wirs, miszvorstandt zuvorhutten bey dem wort warhaft bleiben
formulations, Bucer, like Zwingli, suggests believers enjoy the body of Christ "spiritually," where "spiritually" is not specifically qualified with regard to the person and work of the Holy Spirit, but is applied more generally to mean "non-corporeally," "not physically."892 Despite the fact that Bucer ascertained some difference between his thought and that of the Swiss, in autumn 1529 he allied with Zwingli and Oecolampadius at the Marburg Colloquy, where he was given little opportunity to voice such difference.893 Already by then, Bucer had read Luther's definitive *Vom Abendmahl Christi, Bekenntnis*, presumably soon after it was released in 1528, and it was having its effect on Bucer's refreshed understanding of Luther's doctrine, particularly given his newly expressed concept of *unio sacramentalis*.894 Thus Bucer increasingly, though

lassen, und reden, wie Herr Johann Brendz, ders doch mit D. Luthern furnehmen halte, der mundt des glaubens niesse den leib Christi, der mundt des leibs das brot, so stimmen wir in dieser sach nit mit im."

See also Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 129ff. According to Hazlett, in his letter to Martin Germanus of 1526, Bucer writes: 'Also glauben wir, das alle christen, so diesen wort glauben, uber dem tisch de Herrn mit empfahung des brots, und auch ob schon kein brot da ware, die wort aber sunst bedacht und glaubt wurden, dn waren leip cristi entfahen und esse, . . . Aber durchs wort, und also esse der mundt nur das brodt, der geyst aber den leip Cristi durch den glauben.' [citation given – Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," appendix notes 36n154]. Notice that *geyst* in the quotation in the body of the text refers to the spirit of the participant, not the Holy Spirit. Such formulations are presumably the object of Zwingli's denunciation, that is, those whom he makes his opponents in his *De vera et falsa religione* when he writes: "Nor do I think we have to listen to those who, seeing that the view mentioned is not only crude but even frivolous and impious, make this pronouncement: 'We eat, to be sure, the true body flesh of Christ, but spiritually' ("On True and False Religion," LWZ 3:214).

892 In *Apologia*, "spiritaliter" is employed, but clearly in tandem with "non corporaliter, non carnaliter, non physikos." Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 134ff.


894 Hazlett, "Eucharistic Communion: Impulses and Directions in Martin Bucer's Thought," in *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community*, ed. David F. Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 73-74. Also Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 240ff. Hazlett astutely observes the following, however: "For Bucer then, the notion of sacramental union was essentially a fresh means of understanding the significative relationship between the bread and Christ's body; this can hardly have corresponded to Luther's actual meaning" (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 246). In his Introduction to Bucer's *Defensio adversus axioma catholicum* 1534, Hazlett writes: "It was Luther's use of the concept of a 'unio sacramantalis' as explained by the figure of a 'synecdoche' that Bucer believed would help cut the Gordian knot and end the unseemly strife" between
judiciously, distinguished his thought from that of Zwingli in hope of ultimate conciliation between the followers of Zwingli and the followers of his opponent, Luther.

This is evident come 1530, when Charles V summoned a diet at Augsburg. Melanchthon presented a confession on behalf of the German princes, Bucer and Capito on behalf of the south-German cities of Strasbourg, Lindau, Constance, and Memmingen, and Zwingli on his own behalf. In the wake of this event, Bucer and Melanchthon discovered common theological ground, a plot of sacramental properties, if you will, on which they labored for more than half of a decade to build a formula of agreement, the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. 1536: This was the same year in which Bucer and his elder Strasbourg colleague Wolfgang Capito participated in the Swiss Confederation's preparation of the Second Basel Confession, better known as the First Helvetic Confession; this was the same year in which Bucer republished his commentary on the gospels, this time with his retractationis of previously expressed sacramental views. In Hazlett's reading, Bucer's mature eucharistic conception is characterized by a dualism or parallelism: in Communion there is a double eating; just as the mouth eats the bread, so the mouth of faith feeds off the body of Christ; in the Lord's Supper, there are 'duae res' (two realities), one earthly and one heavenly or spiritual. There is therefore a synthesis between the offering of representative bread by the minister and the self-offering of Christ himself, a synthesis also grasped in the formula 'unio sacramentalis'. And so this essential parallelism is conveyed in the word typically, though not uniquely, employed by Bucer, namely 'exhibit' ('exhibere'). This embraces both the figurative representation and the actual offering of Christ's body.896

895 From the discussion above, note that Hazlett suggests Bucer may have obtained this emphasis from Brenz.

As a consequence of Bucer and Capito's subscription to the Wittenberg Concord and the publication of Bucer's retractions, the Swiss regarded especially Bucer with grave suspicion, though they did afford both Capito and Bucer opportunities to defend their seemingly concessive position. One such opportunity came in September 1537, at the Synod of Bern, the same synod for which Calvin, Farel, and Viret prepared their *Confessio fidei de eucharistia*, the same synod at which Bucer and Capito ratified that *Confessio*.

When Calvin left France in July 1536 with his brother, Antoine, and half-sister, Marie, in the realization that he would not soon, if ever, be returning, his initial destination was *Strasbourg*, by then renowned as the provenance of Bucer's conciliating doctrine. Calvin was not on his way to Zurich, nor to Wittenberg—readily recognized as the provenances of the theologies of Zwingli (and Bullinger), and Luther and Melanchthon, respectively. He was forced to pass through Geneva because of military activity along the most direct route from Paris to Strasbourg, and he intended to bed down there but one night. So why Strasbourg? Was it the prospect of making inroads with publishers there? But then why not Basel, as before? Was it the growing community of French refugees there? Did the presence of some prominent reform-minded folk from France draw him there? Was it Bucer himself, given what Calvin had thus far assessed of Bucer's theological disposition? Again, why Strasbourg? Ultimately this question cannot be given a definitive answer, as Calvin does not betray one. And yet it cannot be overlooked that Calvin must have already sensed some affinity with
Bucer and Capito given that it was to them that he had once submitted a manuscript, seeking their advice about its publication.  

So what of evidence of Calvin's affinity to Bucer and/or Capito's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, early on and with regard to the role of the Holy Spirit in particular? Or, to reverse the priority of subjects in this question, Is there anything particular in Bucer and Capito's primary expositions of the Lord's Supper in the early 1530s that would suggest that Calvin had adopted their thought, that he had assimilated it to some degree? An answer to such a question seemingly runs along this line: Calvin's early doctrine of the Lord's Supper is not contrary to that of Bucer and Capito's contemporaneous doctrine, and on some points is a perfect parallel, perhaps because it is a perfect assimilation. But with regard to an emphasis on the person and work of the Holy Spirit, Calvin's expression is distinct and distinctly robust in comparison to that of Bucer and Capito. A pointed survey of significant expositions, taken from especially the early 1530s and prepared by either or both Bucer and Capito, bears this out.

Given their brevity, confessional statements prepared by the Strasbourg reformers afford an easy entry into the essentials of their thought, though it must be borne in mind that in this era such statements were prepared as much for political reasons as for theological ones. This means their expressions may be deliberately

---

897 In 1534, Calvin sent the first version of his Psychopannychia to Strasbourg, to Capito in particular. See de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 166. See also Muller, "From Zürich or from Wittenberg?" Calvin Theological Journal, forthcoming. Muller cites a letter of Capito to Calvin, 1534, in CO 10/2, col. 45-46. Also a letter of Calvin to Pignaeus, 1 Oct. 1538, in CO 10/2, col 260.

898 This is particularly so between Calvin and Bucer and their employment of the term exhibere. See footnote 58 above regarding this term.
bold—or not—depending on their possible political consequence. In 1530, as noted above, Bucer and Capito prepared the Tetrapolitan Confession for the Augsburg Diet. In its final version, in the articles "Of the Sacraments," "Of Baptism," and "Of the Eucharist," the words Spirit, spirit, and spiritually appear not at all. In its original version, the article "Of the Eucharist," likely prepared by Capito, declared "Christ the Lord is truly in the Supper and gives his true body truly to eat and his blood truly to drink, but especially to the spirit, through faith." In this article, which is key theologically and thus politically, the referent of "spirit" is the human spirit, the participant's spirit, or soul, which (according to the same chapter of the confession) receives "nourishment unto eternal life." This appears to be a reworking of what

899 This is especially true of, e.g., the Tetrapolitan Confession, prepared for the Augsburg Diet of 1530. Summoned by the newly appointed Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, the aim of the Diet was to mollify relations within the empire and with the Roman Catholic Church in order that there might be a united empire standing against the Turks.

900 According to Dennison, this confession is the first "Reformed" confession, being neither Lutheran, though Protestant, nor even Zwinglian (Dennison, introduction to "The Tetrapolitan Confession (1530)," in Reformed Confessions, 139). The original Latin and German texts, in parallel, are found in Robert Stupperich, ed., Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften (Band 3): Confession Tetrapolitana und die Schriften des Jahres 1531 (1969), 14-185. Standard English translations may be found in Dennison, Reformed Confessions (2008), 138-71; and Cochrane, ed., Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century (WJK), 51-89.

901 Chapters 16, 17, and 18 of the Tetrapolitan Confession respectively.


903 In his exposition of Capito's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, James Kittelson notes a letter Capito sent to the mayor of Basel, Jacob Meyer, in 1532, "a long letter he intended for publication: Therefore the Scriptures say, 'The Lord took bread, broke it, etc.' Here bread is meant; that we all know. this he broke and gave to his disciples, and then he said, 'This is my body;' namely that which he broke. Therefore the Lord gave two things, the bread and his body, and he commanded to eat them both, the bread as body. Such a statement might have been acceptable to Luther. But, just as in the first version of the Tetrapolitana, Capito added something else: 'But his body as food for souls.' Faith remained the prerequisite for Christ's presence in the sacrament" (Kittelson, Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to
might have been picked up from Brenz, as noted above, namely, that while the mouth eats bread, "der geyst aber den leib christi durch den glauben." Der geyst, the spirit, the soul—of the participant. Were this referred to as a "spiritual" partaking, "spiritual" would be well taken to mean "not physically," "non-corporeally," but not necessarily to mean something God in Christ accomplishes specifically by the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Nearly six years later, in January and February 1536, Bucer and Capito assisted delegates of the Swiss Confederation, gathered in Basel, to prepare the confederacy's first unifying confession: The First Helvetic Confession, also known as the Second Confession of Basel. (Incidentally, Calvin was in Basel at this time, likely rubbing shoulders with these delegates even as he sought a publisher for his first theological work, the 1536 *Institutio*.) Though not formally delegates themselves, Bucer and Capito are taken to have influenced especially the three articles on the sacraments: "Of the Power and Efficacy of the Sacraments," "Baptism," and "The Eucharist." Strikingly, a derivative of *spiritus* or *Geist* appears but once in these sacramental

---

Reformer [Leiden: Brill, 1975], 160. Kittelson's conclusion does not necessarily seem to follow, however, since for Capito as for Calvin, in Calvin's words, "It is one thing to offer and another to receive." Christ's offer of his body and blood, but the power of the Holy Spirit, is objective. Christ is present. Faith does not make Christ present anymore than lack of faith makes Christ absent. Faith is the instrument by which that which is objectively present is received, but if that instrument is lacking, then the objectively offered gift simply cannot be received. Interestingly, Zwingli was "critical of the Tetrapolitan Confession, with its reference to Christ's truly giving his true body as food for the soul" (Stephens, "The Sacraments in the Confessions," 57, with reference to Zwingli in Huldreich Zwingli's *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Emil Egli et al., (Zurich: 1905) 11:340-41.

---

904 See footnote 891 above.

905 The First Confession of Basel was ratified in 1534 and binding upon only that city. This confession, The First Helvetic Confession, was prepared principally by Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575), Simon Grynaeus (1493-1541), Oswald Myconius (1488-1552), Leo Jud (1482-1542), and Kaspar Megander (1495-1545). For the First Helvetic, or Second Basel, Confession: A new English translation of the Latin text is found in Dennison, *Reformed Confessions*, 342-352. A standard English translation of Leo Jud's expanded German text may be found in Cochrane, e.d., *Reformed Creeds*, 97-112. Since Calvin would not have been able to read the German text, and likely only availed of himself the Latin text, the Latin text is considered here.
passages, in the article "Of the Power and Efficacy of the Sacraments," in the phrase
"spiritual things [are received] by faith."  

In the period between the preparation of these two confessions, Bucer and Capito were engaged in rigorous theological reflection on the sacraments, reflection that was often penned and eventually printed in ink. While these two seminal confessions do not bear witness to the role of the Holy Spirit with regard to believers' participation in the Lords' Supper as Calvin eventually expounds it, some expressions in the Strasbourg reformers' intervening works gesture in this direction. Such gestures may suggest that the speech patterns of Bucer and Capito might have embraced more explicit sacramental pneumatology than their confessional writings betray. This, of course, is speculation, but not unjustifiable speculation.

The first exposition of such significance appeared in 1532. In January of that year, the city of Bern (which had given itself over from Roman Catholicism to "Zwinglian" reform as a consequence of the Bern Disputation of 1528) held a Synod for the purpose of discerning the city's theological disposition, whether "Zwinglian" or

---


"Lutheran-leaning," or, as Amy Nelson Burnett would indeed have it, whether "Zwinglian" or "Bucerian." 908 Capito presided over the synod, and at its end, produced "an important document entitled simply the *Berner Syodus*, which was a cross between a confession of faith and an ecclesiastical ordinance." 909 In its chapters on the sacraments, Capito explicitly mentions the Holy Spirit and often. 910 Two occasions are worthy of citation here:

**Chapter nineteen: The holy sacraments and baptism in general**

. . . . the sacraments are the mysteries of God, or the mysteries of the churches of Christ. By these external means, Christ is presented to believers, He being present in the Holy Spirit, filling and imbuing the heart. Therefore, we pray the Almighty that He would make the use of the sacraments among us to be a truly divine operation, not leaving it a human undertaking. Thus the great mystery of God in the flesh will always live and grow in us at the same time that He is presented externally through the sacrament.

**Chapter twenty-two: The Lord's Supper**

. . . . The breaking of the bread is no bare ceremony, but a sacramental action in which there is presented to believers the body and blood of Christ Jesus, who died for us. This body and blood of Christ feeds us and gives us to drink, albeit

---

908 Burnett presents a compelling argument against the long-held assumption that "Lutheran" is the legitimate moniker for one particular theological faction in Bern during the 1530s and 40s. According to Burnett, this faction is not Lutheran but "Buceran." Scholars' persistent identity of this faction as "Lutheran" is in keeping with the seminal work of Carl Hundeshagen, *Die Conflicte des Zwingianismus, Luthertums und Calvinismus in der Bernischesn Landeskirche von 1532-1558* (Bern, 1842). See Burnett, "The Myth of the Swiss Lutherans," 45-70.

909 Bruening, *Calvinism's First Battleground*, 65. For more, see also Kittelson, *Wolfgang Capito*, 159ff.

910 This accords with his rich mention of the Holy Spirit in previous articles, where he declares that "The Father still speaks to us today by His Son, who through the Holy Spirit dwells in our hearts," and that it is by the "inward operation of the Holy Spirit" that we partake of grace in Christ, and that "The Spirit views the work and miracles of Christ in terms of the inward progress of grace and the spiritual operations of Christ in the heart," and that "by the same Holy Spirit" by whom Christ was born, we are made "children of God, if beyond the both which is from flesh and blood we are also made new and heavenly people." For this reason, Locher declares that "Der Synodus steht in der Tradition nicht einer sacramentalen, sondern eniner pneumatologischen Frömmigkeit" (Gottfried W. Locher, "Die Sakramentslehre des Berner Synodus," *Der Berner Synodus von 1532: Edition und Abhandlungen zum Jubiläumsjahr 1982*, vol. 2 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988], 234, 236, and 239 respectively).
inwardly by the Holy Spirit, just as with the mouth the corruptible body feeds on the perishable bread and drinks the wine. . . .

Such expressions are not specifically replicated by Calvin, but a similarly repeated, explicit reference to the person and work of the Holy Spirit in the midst of expositions on the sacraments and the Lord's Supper is.

In April 1532, Strasbourg, at the hand of Bucer and his ministerial colleagues, subscribed to the Augsburg Confession at the Assembly of Protestant Estates in Schweinfurt. Acceptance of the confession was based on Melanchthon's *Apologia*

---

Confessionis Augustanae (1530), and "was accompanied with a further statement on sacramental doctrine, which was composed by Bucer." This "further statement" is The Schweinfurt Confession, never officially published and yet extant. The confession primarily concerns the Lord's Supper, in which Bucer once opposes leiblich and geistlich, but geistlich remains unqualified by Heilige Geist. Baptism figures in briefly, and features Bucer's nearly sole mention of the Holy Spirit, as part of the baptismal formula presented in Matthew 28:19.

As noted above, it is in 1534 that Bucer's doctrine seemingly comes into its own, evidenced by its expression in the Bericht auss der Heyligen Geschrift and the Defensio adversus axioma catholicum. Hazlett has devoted significant attention to these works. Given the primary interest of this study, reading his secondary studies is compelling not

---

912 Eventually, this is precisely the basis on which Calvin declares he "affirms" the Augsburg Confession: "My words are: in regard to the Confession of Augsburg my answer is, that (as it was published at Ratisbon) it does not contain a word contrary to our doctrine. If there is any ambiguity in its meaning, there cannot be a more competent interpreter than its author, to whom, as his due, all pious and learned men will readily pay this honor. To him I boldly appeal . . . ." And again, "We teach nothing at variance with the confession of Augsburg, and therefore they have no case for quarrelling so bitterly . . . . If there is any doubt as to this, we appeal to Philip (Melanchthon) who write it . . . . Let Philip, as ofte as it is thought proper, be called upon to explain his own meaning" (Ultima admonitio (1557), Tracts and Treatises 2:355 and 467 respectively). For further discussion see, Danièle Fischer, "Calvin et la Confession d' Augsbourg," in Calvinus ecclesiae Genevensis custos: Die Referate des Congrìs International des Recherches Calviniennes vom 6 bis 9 Sept 1982 in Genf, ed. Wilhelm H. Neuser (Frankfurt: Verlag Peter Lang, 1984), 245-71.

913 Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 358.


only for what they say, but especially for what they do not say. Regarding the *Bericht*, Hazlett notes that

for Bucer by now the issue of the presence of Christ in Communion goes far beyond fixing one's attention on the elements of bread and water, and pondering on the relationship between them and the body of Christ. It is within a much wider constellation of concepts that the matter is to be considered, namely faith, Christian community, the (mystical) body of Christ, ministry, the Holy Spirit, love, the promises of Christ edification and nurture, covenant, thanksgiving, remembrance, the Word of God, the church, and so on.\(^{917}\)

Interestingly, however, this is Hazlett's nearly sole reference to the person and work of the Spirit in his survey of Bucer's exposition.\(^{918}\) Indeed in his conclusion—in the penultimate sentence of his article—Hazlett sums Bucer's thought in this way: "In the eucharistic happening, then, the person of Christ himself ('Christus ipse') manufactures a *supernatural* synthesis of ways and means by which he transmits himself into the flesh, bones, and souls of those who wish to be joined with him."\(^{919}\)

*Supernatural*? If the Spirit is in fact so significant to his doctrine of the Lord's Supper—as some would claim—why then is so astute a reader as Hazlett inclined to say "supernatural" rather than "spiritual," with the referent being clearly the person and work of the Holy Spirit? Or is it that this simply is not characteristic of this work of Bucer's, given that he is attempting to set up his view over against that of the spiritualists, and to refer to the...

\(^{917}\) Hazlett, "Eucharistic Communion: Impulses and Directions," 73.

\(^{918}\) There are, admittedly, three others, but they are not relevant, at least not to the interest of this study. The first occurs in a sentence characterizing Anabaptist and "spiritualist thinking": "In some cases, even Scripture could be dropped, or at best relativized, in favour of the belief that the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the soul was direct and exclusive" (74). The second is Hazlett's paraphrase of Bucer's overall thought: "... but the church as the bride of Christ can act on his behalf in accordance with his Spirit and Word, just as she does in the forgiveness of sin" (76). And the third is a quotation of Bucer who is shoring his view against the error opposite that of the radical spiritualists: Bucer "emphasizes that he has never taught that *in se* the sacrament is an 'instrument, canal, or vessel of the grace and Spirit of God'" (Hazlett, "Eucharistic Communion: Impulses and Directions," 76, with reference to *BDS* 5:166).

\(^{919}\) Hazlett, "Eucharistic Communion: Impulses and Directions," 82, emphasis added.
Spirit might incite confusion, might diminish his intended distinction? In any case, Hazlett's lack of formidable, positive reference to the Holy Spirit regarding the efficacy of the sacraments is striking, and a perusal of the chapters of the Bericht concerning the Lord's Supper indicates that the nature of Bucer's references to the Spirit do not parallel the nature of Calvin's references.  

Bucer's Defensio, also of 1534, is likewise puzzling. Despite scholars' emphasis on Bucer as a "theologian of the Holy Spirit," that label hardly seems to hold—at least with respect to his doctrine of the Lord's Supper—when one considers a text such as the Defensio. However, it could be that since the Defensio is for Bucer "a key step on the tortuous road to the Wittenberg Concord of 1536," Bucer was cautious, lest a certain overemphasis on the sacramental role of the Spirit be construed as "spiritualism" by his watchful Wittenberg interlocutors. Bucer does indeed refer to the Holy Spirit, but to the Holy Spirit he does not refer the exhibitio or communicatio of Christ's "true body and blood." Likewise, Bucer mentions manducatio spiritualis, but does not qualify this

---


922 Ian Hazlett's recent critical edition of this text is prefaced by a thorough historical and theological introduction, also prepared by Hazlett. Strikingly, in his dissertation, Hazlett's survey of Bucer's discussion of the eucharist in the Defensio adversus axioma catholicum does not include a single mention of the Holy Spirit (Hazlett, "Development of Bucer's Thinking," 384-96).

923 Hazlett, "Introduction" to Defensio adversus axioma catholicum, xxii. Hazlett also notes that "since Ceneau attacks not only Zwingli, Oecolampadius, and Bucer on the issue [of the Lord's Supper], but Luther as well, accentuating their mutual disagreements, Bucer was provided with a golden opportunity to advertise his sacramental concord theology and advance it further" (Hazlett, "Introduction" to Defensio adversus axioma catholicum, xi; see also xxv).
with respect to the Holy Spirit, which makes it ambiguous, just as well taken to mean "non-corporeally," or "not carnally," as "by the Spirit."

In September 1536, Bucer published anew his gospels commentary, entitled *In Sacra Quatuor Evangelia, Ennarationes*. Its various changes included four sections headed with the term *Retractatio*: "retraction," or, to render it more moderately, "reconsideration." As in the *Defensio*, Bucer is adamant that the *signa exhibitiva* are *non nuda*. According to the fathers, these are sacramental signs, and as such they are exhibitive signs: the *id* is sisted with—such that the hands, so to speak, carry—what is

---

924 A *Retractatio de Coena Domini* is inserted into his commentary on Matthew 26:26; a *Retractatio* is inserted at the outset of his commentary on John; a *Retractatio* is inserted at the outset of his exposition of John 6:63; and, finally, a *Retractatio* is inserted into his *De sacro baptismate tractatio* found in his commentary on Matthew 3. Bucer eventually published "an enlarged German version of his retractions under the title *Corrections (Verbesserung)*" (Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times*, trans. Stephen E. Buckwalter [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004], 141).

signified. Christ himself is encountered in the sacrament, and his body and blood are se
nobis in sacra coena vere exhibere, "for the Lord himself said, 'hoc est corpus meum,
non hic est spiritus meus, virtus mea." Furthermore, he emphasizes that while the
confirmation and increase of faith is the work of Christ through the Holy Spirit, Christ uses the sacraments as instrumenta to this end:

Christ alone by his Spirit effects the whole of salvation in us, which he does not
by some alien power (virtute), but by his Spirit alone. However, to this very end
he uses with us the word, whether the visible word in sacraments or the audible
word in the Gospel. These offer and exhibit (adfert & exhibet) the remission of
sins, communion in him, and eternal life.

These, of course, are the very themes Calvin sounds in his doctrine, though Calvin's
repeated riff—which Bucer very nearly presents here—is that Christ accomplishes the
nourishment of souls with his body and blood "by the power of the Holy Spirit," or "by
the power of his Spirit." So, clearly Calvin's pneumatological view is compatible with,
perhaps even an assimilation of, Bucer's view, at least as Bucer presents it here in this
one, compact passage.

926 See footnote 925.

927 "... confirmare & augere fidem esse opus Christi per spiritum sanctum" (Bucer, "Retractatio
de Coena Domini" at Matthew 26, En Sacra Quator Evangelia, rendered as it appears in The Digital

928 "Efficit quidem omnem salutem in nobis unus Christus, idque nulla aliena virtute, sed suo
solius spiritui. Interim tamen ad id ipsum utitur ad nos suo verbo, tam visibili in sacramentis, quam
audibili in Evangelio. His remissionem peccatorum, communionem sui, & vitam aeternam adfert &
exhibet." (Bucer, "Retractatio de Coena Domini" at Matthew 26, En Sacra Quotor Evangelia, rendered as
it appears in The Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts: www.alexanderstreetpress.com) Stephens,
The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer, writes of this passage: For Bucer, "there is nothing
automatic about the sacrament. Its effectiveness comes not from the symbols, but from Christ acting
through the Holy Spirit. Not until now does Bucer link the work of the Holy Spirit unequivocally with the
elements, without making the primary reference to the work of the Spirit in the heart. The confirmation of
faith rests not on the power of the symbols themselves, but on Christ's power which is dispensed 'by his
Spirit through word and sacred symbols'" (Stephens, The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer,
255). "Unequivocally" is perhaps too strong a qualifier here.
Still, in discourse about the Lord's Supper, an emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit does not seem to be the priority for Bucer that it is for Calvin. This is perhaps understandably evident in the events and writings of 1530-36, in the arduous run-up to the formulation of the Wittenberg Concord. It is strikingly evident in Bucer's late *Confession on the Eucharist in Aphorisms* (1550), in which he speaks of the Spirit, but infrequently and not where or in ways one would expect given his statement above as well as his oft-presumed influence on Calvin in this regard. However, it is exceptionally evident in documents presented at the Synod of Bern in September 1537. As noted above, it is in the context of this synod that Calvin, Farel, and Viret presented their *Confessio fidei de eucharistia*, and that Bucer and Capito sanctioned that confession with their signatures.

929 In his dissertation, Hazlett notes, though regrettably without specific citation: "At Augsburg, Bucer rightly informed Melanchthon that he had always taught that Christ's body and its fruits are transmitted by the Spirit, but that he would be quite happy to substitute the word 'Word' for 'Spirit'" (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 345).


931 Aphorism 11 reads: "The Holy Spirit considered it insufficient to testify to us that we are granted the Spirit and merit of Christ and live by his intercession and working; he declares in addition that Christ himself is with us and dwells in our hearts and is our head, that we are in him and he in us, and he affirms that such communion in him is given to us and received by us by means of the sacrament of the eucharist. Therefore we too must declare and affirm these truths" ("Confession of the Eucharist," trans. Wright, 389). The Holy Spirit is conspicuous by absence in Aphorism 41, which reads: "As a result of these comments it will, I trust, be evident that it is in harmony with the divine Scripture and worthy of the reverence we owe to God and his Scriptures and the whole ancient Church for us to say (limiting ourselves to the words of the Lord, the apostle, and the primitive Church) that the true body and blood of the Lord, that is, Christ himself, God and man, are given and received, given indeed by the word and the symbols but received by faith; and that he is given and received in order that we may more fully abide and live in him and he in us" ("Confession of the Eucharist," trans. Wright, 394).
The 1537 Synod of Bern was called, in the first place, for the purpose of settling the ongoing dispute in Bern on a fitting doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In the immediate backdrop, too, was ongoing discussion about the Wittenberg Concord, which had been signed by Bucer and Capito but rejected by the Swiss Confederation, including Bern. Calvin, though of Geneva, a *combourgeoisie* (*Burgrecht*) associated with member cantons of the Swiss Confederation but not itself part of the Swiss Confederation, had already encountered Capito and Bucer at two meetings, one in Basel and another in Bern, concerned in part with Bucer and Capito's ratification of the Wittenberg Concord. These meetings were held in Basel in September, October, and November 1536, and were followed on in January 1537 with a letter to Luther. The letter contained an elaboration of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as expressed in the First Helvetic Confession; like that confession's articles on the Lord's Supper, the letter speaks of "spiritual" but not of the Holy Spirit. Still earnest for conciliation, Bucer

---

932 Bruening, *Calvinism's First Battleground*, 82-83.

933 Bruening, Chapter 2: "Politics in Vaud," in *Calvinism's First Battleground*, 23: "Historians of Switzerland are fond of pointing out – and it bears repeating here – that one must not think of the Swiss Confederation as anything like a modern nation-state. Member cantons maintained almost complete autonomy, and there was no central body with coercive authority. The Confederation's cohesion stemmed from a common desire for independence from imperial authority. Representatives would meet to discuss issues affecting all the cantons, but no decision made at Confederation diets was compulsory on the individual cantons. It was a federal system in the loosest possible sense, and the independence of the cantons very nearly led to the system's demise when religious conflict tore the cantons apart in the 1520s."

934 A meeting in Basel, 24 September 1536 and a synod in Bern, October 1536. Cf. detail in Bruening, *Calvinism's First Battleground*, 79; the "Chronology" of Calvin's early life according to his letters in *Ioannis Calvini Epistolae*, vol. 1, ed. C. Augustijn and F. P. van Stam, 33; and de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 29.

935 The city councils of Zurich, Bern, Basel, St. Gallen, Mulhouse, and Biel to Luther, as well as Basel, 12 January 1537: "So wurt der lib Christi von uns im nachtmaal warlich gäßen un sin blůt würt warlich getrunken, aber nitt so rouw und fleischlich, wie es die bäpstler bißhar gelert und fürgäben habend, nämlich das man in ässe substantzial, das ist lyblich und fleischlich, also das das brot in das
"successfully encouraged the Bernese to grant him a hearing in September 1537." He and Capito arrived with a short, sacramentally robust confession regarding the Lord's Supper, yet a confession that mentions the Holy Spirit not at all. Sometime later, at the same synod, the Genevan ministers Farel, Viret, and Calvin presented a confession concerning the Lord's Supper as well, the *Confessio fidei de eucharistia*. Taken to have been composed by Calvin, it, too, is sacramentally robust, centering its entire doctrine on the person and work of the Holy Spirit: Though Christ is in heaven and though we as pilgrims in mortality are neither included nor contained in the same space with him, yet the efficacy of his Spirit is limited by no bounds, but is able really to unite and bring together into one things that are disjoined in local space. Hence we acknowledge that his Spirit is the bond of our participation in him, [but such that] he really feeds us with the substance of the body and blood of the Lord to everlasting life, and vivifies us by participation in them.

---

936 Bruening, *Calvinism's First Battleground*, 82.

937 For the text in Latin and German parallel, see BDS 6.1:294-297. Amy Nelson Burnett writes of this confession: "Despite an initially unpromising situation [in Bern in September 1537], the Strasbourg theologians succeeded in persuading Bern's clergy to unite behind a confession on the Lord's Supper. The Strasbourgers confession taught that 'all of those who are in the congregation, approach the table, and receive the holy sacrament and do not pervert the Lord's word, but who believe it and celebrate it according to the Lord's institution, truly receive and eat the true body and the true blood of Christ together with the visible signs . . . not as a perishable food for the stomach, but as food for the soul too eternal life.' It should be noted that while this confession clearly went beyond Zwingli's symbolic and representational view of the sacrament, it was by no means a full endorsement either of Luther's own eucharistic theology or of the Lutheran position contained in the Augsburg Confession. It could be called Lutheran only in the sense that it accorded with the Wittenberg Concord, which Luther had accepted (Burnett, "The Myth of the Swiss Lutherans," 51-52, with reference to both BDS and to the "detailed description" of the synod in Carl Hundeshagen, *Die Conflicte des Zwinglianismus, Luthertums und Calvinismus in der Bernischen Landeskirche von 1532-1558* [Bern, 1842], 74-89).

938 The Genevan ministers were invited by the Council of Bern at the request of Bucer and Capito. They were requested to present a statement regarding the Lord's Supper, and were looked upon as a neutral, third party to the ongoing discussion between Bucer, or Strasbourg, and the Swiss cities, given the rapprochement of Strasbourg with Luther in the signing of the Wittenberg Concord, May 1536. See Henri Vuilleumier, *L'Âge de la Réforme*, vol. 1 of *Histoire de L'Église Réformée du Pays de Vaud sous le Régime Bernois* (Lausanne: Éditions la Concorde, 1927), 635; and *Registres du Conseil de Genève à L'Époque de Calvin*, text est. Paul Hochuli Dubuis and Sandra Coram-Mekkey (Genève: Librairie Droz: 2004), 2:583.
This is the confession Bucer ratifies not only with a formidably large signature, but also with the following declaration:

This statement of our dear brothers and colleagues, G. Farel, John Calvin, and P. Viret, we embrace as right doctrine, believing Christ our Lord in no sense to be diffused locally or ubiquitously in the Holy Supper, but that he has a true and finite body and remains in heavenly glory. Yet none the less, through his word and symbols, he is present in the Supper: He presents himself to us as we are by faith exalted to heaven with him, so that the bread we break and the cup through which we show Christ forth may be for us really the communion of his body and blood. Besides we hold as an error not to be tolerated in the Church that it is naked and bare signs that Christ sets forth in his blessed Supper, or not to believe that here the very body and the very blood of the Lord is received, that is the Lord himself true God and man.

Written by his own hand—Martin Bucer.
Subscribed—Wolfgang Capito.⁹⁴⁰

If the Holy Spirit is so integral to Bucer's doctrine of the Lord's Supper—as, for example, Willem Van't Spijker suggests⁹⁴¹—why is it that Bucer (with Capito) fails to mention the Holy Spirit in both the brief confession he himself prepared and his addendum to the confession that the Genevans prepared? Why? Is he striving to satisfy

---

⁹³⁹ Calvin: Theological Treatises, 168, with slight modification. "Nam utcunque nos in hac mortalitate peregrinantes in eodem loco cum mipso non includimur, aut continemur, nullis tamen finibus limitata est eius spiritus efficacia, quin vere copulare et in unum colligere posite, quae locorum spatii sunt disiuncta. Ergo spiritum eius vinculum esse nostrae cum ipso participacionis agnoscimus, sed ita ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini substantia vere ad immortalitatem paseat, et eorum participacione vivificet" (CO 9:711).


both his immediate audience in Bern as well as his "Lutheran," or "Melanchthonian," audience in Wittenberg? Is this why he speaks of "word and symbol," thereby substituting "Word for Spirit" just as he is alleged to allow?  

So what is the yield of this entry into Bucer's doctrine of the Lord's Supper? As suggested at the outset of this survey, it would seem that while Calvin's early doctrine of the Lord's Supper is not contrary to that of Bucer and Capito's contemporaneous doctrine, his emphasis on the person and work of the Holy Spirit is distinct and distinctly robust in comparison to that of Bucer and Capito.

### 6.7 Guillaume Farel (1489-1565) and Pierre Viret (1511-1571)

Calvin, of course, had much to do with Guillaume Farel and Pierre Viret at the time that his expressions concerning the role of the Holy Spirit in conjunction with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper first appear. It was they, after all, who invited Calvin to accompany them to the disputation at Lausanne, a disputation called by authorities in Bern for the purpose of publicly establishing the confessional disposition of not only

---

942 "At Augsburg, Bucer rightly informed Melanchthon that he had always taught that Christ's body and its fruits are transmitted by the Spirit, but that he would be quite happy to substitute the word 'Word' for 'Spirit'" (Hazlett, "Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking," 345, without reference to a primary source).


944 Viret was the only native of the Pays de Vaud among the three colleagues. Also, he was about two years Calvin's junior and, like Calvin, had studied at the College de Montaigu in Paris, arriving just after Calvin had left in 1528. On Calvin and his friendship and professional association with Viret, see Linder, "Brothers in Christ," 187-204; Michael W. Bruening, "Pierre Viret and Geneva," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 99 (2008), 175-197.
Lausanne, but also the Pays de Vaud. It was, as Michael Bruening puts it, "catechism as live theater": it had a pedagogical purpose for the people of Vaud, "and for those who could not be there in person, the planned publication . . . would provide a theological justification for Bern's religious decrees." Given the papal promise of a general council to be held in 1537 in Mantua, the Lausanne cathedral chapter revoked its participation. Clergy were disallowed from participating, on pain of excommunication, so self-appointed theologian-disputants stepped in, including one Claude Blancherose, "whom even his co-religionist Pierrefleur characterized as 'a man howling at the moon and quite fantastic, who mixed up medicine with theology in his disputes and made everyone laugh.'" Members of the Protestant delegation were led by Pierre Viret and Guillaume Farel, supported by a cast that included Christophe Fabri, Antoine de Marcourt, Pierre Caroli, and John Calvin. Given their prominence and immediate association with Calvin at this time, it is necessary to consider the thought of Farel and Viret, and fitting to begin with their expression at this disputation itself.

---

945 For the political background and ramifications, see Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, esp. Chapter 2: "Politics and Diplomacy in Vaud," 36-46, and 138ff.

946 Bruening, Calvinism's First Battleground, 138. With reference to Piaget, Les actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 1536, vi-viii, Bruening notes that "Bern's intention that the disputation serve a pedagogical purpose is made even clearer in its appointment of four secretaries to record the entire proceeding with a view to publication." This publication was not realized until the twentieth century.

In advance of this disputation, Farel prepared ten statements for debate, published as a placard in parallel columns in Latin and French.  

The third of these statements is of particular interest. It reads, in Piaget's rendering of the original text:

3. Hanc vero ecclesiam Dei esse scriptura sancta predicat, quotquot se [solo] Christi sanguine redemptos credunt, eiusque solius verbo inconcusse credunt et nituntur, qui nobis corporali presentia subductus, spiritus sui virtute omnia impleat, sustineat, regat ac vivificet.

3. La saincte scripture appelle eglise de Dieu tous ceux qui croient qu'ilz sont racheptez du seul sang de Jesuchrist, et qui constamment sans vaciller croient et du tout se fondent et s'appuient en la parolle de celluy seul, lequel estant retire de nous par sa presence corporelle remplist par la vertu de son sainct Esprit, soubstient, gouverne et vivifie toutes choses.

Farel's statement has three theological foci—ecclesiology, Christology, and pneumatology—delivered in cumulative fashion. Regarding the interests of this study, the pneumatological claim is striking: Christ accomplishes much *spiritus sui virtute*, or *par la vertu de son sainct Esprit*.

In the course of the disputation, this statement is the entrée to extended discourse about the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In the ten statements themselves, the topic of the sacraments is not broached until statement four, but in the course of

---


949 Piaget, *Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 1536*, 5. Trans. Dennison,"The Lausanne Articles (1536)," *Reformed Confessions*, 340-41. Dennison's rendering of Latin text reads: "Truly, holy Scripture proclaims this Church of God to consist of as many as believe they are redeemed by the blood of Christ alone, and firmly believe and lean upon Him by His word alone, who taken away from us in bodily presence, fills, sustains, rules, and makes all things alive by the power of His Spirit."

950 In Piaget's edition of the account of the Lausanne Disputation, debate over the third statement is presented on 98 pages of continuous text. Reference to the Lord's Supper first appears on the fourth of these pages, and then on every page following. These pages comprise the challenges of the Protestant delegation, Farel, Viret, Caroli, and Calvin, and the Roman Catholic delegation, Blancherose, Berilly, Mimard, and Tandy, alike. (Piaget, *Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 1536*, 147-244).

the disputation, the Lord's Supper is first broached here, by the Protestant delegation, in the opening exposition of Pierre Viret.

In his discourse with Jehan Berilly and a certain Blancherose, both of the Roman Catholic delegation, Viret presents several features of the French-Swiss Protestant, i.e., "Reformed," doctrine of the Lord's Supper, among which is reference to the work of the Holy Spirit. In his explicit reference to the person and work of the Holy Spirit, Viret, like Calvin, distinguishes his expression from that of Zwingli. Also, not unlike Calvin, Viret emphasizes that par l'esprit, vous avez the corps et l'ame et toute la vertu de Jesuchrist, autrement n'en pouvez rien avoir. One cannot receive Christ's body or Christ's blood and not receive Christ, all his benefits, Christ entier. Implicitly, in this expression, Viret (like Calvin) appears to distinguish his view from that of Zwingli, in that he does not absolutize the distinction between "body" and "spirit," since he declares that par l'esprit, vous avez le corps. A little on, he regards faith with respect to this communion, as well as the summons sursum corda, akin to Oecolampadius and Farel, and soon, Calvin:

---

952 Some of these features appear near to Zwingli's expression. For one, Viret emphasizes that "manger la chair et boire le sang de Jesuchrist, ce n'est aultre chose que croire en Jesuchrist qu'il a donné son corps en la croix a la mort pour nous, et a respandu son sang pour nous lavet et purger de noz pechez" (Piaget, Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 1536, 153; also 155, 157, 158, 159). For Calvin, as noted elsewhere, "to eat and to drink" is not "to believe," or "to have faith," but rather the soul's eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood follow from faith. This is evident in his exegesis of John 6, both in his Commentary on John 6 (1553) and in expositions of this text in treatises prepared prior to its publication.

953 Piaget, Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 1536, 158.

954 See e.g., Piaget, Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 1536, 163 and 169; also 159.

955 See also Piaget, Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne, 169, in the midst of discussion about what the faithful and unfaithful receive upon participation in the Supper. In this sense, he and Calvin appear to be close in their understanding of signification as well. See Piaget, Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne 1536, 169-170.
... tout qui sommes ses members par foy nous tirons et prenons nourriture et vie de luy qui est la vie et le vray pain celeste. Et quis qu'il est celeste, il ne se mange point en terre, mais fault que nous montons au ciel, si nous en voulons estre participans. Car nostre conversation est au ciel, et sommes par foy assis au ciel avec luy...

Twice Viret employs the phrase lien de charité. On the first occasion, he is clearly speaking of that which conjoins believer to believer. Reference to the Spirit is null.

Et, pourtant, nous mangeons tous d'un mesme pain et boivons d'un mesme calice tous, a couse que nous sommez tous ung pain, c'est a dire un corps. Et, a ceste occasion, sommez nous appellez le corps et les members de Jesus, veu donc que, par l'obation du corps et du sang de Jesus, nous sommes remis en la grace du pere et, par la foy en loy, nous sommes nourriz, vivifiez, resjouiz, corroborez, assemblez et uniz en ung corps, en ung people, en une commune, estans members les ungs des autres, incorporez en Jesuchirst, qui est nostre chief, conjointz, liez ensemble par le lien de charité, par laquelle il s'est donné aussy bien pour nous, comme le pain et le vin nous sont donnez, qui nous representent toutes ces choses mieux que chose du monde.

On the second occasion, the context and thrust of Viret's comment are the same as those of the first. The referent of lien de charité is what conjoins believer to believer, but in the same breath, Viret mentions esprit as well. Given that we eat of one loaf and drink of one cup, signs that we are one, says Viret,

Il faut donc que tous ensemble le confessions publiquement, et que, ainsi que nous sommes tous uniz par ung mesme esprit et par le lien de charité en ung corps...

---

956 Piaget, *Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne 1536*, 161; see also 169. As no standard English translation is available, Piaget's text is presented in its original language.


958 Piaget, *Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne 1536*, 173, with eventual reference to Eph. 4 and Acts 4 and 5. (It is unclear from Piaget's text whether these these biblical references are inserted by the disputant, the sixteenth century editor of the disputants' discourse, or Piaget's.) The phrase "bond of love" with respect to the sacrament is Augustinian, and is referenced by Calvin already in 1536: "Augustine with good reason frequently calls this sacrament 'the bond of love.' For what sharper goad could there be to arouse mutual love among us than when Christ, giving himself to us, not only invites us by his own example to pledge and give ourselves to one another, but inasmuch as he makes himself common to all,
By *esprit*, Viret is presumably speaking of the Holy Spirit, and he follows it with a parallel phrase regarding the "bond of charity." He does not, as Calvin explicitly does, *identify* the Spirit and the bond, as one and the same thing. Still, standing in tandem, the association is close. Furthermore and again, his emphasis here is explicitly on the unity of believers to, or with, one another, and perhaps thereby implicitly regarding the unity of believers to, or with, Christ, since the latter precedes the former soteriologically.

Following Viret's defense of the third proposition, Farel takes up the same, challenged by Blancherose. Occasioned by his opponent's query, Farel draws out an analogy between the body of Jesus Christ and the sun: Like the sun, the body of Jesus is not on earth but in heaven alone; however, *par son esprit et vertu, il oeuvre icy et est avec les siens selon sa promesse: Je suis avec vous jusques a la consummation du monde*. This is an analogy to which Farel returns only a little on, an analogy that Calvin himself employs—perhaps appropriating it from Farel himself—in a fresh, seminal passage in the second edition of his *Institutio* (1539):

> the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of Christ, with whom [Christ] we are joined in unity, and is like a channel [the Spirit] through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us. For if we see that the sun, shedding its beams upon the earth, casts its substance in some measure upon it in order to beget, nourish, and give growth to

---


its offspring — why should the radiance of Christ's Spirit be less in order to impart to us the communion of his flesh and blood?\textsuperscript{961}

Strikingly, both Farel and Calvin refer specifically to the person and work of the Holy Spirit in conjunction with this analogy. Indeed, a principle point of the analogy is the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

Amid debate over this third statement, Jehan Mimard of the Roman Catholic delegation charges the Protestant delegation with having dismissed the teaching of the sainetz docteurs. Farel replies at length. Still, the little-known, junior theologian and guest of the Protestant delegation addresses Mimard's allegation. With copious detail, Calvin demonstrates his (and thus his delegation's) acquaintance with the writings of the fathers, the sainetz docteurs.\textsuperscript{962} Toward the end of this response, though without reference to any specific docteur, Calvin declares:

\begin{quote}
. . . nous disons que ce n'est pas le corps naturel de Nostre Seigneur Jesus ne son sang naturel qui nos sont donnez en sa saincte cene. Maix que c'eest une communication spirituelle par laquelle, en virtue et en efficace, il nous faict participans de tout ce que pouvons recepvoir de grace en son corps et en son sang, [o]u encore pour mieux [de] clairer la dignité de ce mystere par la [qu]elle il nous faict [vr]aye-ment participans [de] son corps et son sang, mais le tout spirituellement, c'est a dire par le lien de son esprit.\textsuperscript{963}
\end{quote}

Set against the thought of both Farel and Viret as expressed at Lausanne, Calvin's formulation is distinctive. Neither of his Genevan colleagues speaks of \textit{une communication spirituelle}, nor of \textit{le lien de son esprit}, binding Christ and the believer one to the other, and thereby affording the participation \textit{de tout ce que pouvons}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{961}{1539 \textit{Institutio}, as rendered in \textit{Inst.} 1559 LCC 4.17.12; 1539 \textit{Institutio}, \textit{CO} 1: 1003-1004; 1559 \textit{Institutio}, \textit{CO} 2: 1011.}

\footnotetext{962}{See also discussion of Calvin's participation in the Lausanne Disputation in Chapter 2 above.}

\footnotetext{963}{Piaget, \textit{Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne}, 1536, 230.}
\end{footnotes}
recepvoir de grace en son corps et en son sang. Nor do they explicitly qualify
"spiritually" with specific reference to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Though
the theological trajectory of Calvin's thought follows—or we might say assimilates—
that of Farel's and of Viret's, these specific expressions are his, not theirs.

What is characteristic of Farel's expression here, at least in the propositions set
forth allegedly by him in advance of the disputation, is "spiritus sui virtute omnia
impleat, sustineat, regat ac vivificet, or par la vertu de son sainct Esprit, soubstient,
gouverne et vivifie toutes choses." Though Calvin does not employ the phrase "by the
virtus of the Holy Spirit" at Lausanne, eventually this becomes a prominent
expression in Calvin's sacramental thought to make a claim about the specific
sacramental work of Christ by way of the person and work of his Spirit, the Holy Spirit.
The passage that most nearly parallels Farel's is this, though it appears in Calvin's
exposition of the creed, not explicitly in his discussion of the sacraments:

We are persuaded that there is for us no other guide and leader to the Father than
the Holy Spirit, just as there is no other way than Christ; and that there is no
grace from God, save through the Holy Spirit. Grace is itself the power and
action of the Spirit: through grace God the Father, in the Son, accomplishes
whatever good there is; [through grace, He empowers and sustains all things,
causes them to grow, and quickens them;] through grace, He justifies, sanctifies,
and cleanses us, calls and draws us to himself, that we may attain salvation
[Romans 8.11-17; Eph 2.18; 1 Cor 12.12-13].

---

964 Piaget, Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne 1536, 5.
965 Neither do Farel or Viret, by the way.
966 The same may be said of Farel's thesis: The thesis is not particularly sacramental in the sense
of directly referring to the sacraments, or directing a reader's attention to the sacraments. In discussion,
however, disputants immediately turned to the sacramental ramifications of the thesis.
967 Inst. 1536, 57. This text is modified slightly. The text in brackets is a translation of a line that
Battles seems to have overlooked as it is omitted in his translation of the 1536 Institutio. Thus, the phrase
is translated according to Battles' rendering of the same phrase in Calvin's 1538 Catechism, for which
Calvin appropriates much of this very passage from the Institutio. The Latin text of the 1536 Institutios is
Interestingly, this passage in Calvin's 1536 *Institutio* actually antedates Farel's theses for the Lausanne Disputation. So the question might be asked whether Farel appropriated this conceptual flow from Calvin, or whether both might have appropriated it independently from a third resource. Elfriede Jacobs, in her study of Farel's theology of the Lord's Supper, suggests notes that scholarly tradition assumes that prior to 1536 Farel's sacramental disposition was akin to Zwingli's, and after 1536 akin to Calvin's. According to her, "cette thèse simpliste demande revision," since Farel's theology is actually closer to that of Oecolampadius, Bucer, and Capito. All four reject Zwingli's radical dualism of body and soul, spirit and flesh. Especially the last three emphasize that the sacraments are not empty signs, but true signs, such that the sign can never be conceived of without the "thing signified." So in the sacrament, as Jacobs presents the Frenchman in particular, "Bien que Farel appelle les éléments de la Cène 'choses terriennes,' il dépasse le dualisme antithétique en faisant de l'usage corporel et de l'action spirituelle du sacrament un acte simultané." Here, as elsewhere, Jacobs ascribes the word "spirituelle" to Farel, or at least to Farel's thought, or intention of as follows: Persuasi, non alium esse nobis ad patrem ductorem ac directorem, quam spiritum sanctum, quemadmodum non alia est via quam Christus, nihil nobis gratiae a Deo esse, quam per spiritum sanctum; cum gratia, ipsa sit spiritus virtus atque actio, per quam Deus pater, in filio, quidquid usquam est boni, operatur, per quam agit, sustinet, vegetat, ac vivificat omnia, per quam nos justificat, sanctificat, expurgat, ad se vocat ac trahit, ut salutem consequamur (Rom. 8. Eph. 2. 1 Cor. 12)" (*CO* 1:71-72). Recall that in the preamble to his discussion of the creed, Calvin says the Spirit is the power and efficacy. See 1536 *Inst.*, 48 and 49.

---


969 Jacobs, "Die Abendmahlslehre Wilhelm Farels," the French summary, 169 and 170. See also 161-62 of the main text.

thought, though never in a direct quotation of Farel. A survey of, e.g., his Sommaire (1529) suggests Farel does not use this term, nor does he explicitly qualify it with regard to the work of the Holy Spirit. So Jacobs’ ascription is curious.

Focus has thus far rested on an account of Farel and Viret's discourse at the Lausanne Disputation, October 1536. What might other of their writings tell us of their speech patterns with respect to the Holy Spirit, particularly sacramentally, and thus of the prospect of Calvin's having assimilated their thought into his own?

As for Farel, the senior member (by twenty years) of the Protestant delegation at Lausanne and a prominent figure among early French reformers: His Sommaire of 1529 stood alongside Melanchthon's Loci Communes (1521) and Zwingli's Commentarius de vera et falsa religione (1525) as topical expositions of Protestant

---

971 Jacobs demonstrates that Farel's Sommaire was first prepared in 1529, not 1525, and its revision in 1542, not 1538. See Jacobs, "Die Abendmahlslehre Wilhelm Farels," 161 and 169. Also Charles Partee, "Farel's Influence on Calvin," 175; Wiley, "Calvin's Friendship with Guillaume Farel," 188; Dennison, introduction to "William Farel's Summary (1529)," Reformed Confessions, 52.

972 See Partee, "Farel's Influence on Calvin," 175. According to Partee, "Farel was clearly one of the few outstanding [French-speaking Protestant] leaders until he was eclipsed by Calvin, not so much as a pioneer and preacher, but as a thinker and organizer. Farel was a kind of Caleb to Calvin's Joshua." Partee demonstrates this is nothing against Farel and his significance as a reformer among reform-minded folk such as Lefèvre, Zwingli, Bucer, Capitó, Oecolampadius, and Erasmus, each of whom was his dialog partner at one time or another (Partee, "Farel's Influence on Calvin," 183). "That Farel now stands in Calvin's shadow is appropriate," says Partee, "but we do well to remember that it was not always so" (Partee, "Farel's Influence on Calvin," 185).

973 Editions include Le sommaire de Guillaume Farel: reimprime d'après l'édition de l'an 1534 et précédé d'une introduction, ed. J.-G. Baum (Geneva: Jules-Guillaume Fick, 1867); Sommaire et brève déclaration, ed. Arthur-L. Hofer (Neuchâtel: Belle-Rivièreme, 1980); Eberhard Busch, et al., Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften, Bd. 1/1, 1523-34 (Neukirchener Verlag, 2002), 288-420; trans. James T. Dennison, "William Farel's Summary (1529)," Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation, Volume 1, 1523-52, compiles with introductions by James T. Dennison, Jr. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008), 53-111. This English translation is based on the 1534 edition of the text originally published in 1529, the text found in the Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften (above). No copy of the 1529 edition is known to be extant. Expectably, the style of Farel's work is stilted, abrupt, irregular. (See the introduction; also Wiley, "Calvin's Friendship with Guillaume Farel," 188.)
theology, Farel's exposition being "more suggestive than comprehensive." Early on, he speaks of the "the Law" finding "all men carnal and destitute of the Spirit of God," whereby it incites sin. The Spirit "is the movement and affection that God hands over to man, renewing him, giving him grace, and justifying him through Jesus (Gal. 5:5), and is, therefore, the one whom the elect desire, and for whom they pray, prompted by the holy Word. Charles Partee notes in his discussion of Farel's work that Farel demonstrates a relatively "strong conception of the union with Christ"; explicit appeal to the Holy Spirit in this regard, however, is null. Unlike in Calvin—already in 1536—the Holy Spirit is not depicted as "the bond" of believers' union with Christ, nor with one another, nor as the virtus by whom God and/or Christ accomplish divine ends. In his discussion of the sacraments, Farel mentions the Holy Spirit with respect to faith, that is: "having life, believing in him, we also are made certain for the earnest (arrabon) which we have been given by the Holy Spirit (Eph. 2:8-9)."

As for Viret, a native of the Pays de Vaud and two years Calvin's junior: It appears he did not publish anything, much less anything on the Lord's Supper, prior to

974 Partee, "Farel's Influence on Calvin," 176-77, and 182. The second part of Partee's essay proceeds with an exposition of the structure and content of Farel's Sommaire.

975 "William Farel's Summary (1529)," trans. Dennison, Reformed Confessions, 57.

976 "William Farel's Summary (1529)," trans. Dennison, Reformed Confessions, 60.


979 "William Farel's Summary (1529)," trans. Dennison, Reformed Confessions, 68.
1542, when he edited for publication (Geneva: Jean Michel, 1542) a volume of Antoine de Marcourt, *Declaration de la messe*. His own thought on the Lord's Supper appears not to have been published until the latter half of the 1540s; thus they are not particularly relevant for a consideration of Viret's likely specific speech patterns with respect to the Lord's Supper prior to 1536, and therefore the prospect of Calvin's assimilating his thought into his own. Still, from a brief consideration of these works, it may be said that his thought would seemingly resonate with Calvin's, or Calvin's with his.

6.8 Desiderius Erasmus (c. 1467-1536)

Despite the claim of an eventual assimilation of a "Farellian" emphasis on the Holy Spirit as expressed in third proposition submitted for the disputation at Lausanne in July 1536, it must be noted again that Calvin did not assimilate this specific phrase—*spiritus sui virtute*—at Lausanne. This phrase worked its way into Calvin's sacramental speech patterns in writings to come. The sacramental speech pattern that flows from Calvin's lips at Lausanne concerns the Holy Spirit as the *lien* or, in Latin, the *vinculum*, between believers and Christ, the bond which then affords the spiritual nourishment of Christ's body and blood. As noted above, such a conception is *implicit* in Viret's expression at two points in Viret's defense of the third proposition, but *only* implicit, as he speaks of the *lien* binding believers one to another.

---

980 Marcourt was a French refugee, a pastor, who had written and printed the placards posted in Paris in 1534 denouncing the Mass, i.e., whose writings incited the *Affaire des Placards*. See Frederic J. Baumgartner, "Placards, Affaire des" in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
Interestingly, an explicit statement regarding the Holy Spirit as the vinculum who unites not only believers one to another, but preeminently believers to Christ, is found in a work prepared by a prominent sixteenth century humanist of Dutch descent, Desiderius Erasmus. In 1533 he composed "A Plain and Devout Explanation of the Apostles' Creed, the Precepts of the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer"—Dilucida et pia explanatio symboli quod apostolorum dicitur, decalogi praeceptorum, & dominicae precationis—published first by Hieronymus Froben in Basel and circulated widely throughout Europe.\(^{981}\) As a catechism, it was soon overshadowed by more popular partisan catechisms.\(^{982}\)

In setting up his discussion of the Apostles' Creed, in Catechesis II, Erasmus begins with an affirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity, indicating that the understanding of God as Triune gives rise to the parts of the creed: "There is one divinity in the three, and the three are one God. The major divisions in the creed arise from this truth. The Father holds first place, the Son holds second, the Holy Spirit, who is love and an ineffable bond between the other two, holds the third."\(^{983}\) Here, Erasmus

\(^{981}\) Sir Thomas Boleyn, father of Anne Boleyn, Henry VIII's second wife, commissioned this catechism of Erasmus. Sir Thomas immediately submitted it to the newly appointed archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, for his consideration. At the time that it was published, it was enthusiastically received. In a letter, Erasmus expressed delight that Froben's first edition sold out in three hours at the spring book fair in Frankfurt. Also, this catechism gave rise to the final bout between Luther and Erasmus, with Luther lashing out at Erasmus over it in 1534, and Erasmus responding within a month with his Purgatio adversus epistolam non sobriam Lutheri. See Desiderius Erasmus, "An Explanation of the Apostles' Creed," in Spiritualia and Pastoralia, ed. John W. O'Malley, in Collected Works of Erasmus, vol. 70 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), xx-xxi.

\(^{982}\) Erasmus, Spiritualia and Pastoralia, xxi.

refers to the Spirit as the *nexus* between the Father and Son, but in his next deep catechetical breath he confesses,

> The church is attached to [the Son] as the human body is attached to its head. As that divine Spirit binds (*conglutinat*) the Father and Son closely together, so too he fastens the church to Christ by an invisible and indissoluble bond (*adglutinat arcano et indissolubili vinculo*). The mystical body of Christ occupies the fourth part of the creed.\(^{984}\)

In light of Calvin's use of the same, Erasmus' use of *arcano* and *vinculum* here is striking, as is his emphasis on the attachment of a head to its body—Christ to his own—in this regard.

In *Catechesis IV*, in his elaboration of the third and fourth parts of the creed, Erasmus returns to this emphasis on the union of the Godhead and Christ's union with the church. He writes,

> A person who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him. As the Holy Spirit is the ineffable bond by which the three Persons are inseparably joined to one another in eternal harmony, so too the same Spirit joins the spouse of Christ to her spouse by an indissoluble bond, uniting all members of the mystical body in an eternal compact.\(^ {985}\)

Again, Erasmus' formulation in his catechism is striking given its resonance with Calvin's formulation in two prominent passages from his early writings. First, as just mentioned, at the Lausanne Disputation, Calvin qualifies his use of the word "spiritual" with a specific reference to the person and work of the Holy Spirit, and in relation to


\(^{985}\) Erasmus, "Explanation of the Apostles' Creed," 323. Qui enim Christi spiritum non habet, hic non est eius. Quemadmodum autem spiritus sanctus nexus est ineffabilis quo aeterna concordia inseparabiliter sibi iunctae sunt tres personae, ita idem indissolubili vinculo sponsam Christi iungit sponso suo, omniaque mystici corporis membra sempiterno foedere inter sese copulat" (Erasmus, *Explanatio symboli*, as in *The Digital Library of the Catholic Reformation*).
that specific reference, explicitly identifies the Spirit as the bond, \textit{le lien}, by whom participation in Christ's body and blood is afforded. Second, as noted in Chapter 2 above, in his second edition of the \textit{Institutio}, published in 1539, Calvin inserts a poignant passage regarding the Spirit. Contrasting his own view with that of those who would, as he understands them, either "draw back [Christ's body] under these corruptible elements or . . . imagine it to be present everywhere," Calvin says,

there is no need of this for us to enjoy a participation in it, since the Lord bestows this benefit upon us \textit{through his Spirit} so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The \textit{bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of Christ}, with whom [Christ] we are joined in unity, . . . On this account, Scripture, in speaking of our participation with Christ, relates its whole power to the Spirit. But one passage will suffice for many. For Paul, in the eighth chapter of Romans, states that Christ dwells in us only through his Spirit. Yet he does not take away that communion of his flesh and blood which we are now discussing, but teaches that the \textit{Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ} completely and have him dwelling in us.

Here, just exactly as Erasmus does, Calvin cites Paul's letter to the Romans as warrant for his assertion regarding the efficacy of the Spirit as "the bond"—\textit{vinculum}—through whom Christ himself joins his own to himself that they might possess him completely. Unlike Erasmus, Calvin provides specific reference to Paul's letter, though Erasmus' quotation of the same speaks for itself.

---

986 1539 \textit{Inst}, per the rendering of that phrase in 1559 LCC \textit{Inst.} 4.17.12. \textit{CO} 1:1011

987 \textit{Institutio} 1539, as in \textit{Inst}. 1559 LCC 4.17.12, emphasis added. "Neque id sane opus est, quo ipsius participazione fruamur; quando hoc beneficii \textit{per spiritum suum} nobis Dominus largitur, ut unum corpore, spiritu et anima secum flamus. \textit{Vinculum ergo istius coniunctionis est spiritus Domini}, cuiusnexu copulamur; et quidam veluti canalis, per quem quidquid Christus et est et habet ad nos derivatur. Nam si solem conspicimus radiis in terram emicantem, ad generandos, fovendos, vegetandos eius foetus, suam quodammodo substantiam ad eam traiicere :\textit{cur inferior spiritus Christi esset irradiatio}, \textit{ad communionem carnis et sanguinis eius in nos traducendam}? Quapropter scriptura, ubi de nostra cum Christo participatione loquitur, vim eius universam ad spiritum refert. Pro multis tamen unus locus sufficiet. Paulus enim ad Rom. cap. octavo, Christum non aliter in nobis, quam per spiritum suum habitare disserit: quo tamen illam, de qua nunc sermo est, carnis et sanguinis communionem non tollit, sed ab uno \textit{spiritu} efficic docet, \textit{ut totum Christum possideamus}, et habeamus in nobis manentem"(1539: \textit{CO} 1.1003-04, emphasis added).
Now, it cannot be declared definitively that Calvin adopted his expression from Erasmus. But the parallelism is striking: the parallelism of the terminology and of the singular reference to Romans 8. Could it not be that Calvin was assimilating the terminology and textual reference of Erasmus into his assimilation of the thought of other of his contemporaries? Could it not be that Calvin engaged Erasmus' popular catechism perhaps when he resided in Basel in the mid 1530s, and perhaps again in anticipation of the Lausanne Disputation? Could it not be that Calvin's expression here exhibits a coalescence of his appropriation of Erasmus' catechetical locution on the doctrine of the Trinity with his concurrent study and exegesis of Paul's letter to the Romans, with his rumination on what transpires in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper?988

As mentioned in chapter three, Calvin was certainly well familiar with Erasmus and his works early in his career. After all, Calvin's first published work was an ambitious commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia*, the stated intent of which—according to Calvin himself—is to "correct" here and there some exegetical indiscretions on the part of Erasmus.989 Wendel notes that, ever after, Calvin's method

---

988 In September 1536, soon after Calvin arrived in Geneva, he was appointed *sacrarum literarum doctor* at the Cathedral of Saint Pierre. He immediately took up instruction in the epistles of Paul, likely beginning with the epistle to the Romans. See de Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 29; Gilmont, *Calvin and the Printed Book*, 28 and 45; Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context*, 11; Ganocy, *Young Calvin* 109.

989 De Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, 85. See also Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, 199n60 regarding Calvin's "Erasmian" aim for the genre *commentarius*. "Calvin learned from Budé and Erasmus the importance . . . of interpreting texts in light of their literary, linguistic, and cultural contexts so that their genuine meaning would emerge from that context. He first applied this method to Seneca's treatise *De clementia*. . . . In the work, Calvin's clear preference for Budé over Erasmus comes to light, a preference that would remain in evidence to the end of his life" (Zachman, "The Life and Work of John Calvin," in *John Calvin as Teacher*, 16-17).
of exegesis was based on that "devised by Valle and by Erasmus." Following on this, Wendel probes:

Was there a still deeper Erasmian influence, extending for example even to theological concepts? Only a profounder comparison would enable one to answer that question, but certainly one is often reminded, when reading Calvin's expositions, of formulas or expressions invented by Erasmus. Although Erasmus's name nowhere appears in the *Institutes*, it has been possible to show that numerous passages . . . present striking analogies with parallel texts from the great humanist. 

Might Wendel's observation be claimed here, with regard to Calvin's "Erasmian" locution of the Spirit as the *vinculum* between Christ and his own? Such a locution simply is not readily found in the primary works of Calvin's other contemporaries, nor in secondary studies on their sacramental thought.

### 6.9 Conclusion

In the mid 1530s, Calvin's expressed doctrine of the Lord's Supper emerges with a fresh emphasis on the person and work of the Holy Spirit, not only with respect to the inward work of the Holy Spirit regarding faith, but also the "outward" work of the Holy Spirit who employs sacraments as instruments. As declared at the outset of this chapter, while this emphasis is fresh, it is not so fresh as not to be considered an assimilation of the thought of his contemporaries. Calvin appropriates tendencies in the thought of his contemporaries, seeming to provide a *pneumatological refinement* of their thought to steer a middle course between "the Scylla of Luther's sacramental realism and the

---


991 Wendel, *Calvin: Origins and Development*, 130. Although his point concerns Calvin's lack of explicitly citing contemporaries' influence on his thought, Lane quotes this passage of Wendel in such a way as to appear to approve Wendel's point about Calvin's appropriation of Erasmus' thought. See Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 30.
Charybdis of Zwingli's spiritualistic symbolism.⁹⁹² Ganoczy has suggested that Calvin read quickly, and just as quickly reaped a harvest from his reading.⁹⁹³ Along the same line, van't Spijker has declared that Calvin "shows particular independence in the way he assimilated the material he had received from others."⁹⁹⁴ This surely seems to be the case with respect to Calvin's emphasis on the person and work of the Holy Spirit with regard to believers' participation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

⁹⁹² Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology," 37. Janse's statement is: "My own favourite one-liner [to summarize Calvin's Eucharistic theology] is: Calvin's pneumatological instrumentalism move between the Scylla of Luther's sacramental realism and the Charybdis of Zwingli's spiritualistic symbolism."

⁹⁹³ Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 75.

⁹⁹⁴ Van't Spijker, "Bucer's Influence on Calvin," 34.
CHAPTER 7

ASSIMILATION: THE THOUGHT OF PREDECESSORS

The previous two chapters featured an attempt to demonstrate that the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to the economy of the Lord's Supper can be construed as an assimilation of his doctrine of the Trinity and an assimilation of the thought of his contemporaries with, or into, his doctrine of the sacrament. These are two ingredients that contributed to the development of his thought. Now a third is to be added, namely, Calvin's assimilation of the thought of his predecessors, especially patristic predecessors.

As pointed out previously, especially in the third chapter of this study, Calvin was a humanist—a humanist among humanists whose studies drew him continually ad fontes for understanding Christian doctrine and practice. Calvin's early works proved his aptitude for handling patristic sources as well as intermediary resources to patristic sources. This is true of his earliest work, his commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia*, as well as what followed on: the first edition of his *Institutio* and his contribution at the Lausanne Disputation (both 1536).

---

995 Recall that early on Calvin relied heavily on the *Decretum Gratiani* and Lombard's *Sententiae*. According to Lane, "after the 1543 *Institutio* Calvin relied less upon these works." Anthony N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1999), 48.
Since Calvin's early interest in the writings of the fathers has been explored in chapter three, this interest is not further explored or documented here. The primary concern of this chapter is Calvin's specific reference to certain fathers of the early church, and his prospective appropriation of expressions of a certain work of the medieval era. The chapter itself is developed in three parts: 1) a brief consideration of Calvin's "citation" of predecessors' thought, followed by 2) a close examination of his "citation" of such sources with respect to his understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit and believers' participation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, followed finally by 3) an (introductory) survey of another prospective contribution to his specific expression. In the end, this chapter demonstrates that Calvin did not "discover" the sacramental role of the Holy Spirit in the thought of the early church (as Wilhelm Niesel would have it), or even the medieval church, but that Calvin assimilates the thought and expression of his predecessors, referring to them as warrant for his pneumatological understanding, as evidence of his faithfulness to Scripture and tradition.

7.1 Calvin's References to Predecessors' Thought

For some time now, Calvin's numerous references to the thought of his predecessors have piqued the interest of scholars. Several studies have been generated, with some of the most recent, penetrating efforts being taken up by Irena

---

996 See Chapter 4 above.

Backus and Anthony Lane. In a publication of a collection of his essays on Calvin as a "student of the church fathers," Lane prepares a fresh essay entitled "Calvins' Use of the Fathers: Eleven Theses." Here he provides a judicious methodological guide for reading Calvin's (apparent) reading of earlier ecclesial works. Lane's first thesis provides an apt critique of Niesel and all who kept cadence with him in understanding that, as one scholar put it, "Calvin found the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the bond of our union with Christ in the Eucharist in a sermon Erasmus attributed to John Chrysostom." As Lane declares, "Calvin's citations of the fathers are not to be confused with modern footnotes and must not be used uncritically to establish sources." Such a thesis, proclaimed by so careful a scholar as Lane, well-tempers Niesel's claim that Calvin "discovered" in a sermon attributed to Chrysostom a solution to the conundrum of the communication of the ascended Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. Like his sixteenth century contemporaries, Calvin is not concerned with citing sources, or properly attributing to another his or her intellectual property. Rather, he is calling in witnesses for the defense. Accordingly, Lane's second thesis reads:


998 E.g., Backus, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers," in Continuity and Change.

999 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 1-14.

1000 McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist, 257, emphasis added. Again, see Chapter 4 above.

1001 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 1, emphasis added.
"Calvin's use of the fathers (especially in the *Institutio* and in the treatises) is primarily a polemical appeal to authorities." ¹⁰⁰²

The remainder of Lane's essay is significant, but these initial two theses are particularly relevant for a consideration of Calvin's first overt appeal to a patristic authority with respect to the Holy Spirit and the Supper, and his subsequent indirect appeals.

### 7.2 Examination of Calvin's Reference to Patristic Sources

At the Lausanne Disputation of 1536, Calvin offers his first robust expression of the role of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament, namely, as *le lien* by whom, or through whom, Christ affords the partaking of his body and blood. In the first of his two orations at the debate (or at least in the published account thereof), Calvin declares

> it is not the natural body of our Lord Jesus nor his natural blood which is given to us in his Holy Supper. We affirm that it is a spiritual communication, by which in virtue and in power he makes us participant of all that we are able to receive of grace in his body and blood; or again, to declare better the dignity of this mystery, it is a spiritual communication by which he makes us truly participant of his body and his blood, but wholly spiritually, that is by the bond of his Spirit. ¹⁰⁰³

While at the dispute, Calvin proves himself a student of the fathers, rehearsing from memory several quotations from the works of Cyprian, Tertullian, and the "unfinished commentaries on Matthew which are attributed to John Chrysostom," and six specific

---

¹⁰⁰² Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 3; see also 91, 159-160.

¹⁰⁰³ Calvin: *Theological Treatises*, 44. "Mais que c'est une communication spirituelle par laquelle en vertu et en efficace il nous fait participans de tout ce que pouvons recevoir de grace en son corps et son sang, ou encore, pour mieux declarer la dignite de ce mystere, par laquelle il nous faict vrayement participans de son corps et son sang, mais le tout spirituellement cest a dire par le lien de son esprit" (*CO* 9:844).
passages in six different works of Augustine. His explicitly pneumatological point, however, he does not support with patristic testament.

Specific patristic support for this does not appear until his second edition of the *Institutio*. As compared to the 1536 edition, the 1539 edition of the *Institutio* exhibits a significant increase in Calvin's appeals to the writings of the church fathers. In his discussion of the Lord's Supper, Calvin provides a polemic against those who (as he puts their positions) "draw back [Christ's body] under these corruptible elements or . . . imagine it to be present everywhere." Such is not necessary for our participation in the lifegivingness of Christ's body, says Calvin,

since the Lord bestows this benefit upon us through his Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit, and soul with him. The bond of this connection is therefore the Spirit of Christ, with whom [Christ] we are joined in unity, and is like a channel [the Spirit] through which all that Christ himself is and has is conveyed to us.

Beside this passage, Calvin includes a marginal note referring the reader to a sermon of John Chrysostom "on the Holy Spirit." The alignment of this reference in the original printed edition appears exactly as follows:

---

1004 *Deux discours de Calvin au colloque de Lausanne* as found in CO 9:877-86; English translation found in Calvin: Theological Treatises, 35-37. Lane writes, as noted in Chapter 3 above as well: "In keeping with the humanist principle of *ad fontes* Calvin read widely in the works of the fathers themselves. Examination of his quotations at Lausanne makes it clear that this was already his practice by that stage. They are placed in context and their position within specific homilies is given, clearly indicating that Calvin had read the originals. There is no serious doubt that Calvin's knowledge of the fathers came overwhelmingly from his own reading of their writings" ("Calvin's Use of the Fathers and Medieval," 47, and with reference to Todd, *Function of the Patristic Writings*, 128-30 and Old, Patristic Roots, 153).

1005 Van Oort, "John Calvin and the Church Fathers," 673-74: "Calvin's knowledge and use of the Fathers appears to be enlarged and enriched in accordance with the reworking and enlargement of the whole work."

1006 *Institutio* 1539 (CO 1:1011), per Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.12.

Furthermore and interestingly, it appears that Calvin's appeal to Chrysostom is unique. In pursuit of the study at hand, numerous texts of Calvin's contemporaries have been engaged, though admittedly not all of them. But in those that have been engaged, reference to Chrysostom regarding this or a similar pneumatological point has not been found.¹⁰⁰⁹

Niesel suggests the sermon Calvin has in mind is one found in the opera omnia of Chrysostom's works compiled and edited by Erasmus, published in Basel in 1530 by Froben.¹⁰¹⁰ Niesel infers a strong parallel between Calvin's expression and Chrysostom's thought, the latter being articulated as follows (as it appears in Niesel's text):
In diesem Sermon heißt es u. a.: "Spiritus sanctus ipse fidem facit, quod nos ad deo in filios adoptati simus, ipse corda nostra Christo conglutinate. S. s. ipse cibus est diligentium Christum, quo nunquam satiantur: ipse potus est animarum filiorum det, ipse charitas eorum qui sibi coniuncti sunt. Spiritus sanctus copula est unions nostrae in Christo, animarum exultatio, coris tripudium, ignis, fons rorulentus" (Chrys., Opera, Basileae 1530, Bd. V 379).\(^{1011}\)

The terminology is not exactly parallel, but *copula-* may be taken to mean "linked," and therefore suggestive of a *vinculum*—which appears to be the connection Niesel infers.

Niesel then draws an immediate conclusion that Calvin obviously speaks in connection with this sermon of Chrysostom already in the *Confessio fidei de eucharistia* of 1537, since there Calvin "speaks of the Holy Spirit as the bond of our communion with Christ."\(^{1012}\) In his footnote regarding his comment on the *Confessio fidei de eucharistia*, Niesel indicates that the word *copulare* is used proximal to this expression of the idea of

---

\(^{1010}\) Niesel's citation reads as follows: "Chrys. Opera, Basileae 1530, Bd. V 379." This is a reference to *D. Ioannis Chrsostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opera, quae hactenus versa sunt omnia, ad Graecum codicum collationem multis in locis per utriusque linguae peritos emendate*, ed. Erasmus Desiderius (Basileae: In Officina Frobeniana, 1530). It is known, however, that Calvin possessed and marked up the edition *Divi Chrysostomi Archeepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opera, quatenus in hunc diem Latio donate noscuntur, omnia*, ed. Desiderius Erasmus (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Apud Claudium Chevallionium, 1536). See the study A. Ganoczy and K. Müller, *Calvins Handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1981). See also Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 12, 72-73, 177, and 223. In his 1536 edition of Chrysostom's works, one also finds this sermon—*Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi sermo in pentecoste de sancto spiritu*—in Tome V, at n* ii. The Latin text of the passage in consideration is identical to that in the 1530 edition (1536, Tome V, n* iii, left column at B).


the Spirit as the vinculum—a further proof for Niesel that Calvin had Chrysostom's sermon in mind already in 1537, and apparently further proof that Calvin "discovered" the Spirit in this ancient text. While this is seemingly further proof for Niesel, such conclusions would not stand in light of Lane's theses, nor does it seem as apt as the observation in the previous chapter regarding Erasmus' catechism: Chrysostom does not use the word vinculum in this sermon, but conglutinat and copula est. Erasmus, however, uses the word vinculum, distinctively, even as Calvin does, and in conjunction with a specific, identical reference to Romans 8.

Following Lane's due caution to provide proper exegesis of Calvin's marginal reference, it may well be noted that in his 1539 Institutio Calvin is indeed appealing to this sermon of Chrysostom for the sake of giving patristic warrant for his view. Chrysostom is cited not as a source, but as a witness for the defense. Calvin cross-references Chrysostom's sermon to justify his pneumatological emphasis with regard to the Supper, not to account for its origin. Therefore, this passage in Calvin's second edition of the Institutio—a passage which, with its marginalia, appears unedited in every edition of the Institutio after—seems to exhibit a coalescence of Calvin's appropriation of patristic thought, Erasmus' catechetical instruction, and Calvin and Erasmus' Trinitarian exegesis of Romans 8. Again, at this time in his life, Calvin was

---

1013 Niesel, Calvins Lehre von Abendmahl, 92n109.

1014 See discussion in Chapter 6.

1015 For whatever reason, the editors of CO fail to "cite" Calvin's marginal reference in their edition of the 1559 Institutio (CO 2:1011). It does appear, however, in their text presenting the Institutio editions 1539-1554 (CO 1:1004).

1016 For discussion of Erasmus' catechetical instruction and exegesis of Romans 8, see Chapter 6 above.
increasing his reading in the church fathers, he had recently acquired his own edition of Chrysostom's works, and he was embarking on an unusual project to translate a number of Chrysostom's homilies into French, not least because he considered Chrysostom the master exegete and preacher whose method should be modeled by scrupulous biblical commentators and sermon writers alike. Along with this and at the same time, Calvin himself was playing the part of biblical commentator, having been appointed sacrarum litterarum doctor at the Cathedral of St. Pierre in Geneva, and having begun his tenure as such with the Pauline epistle of Romans. With due respect for Lane's call for methodological care, this conjecture of a timely coalescence of various elements is put forth. But it is conjecture, as there is no proof that Calvin was engaging Erasmus' catechism at this or any time. However, there is also no proof of this coincidental coalescence in another's work, whether that of a contemporary or of a predecessor. Calvin and Erasmus seem to be unique in this regard.

---

1017 See Chapter 3 above, as well as Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 72-73; Gilmont, Calvin and the Printed Book, 161; Ganoczy and Müller, Calvins Handschriftliche. As noted just above, Calvin is known to have acquired Divi Chrysostomi Archeepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opera, quatenusin hunc diem Latio donate noscuntur, omnia, ed. Desiderius Erasmus (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Apud Claudium Chevallonium, 1536).


1019 See discussion in Chapter 3 above, with reference to Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface," and Irena Backus, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers." Backus writes: Some aspects of Calvin's preface, including his insistence on "Chrysostom's qualities as a preacher, are perhaps due to the influence of Erasmus" ("Calvin and the Greek Fathers," 254, also 256).

1020 As noted before, see de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 29; Gilmont, Calvin and the Printed Book, 28 and 45; Steinmetz, Calvin in Context, 11; Ganoczy, Young Calvin, 109.
Interestingly, in his presentation of Calvin's reference to the sermon of Chrysostom, Niesel reflects and fosters an idea that the sermon to which Calvin refers is *spuriously* ascribed to Chrysostom. Niesel's suggestive line is this: "Auf dem Wege zur vollen Klarheit ist Calvin ein 'Sermo in Pentecoste de sancto spirito' von Wichtigkeit geworden, der sich damals unter den Schriften des Chrysostomus befand."\(^{1021}\) Such a statement suggests that, though at the time the sermon was found among the writings of Chrysostom, now it no longer is or should be. Regrettably, Niesel neither explains nor cites scholarship for the allegation that this sermon is spurious. Some who have followed on the work of Niesel likewise imply that this sermon is not in fact Chrysostom's. For example, McDonnell paraphrases Niesel's indirect conclusion saying, "Calvin found the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the bond of our union with Christ in the Eucharist in a sermon Erasmus attributed to John Chrysostom, which Erasmus inserted into an edition of Chrysostom's works published at Basel in 1530."\(^{1022}\) Boniface Meyer follows suit, saying "Erasmus had taken the idea [regarding the role of the Holy Spirit] from a sermon of John Chrysostom and published it in one of his works in 1530. Calvin now uses it for the first time and reinforces it with this beautiful analogy: . . . ."\(^{1023}\)

Ascertaining whether the sermon to which Calvin refers in his marginalia is in fact spurious or not lies well beyond the scope of this study. Indeed, the point is relatively moot in the context of this study: Erasmus' edition includes it among the works of Chrysostom, even as a long-standing medieval tradition did before him. Calvin

---

1021 Niesel, *Calvins Lehre von Abendmahl*, 92. See above for this statement in its context.


trusted Erasmus as an authority on such a point. However, Niesel's suggestion is a fascinating one, even as it begs for a scholarly demonstration of his point, or if not demonstration, then dialog. A question one might well raise is this: Is Niesel confusing this sermon with another by nearly the same name in the 1530 Erasmus/Froben edition of Chrysostom's works? This other sermon has in fact been identified as spurious: In the early twentieth century, André Wilmart published a short study, "La collection des 38 homélies Latines de Saint Jean Chrysostome," in which he presents and discusses a few more than 38 sermons once attributed to, though no longer attributable to, Chrysostom. Wilmart's interest is their identification, as well as their manuscript and early printed history. One sermon Wilmart identifies is De pentecosten, which he notes has had a long tradition of being attributed to Chrysostom, and in fact was so attributed by Erasmus in his 1530 edition of Chrysostom's opera. This particular sermon, however, is included in Tome III of Erasmus' 1530 edition of Chrysostom's works (Basel: Froben), as well as his 1536 edition of the same (Paris: Chevalon), the latter edition being the one Calvin acquired. In the 1536 edition, the sermon is introduced with not only its title, "De Pentecoste, sermo," but also the phrase "Incerto interprete." With this phrase, Erasmus indicates that this sermon may be spurious, or

---

1024 This is not to say that Calvin always and ever agreed with Erasmus. See Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 49-50.


1027 See discussion just above, and in Chapter 3 above.

1028 Divi Joannis Chrysostomi, ed. Erasmus (Basel: Froben, 1530), R 3-r.
is likely spurious, its preparer being "uncertain." The sermon to which Calvin refers (assuming Niesel's identification of the "influential" parallel passage is sound) is introduced with no such caveat. Erasmus apparently considered this a work authentic to the fourth century bishop of Antioch, so Calvin did after him.

As noted just above, whether the sermon to which Calvin refers is spurious to Chrysostom or not, the sermon itself—as Calvin read it—provided for him patristic, or at least traditional, warrant for his pneumatological view, namely, that it is the Spirit by whom Christ communicates to believers all that he has and is. However, it is interesting to note that Calvin never again refers to Chrysostom or this sermon as warrant for his pneumatological emphasis in subsequent, newly-composed expositions on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. As noted before, Calvin never edited the passage in his *Institutio* that parallels the marginal reference to Chrysostom, nor did he ever omit that marginal reference; but he also never reiterated this testimony, never summoned it or Chrysostom again as a witness, not even against Westphal and Heschestusius. This is striking, given that for Calvin (as McDonnell states so well):

> There was [sic] no need for including the body of Christ under the species of bread and wine... when all the demands of biblical and patristic realism could be fulfilled by the body of Christ being given to us through the power of the Holy Spirit. His invocation of the Holy Spirit and his elaboration of the large role played by the Holy Spirit is anti-Roman and anti-Lutheran in motivation, but it is precisely the role of the Holy Spirit... which makes it possible to retain a sacramental realism. It was to retain this realism while rejecting transubstantiation and consubstantiation that he developed his doctrine of the eucharistic role of the Holy Spirit.

---

1029 *Institutio* 1539, as in *Inst.* 1559 LCC 4.17 12.

1030 McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist*, 257.
Since the Spirit is so significant in Calvin's argument, it is striking that he never again subpoenas this seemingly key testimony—key precisely because it comes from the authority of tradition.

One can only speculate reasons for Calvin's lack of recurrent reference to Chrysostom, if in fact there are reasons for it. Still, it is plausible to wonder, Is it possible that Calvin recognized the polemical strength of appealing to Augustine rather than to Chrysostom, and therefore shelved Chrysostom's testimony in the *Institutio* in favor of Augustine's there and elsewhere? Such a question leads to discussion of Calvin, sacramental pneumatology, and Augustine.

Interestingly, Calvin does not explicitly refer to Augustine regarding the role of the Spirit as the "bond"—as *vinculum* or as *nexus*—in the economy of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper—ever. In a passage in the *Institutio*, first introduced to his discussion of the Lord's Supper in the 1543 edition of the *Institutio*, he comes close, but not definitively close. In the passage, Calvin exegetes Augustine's exegesis of John 1 and declares that Augustine there "conceives of Christ as present among us in three ways: in majesty, in providence, and in ineffable grace." Interpreting Augustine to explicate his own doctrine of "presence," Calvin writes:

> Under grace I include that marvelous communion [*communionem*] of his body and blood provided we understand that it takes place by the power of the Holy Spirit [*modo spiritus sancti virtute fieri intelligamus*], not by that feigned inclusion of the body itself under the element, indeed, our Lord testified that he had flesh and bones, which could be felt and seen.\(^{1032}\)

---

Once again Calvin's signature explanation appears: believers' communion with Christ is effected by the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit; the Spirit figures as the agent of communication. But in this passage, the ascription of this role to the Holy Spirit is *Calvin's*, not *Augustine's*.

Despite Calvin's lack of direct reference to Augustine with respect to his pneumatological emphasis, a consideration of Augustine is of interest given the assumptions of scholarly tradition, namely, the twin assumptions that Augustine identifies the Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son, and that Calvin, *following on Augustine*, likewise identifies the Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son, and, by extension, between the Son and his own.

While Calvin preferred Chrysostom's literal exegesis to Augustine's allegorical, he clearly considered Augustine the premiere theologian of the ancient church— he along with everyone else in the sixteenth century, Roman Catholic or Protestant. Already in the 1536 *Institutio* and its dedicatory letter to Francis I, Calvin repeatedly appeals to Augustine as a theological authority.

---


1033 McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist*, 40; Calvin himself says in his preface to a prospective, vernacular edition of Chrysostom's sermons: "It is beyond dispute that Augustine does surpass everyone in dogmatics" (Calvin, in the preface as translated in Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface to His Proposed French Edition of Chrysostom's Homilies: Translation and Commentary," 145).


1035 E.g., Van Oort, "John Calvin and the Church Fathers," 664ff.
In his discussion of the sacraments in the 1536 *Institutio*, Calvin does in fact cite Augustine relatively often.\textsuperscript{1036} The one passage of particular interest here, however, is his association of Augustine with the notion of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as the ethical *caritatis vinculum*, or "bond of love":

Augustine with good reason frequently calls this sacrament 'the bond of love.' For what sharper goad could there be to arouse mutual love among us than when Christ, giving himself to us, not only invites us by his own example to pledge and give ourselves to one another, but inasmuch as he makes himself common to all, also makes us all one in himself.\textsuperscript{1037}

Calvin's reference to Augustine is made passingly, that is, presumably from memory and presumably under the general assumption that his critical readers will not dispute such attribution to Augustine. Though Ford Lewis Battles provides specific reference to "Augustine, *John's Gospel*, 26.13" in the notes of his translations of the 1536 and 1559 *Institutio*,\textsuperscript{1038} the original printed editions of Calvin's work bear no such reference, as marginalia or otherwise.\textsuperscript{1039} Calvin retains this passage and its context in every edition

\textsuperscript{1036} Smits, *Saint-Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin*, 31f.

\textsuperscript{1037} *Inst*. 1536, 110. "Quamobrem non abs re Augustinus, toties sacramentum hoc appellat caritatis vinculum. Quis enim acrior admovevit stimulus poterat ad excitandam mutuam inter nos caritatem, quam dum Christus se ipsum nobis donans, non modo suo nos exemplum, ut alter alteri nos mutuo devoveamus ac tradamus invitat, sed quatenus se facit omnium, communem, nos quoque omnes unum in se ipso esse facit?" (*CO* 1:126). Calvin's concern for ethical living in relation to participation in the sacrament is evident here.

\textsuperscript{1038} Respectively: *Inst*. 1536, 110 and 283n"love"; *Inst*. 1559 4.17.38, 1415n27.

\textsuperscript{1039} Calvin, *Institutio Christianae religionis* (Geneva: Stephani, 1559), 523. "... the reader should be warned about the indexes to the McNeill/Battles translation of the *Institutes*. These are indexes to the notes of this edition, not to Calvin's text. ... Also no distinction is made in the body of the text between Calvin's own biblical and patristic references and those of the editors. The biblical references in the text may or may not go back to Calvin and some of Calvin's own references are dropped. Calvin's marginal patristic references are usually (but not always) found in the footnotes, but these notes make no distinction between the references given by Calvin and those of the editors. In short, this edition is highly misleading as an indicator of which biblical and patristic passages Calvin himself cited" (Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, xii-xiii).
of the *Institutio*, and the expression is as close as Calvin ever gets to associating Augustine, *vinculum*, and Christ's union with Christ's own. The Spirit is missing.

Attention is naturally drawn, then, to the twin assumptions identified above, the first with respect to Augustine and *vinculum or nexus*, and the second with respect to Calvin, Augustine, and *vinculum or nexus*. With regard to Augustine: In a recent, short study on Augustine, the Trinity, and *nexus amoris or vinculum amoris*, Catherine Osborne observes, "It is sometimes said that Augustine, in the *De Trinitate*, identified the Holy Spirit as the bond of love (*nexus, or *vinculum, amoris*) between Father and Son."\(^{1040}\) Though Osborne cites others,\(^{1041}\) Bertrand de Margerie is among those who make such a claim, as when he says outright: "Even though the great Bishop of Hippo did not actually discover it, yet he is the very first to systematically elaborate the theological doctrine that considers the Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son."\(^{1042}\) Robert Letham, in his recent comprehensive study of the doctrine of the


\(^{1041}\) Osborne: "The phrase 'bond of love,' *nexus amoris* or *vinculum amoris*, is used to describe Augustine's theory by e.g. L. Hodgson, *The Doctrine of the Trinity* (London, 1943), 68, 110, 226; K. E. Kirk, in A. E. J. Rawlinson (ed.), *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (London, 1928), 224; F. W. Green, in the same volume, 298, where the phrase is apparently attributed to W. Sanday (who does not use it); L. Dewar, *The Holy Spirit in Modern Thought* (London, 1959), 120; A. I. C. Heron, *The Holy Spirit* (London, 1983), 89; R. P. C. Hanson, 'The Filioque Clause,' in *Studies in Christian Antiquity* (Edinburgh, 1985), 290-1, where the phrase is attributed to Karl Barth (who does not use it)" (Osborne, "Bonds of Love," 201n1).

Trinity, follows de Margerie's lead on this point.\textsuperscript{1043} For her part, Osborne bears little tolerance for such a reading of Augustine, since her immediate response to it is this:

Strictly speaking this is clearly incorrect, since Augustine does not use either \textit{vinculum} or \textit{nexus amoris}. He consistently enumerates three elements, lover, beloved, and love, and the Holy Spirit is occasionally identified as the third of these, love, but love is not said to be a bond. Augustine does not identify the Holy Spirit as a 'bond of love' in so many words.\textsuperscript{1044}

Indeed, upon close examination of Augustine\textsuperscript{1045} and of secondary sources with reference to Augustine, it may be observed with Osborne that, while Augustine does approximately identify the Holy Spirit with love, Augustine does not specifically identify the Holy Spirit with love, nor love with bond. So even the mathematical proof of $A = B$ and $B = C$, therefore $A = C$ cannot be applied to proximately identify the Spirit as the \textit{nexus} or \textit{vinculum}. However, Augustine does say the Holy Spirit is that which is "\textit{common} to the Father and the Son," and is "\textit{that by which the two are joined each to the other.}"\textsuperscript{1046} While \textit{communio} and \textit{conjungitur} approximate the concept "bond," these Latin terms are not species of one another. So Osborne is seemingly on to something here: Augustine himself does not identify the Spirit as the bond—whether between the Father and Son, or the Son and his own—as so many assume and declare.

\textsuperscript{1043} Letham, \textit{Holy Trinity}, 199-200. Letham offers this critique of de Margerie: "However, de Margerie is enamored with the strengths of this [Augustine's] insight, and does not appear to be aware of its weaknesses. For one thing, it obscures the mutual indwelling of the three persons, of which Augustine scarcely appears aware."

\textsuperscript{1044} Osborne, "Bonds of Love," 201.

\textsuperscript{1045} This examination was taken up by way of especially \textit{Patrologia Latina: The Full Text Database} © 1999-2010 ProQuest LLC, http://pld.chadwyck.com.proxy.library.nd.edu.

Even though such an expression is not to be found in Augustine, the high-
medieval tradition certainly received it as "Augustinianesque," attributing it to
Augustine and assimilating it into occidental Trinitarian doctrine. In her examination of
the tradition (which is not completely repeated here), Osborne notes that

Aquinas has much to say about what love is, and though he also uses Augustine
as his basis he differs from his predecessors [Anselm and Lombard] in
introducing the notion of bond into the analysis of love. *Nexus amoris* and
*vinculum* occur occasionally and *nexus Patris et filii* is a common phrase, and
the claim that love is a bond is attributed to Augustine's *De Trinitate*, inaccurate
though this attribution is.\(^{1048}\)

As Osborne reads him, Aquinas equivocates on the fittingness of applying such
language to the Spirit, such that in the end "we are left to conclude that the Spirit is a
*nexus* and not a *nexus.*"\(^{1049}\) In any case, says Osborne, "Aquinas perhaps reached this


\(^{1047}\) Though clumsy, "Augustinianesque" is used in preference to "Augustinian" here in order to
reserve the term "Augustinian" for an idea or expression that truly derives from Augustine's works. See
below.

\(^{1048}\) Osborne, "Bonds of Love," 201-202, with copious reference to the works of Aquinas.


\(^{1051}\) Osborne, "Bonds of Love," 214 and 216.
is not wholly incompatible with Augustine, but, strictly speaking, is not Augustine. It is not "Augustinian," but "Augustinianesque."¹⁰⁵²

Since Aquinas presented this concept as Augustine's, it is perhaps easy to see that it would become so widely accepted and firmly entrenched in the tradition as Augustine, such that its inheritors rarely if ever saw need to attribute the thought to Augustine. That is to say, is it possible that the notion was so commonly assumed in the Western theological tradition by the sixteenth century, and so commonly assumed as authentically Augustine, that no one, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, was compelled to explicitly identify it as Augustine? Might this not explain Erasmus' formulation in his catechism cited in the previous chapter? Might this not explain Calvin's emphasis on "the Spirit as the bond of our union with Christ," though without attribution—ever? And does this not explain contemporary assumptions of Augustine and Calvin, and the relation of their thought on this point?

As noted in the previous chapter, in his catechism of 1533, *Dilucida et pia explanatio symboli quod apostolorum dicitur, et decalogi praeceptorum*, Erasmus declares:

> There is one divinity in the three, and the three are one God. The major divisions in the creed arise from this truth. The Father holds first place, the Son holds second, the Holy Spirit, who is love and an ineffable bond between the other two, holds the third. . . . . The church is attached to [the Son] as the human body is attached to its head. As that divine Spirit binds (*conglutinate*) the Father and Son closely together, so too he fastens the church to Christ by an invisible and indissoluble bond (*adglutinat arcano et indissolubili vinculo*). The mystical body of Christ occupies the fourth part of the creed.¹⁰⁵³

¹⁰⁵² See the footnote above.

¹⁰⁵³ Erasmus, "Explanation of the Apostles' Creed," 248. For the Latin, consult the citation of this passage in the previous chapter.
Throughout the dialog between the Katechumenus (KA) and the Catechista (CA), Erasmus works in references to several fathers, including Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, Thomas Aquinas, and Augustine. However, the context of the Trinitarian claims above—which are readily recognizable as "Augustinianesque"—bears no reference to any of the fathers. Is its Augustinianism assumed? Does Erasmus consider a reference to Augustine to be superfluous?

As noted in the previous chapter, Calvin's expression at the Lausanne Disputation (1536) about the Spirit as the bond between believers and Christ, the bond which then affords the spiritual nourishment of Christ's body and blood, is very like that of Erasmus, as expressed in his catechism. Though Calvin offers patristic warrant for other theological claims, he does not for this one, here or ever after. Does he assume that it is self-evidently Augustinian?

If Calvin assumes this as self-evidently Augustinian, contemporary scholars do not, and are wont to point out Calvin's debt to Augustine with regard to the vinculum that binds the Trinity and believers to God the Father through the Son. They do this, "inaccurate as this may be," to paraphrase Osborne. In the mid-1990s, Philip Walker Butin prepared a fine study of Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity, tellingly entitled Revelation, Redemption, and Response: Calvin's Trinitarian Understanding of the Divine-Human Relationship. In his discussion of "The Spirit: The Way We Receive the Grace of Christ," Butin appropriately dwells on the opening paragraph of the third book of the 1559 Institutio. While this passage of the Institutio is prepared late in Calvin's life, regarding "Spirit" and "bond," it is perfectly resonant with his expressions

prepared already in 1536 and 1537. In this passage, Calvin's concern is how Christ's benefits are availed of Christ's own: "As long as Christ remains outside of us, and we are separated from him," says Calvin, "all that he has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race remains useless and of no value for us." So, "to share with us what he has received from the Father, he had to become ours and to dwell within us." To grasp this, we must "climb higher and . . . examine into the secret energy of the Spirit, by which we come to enjoy Christ and all his benefits."1055 In sum, says Calvin, "the Holy Spirit is the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself"—"Huc summa redit, spiritum sanctum vinculum esse, quo nos sibi efficaciter devincit Christus."1056

Commenting on this passage, Butin notes Calvin's "preeminent focus on the Pauline concept of the Spirit as the testimony and seal of the believer's salvation in Christ."1057 This, says Butin, "is the biblical root of the theme that had eventually taken expression via Augustine in the classic Western notion of the Spirit as the 'bond of love' between the Father and the Son, and between the believer and Christ."1058 According to Butin, it is essentially Augustine's thought that Calvin "reflects and sharpens" with his summary statement "the Holy Spirit is the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to

1055 Inst. 1559 LCC 3.1.1. "Ac primo habendum est,quamdiu extra nos est Christus et ab eo sumus separati, quidquid in salutem humili generis passus est ac fecit, nobis, esse inutile nulliusque momenti. Ergo ut nobiscum quae a patre accept communicet, nostrum fieri et in nobis habitare oportet . . . altius conscendere ipsa ratio nos docet, ac de arcane spiritus efficacia inquirere, qua fit ut Christo bonisque eius omnibus fruamur" (CO 2:393)


1057 Butin, Revelation, 81.

1058 Butin, Revelation, 81.
himself." So Butin, for one among others who could be cited, assumes Augustine is the progenitor of the language Calvin employs.

In his footnote, Butin gestures in the direction of the discussion at hand, namely, the "patristic provenance" of Calvin's expression. His footnote opens with approving reference to Niesel's discussion of the sermon of Chrysostom discussed above. He invites his reader to cross-reference Augustine's *De Trinitate* VI.5, and then notes that *vinculum* appears in neither the sermon of Chrysostom, nor in the treatise of Augustine at this point. In the final paragraph of his extended note, Butin declares

> We have not discovered any occurrence of the term *vinculum* in Calvin which directly endorses the Augustinian conception of the immanent Trinity (in which the Spirit is the bond of love between the Father and the Son), although the concept appears to be tentatively present in 1559 *Institutes* I.13.19. Rather, Calvin characteristically focuses on the economic relationship of the triune God with believers; thus, the emphasis is on the Holy Spirit as 'the bond by which Christ effectually [*efficaciter*] unites us to himself.'

The point is this: In 1536, while at Lausanne, Calvin declares that in the Holy Supper, the natural body and blood of Christ is not given, but is communicated spiritually: "it is a spiritual communication by which he [Christ] makes us truly participant of his body and blood, but wholly spiritually, that is by the bond of his Spirit." Here, Calvin's expression of the Spirit as the bond is "Augustinianesque," if it may be put that way. It is not wholly incompatible with Augustine's doctrine, particularly (if Osborne is right) as Aquinas receives and interprets it, but it is not Augustine himself. Whether this matters to Calvin or not is ultimately unknowable, since Calvin nowhere explicitly ascribes his employment of this concept to Augustine. And why would he if "tradition" has done so for him? On the one occasion where he

---

does provide explicit patristic ascription, he indicates a debt to a sermon of Chrysostom, as discussed above. If Letham is right—that "the Spirit is never considered by the East as the bond of love between the Father and the Son, as in Western tradition after Augustine; nor is he the bond uniting Christ and the church"—then this sermon attributed to Chrysostom is perhaps more likely of occidental rather than oriental provenance. Perhaps this is Niesel's inference as well, and perhaps this is why he speaks of it being including among the works of Chrysostom "at the time," meaning, in the sixteenth century.

While Calvin never explicitly attributes to Augustine his understanding of the Spirit as the *nexus* or *vinculum* of believers' union with Christ, and therefore the one through whom God in Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit avails to their souls Christ's body and blood as spiritual food for the spiritual journey, Calvin does, in a single breath, correlate Augustine, the reception of Christ's body in heaven, and the inspiration of life into believers from that body "by the secret virtue of the Spirit." The passage appears in his 1557 *Ultima admonitio* against Westphal. It is quoted here at length for context, with especially relevant elements indicated with italics:

. . . although believers have spiritual communion with Christ without the use of the sacrament, still we distinctly declare that Christ, who instituted the Supper, works effectually by its means.

Westphal confines spiritual eating to the fruit merely, regarding it a means by which the salvation obtained by the death of Christ is applied to us, while his sacramental eating, as I have observed, is nothing more than a gulping down of Christ’s flesh. What does Augustine say? He teaches that the body of Christ is eaten sacramentally only when it is not eaten in reality. In two passages this antithesis is distinctly expressed by him. Hence we surely gather that the

---

1060 Letham, *Holy Trinity*, 343, with punctuation is slightly altered to accommodate this sentence.

1061 See discussion above.
sacramental is equivalent merely to the visible or external use, when unbelief precludes access to the reality. Westphal, therefore, acts calumniously in charging our spiritual eating as a fallacious pretext for destroying the true communion which takes place in the Supper. For if spiritual is to be separated from sacramental eating, what are we to make of the following passage of Augustine? (In Psalm 98): You are not about to eat the body which you see and to drink the blood which those who are to crucify me will shed. I have committed a sacrament to you: when spiritually understood, it will give you life. Now, if it is clear that in the Supper, when the body is not spiritually eaten, nothing is left but a void and empty sign, and we infer from the words of Christ that spiritual eating takes place when faith corresponds to the mystical and spiritual doctrine, there is no ground for Westphal's attempt to dissever things which cannot be divided. I admit it to be certain that the same body which Christ offered on the cross is eaten, because we do not imagine that Christ has two bodies, nor is aliment for spiritual life to be sought anywhere else than in that victim. How does Augustine deny it to be the same body, but just in respect that having been received into heaven it inspires life into us by the secret virtue of the Spirit? Therefore a different mode of eating is denoted, viz., that though the body remains entire in heaven, it quickens us by its miraculous and heavenly virtue. In short, Augustine’s only reason for denying that the body on which the disciples were looking is given in the Supper, was to let us know that the mode of communion is not at all carnal, that we become partakers of flesh and blood in a mystery, our teeth not consuming that grace, as he elsewhere expresses it. Thus Westphal gains nothing by his quibbling. He is also detected in a manifest calumny, when he charges us with wresting this passage to mean that the Supper gives us nothing but an empty figure.¹⁰⁶²

Calvin's exposition implies that Augustine himself refers to the work of the Holy Spirit, but Augustine does not. So the robust pneumatology expressed in this passage quoted from Calvin is Calvin's, not explicitly Augustine's, at least not of the passage in Augustine to which Calvin refers. Language with regard to the Spirit is prominent in Augustine's *Homilies on the Gospel of John*, but even there his particular expression is different from that of Calvin's, and Calvin seemingly does not refer to Augustine's expositions on the fourth gospel with regard to the role of the Holy Spirit and believers' participation in the Lord's Supper. That is, Calvin's emphasis on the *virtus* of the

etiam calumnia deprehenditur, locum hunc a nobis torqueri insimulans, ut nihil nobis coena affarer praeter inanem figuram" (CO 9:162-63). [At the * the editors indicate a footnote, the text of which reads: In Psal. 98. This reference appears in the margin of the sixteenth century edition at this very point (John Calvin, *Ultima admonitio ad Joachimum Westphalum* [Geneva: Ioannem Crispinum, 1557], 65).


1064 Unlike Zwingli, and even Oecolampadius and Viret, Calvin does not appeal to John 6:63—"The Spirit is life; the flesh profits nothing"—as a mantra against Roman Catholic and Lutheran views of the sacrament. In his 1553 commentary on the text, he forthrightly declares: "Nor do I approve of the views of those who say, that the flesh of Christ profiteth, so far as he was crucified, but that, when it is eaten, it is of no advantage to us; for on the contrary, we must eat it, that, having been crucified, it may profit."

In his commentary on John 6, Calvin refers approvingly to the progression of Augustine's exegesis: "I confess that there is nothing said here that is not figured and actually presented to believers in the Lord's Supper. Indeed, we might say that Christ intended the holy Supper to be a seal of this discourse. This is also the reason why John makes no mention of the Lord's Supper. And therefore Augustine follows the proper order when, in expounding this chapter, he does not touch on the Lord's Supper until he comes to the end. And then he shows that this mystery is represented in a symbol whenever the Churches celebrate the sacred Supper, in some places daily, in others only on the Lord's day" (*The Gospel according to St. John 1-10*, trans. T. H. L. Parker, CNTC 4:170). Regarding John 6:63, Calvin writes: "Augustine thinks that we should supply the word 'only' or 'by itself', because it must be joined with the Spirit. This fits in well with the argument, for Christ is referring simply to the manner of eating. He does not exclude every kind of usefulness, as if none at all could be obtained from his flesh, but says that it will be useless if separated from the Spirit. For where does the flesh get its quickening power, but because it is spiritual? Therefore, whoever stops short at the earthly nature of the flesh, will find in it nothing but what is dead. But those who raise their eyes to the power of the Spirit which which the flesh is imbued, will feel from the effect itself and the experience of faith that quickening is no empty word. §§We now understand how the flesh is meat indeed and yet profits nothing. It is meat in that, by it, life is procured for us, in it God is reconciled to us, and in it we have all the parts of salvation accomplished. It profits nothing if considered in its origin and nature; for the seed of Abraham, which in itself is subject to death, does not give life, but receives its power of feeding us from the Spirit. Therefore
Spirit is not expressed in Augustine here, nor is the explicit use of vinculum or nexus, though Augustine does speak eloquently of the "dread" a Christian ought to harbor at the thought of being "separated from Christ's body".  

For if he is separated from Christ's body, he is not a member of Christ; if he is not a member of Christ, he is not quickened by the Spirit of Christ. "But if any man," saith the apostle, "have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." [Rom 8:9] It is the Spirit," then, "that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life." What means "are spirit and life"? They are to be understood spiritually. Hast thou understood spiritually? "They are spirit and life." Hast thou understood carnally? So also "are they spirit and life," but are not so to thee.  

All of this is said simply to point out that Augustine's writings do not appear to be the provenance of Calvin's very expressions. It is not said to counter the seminal, long-standing discussion about the diversity of Eucharistic doctrines in the early and medieval periods of the church, their nature, whence they emerged, and when and where they converged or clashed. Amid this diversity, many scholars discern two
primary classifications of Eucharistic doctrine. Some label these two categories the "realist" and the "spiritualist," ascribing the first to especially Ambrose of Milan, and the second to especially Augustine of Hippo. Others ascribe them respectively as "metabolic" and "non-metabolic," or "somatic" and "non-somatic," or "somatic" and "symbolic." Such categories are carried through analyses of medieval and scholastic doctrines of the Eucharist. In these periods, proponents of these discernible views found themselves at odds, giving rise to, e.g., the Eucharistic controversies of the ninth and eleventh centuries. Notably, the authors of the first two extant treatises on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper each take a view, with the second placing his view in irenic opposition to that of the first. Not surprisingly—or surprisingly (depending on your take on the history of the church and its dogma)—the authors resided at the same monastery at the same time: In the mid-ninth century, both Paschiasius Radbertus and

---


1069 Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre des Vorscholastik, as referred to by Macy, Treasures, 2.

1070 Kilmartin, Eucharist in the West, xxiii, as referred to by Riggs, volume on the Eucharist in the Reformed tradition, forthcoming.


1072 Macy, Treasures, 11.
Ratramnus were monks at the Benedictine monastery of Corbie, and each wrote a treatise entitled *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.

There is no proof that Calvin engaged these medieval texts, nor is there proof that he did not. However, a certain speech pattern within these works is striking with regard to the discussion at hand, and therefore they are taken up briefly—and conjecturally—below.

### 7.3 Early Medieval Writings

In the sixteenth century, even prior to Calvin's arrival on the scene of reform, those who appealed to the Spirit in discourse on the Lord's Supper were often accused of reviving the eleventh century heresy of Berengar. Quite famously, his view was condemned and he was forced to swear a sacramental oath before Pope Nicholas II, a short, blunt, forceful oath prepared by Humbert of Silva Candida:

I agree with the holy Roman Church and the Apostolic See, and I profess with mouth and heart to hold as the faith concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper what the lord and venerable Pope Nicholas and this holy synod by the authority of the gospels and the apostles have given to be held and have ratified to me: Namely, that the bread and wine which are palced on the altar after the consecration are not only signs (*non solum sacramentum*), but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that sensually, not only in sign, but in truth (*non solum sacramento, sed in veritate*) they are handled and broken by the

---


1074 Lane, *Student of the Church Fathers*, 45.

1075 For more see Macy, *Treasures*, 20ff.
hands of the priest and crushed by the teeth of the faithful, swearing by the holy and one-in-substance Trinity and by the most holy gospel of Christ.\textsuperscript{1076}

In 1059, a synodical assembly convened by the pope adopted Berengar's oath. Deemed authoritative, "the oath of Berengar was subsequently included in several canon law collections of the early twelfth century, thus finding its way into Gratian's \textit{Decretum} in the twelfth century."\textsuperscript{1077} Gratian's work was among the few on which Calvin leaned his learning early in his career, prior to his extensive engagement with patristic works themselves.\textsuperscript{1078}

Humbert's oath for Berengar is an explicit recrudescence of Paschasius' view of the Lord's Supper, his view being opposed to Ratramnus' of the ninth century as well as Berengar's of the eleventh.\textsuperscript{1079} Both Ratramnus (whose work Berengar mistakenly ascribed to John Scotus Eriugena\textsuperscript{1080}) and Berengar espoused views taken to align with the Augustinian symbolic, or non-metabolic, or non-somatic expression of a believer's encounter with Christ in the sacrament with the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{1081} So Humbert's point,
as the papal legate designated to prepare an oath for Berengar to swear, was to quash an overly "spiritualistic" understanding of the sacrament, and to uplift a robustly "realistic" one.\textsuperscript{1082}

It is true that there were those in the sixteenth century who saw to the reprinting of Ratramnus' treatise, though under a misnomer: "Bertramus." A thorough study of the recrudescence of his work, entitled at the time \textit{Bertrami Presbyteri de corpore et sanguine Domini: liber ad Carolum Magnum Imperatorem, iam recens aeditus},\textsuperscript{1083} is beyond the scope of this study, but worthy of note is one edition printed in Gevena in 1541 under the title \textit{Bertrami Presbyteri de corpore et sanguine Domini liber, ad Carolum Magnum Imperatore, ante D C C. annos aeditus. Addita est epistola Augustinin ad Dardanum, De praesentia Dei & Christi. Item, tractatus eiusdem De corpore & sangunine Domini}.\textsuperscript{1084} There is no evidence that Calvin ever read or encountered Ratramnus' treatise firsthand. Even if he had, Calvin himself likely would not have allied his thought with Ratramnus': by the sixteenth century Ratramnus is

\textsuperscript{1082} In 1079, Berengar was forced to swear another oath, this time at the Synod of Rome convened by Gregory VII. The oath "moderated considerably that of 1059." It "demonstrated the technical expertise which had developed throughout the controversy. Here the technical terms of Aristotelian philosophy were introduced to describe the mode of presence which the Lord undertook in the sacrament. The sophistication which later theologians would develop as they rediscovered Aristotelian concepts such as \textit{substantia}, would continue to evolve new and more nuanced understandings of a sacramental terminology which would remain remarkably unchanged" (Macy, \textit{Theologies of the Eucharist}, 37).

\textsuperscript{1083} Published in Cologne by John Prael in 1531, the \textit{edition princeps} for every reprinting of the text for the next century and half. See the "Introduction" to \textit{Ratramnus: Christ's Body and Blood}, 114. By February 1532, Leo Jud had prepared a German version of the text. For a thorough discussion of the history of the text, see the introductory material to Bakhuisen van den Brink, \textit{Ratramnus: De corpore et sanguine Domini—texte établi d'après les manuscrits et notice bibliographique} (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1954).

\textsuperscript{1084} Published in Genevae: Excudebat Michael Sylvuius, 1541.
identified with heterodoxy, even heresy, though the orthodoxy of his view was not questioned at the time he presented it, nor for decades to follow. So to ally with Ratramnus was to ally with an influence outside the Catholic church, not within it. As noted in the introduction to this study, no one in the sixteenth century countenanced novelty of thought. Ratramnus' thought, rightly or wrongly, was eventually deemed novel, even heretical; to espouse this openly would be to espouse novelty, to associate with heterodoxy, to undermine one's own argument. Furthermore, by the time Calvin might have engaged Ratramnus' work, the authenticity of this ninth century work was questioned: some theologians surmised it was a fabrication of certain Protestants vainly grasping to historicize their view. So, if it is difficult to imagine that Calvin did not engage Ratramnus' work, it is that much easier to imagine why he and his works do not admit such engagement: the work is likely spurious, and even if not, heretical. Furthermore, Augustine's authority trumps Ratramnus', even if the latter's were considered orthodox; so Ratramnus simply is not a necessary witness.

Still, suppose Calvin had encountered Ratramnus' thought: Several significant points of contrast could be rehearsed between Calvin's discourse on the sacrament of the

---

1085 Macy, Treasures, 11.
1086 Macy, Treasures, 11; Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 46.
1087 McCracken, Introduction to "Ratramus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," 114. In 1672, Ratramnus' treatise was proved authentic when "the great Benedictine Mabillon visited Lobbes and transcribed the text of Codex Lobiensis" (McCracken, Introduction to "Ratramus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," 114 and 112, with reference to Codex Lobiensis 909).
1088 Lane, Student of the Church Fathers, 46. "To borrow a twelfth-century metaphor, to them [the Reformers] Radbertus and Ratramnus seemed to be fighting out their debate 'as dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants,' i.e., the Church Fathers" (Otten, "Between Augustinian Sign and Carolingian Reality," 139).
With respect to the Holy Spirit and the sacrament, however, one thin point of conjunction is of interest. This conjunction lies in their explicit reference to the third person of the Trinity, whose work, or power, is variously expressed as secret, invisible, or incomprehensible. In a passage in which he draws off "the blessed Isidore in the books of Etymologies," Ratramnus theologizes:

But the bread and wine are likened to the body and blood because, just as the substance of this visible bread and wine nourishes and stimulates the outer man, so the Word of God, who is living bread, refreshes faithful souls that share in it. ... This is why the bread which is offered, although from the fruits of the earth, is transferred into the body of Christ while it is being consecrated. So also the wine, though it flowed out of the vine, is made the blood of Christ through the consecration of the divine mystery—not visibly, of course, but as this doctor says, working invisibly through the Spirit of God (non quidem visibiliter sed sicut ait praesens doctor operante invisibiliter spiritu dei). This is why they are

1089 For examples: 1) As may be noted in the passages quoted below and elsewhere in his treatise, Ratramnus' use of "outward" and "inward" differs from, e.g., Zwingli and Bullinger's, in that Ratramnus uses these qualifiers specifically with respect to the elements, the bread and wine. The reformers mentioned employed these terms with respect to the communicant: what one does outwardly (eating bread with the mouth of the body) depicts what one does, or what happens, inwardly, though not necessarily on the occasion of the celebration of the sacrament (feeding on Christ's body with the mouth of the soul, that is, faith). Calvin speaks similarly, though with a different nuance than Zwingli and Bullinger. 2) Ratramnus seems to use the term "body" ambiguously, or at least variously. In answering Charles the Bald's question "whether that very body which was born of Mary, suffered, died, and was buried, and which sits on the right hand of the Father, is what is daily taken in the church by the mouth of the faithful through the mystery of the sacraments" ("Ratramus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," trans. McCracken, 132), Ratramnus speaks of corporal body of Christ and the spiritual body of Christ, seemingly suggesting (unless one grants him a poetic license to be liberally applied) that Christ has two bodies, as when he says "under cover of the corporeal bread and of the corporeal wine Christ's spiritual body and spiritual blood do exist" ("Ratramus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," trans. McCracken, 123). His conclusion is that there is great "difference between the body which exists through the mystery and that which suffered, was buried, and rose again" ("Ratramus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," trans. McCracken, 146; also 137, 138, 143, 144). The very charges of "ambiguity" and "two bodies" that one might bring to Ratramnus' exposition are the very charges Calvin must address with respect to his own doctrine. Calvin's response indicates that he would not be comfortable with Ratramnus' exposition: "He [Westphal] rejoins that I am deceiving by using the term body in an ambiguous sense. But I thought I had sufficiently obviated such cavils by so often repeating, that it was the true and natural body which was offered on the cross. From what forge the fiction of a twofold body proceeded, I know not: this I know, that I hold it detestable impiety to imagine Christ with two bodies. I know, indeed, that the mortal body which Christ once assumed is now endued with new qualities of celestial glory, which, however, do not prevent it from being in substance the same body. I say, then, that, by that body which hung on the cross our souls are invigorated with spiritual life, just as our bodies are nourished by earthly bread" (Tracts and Treatises 2:280; CO 9:72). Pursuing this further lies beyond the scope of this dissertation, though this, along with other points of comparison and contrast, would comprise an interesting study.

337
called Christ's blood and body, because they are received, not as what they outwardly seem, but as what inwardly, through the agency of the divine Spirit, they have been made (sed quod interius divino spiritu operante facta sunt accipiuntur). 1091

Linguistically, Calvin prefers derivatives of *virtus* rather than those of *opera*. But conceptually, Calvin's field of vision, with its specific focus on the Holy Spirit, seems to overlap Ratramnus', especially when Calvin is wont to declare that "by the *virtus* of the Spirit, there is a present *exhibitio* of the thing." 1092 Given its greater similarity to Calvin's pattern of speech, the following passage from Ratramnus' treatise, in which Ratramnus offers a reading of Ambrose, draws this to sharper relief:

Saint Ambrose says that in that mystery of Christ's blood and body a change took place both miraculously because divinely and ineffably because incomprehensibly. . . . For with respect to the substance of things created, what they had been before consecration, that they afterward are. They were bread and wine before; they seem to remain of this same appearance now when consecrated. Therefore, what faith sees, what feeds the soul, what provides the substance of eternal life, has been changed inwardly by the mighty power of the Holy Spirit (est ergo interius commutatem spiritus sancti potenti virtute quod fides ascipt animam pascit aeterne vitae substantia subministrat). 1093

1090 Here as elsewhere Ratramnus' use of "outward" and "inward" differs from, e.g., Zwingli and Bullinger's, in that Ratramnus uses these qualifiers specifically with respect to the elements, the bread and wine. The reformers mentioned use these terms with respect to the communicant: what one does outwardly (namely, eat bread with the mouth of the body) depict what one does inwardly, though not necessarily on the occasion of the celebration of the sacrament (namely, "feed" on Christ's body with the mouth of the soul, that is, faith). Pursuing this further lies beyond the scope of this dissertation, though this, along with other points of comparison and contrast, would comprise an interesting study.


Here, as in the passage above, Ratramnus speaks of "inward" and "outward" with respect to the elements of the sacrament themselves, the bread and the wine. Calvin, like, e.g., Bullinger, prefers to employ these terms with respect to the communicant: What transpires outwardly—the physical eating of bread by the mouth of the body—depicts what transpires inwardly—the spiritual nourishing of the soul, which feeds by the mouth of faith. Calvin's view is more robustly sacramental than Bullinger's, however, in that Calvin is emphatic that this nourishing of the soul takes place in the Supper, in the liturgical act of the communion, because in that moment, "by the virtus of the Spirit, there is a present exhibitio of the thing."1094 In this robustly sacramental sense, Calvin's view is further from Bullinger's than from Ratramnus' as expressed in the passage above. Though Calvin does not readily employ the language of "change" as Ratramnus does, he does constellate certain terms as Ratramnus does, including spiritus sanctus, virtus, anima, corpus and sanguis.

Again, this point of conjunction is thin. Its elaboration is not to be taken as an argument for source, resource, provenance, or influence, except perhaps in a secondary way, even an inadvertent secondary way. In 1532, Leo Jud had translated Ratramnus' treatise into German, thereby demonstrating his approbation for its theological contribution to contemporary discourse on the Lord's Supper. Soon after, Bullinger sent a

1093 "Ratramus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," trans. McCracken, 133, with reference to Ambrose, De mysteriis. "Dicit sanctus Ambrosius in illo misterio sanguinis et corporis Christi commutationem esse factam et mirabili quia diuine et ineffabiliter quia incomprehendibile. . . . nam secundum creaturarum substantiam quod fuerunt ante consecrationem hoc et postea consistent. panis et unum prius existiterea in qua etiam specie iam consecrate permanere uidentur. est ergo interius commutatum spiritus sancti potenti uirtute quod fides aspicit animam pascit aeternae uitae substantiam subministrat" (Ratramnus, De corpore et sanguine domini, 44-45)

1094 Tracts and Treatises 2:517. "... quum ubique asseram praesentem in spiritus virtute exhibitionem rei..." (CO 9:477).
copy of Jud's translation to the Margrave of Brandenburg, thereby announcing his approval of the work. By their exposure to and dissemination of Ratramnus' work, Jud and Bullinger no doubt incited broader exposure to Ratramnus' work, including, then, its constellation of *spiritus*, *virtus*, and *corpus* in a discussion of *coena domini*. However, by their actions, Jud and Bullinger also *de facto* identified Ratramnus' sacramental doctrine with the sacramental doctrine of Zurich and its "Zwinglians." This sacramental doctrine of Zwingli and his successors is precisely the sacramental doctrine from which Calvin attempts to dissociate his own sacramental doctrine, especially in his writings of the 1530s and 1540s. So even if Calvin had found interest in Ratramnus' treatise (despite its being deemed heterodox and perhaps even spurious), his disinclination to have his sacramental doctrine associated with that of Zurich would surely have inclined him to leave Ratramnus aside.

### 7.4 Conclusion

The point of this chapter has been to consider Calvin's assimilation of the thought of his predecessors, a consideration occasioned by Calvin's specific reference to one particular patristic work, his nonspecific reference to the thought of another church father, and his lack of reference to one medieval text. Each of these demonstrates Calvin's intended, if not wholly founded, aim to ground his particular pneumatological emphasis in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the biblical-

---

1095 McCracken, Introduction to "Ratramus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," 114.
1096 As much, if not more, for political than theological reasons, Calvin strives for concord with Bullinger and the churches of Zurich in the late 1540s. See discussion above at page 84.
1097 Whether on his part in the sixteenth century, or on our part, in retrospect from the twentieth, given subsequent scholarship on the works of Chrysostom and Augustine.
theological tradition of the church. By referring to Chrysostom and specifically one work, and by referring to Augustine, though nonspecifically to his thought, Calvin demonstrates his esteem for the church fathers and the theological tradition they bequeathed to the church. If Calvin consciously omitted reference to Ratramnus, this action, too, would demonstrate Calvin's intention to ground his doctrine in the orthodox tradition of the church. Though from a twentieth century perspective, one might enjoy toying with Calvin's patristic and medieval sourcework, this does not mitigate the fact that Calvin himself saw himself assimilating the thought of his predecessors, the thought of the church.
A SURPRISING FAILURE TO ASSIMILATE LITURGICALLY:
A PROLUSION

In his study of Luther and his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Hermann Sasse notes a little-observed fact, already quoted twice before in this study: "In the liturgy of Geneva there is no trace of an invocation of the Spirit."1098 With regard to the liturgy for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, this is indeed so. Nor is there mention of the Holy Spirit otherwise, except in one doxological formula concluding the post-communion prayer of thanksgiving. So when one considers Calvin's liturgy, his form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, one discovers an apparent and interesting failure on Calvin's part to assimilate his robust sacramental pneumatology liturgically.

To explore this further, this chapter comprises 1) an investigation of Calvin's form for celebrating the Lord's Supper, including the setting and context of its preparation; 2) a survey of three reformed forms for celebrating the sacrament well-familiar to Calvin when he prepared his own form, two of which are taken to be antecedents of Calvin's liturgy; 3) a study—albeit a short study—of the pneumatology of Calvin's liturgy as a whole; and finally, 4) a consideration of an early descendant of Calvin's form for celebrating the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

1098 Sasse, This Is My Body, 264.
8.1 Calvin's Liturgy: Context and Commentary

In April 1538, the council of Geneva summarily evicted John Calvin and Guillaume Farel from the city. Chastened by his first experience as a pastor, Calvin elected to retire to Basel, to take up the quieter life of a scholar there. Even as Farel had enlisted Calvin to serve the cause of the reformation of Geneva, Bucer now confronted Calvin in Basel and enlisted him to serve the community of French refugees in Strasbourg.

By the time Calvin arrived in Strasbourg, the city had been well established as an important center of Protestantism, not least because of the erudite leadership and political genius of its mayor, Jacob Sturm. In the mid- to late-1520s and into the 1530s, it became a prominent destination for French refugees, indeed, the very destination for the Frenchman "Jean Cauvin" in 1536. In 1538, Bucer and Capito summoned Calvin to serve a newly formed but growing French congregation, at the time involving about four or five hundred members. Wendel notes that in September of that year, Calvin began to preach, first at the Church of St. Nicolas-des-Ondes and then in the Chapel of the Penitents of St. Magdalene; later, the Magistracy gave the French congregation the use of the choir of the secularized Church of the Dominicans. In organizing the

---

1099 Farel proceeded to Neuchâtel and established himself as a pastor, a post he held to the end of his days.

1100 Regarding Calvin in Strasbourg, these works and the resources cited there: de Greef, Writings of John Calvin, 30-41; Wendel, Calvin: Origins and Development, 57-68; Jacques Pannier, Calvin à Strasbourg (Strasbourg, 1925); Daniel Benoit, Calvin à Strasbourg, 1538-1541 (Strasbourg, 1938); Gordon, Calvin, 85ff.

parish, Calvin consciously followed on the organization of the Strasbourg church and its practices. In Wendel's words:

> Without restricting himself to any literal translation of the liturgies in use, it was nevertheless from them that he borrowed the general order of worship and the most characteristic formularies. The confession of sins, the prayers of thanksgiving recited at Holy Communion, and the marriage service, were thus transposed into French, moreover, these were still preserved by Calvin later on in the Genevan Church, which in its turn transmitted them to all the Reformed Churches using the French language.\footnote{1102}

Calvin himself attests, "As for the Sunday prayers, I took the form of Strassburg and borrowed the greater part of it."\footnote{1103} Given his appropriation of Strasbourg's practice and its prayers, it will be worth looking closely at the Strasbourg form for celebrating the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for now, however, Calvin's is given close consideration.\footnote{1104}

Calvin first prepared his liturgy in the late 1530s and published it around 1540.\footnote{1105} This edition is no longer extant, though a second edition, published by Calvin's successor, Pierre Brully, in 1542, is; as is a third edition, edited by Calvin


\footnote{1103} Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 189, quoted without reference to a source.


himself and printed in Strasbourg in 1545. While the order of the elements of the celebration of the sacraments differs slightly in the 1542 and 1545 versions, the texts of these elements are identical. As Bruno Bürki demonstrates, the most significant difference between Calvin's 1542 and 1545 editions is the placement of the communion prayer: In Geneva, on Sundays when the Lord's Supper is celebrated, it is appended seamlessly to the intercessions, which follow the sermon and which are in fact a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer; in Strasbourg, as in the Strasbourg (Bucer) liturgy of the late 1530s, the communion prayer is independent of the intercessions. In this liturgy of Calvin's, the communion prayer follows the communal singing of the confession of faith, during which the bread and wine are prepared, and precedes the Words of Institution. Schematically, Calvin's 1542 and 1545 liturgies may be rendered accordingly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geneva 1542</th>
<th>Strasbourg 1545</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sermon, entirely, or at its end, concerning the Lord's Supper</td>
<td>Sermon, entirely, or at its end, concerning the Lord's Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercessions following a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer and concluding with the Communion Prayer</td>
<td>Intercessions following a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession of Faith recited</td>
<td>Confession of Faith sung, during which time the bread and wine are prepared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Given Calvin's testimony of his desire to comport with Strasbourg's practice while he was there, the structure of his liturgy c. 1540 likely appeared as it is in the 1545 printed edition, as this edition most closely approximates the Strasbourg liturgy. It is this 1545 version, then, that is followed in the discussion below. Each element is taken up in turn with comment, attention being paid to Calvin's pneumatological concern—or surprising lack thereof.

The form for celebrating the sacrament of the Lord's Supper itself begins with a rubric: On the Sunday prior to the celebration, the minister is to announce the upcoming celebration of the sacrament. Thus, all are to prepare to partake of it worthily, children are to be properly instructed, and any who are "strangers" who may yet be "untaught and ignorant" are to present themselves for instruction. The rubric closes as follows:

---

1109 This chart is rendered from Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," *Coena Domini I*, 350.
On the day of the Lord's Supper, the Minister touches upon it [the sacrament] in the conclusion of his Sermon, or better, if there is occasion, preaches the whole Sermon about it, in order to explain to the people what our Lord wishes to say and signify by this mystery, and in what way it behooves us to receive it.\footnote{1111}

Such a statement attests to Calvin's affirmation of the unity of Word and Sacrament, the latter being the tangibly received seal of the former. Properly speaking then, an exploration of Calvin's liturgy for the celebration of the Lord's Supper should begin with the beginning of the occasion of worship, with its opening votum: "Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth" (Ps. 124:8). For this reason, Calvin's liturgy for the Lord's Day is considered below, though here his liturgy immediate to the celebration of the sacrament is take up for discussion.

The communion celebration itself begins with the singing of the confession of faith, the Apostles' Creed. In the words of the minister, in this way, all "testify that we are children of God."\footnote{1112} The third article of the creed, of course, concerns the Holy Spirit.

During the singing of the creed, the minister prepares the bread and wine for the celebration. Bard Thompson suggests that at this time, the bread and wine are actually brought forward to the table. Calvin did not think it fitting, says Thompson, "to expose the elements until the Word could be added to validate the sacrament." As warrant for his interpretation, Thompson quotes Calvin: "The Word ought to sound in our ears as

\footnote{1110}Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 203-204; see also Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," \textit{Coena Domini I}, 357.

\footnote{1111}It would be an interesting study to examine Calvin's sermons preached on the occasion of the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, assuming these could be culled from his oeuvre.

soon as the sign itself meets our eyes." Regrettably, Thompson provides no citation for this statement.

Following the confession of faith, the minister voices the communion prayer. (The Genevan liturgy explicitly instructs, *il dit à haute voix*.) As Thompson observes, this prayer is essentially a "prayer of humble access": it is a confession of faith that Christ offers his very body and blood as "our nourishment unto everlasting life," and a prayer "that we may receive at His hands such a great gift . . . with true sincerity of heart and with ardent zeal." Surprisingly, neither a confession of the role of the Holy Spirit nor a summons for the work of the Holy Spirit is expressed. Though in his treatises on the Lord's Supper Calvin repeatedly emphasizes that the nourishment of souls transpires only by the *virtus* of the Holy Spirit, who is the *vinculum* of believers' union with Christ and thereby the one who affords the gift of the sacrament, in this prayer, Calvin fails, if you will, to acknowledge this.

After this prayer, which concludes with the Lord's Prayer, the minister offers an exhortation concerning the sacrament. The exhortation opens with the Words of Institution, taken from 1 Corinthians 11. In light of Paul's admonition, the minister "excommunicates" the unrepentant and calls the repentant to self-examination. However, the lengthier part of Calvin's exhortation is pastoral assurance that Christ

---

1113 Thompson, *Liturgies*, 192, quoted without reference to a source.


himself invites us to His Table: though our conscience may accuse us of our inclination "toward defiance and unbelief," such "sins and imperfections which remain in us will not prevent Him from receiving us and making us worthy partakers of this spiritual Table." The sacrament is a "medicine for the poor sick souls"; we need only know our soul's sickness to receive it. "May we never be so perverse as to draw away when Jesus Christ invites us so gently by His Word." In the midst of this pastoral summons to participation, Calvin offers an interpretation of the sacrament. Christ has promised "with His own lips," says Calvin, that

He is truly willing to make us partakers of His body and blood, in order that we may possess Him wholly and in such wise that He may live in us and we in Him. And though we see but bread and wine, we must not doubt that He accomplishes spiritually in our souls all that He shows us outwardly by these visible signs, namely, that He is the bread of heaven to feed and nourish us unto eternal life.

In this exhortation, Calvin employs the word spirituelle and spirituellement but once each, and in neither case does he qualify their use with regard to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. By 1540, Calvin had prepared no fewer than four expositions

---

1116 Thompson, *Liturgies*, 206. "... mais estre enclins à incredulité et defiance: ... que les vices et imperfections, qui sont en nous, n'empescheront point, qu'il ne nous receoye, et nous face dignes d'avoir part en ceste Table spirituelle" (Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," *Coena Domini I*, 359).


1118 Thompson, *Liturgies*, 207. "Que nous ne soyons point donques si pervers de nous reculer, où JESUS Christ nous convie si doulcement, par sa parolle" (Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," *Coena Domini I*, 360).

1119 Thompson, *Liturgies*, 207. "Premierement donques, croyons à ses promesses, que JESUS Christ, qui est la verité infallible, a prononcé de sa bouche; assavoir qu'il nous vault vrayement faire participans de son corps et de son sang: afin que nous le possedions entierement; en telle sorte, qu'il vive en nous, et nous en luy. Et combine que nous ne voyons que du pain et du vin: toutesfois que nous ne doubtions point, qu'il accomplit spirituellement en noz ames, tout ce qu'il nous demonstre exterieurement, par ces signes visibles: c'est à dire qu'il est le pain celestial, pour nous repaistre et nourrir à vie eternelle" (Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," *Coena Domini I*, 360).
of the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{1120} In these expositions, in passages theologically parallel to this liturgical instruction and invitation, Calvin rarely misses the opportunity to specify the activity of the Spirit. In fact, he often emphasizes it, as he did at the disputation in Lausanne (1536) and in his first catechism (1537). Given this, the Holy Spirit is, so to speak, "conspicuous by His absence" in Calvin's form for the celebration of the sacrament. As in the works of his contemporaries, Calvin's use of "spiritual" and "spiritually" here is ambiguous: each can just as well be taken to mean "non-corporeally," "not physically," as "by the person and work of the Holy Spirit."

The conclusion to Calvin's exhortation is what has come to be called the Reformed \textit{sursum corda}. To "present ourselves to Him with ardent zeal," says Calvin,

\begin{quote}
let us lift our spirits and our hearts on high where Jesus Christ is in the glory of His Father, whence we expect Him at our redemption. . . . Let us be content to have the bread and wine as signs and witnesses, seeking the truth spiritually where the Word of God promises that we shall find it.\textsuperscript{1121}
\end{quote}

Calvin's use of \textit{espritz} here seems to ratify a "non-corporeal," "not physical," reading of his previous uses of \textit{spirituelle} and \textit{spirituellement}. That is, here Calvin is invoking congregants to "lift up" that which is their "non-corporeal," their "not physical," part of their being. In doing so, one withdraws from the inclination to "be fascinated by these earthly and corruptible elements which we see with our eyes and touch with our hands," lest one seek Christ "there as though He were enclosed in the bread or wine"; instead,

\begin{quote}

\textsuperscript{1120} These include his 1536 and 1539 editions of the \textit{Institutio}, his 1537 French and 1538 Latin editions of his first catechism, his two discourses at Lausanne, and the 1537 \textit{Confessio fidei de eucharistia}. For discussion of these, see Chapter 2 above.

\textsuperscript{1121} Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 207. "Pour ce faire eslevons noz espritz et noz coeurs en hault, ou est JESUS Christ en la gloire de son Pere, et don’t nous l'attendons en nostre redemption. . . . Contentons nous donques, d'avoir le pain et le vin, pour signes et tesmoignages, cherchans spirituellement la verité, où la parolle de Dieu promet que nous la trouverons" (Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," \textit{Coena Domini I}, 360).
\end{quote}
one "disposes" one's soul "to be nourished and vivified by His substance when they are
lifted up above all earthly things, attaining even to heaven, and entering the Kingdom of
God where he dwells."\textsuperscript{1122}

With this, the minister partakes of the bread and wine, then administers it to the
diacre, and then they to the whole congregation. During the distribution and
communion, the congregation sings Psalm 138.

The celebration of the sacrament proper concludes with a prayer. Thanksgiving
is offered for the gift of the Father's "having drawn us into the Communion of thy Son,
Jesus Christ our Lord, whom thou hast delivered to death for us, and whom thou givest
us as the meat and drink of life eternal." Supplication is offered, that "thou wilt never
allow us to forget these things; but having them imprinted on our hearts, may we grow
and increase daily in the faith which is at work in every good deed." All of this is
offered "through . . . Jesus Christ, thy Son, who in the unity of the Holy Spirit liveth and
reigneth with thee, O God, forever. Amen."\textsuperscript{1123} Given that Calvin so often avers that the
gift and increase of faith is "the proper and entire work of the Spirit alone,"\textsuperscript{1124} who uses
the sacraments as his instruments, might he not have confessed as much here, too?

\textsuperscript{1122} Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 207. "Et ne nous amusons point à ces elemens terriens et corruptibles,
que nos voyons à l'oeil, et touchons à la main, comme s'il estoit encloz au pain ou au vin. Car lors noz
ames seront disposees à estre nourries et vivifiees de sa substance, quand elles seront anisi eslevees, par
dessus toutes choses terrestres, pour attainder iusque au Ciel, et entrer Royaulme de Dieu, ou il habite"

\textsuperscript{1123} Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 208. ". . . par iceluy JESUS Christ ton Filz, qui en l'unité du sainct
Esprit, vit et regne, avec toy Dieu eternellement, Amen" (Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," \textit{Coena
Domini I}, 356).

8.2 A Survey of Liturgies on Which Calvin's Is Based

Calvin did not prepare his liturgy in a vacuum. As indicated above, by his own confession, he had the Strasbourg liturgy at hand, borrowing from it liberally. Prior to his tenure in Strasbourg, Calvin had become well-familiar with at least the liturgy of Basel and, of course, the liturgy of Geneva. Each of these liturgies—those of Strasbourg, Basel, and Geneva—are associated with reformers who figure prominently in Calvin's budding development as a reformer and churchman. These reformers are, of course, Bucer, Oecolampadius, and Farel respectively. In chapter six, the sacramental thought of each was plumbed, the question being whether Calvin might have appropriated pneumatological emphasis from any one of them in particular. It was demonstrated that each figure exhibited a concern for pneumatology, though Calvin seemingly assimilated their thought and expression in his very discussions of the Lord's Supper to a greater degree than any one of them. Given that each figure also prepared at least one form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and given that Calvin was acquainted with each of these forms, the question may be asked whether their forms are just as void of mention of the Holy Spirit as Calvin's, or if Calvin, for whatever reason, overlooked or removed their pneumatological emphases as he adopted their uses for his own. Such is the question that prompts the brief survey to come, a survey which follows the chronology of Calvin's encounter with the liturgies.

In 1535 Calvin arrived in Basel. He came with the first edition of his *Institutio* in hand, though still as a manuscript. Whether it was complete or not is not known. Thompson implies that it may not have been. In his reading, Calvin's first "reconstruction" of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, found in prose in the first
edition of his *Institutio*, "suggest[s] the milieu of Basel, where Calvin repaired to complete and publish the *Institutes*."\textsuperscript{1125} Calvin's description reads as follows:

> As far as the Sacred Supper is concerned, it could have been administered most becomingly if it were set before the church very often, and at least once a week. First, then, it should begin with public prayers. After this a sermon should be given. Then, when bread and wine have been placed on the Table, the minister should repeat the words of institution of the Supper. Next, he should recite the promises which were left to us in it; at the same time, he should excommunicate all who are debarred from it by the Lord's prohibition. Afterward, he should pray that the Lord, with the kindness wherewith he has bestowed this sacred food upon us also teach and form us to receive it with faith and thankfulness of heart, and, inasmuch as we are not so of ourselves, by his mercy make us worthy of such a feast. But here either psalms should be sung, or something be read, and in becoming order the believers should partake of the most holy banquet, the ministers breaking the bread and giving the cup. When the Supper is finished, there should be an exhortation to sincere faith and confession of faith, to love and behavior worthy of Christians. At the last, thanks should be given, and praises sung to God. When these things are ended, the church should be dismissed in peace.\textsuperscript{1126}

Whether Thompson is right or not that this is principally reflective of Basel's practices, it is certainly reflective of Calvin's intuitions even in the late 1530s and into the 1540s. The commentary above on his later form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper demonstrates an inclusion of several of these elements. Whether his description is a witting expression of it or not, Calvin was no doubt familiar with the liturgy of Basel.

The Basel liturgy of (1529) 1537 is said to bear the influence of Oecolampadius.\textsuperscript{1127} While there are some parallel elements between this form for the celebration of the sacrament and Calvin's form, structurally the liturgies are distinct:

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{1125} Thompson, *Liturgies*, 185 and 186.
    \item \textsuperscript{1126} *Inst.* 1536, 122. *Inst.* LCC 1559: 4.17.43.
    \item \textsuperscript{1127} Bürki, 10. Kapitel: "Das Abendmahl nach den Basler Ordnungen," *Coena Domini I*, 202.
\end{itemize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basel (1529) 1537</th>
<th>Strasbourg 1545¹¹²⁸</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Abendmahlsvermahnung]</td>
<td>Sermon, entirely, or at its end, concerning the Lord's Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Glaubensbekenntnis]</td>
<td>Intercessions following a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Bann]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Offene Schuld – Kyrie]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Trostwort]</td>
<td>Confession of Faith sung, during which time the bread and wine are prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Psalm]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Allgemeines Kirchengebet]</td>
<td>Communion Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Vater Unser]</td>
<td>The Lord's Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Lesung]</td>
<td>Words of Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Vermahnung]</td>
<td>Excommunication Exhortation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Abenmahlsgebet]</td>
<td>Distribution during which, sing Psalm 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Einsetzungsworte]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Vater Unser]</td>
<td>Prayer of Thanksgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Vermahnung]</td>
<td>Canticle of Simeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Austeilung]</td>
<td>Benediction (Num. 6)¹¹³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Schlussgebet]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Psalm]¹¹²⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹²⁸ Recall that this edition of Calvin's liturgy is taken to best approximate Calvin's first edition, published in Strasbourg around 1540. See above.

¹¹²⁹ These headings are taken from Bürki's presentation of the text (Bürki, "Das Abendmahl nach den Basler Ordnungen," Coena Domini I, 215ff).

¹¹³⁰ This chart is rendered from Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," Coena Domini I, 350.
Their content is likewise distinct. Two primary observations may be made: First, the Basel liturgy is no more or less pneumatological than Calvin's liturgy. A reference to the "heiligen Geyst" appears but once, and then in a doxological formula. 1131 "Im geyst" appears, but in a clear allusion to John 4: "worship God in spirit and in truth." 1132 And finally, "den geystlichen lyb Christi" is referred to in the opening Abendmahlsvermahnung, though this is a reference to the church as the "spiritual body of Christ." 1133 So while there are mentions of the Spirit and of spirit, they are not individually parallel to those expressed in Calvin's liturgy, nor are they parallel to those expressed in his doctrinal expositions.

Second, a sursum corda, expressed in tandem with allusion to Colossians 3, is strikingly absent in the liturgy of Basel. As indicated in chapter six, Oecolampadius is the apparent progenitor of this exegetical connection and theological employment, at least in his expositions on the sacrament. 1134 Farel, among others, inherited it theologically, but Farel (it seems) uniquely incorporated it into the Lord's Supper liturgy, followed by Calvin, followed by others. 1135 So apparently it was Oecolampadius who planted this liturgical seed, but Farel who gave it growth.

---

1134 "The sursum corda, applied in a new way, became the liturgical counterpart of the creedal affirmation of the Ascension for Reformed theology. Oecolampadius urges that hearts be lifted up to Christ at the right hand of the Father and not the bread on the altar" (Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 182, with reference to Oecolampadius, De genuine verborum, Biiri-r).
Indeed, it was this growth that Calvin encountered in Geneva in 1536. Farel first arrived in Geneva in 1532, but did not arrive to stay until 1535. In May 1536 the General Council of Geneva formally adopted the reformation, though the practice of Roman Catholic worship had been suspended already six months earlier. In its stead, Genevan churches likely exercised the form for Sunday worship Farel prepared already in 1533, his *Maniere et Fasson* printed in Neuchâtel during his first tenure there.\(^\text{1136}\)

Farel's is the first liturgy in vernacular French, and is itself an adaptation of the liturgy of Bern of 1529.\(^\text{1137}\) A new edition of Farel's liturgy appeared in 1538, in Geneva, under the title *Ordre et maniere*. According to Bürki, some additions to the liturgy (and this would include service material for occasions other than the celebration of the Lord's Supper as well) are thought to bear Calvin's influence.\(^\text{1138}\) Given interest in Calvin's liturgy of the 1540s, both the 1533 and 1538 editions of Farel's form for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper are of interest in the forthcoming discussion.

Farel's 1533 edition of a form for the Lord's Supper most likely best approximates that which Calvin encountered and employed upon his arrival in Geneva in 1536.\(^\text{1139}\) The form begins with an exhortation, heavy on sin but buoyed by the...

---

\(^{1135}\) Jacobs, "Die Abendmahlslehre Wilhelm Farels," 164-65. See also discussion above at footnotes 850 and 956.

\(^{1136}\) For another account of Farel's liturgy, particularly in its socio-historical context, see Christopher Elwood, *The Body Broken: The Calvinist Doctrine of the Eucharist and the Symbolization of Power in Sixteenth-Century France* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 32-48. See also Andre Emile Kaltenrieder, "The Liturgies of Guillaume Farel: Their Meaning and Relevance" (PhD dissertation, Rhodes University, 1980); the Lord's Supper is taken up in Chapter 5, 94-113.


lavishness of God's "peace, grace, and forgiveness, for the sake of His own love instead of our good works or righteousness." With rich baptismal allusion, Farel assures his hearers that God, "according to His holy promises, grant[s] us clean water and His Holy Spirit to cleanse us from all filth and defilement." An invitation to the table follows: "all true Christians and faithful ones, who believe steadfastly in our Lord Jesus Christ" are to "come to this Holy Table." All are summoned to self-examination, as to whether "true faith" resides in their hearts. If any does not have true faith, he or she "must not presume at all to come to the Holy Table, pretending and falsely testifying to be members of the body of Christ." An extended prayer of confession is offered, concluded by the Lord's Prayer and a recitation of the Apostles' Creed. Finally an assurance of the long reach of God's love, an "assurance of pardon," is granted. The Words of Institution from 1 Corinthians 11 are recited by the minister, followed by a brief exhortation closed with "The sursum corda":

Therefore, lift up your hearts on high, seeking the heavenly things in heaven, where Jesus Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father; and do not fix your eyes on the visible signs which are corrupted through usage. In joy of heart, in brotherly union, come, everyone, to partake of our Lord's Table, giving thanks unto Him for the very great love which He has shown us. Have the death of this good Saviour graven on your hearts in eternal remembrance, so that you are set afire, so also that you incite others to love God and follow His holy Word.

Clearly Calvin's own sursum corda is an adaptation of Farel's. Both invoke all the gathered to "lift up hearts to heaven, where Jesus Christ is." The last half of that invocation is, of course, an expression of their shared Christology. As a polemic against

---


contemporary practice in some worshiping communities, all are adjured not to fixate on the "stuff" before them. However, whereas Farel's subsequent emphasis falls on love of neighbor, Calvin's falls on the nourishing and vivifying of souls by the substance of Christ.1142

One of the most striking features in Farel's 1533 liturgy is *le voeu épiclétique*, as Bürki puts it, which accompanies the distribution of the bread. The bread itself is to be "without image," and is to be distributed "into the hands" of the communicant as the minister says:

Jesus, the true Saviour of the world, who died for us and is seated in glory at the right hand of the Father, dwell in your hearts through His Holy Spirit, that you be wholly alive in Him, through living faith and perfect love.1143

In the second edition of Farel's liturgy, which appeared in Geneva in 1538, the optative blessing is expressed slightly differently:

Jesus, the true Saviour of the world, who died for us and is seated in glory at the right hand of the Father, dwell in your hearts through His Holy Spirit, *par la vertu dicelluy, le donnant et communicquant a vous*, that you be wholly alive in Him, through living faith and perfect love.1144

An expression such as is interpolated here certainly sounds as if it could have come from Calvin's lips. The pneumatology is rich and compatible with that in Calvin's expositions. So perhaps this addition does bear evidence of Calvin's influence, just as

---

1142 See above, also Thompson, *Liturgies*, 207.


1144 "Jesus le vray sauveur du monde, qui est mort pour nous, estant assis en gloire a la dextre du pere, habite en voz cueurs par son sainct esperit, par la vertu dicelluy, le donnant et communicquant a vous, faisant que du tout soyez vivans en luy par vifve foy et parfaicte charite. Amen." From Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Farel," *Coena Domini I*, 345, with the insertion of 345n6.
Bürki suggests. And yet such a richness is not expressed in the liturgy attributed to Calvin stemming from his tenure in Strasbourg.

While in Strasbourg, Calvin appropriated the use of the Strasbourg liturgy, chiefly attributed to Bucer. Apparently the liturgy Calvin had at hand was the Strasbourg liturgy (c. 1537) as printed in 1539. The formation of this liturgy follows on several earlier manifestations of reform, of which Diabold Schwarz's *Teütsche Meß* (1524) was the first. Continued reform and innovation furthered Schwarz's initiative, giving rise to a diversity of practices and orders for worship. In the 1530s, the synod of the church of Strasbourg sought to stabilize a uniform liturgy, not least because of the extremes of an increasingly "spiritualist" community in and around Strasbourg. According to Thompson, while Bucer (presumably with his colleagues) "still maintained that 'the Spirit of Christ inspires the churches,' he was now dismayed by 'deplorable differences' of practice and 'detestable changes' made upon an unfounded notion of freedom." A final edition of a form for worship was proffered and published—probably already in 1537, though certainly in 1539—presumably by

1145 For more detail about Calvin's arrival to Strasbourg, and his public and private life there, see the opening chapter of Robert Weeda, *L’Église des Français* de Strasbourg (1538-1563), in Collection d'Études Musicologiques Sammlung Musicwissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen 94 (Badden-Badden: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 2004), 11ff.


1149 Thompson, *Liturgies*, 163. Again, Thompson does not provide citation for these quotations, allegedly of Bucer himself.
Bucer\textsuperscript{1150} under the auspices of the synod of the church of Strasbourg. This form was to be observed each Lord's Day in Strasbourg, in the cathedral and in parish churches.\textsuperscript{1151}

According to Thompson,

the Strassburg rite remained a true Eucharist, immediately derived from the Mass, and neither conjured up by the Reformers nor drawn from the medieval office of Prone. When the Lord's Supper was not celebrated, the Eucharistic portions were simply omitted, and the liturgy attained the character of the ancient mass of the Catechumens, or Ante-Communion.

Thompson's observation is to be tempered, however, attractive as it is. In his more recent, thorough study of worship reform in Strasbourg in the sixteenth century, René Bornert demonstrates that the development of the Strasbourg liturgy should not be seen as linear evolution, one form following on the next.\textsuperscript{1152} While Diobald Schwarz's \textit{Teütsche Meß} might well be considered a vernacular adaptation, or reform, "immediately derived from the Mass," the remainder of forms suggest a rupture from the medieval Mass, the rupture itself engendering a new continuity.\textsuperscript{1153} The use of forms within this new continuity was not uniform, of course, from one Strasbourg congregation to the next.\textsuperscript{1154}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1150} Bornert indicates that the 1539 edition, as compared to that of probably 1537, is marked with changes – changes "du à la main de Martin Bucer." Bornert, \textit{La Réforme Protestante}, 177.

\textsuperscript{1151} Bornert, \textit{La Réforme Protestante}, 172.

\textsuperscript{1152} This would also temper the introductory comments of the 1539 Strasbourg Liturgy found in R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, \textit{Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed} (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1987/1990), 204.

\textsuperscript{1153} Bornert, \textit{La Réforme Protestante}, 170.

\textsuperscript{1154} Bornert, \textit{La Réforme Protestante}, 110 Bornert also points out that the first editions of forms for worship were printed not at the behest of preachers, but at the initiative of the printers (Bornert, \textit{La Réforme Protestante}, 111).
\end{flushright}
Bucer's rhetorical set-up of this climactic liturgy, which itself bears evidence of his influence, is richly pneumatological. Following the synod of 1539, Bucer prepared a report for the parishes, urging them to adopt this most recent liturgical directory. As Bornert notes, Bucer offers a doctrinal argument to legitimate this new orientation toward liturgical unity: In the first sentence of that report, Bucer claims that "the cult, ordained by the Holy Spirit and celebrated at his inspiration, requires a certain uniformity, even as God is one in his nature and in his action." According to Bornert's interpretation, Bucer is advocating not an absolute uniformity, but a relative unity of practice arising from the singing of the psalms and the exercise of the forms for worship found in a sanctioned service book.

The form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper found in that sanctioned service book proceeds, as would be expected, in a manner similar to the form attributed to Calvin, already discussed above. The Strasbourg liturgy of the late 1530 was, after all, Calvin's prototype. The following commentary on the Strasbourg form for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper attends in particular to its pneumatological expression.

As with Calvin's liturgy, the celebration of the sacrament ultimately cannot be separated from the elements of the Sunday service that preceded, namely, the

---

1155 "Le culte, ordonné par l'Esprit-Saint et célébré sous son inspiration, exige une certaine uniformité, de même que Dieu est un dans sa nature et dans son action" (Bornert, La Réforme Protestante, 183).

1156 Bornert, La Réforme Protestant, 183.

1157 This reading relies on the work of Drömann, "Strassburger Abendmahls ordnungen," Coena Domini I, 299ff; and especially the English introduction to and translation of Bucer's liturgy in Thompson, Liturgies, 159-184.
confession and the reading and preaching of the Gospel. Indeed, just prior to the form for the sacrament, a rubric directs that, "near the end of the Sermon, the Minister explains the action of the Lord's Supper and exhorts the people to observe the same with right faith." According to the same rubric, this exhortation usually touches on four particular points, phrases of which are quoted here:

The first: . . . the Lord now wishes to communicate his body and blood to us . . .

The second: that to deliver us from . . . corruption, the eternal Word of God became flesh, so that there might be a holy flesh and blood: this is to say, a truly divine man, through whom the flesh and blood of us all would be restored and sanctified. And this happens as we truly eat and drink of His body and blood.

The third: that the Lord truly offers and gives His holy and sanctifying body and blood to us in the Holy Supper, with the visible things of bread and wine, through the ministry of the Church, as His holy Word declares: "Take, eat, this is my body . . ." And we must accept this Word of the Lord with simple faith, and doubt not that He, the Lord Himself, is in the midst of us through the external ministry of the Church which He Himself has ordained for purpose. Such does He proclaim to us with His own words: that the bread which we break may truly be, even for us, the communion of His body, and the cup with which we give thanks, the communion of His blood. . . . that He may ever more live in us, and that we may be one body in Him our Head, . . .

The fourth: that in this action, we keep the Lord's memorial and feast with true devotion and thankfulness . . . .

In this opening exhortation, which is new to the Strasbourg liturgy as of 1537 and thus likely the work of Martin Bucer, the third person of the Trinity is never mentioned, despite the fact that the theology expressed would certainly warrant an appeal to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Also, one cannot help but notice the epeletic euchology expressed in the third point: that the bread which we break may

1158 Thompson, *Liturgy*, 171.

truly be for us the communion of His body, and the cup, the communion of his blood. Here—as in Bucer's amendment to the Genevan pastors' *Confessio fidei de eucharistia* (Bern, 1537), the expression of which exactly parallels Bucer's expression here—-the Holy Spirit is conspicuous by absence.

Following this exhortation—that is, following the sermon—the people sing the Apostles' Creed, or, after 1537, a fitting Psalm or hymn. The minister proceeds to the Lord's Table, standing behind it to face the people as he prepares the bread and wine for the sacrament.

In the family of Strassbourg liturgies from which the 1537/1539 liturgy descends (that is, the liturgy allegedly subject to Bucer's revision), the liturgy proceeds with an *Ermahnung zum Gebet um den Hl. Geist*—an admonishment to prayer for the Holy Spirit. According to Hans-Christian Drömann, this bidding to prayer—which puts forth dogmatic safeguards against the Roman Mass-as-sacrifice, functioning instead as "evangelical offertory"—is textually similar to that found in the Ordnung des herren Nachtmal of 1525, not to that found in the 1524 *Teütsche Meß* of Diabol Schwarz.

---

1160 See discussions in Chapters 2 and 6 above. "The amendment reads: This statement of our dear brothers and colleagues, G. Farel, John Calvin, and P. Viret, we embrace as right doctrine, believing Christ our Lord in no sense to be diffused locally or ubiquitously in the Holy Supper, but that he has a true and finite body and remains in heavenly glory. Yet none the less, through his word and symbols, he is present in the Supper: He presents himself to us as we are by faith exalted to heaven with him, so that the bread we break and the cup through which we show Christ forth may be for us really the communion of his body and blood. Besides we hold as an error not to be tolerated in the Church that it is naked and bare signs that Christ sets forth in his blessed Supper, or not to believe that here the very body and the very blood of the Lord is received, that is the Lord himself true God and man. Written by his own hand—Martin Bucer. Subscribed—Wolfgang Capito." (Calvin: Theological Treatises, 169).

1161 Drömann, "Strassburger Abendmahlsordnungen," *Coena Domini I*, 304-305. This liturgy is found in Friedrich Hubert, ed., *Die Strassburger liturgischen Ordnungen im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Göttingen, 1900). Digital images of an original sixteenth century edition are available online at the Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum Digitale Bibliothek of the Bayerische StaatsBibliothek. The "Ermahnung zum Gebet um den Hl. Geist" is found on folio Bii-r.
or two other orders of 1525.\footnote{1162} This admonishment in the Strasbourg liturgies of 1526-1536 reads as follows,

Lieben brüdern vnd schwester, bitten gott, den vatter, durch vnsern herrn Jesum Christum, der in todt zur erlösung vnser seelen geben ist, das er vns den heyligen geyst zusende, der vns lere auffopffern, nit Christum, der sich selb einmal für vns geopffert hat vnd von nyemant mag geopffert werden, sonder die gottgefelligen waren opffer als ein zerbrochnen geyst, ein zerschlagen hertz vnd, das wir vnser leyb zum opffer, das lebendig, heylig vnd jm wolgefellig sey, begeben, welchs vnser vernünfftiger gottesdienst ist, in dem wir gott eer, preyß vnd dancksagung opferen. Der herr wölle euch erhören und seyn heyl erzeygen, amen.\footnote{1163}

This bidding to an epicletic prayer of self-offering is omitted from the Strasbourg liturgy from 1537 on.\footnote{1164}

In the 1537/1539 liturgy, following on the confession of the creed, the minister "leads the prayer, with these or similar words."\footnote{1165} Three texts for intercessory-communion prayer are presented. The conclusion of the first prayer conveys rich sacramental thought, though not one pneumatological thought:

And grant us, O Lord and Father, that with true faith we may keep this Supper of thy dear Son, our Lord Jesus, as He hath ordained it, so that we verily receive and enjoy the true communion of His body and blood, of our Saviour Himself, who is the only saving bread of heaven. In this holy sacrament, He wishes to offer and give Himself so that He may live in us, and we in Him, being members of His body and serving thee fruitfully in every way to the common edification of thy Church, being set free from every passion of our evil, corrupted flesh, from all anger, vexation, envy, hatred, selfishness, lewdness, unchastity, and what more there may be of the damend work of the flesh: To the end that, by all means, we as thine obedient children may ever lift our hearts and souls unto thee

\footnote{1162} Drömann, "Strassburger Abendmahlsordnungen," Coena Domini I, 306; also 301, 302, and 303 for other instances.

\footnote{1163} This text is Drömann's rendering of "Ehrmahnung sum Gebet," in Psalmen, Gebet und Kirchenübung 1526ff., Coena Domini I, 319.


\footnote{1165} Thompson, Liturgies, 172.
in true childlike trust, and always call upon thee, saying as our only Master and Saviour, or Lord Jesus Christ, hath taught us: Our Father . . . .

In the second suggested prayer, no mention of the Spirit is made. In the third, there is likewise rich sacramental theology conveyed, but again, no mention of the Spirit.

Furthermore, this third prayer is clearly the prayer Calvin adopted and slightly adapted, though not adapted so much as to include mention of the person and work of the Holy Spirit:

Strasbourg 1537

[S]ince, for our sake He hath not only sacrificed to thee His own body and blood upon the Cross for our sin, but also wishes to give them to us for food and drink unto eternal life, grant that we may now accept with entire longing and devotion His goodness and gift,

and with right faith receive and enjoy His true body and true blood, yea, Himself our Saviour, true God and man, the only true bread of heaven:

That we may live no more our sinful and depraved life, but that He in us and we in Him may live His holy, blessed and eternal life,

being verily the partakers of the true and eternal testament, the

Geneva 1542/Strasbourg 1545

[A]s our Lord Jesus Christ has not only offered His body and blood once on the Cross for the remission of our sins, but also desires to impart them to us as our nourishment unto everlasting life, we beseech thee to grant us this grace: that we may receive at His hands such a great gift and benefit with true sincerity of heart and with ardent zeal. In steadfast faith may we receive His body and blood, yea Christ Himself entire, who, being true God and true man, is verily the holy bread of heaven which gives us life. So may we live no longer in ourselves, after our nature which is entirely corrupt and vicious, but may He live in us and lead us to the life that is holy, blessed and everlasting: whereby we may truly become partakers of the new and eternal testament, the covenant of

\[1166\] Thompson, Liturgies, 173.

\[1167\] Thompson, Liturgies, 176. The Strasbourg text is forced so that parallel expressions in the two prayers may better align.
covenant of grace, sure and certain that thou wilt be our gracious Father forever, who nevermore reckons our sins against us and makes all manner of provision for us in body and soul as thy dear children and heirs: so that we may at all times render praise and thanks to thee, and glorify thy holy name with all our words and deeds.

Wherefore, O heavenly Father, grant that we may celebrate today the glorious and blessed memorial of thy dear Son our Lord, and shew forth His death, that we shall ever grow and be strengthened in faith to thee and in all good works. And so, greatly comforted, we do now and always call upon thee, our God and Father, and pray to thee as our Lord hath taught us to pray, saying: Our Father . . . .

If he has not already done so in conjunction with the sermon, the minister here offers a brief exhortation on the Supper, after which he "reads the words of the Lord, as the holy Evangelists and Paul have recorded them." In anticipation of the communion, the minister exhorts: "Believe in the Lord, and give eternal praise and thanks unto Him!" Following the communion the church sings the communion hymn

---

1168 Thompson, Liturgies, 202-03 and 204-05 respectively.

1169 Thompson, Liturgies, 177.
"Gott sei gelobet" or a psalm, after which the minister offers a post-communion prayer of thanksgiving. The 1537 liturgy indicates three texts as options, none of which include mention of the Holy Spirit, even in doxological conclusion. Following the Aaronic blessing, the minister bids: "Depart! The Spirit of the Lord go with you unto eternal life! Amen."

This survey of liturgies suggests that Calvin's liturgy is no more or less pneumatological than those that precede it, especially those of Bucer and Farel, on which Calvin's liturgy is based. One possibility for this omission—in Bucer's liturgy as well as Calvin's—is the radical spiritualization of the life of the church by Anabaptists and other extreme spiritualists dwelling in and around Strasbourg and Geneva. Bucer and Calvin were keen to distinguish themselves from such extremism, theologically and no doubt liturgically. Perhaps "desperate times called for desperate measures," and inclined them—whether deliberately or indeliberately—to refrain from mentioning the Spirit in their forms for celebrating the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Another surer possibility is Bucer's understanding of the significance of the Words of Institution, the very words of the Lord, which consecrate the sacramental gifts. These words, as

1170 Thompson, *Liturgies*, 177.


1172 Thompson, *Liturgies*, 179.

Thompson puts it paraphrasing Bucer, are "not addressed to the bread and wine, as if to change them," but to the congregants, these words set apart something ordinary—common bread and wine—for an extraordinary purpose—the exhibitio of Christ's body and blood as spiritual food unto eternal life. Though Bucer was familiar with the Eastern liturgies attributed to Basil and Chrysostom, their pneumatological euchology did not hold liturgical sway for Bucer.

8.3 The Holy Spirit in Calvin's Service for the Lord's Day, Strasbourg and Geneva

If Calvin's form for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is void of mention of the Spirit, his liturgy as a whole is slightly less so. Striking mention of the Spirit is made three times: in the prayer of confession, in the absolution, and in the prayer prior to the reading and preaching of the Word.

1174 Thompson, Liturgies, 240.

1175 Thompson continues, still paraphrasing Bucer, that "therefore the priest should not take the bread into his hand at the Consecration, lest some presume to adore it" (Thompson, Liturgies, 240). This understanding of "consecration with respect to use" as opposed to "consecration with respect to change" is definitely prominent in the Reformed tradition. See, e.g., Calvin: "[B]ecause they [the ancient writers] say that in the consecration a secret conversion takes place, so that there is now something other than bread and wine, as I have just observed, they do not mean by this that the elements have been annihilated, but rather that they now have to be considered of a different class from common food intended solely to feed the stomach, since in tehm is set forth [exhibere] the spiritual food and drink of the soul" (Inst. 1559 LCC 4.17.14; see also 4.17.16). Interestingly, Calvin's Genevan successor, Theodore Beza, reflects the same notion but inflects it pneumatologically. In her careful study of Beza, Jill Raitt writes: "The Supper is not an activity . . . which provides an occasion for a parallel activity of the Holy Spirit. The activity of the Spirit is through the activity and elements of the liturgy"; so bread and wine are not merely bread and wine, "nor are they changed substantially or joined with the body of Christ so that Christ can be said to be 'under, with, or in' the bread. On the natural level, they remain bread and wine and as such nourish the body. But in the action of the Lord's Supper as declared by the words of institution, they are changed. They serve a new end and use through their relation to Christ, established by the Holy Spirit, and they become subservient efficient causes of the union of the faithful with Christ. They are food that nourishes eternal life" (Raitt, The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza: Development of the Reformed Doctrine [Chambersburg, Pennsylvania: American Academy of Religion, 1972], 71).

The prayer of confession immediately follows on the opening votum. Having declared that "Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth," the minister invites the congregants to cast themselves upon that help with a prayer of confession, "following my words in [your] heart." Following words of ardent confession, the minister offers a Trinitarian petition:

O God and Father most gracious and full of compassion, have mercy upon us in the name of thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. And as thou dost blot out our sins and stains, magnify and increase in us day by day the grace of thy Holy Spirit: that as we acknowledge our unrighteousness with all our heart, we may be moved by that sorrow which shall bring forth true repentance in us, mortifying all our sins, and producing in us the fruits of righteousness and innocence which are pleasing unto thee . . . .

Justification and sanctification. Mortification and vivification. The Spirit is integral in these daily dimensions of the Christian life. But not apart from the love of God and the grace of "our Lord Jesus Christ." In stark proclamation of the gospel, reflective of the Trinitarian baptismal formula, the minister announces to all who "look to Jesus for their salvation": "I declare that the absolution of sins is effected, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen."

Following the absolution, the minister enjoins the congregation to sing the first table of the Law. He offers a prayer, and the congregation responds singing the second table of the Law, during which time the minister ascends the pulpit.

---

1177 Thompson, Liturgies, 197.
1178 Thompson, Liturgies, 197-98.
1179 Thompson, Liturgies, 198.
1180 Thompson, Liturgies, 198. This placement of the Law at this point in the liturgy is a classic expression of the Reformed understanding of the third use of the Law: as a guide for grateful living. On Calvin's exposition of the third use of the Law, see, e.g., Inst. 1559 LCC 2.7.12.
The first words of the minister from the pulpit are a prayer. The Genevan rubric reads as follows:

Then the minister commences again to pray, beseeching God for the grace of His Holy Spirit, that His Word may be faithfully expounded to the honor of His name and the edification of the Church, and be received with such humility and obedience which it deserves. This form is left to the discretion of the Minister. 1181

The Strasbourg rubric reads: "While the Congregation sings the rest of the Commandments, the Minister goes into the pulpit; and then he offers prayers of the type which follows: . . . ." 1182 An example of the prayer described in the Genevan rubric is presented.

This liturgical action and its mode appear to be appropriated from Bucer's liturgy. However, if the two reformers' liturgies are compared, at least as they are presented by Thompson in his *Liturgies of the Western Church*, then it may be said that Calvin increases its pneumatological freight. In Bucer's liturgy—the rubric and its prayer are given in this way:

*The Minister offers a short prayer for grace and a right spirit, that the Sermon and the Word of God which are to follow may be heard with profit. The prayer is to this effect:*

The Lord be with you.  
Let us pray.  
Almighty, gracious Father, forasmuch as our whole salvation depends upon our true understanding of thy holy Word, grant to all of us that our hearts, being freed from worldly affairs, may hear and apprehend thy holy Word with all diligence and faith, that we may rightly understand thy gracious will, cherish it, and live by it with all earnestness, to thy praise and honor; through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen. 1183

---

Calvin's Genevan and Strasbourg rubrics have already been cited, the first of which, unlike Bucer's rubric, includes an explicit summons to petition God for the grace of his Holy Spirit. Calvin's sample prayer in the Strasbourg liturgy, which is clearly an adaptation of Bucer's prayer, is a readily identifiable epiclesis (though such liturgical terminology is foreign to Calvin's milieu): the prayer is addressed to God the Father for the work of the Holy Spirit:

Almighty and gracious Father, since our whole salvation standeth in our knowledge of thy Holy Word, strengthen us now by thy Holy Spirit that our hearts may be set free from all worldly thoughts and attachments of the flesh, so that we may hear and receive that same Word, and, recognizing thy gracious will for us, may love and serve thee with earnest delight, praising and glorifying thee in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.  

Given such a prayer's location, its expression, and therefore its function, it is easy to see why Reformed theologians and philosophers have reflected on the proclamation of the Word as a sacramental act. In his Institutio, Calvin writes: "Among the many excellent gifts with which God has adorned the human race, it is a singular privilege that he deigns to consecrate to himself the mouth and tongues of men in order that his voice may resound in them." Noting this, and mindful of the epiclesis that precedes the

---

\[1183\] Thompson, Liturgies, 170.

\[1184\] Thompson, Liturgies, 209. Reflecting on this practice commended by Calvin's liturgy, Jean-Jacques von Allmen writes: "It is forgotten that the Gospel is enclosed in the letter of the Bible and must be freed, that to read scripture is to experience the paschal joy; the Lord reappears, He who is the Word, to tell us of His love and His will, to teach us who He is and who we are, to summon us and give us life. But He does not reappear automatically. In deciphering scripture, we can also draw from it a corpse, a dead letter. Hence, the reading of the Bible in worship is traditionally preceded by an epiclesis, an invocation of the Holy Spirit, that the Word may really come alive for us so as to accomplish its work of salvation and judgment" (J.-J. von Allmen, Worship: Its Theology and Practice [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968], 133).

\[1185\] Inst. 1559 LCC 4.1.5.
action of the proclamation of the Word in Calvin's liturgy, one member of the tradition reflects:

Through the sovereign action of the Spirit, the minister speaks the Word of God—not in the weak sense that he now reflects on the anciently spoken word of God, but in the radical sense that by way of his now speaking, God now speaks. The reading in the church of the anciently spoken word of God provides the basis for the here-and-now speech of God to God's people. The sermon is "sacramental" of the speech of God—not of the static presence of God but of God's very speaking.¹¹⁸⁶

In sum, Calvin's service for the Lord's Day, apart from its form for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, includes few references to the Holy Spirit. Yet where they occur, they occur in richly Trinitarian fashion, with a robust understanding of the person and work of the Holy Spirit as the efficacia of the Godhead. With respect to the form for the Lord's Supper itself, Calvin's expression is pneumatically weak, especially seen in light of his pneumatically robust doctrine of the sacrament as expressed elsewhere. Calvin's successors mind this gap and, as it were, "out-Calvin Calvin" in their pneumatological expression liturgically.

8.4 The Holy Spirit in the Lord's Supper Liturgy of the Palatinate

Given the scope of this study, a mere gesture is made to the liturgies that succeed Calvin's. One liturgy alone is identified, given its pneumatological interest and its prominence in the Reformed tradition, especially among the Reformed churches of

not only Germany, but also the Netherlands.\footnote{For a thorough explanation of the history of the Palatinate liturgy in the Netherlands and in its colonial churches in North America, see Daniel James Meeter, *'Bless the Lord, O My Soul': The New-York Liturgy of the Dutch Reformed Church, 1767* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 1998), 1-91. Peter Datheen (Petrus Dathenus) is the Dutch refugee pastor who encountered the Palatinate liturgy in Frankenthal and translated it for use in his Dutch speaking parish there. Having inherited this liturgy from Datheen, in 1574 the provincial synod of Holland and Zeeland resolved to adopt Datheen's liturgy (with minor amendment); in 1586 the national synod of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands, convened at The Hague, mandated its strict use in every congregation. For a critical edition of Datheen's liturgy, *Forme om dat Heylige Avendtmael te Hovden* see A. C. Honders, "Das Abendmahl nach der ordnung des Petrus Dathenus 1566," in *Coena Domini I*, 525-35.} Wherever their emigrants were destined to settle, many bore this liturgy with them.\footnote{Thus the Reformed churches of North America established by the Dutch in the seventeenth, nineteenth centuries, as well as the Reformed churches of, e.g., South Africa and Indonesia. Regarding the last, see Yudha Thianto, "Elements of Calvin’s Theology and Practice in the Establishment of Reformed Churches in Java in the Seventeenth Century," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Calvin Studies Society, April 2009, Grand Rapids, Michigan.}

The liturgy itself is the *Form, das Heilige Abendmal zu halten*\footnote{Frieder Schulz, "Das Abendmahl nach der Kurpfälzischen Ordnung," *Coena Domini I*, 495-523.} of the *Kirchenordnung* of the Palatinate, commissioned by its elector, Frederick III.\footnote{Kirchenordnung, wie es mit der christlichen lehre, heiligen sacramenten und ceremonien in des durchleuchttigsten, hochgebornen fürsten und herren, herrn Friderichs, pfaltzgraven bey Rhein, des heiligen römischen reichs ertzdruchessen und churfürsten, hertzogen in Bayrn etc. churfürstenthumb bey Rhein gehalten wirdt [vom 15. November 1563] in Emil Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts, Vierzehnter Band, Kurpfalz* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1969), 333-408; Wilhelm Niesel, ed., *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche*, third edition (Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1938), 136-218. The Niesel edition was used by Bard Thompson for a translation of "of Common Prayer," "of the Preparation for the Holy Supper," and "of the Lord's Holy Supper"; see Thompson, "The Palatinate Liturgy Heidelberg 1563," *Theology and Life* 6 (Spring 1963), 49-67.} In the mid-1540s, Frederick II had introduced the Lutheran Reformation to the region. His successor, Otto Henry, was a more moderate Melanchthonian, as was his successor, Frederick III. In a brief account of the history of the region, Lyle D. Bierma writes:

When Frederick III, also of a Melanchthonian spirit, came to power in 1559, he was faced with growing theological tensions in his realm between the more conservative or strict Lutherans, on the one hand, and the less rigid Melanchthonian Lutherans and Reformed, on the other—especially with regard to the issue of the bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. . . . Frederick

\footnote{\textsuperscript{1187} For a thorough explanation of the history of the Palatinate liturgy in the Netherlands and in its colonial churches in North America, see Daniel James Meeter, *'Bless the Lord, O My Soul': The New-York Liturgy of the Dutch Reformed Church, 1767* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 1998), 1-91. Peter Datheen (Petrus Dathenus) is the Dutch refugee pastor who encountered the Palatinate liturgy in Frankenthal and translated it for use in his Dutch speaking parish there. Having inherited this liturgy from Datheen, in 1574 the provincial synod of Holland and Zeeland resolved to adopt Datheen's liturgy (with minor amendment); in 1586 the national synod of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands, convened at The Hague, mandated its strict use in every congregation. For a critical edition of Datheen's liturgy, *Forme om dat Heylige Avendtmael te Hovden* see A. C. Honders, "Das Abendmahl nach der ordnung des Petrus Dathenus 1566," in *Coena Domini I*, 525-35.}
III became increasingly disillusioned with the pugnacity of the strict Lutherans and more and more convinced of the Melanchthonian-Reformed position on the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{1191}

So, Frederick III privileged Reformed doctrine, inviting and appointing Reformed theologians to positions of ecclesial influence. Among them were Caspar Olevianus and Zacharias Ursinus, traditionally taken to be co-authors of the Heidelberg Catechism.\textsuperscript{1192}

While Olevianus' exact role in relation to the production of the catechism is not known, it is known that "he did have primary responsibility . . . for the design of the new Palatinate Church Order (1563) . . . ."\textsuperscript{1193} So the relation between the preparation of the catechism and the preparation of the Kirchenordnung is presumably direct, and it centers on Olevianus, who had once studied theology with Calvin in Geneva.\textsuperscript{1194}

Elements of the Palatinate order for the Lord's Day and the form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper indicate that the Genevan liturgy of 1542 was clearly at hand in the preparation of liturgical materials for Frederick III's program for reform.\textsuperscript{1195}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1192] Bierma indicates that the catechism "is now acknowledged as a committee project," and that Ursinus did "the lion's share of the work" while "Olevianus' role, to the degree that it can be determined, was minima" (Bierma, "General Introduction" to \textit{A Firm Foundation}, xiv and xvii).
\item[1193] Bierma, "General Introduction" to \textit{A Firm Foundation}, xiv. Bierma's introduction provides an excellent, scholarly summary of the relation between the Heidelberg Catechism and Olevianus' \textit{A Firm Foundation} (1567).
\item[1194] It would be too strong to say that Olevianus \textit{composed} the \textit{Form, das Heilige Abendmal zu halten} of the Kirchenordnung; however, he presumably had a hand, perhaps even an editorial hand, in the process of including it in the Kirchenordnung.
\item[1195] E.g., Thompson, in his translation and commentary of the Palatinate liturgy, notes the linguistic parallel of the Genevan prayer of confession, prayer for illumination, intercessions, parts of the communion prayer, and \textit{sursum corda} with such elements in the Palatinate liturgy (Thompson, "Palatinate Liturgy," 52, 55, 62, 64, and 65). Also Christopher Dorn, "The Liturgy for the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper: Critical Turning Points," in \textit{Liturgy among the Thorns: Essays on Worship in the}
\end{footnotes}
However, given their thematic structure and their language, these liturgical materials are readily proved to be companion pieces to the Heidelberg Catechism. The form may be outlined accordingly:

Words of Institution (1 Corinthians 11:23-29)
Self-Examination in Three Parts
Excommunication
Pastoral Words of Assurance
Exposition on the Lord's Supper
Communion Prayer
Lord's Prayer
Sursum corda
Distribution and Communion
Psalm of Thanksgiving (Psalm 103) or Prayer of Thanksgiving

Given the study at hand, the Communion Prayer and sursum corda are of particular interest.

The Communion Prayer of the Palatinate liturgy reads as follows:

Merciful God and Father, we pray you to act upon our hearts by your Holy Spirit in this Supper, at which we keep the glorious memorial of the bitter death of your dear Son Jesus Christ, that with true faith we may ever more yield ourselves to Him, and that through the power of the Holy Spirit our weary and contrite hearts may be fed and quickened by His true body and blood, yea of Him who is true God and man, the only bread of heaven. Thus may we live no


See, e.g., Dorn, "The Liturgy for the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper," 13ff.

These three parts correspond to the three parts of the Heidelberg Catechism: sin, the promises of God in Christ, and gratitude. Or, as these parts of the catechism have been and continue to be learned by English-speaking catechumens: Sin, Salvation, and Service, or Guilt, Grace, and Gratitude.

The concluding line has a Genevan ring: Heidelberg: "...we shall be sure and certain that no sin or weakness yet remaining in us against our will, can keep God from taking us into grace and making us worthy participants of this heavenly food and drink." Calvin/Geneva: "...let us be assured that the sins and imperfections which remain in us will not prevent Him from receiving us and making us worthy partakers of this spiritual Table." Of this entire passage, Thompson notes: "This paragraph corresponds closely to the sixth in Calvin's Communion exhortation" (Thompson, "Palatinate Liturgy," 62n4).

Clearly this is an adaptation of the same element in the Genevan liturgy. See discussion below.
longer in our sins, but He in us and we in Him, and so truly partake of the new and eternal testament and covenant of grace, that we do not doubt that you will be our gracious Father, never more reckoning our sins against us, but providing us all things for body and soul. Grant us grace that we may cheerfully take up our cross, deny ourselves, confess our Saviour, and in all tribulations wait with head uplifted for our Lord Jesus Christ out of heaven, when He will make our mortal bodies like unto His transfigured and glorious body and take us to Himself in eternity. Amen.\textsuperscript{1200}

Thompson notes that to the words "body and soul," "the prayer corresponds to the next-to-last paragraph of Calvin's Great Prayer."\textsuperscript{1201} The two prayers are indeed strikingly resonant. The Genevan prayer reads accordingly:

And as our Lord Jesus Christ has not only offered His body and blood once on the Cross for the remission of our sins, but also desires to impart them to us as our nourishment unto everlasting life, we beseech thee to grant us this grace: that we may receive at His hands such a great gift and benefit with true sincerity of heart and with ardent zeal. In steadfast faith may be we receive His body and blood, yea Christ Himself entire, who, being true God and true man, is verily the holy bread of heaven which gives us life. So may we live no longer in ourselves, after our nature which is entirely corrupt and vicious, but may He live in us and lead us to the life that is holy, blessed and everlasting: whereby we may truly become partakers of the new and eternal testament, the covenant of grace, assured that it is thy good pleasure to be our gracious Father forever, never reckoning our faults against us, and to provide for us, as they well-beloved children and heirs, all our needs both of soul and body.\textsuperscript{1202}

\textsuperscript{1200} Thompson, "Palatinate Liturgy," 64. "Barmbertziger Gott und vater, wir bitten dich, daß du in diesem abendmal, in welchem wir begehen die herrliche gedechtnuß deß bittern todts deines lieben sohns Jesu Christi, durch deinen heilige geist in unsern hertzen wöllest wircken, daß wir uns mit warem vertauen deinem son Jesu Christo je lenger je mehr ergeben, auf daß unsere mühselige und zerschlagene hertzen mit seinem waren leibe und blut, jam it im, waren Gott und menschen, dem einigen himmelbrod, durch die draft des heiligen geistes gespeiset und erquicket warden, auf daß wir nich mehr in unsern sünden, sonder er in uns und wir in im leben und warhaftig des neuen und ewigen testimonials und bunds der gnaden also theilhaft seyen, daß wir nit zweifeln, daß du ewiglich unser gnediger vater sein wöllest, uns unser sünden nimmermehr zurechnen und uns in allem an leib und seel versorgen, wie deine liebe kinder und erben. Verleihe uns auch deine gnad, daß wir getrost unser creutz auf uns nemen, uns selbst verleugnen, unsern heiland bekennen und in aller trübsal mit auergierichtem haupt unsers herrn Jesu Christi auß dem himel erwarten, da er unsere sterbliche leichnam seinem verklärten herrlichen leib gleichförmig machen und uns zu ihm nemen wirtid in ewigkeyt, Amen" ("Das Abendmahl nach der Kurpfälzischen Ordnung," in \textit{Coena Domini I}, 519).

\textsuperscript{1201} Thompson, "Palatinate Liturgy," 64n6.

\textsuperscript{1202} Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 202. "Et comme nostre Seigneur JESUS, non seulement t'a une fois offert en la croix son corps et son sang, pour la remission de noz pechez: mais aussi les nous vaul"
For all their resonance, though, it is clear that the Palatinate prayer strikes a note not sounded in the Genevan prayer—a distinctively pneumatological note. No mention of the Holy Spirit is made in the Genevan prayer, but the Palatinate prayer includes a richly "Calvinian" petition for the work of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Holy Spirit so that hearts may be truly fed with Christ's true body and blood. It seems that Olevianus and company have "out-Calvined Calvin" with this pneumatologically rich emphasis in the communion prayer.

The same may be said of the *sursum corda*, which is readily evident in a comparison of these brief texts:

**Geneva 1542**

. . . let us lift our spirits and hearts on high where Jesus Christ is in the glory of His Father, whence we expect Him at our redemption. Let us not be fascinated by these earthly and corruptible elements which we see with our eyes and touch with our hands, seeking Him there as though He were enclosed in the bread or wine. Then only shall our souls be disposed to be nourished and vivified by His substance when they are lifted up above all earthly things, attaining even to heaven, and entering the Kingdom of God where He dwells.

**Palatinate 1563**

That we may now be fed with Christ, the true bread of heaven, let us not cleave with our hearts to his external bread and wine, but lift up our hearts and faith into heaven, where Christ Jesus is our Intercessor at the right hand of His heavenly Father (where the articles of the Christian faith also direct us), and doubt not that through the action of the Holy Spirit, our souls shall be fed and nourished with His body and blood as truly as we receive the holy bread and cup in remembrance.

---

Therefore let us be content to have the bread and wine as signs and witnesses, seeking the truth spirituall where the Word of God promises that we shall find it.\textsuperscript{1203}

Again, the pneumatological emphasis of the Palatinate liturgy is striking compared to the Genevan liturgy, i.e., compared to Calvin's liturgy.

The pneumatology of the Palatinate liturgy comports with the pneumatology of the Palatinate catechism, particularly as expressed in the Questions and Answers concerning the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{1205} In his careful study of the doctrine of the sacraments in the Heidelberg Catechism, Bierma notes that the authors of the catechism hedge their doctrine. They leave in "critical silence" any clear statement about the relation of sign and thing signified such that Reformed folk of either Calvinist or Bullingerist

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{1203} Thompson, Liturgies, 207. "Pour ce faire eslevons noz espritz et noz coeurs en hault, ou est JESUS Christ en la gloire de son Pere, et don't nous l'attendons en nostre redemption. Et ne nous amusons point à ces elemens terriens et corruptibles, que nous voyons à l'oeil, et touchons à la main, pour le chercher là, comme s'il estoit encloz au pain ou au vin. Car lors nos ames seront disposees à estre nourries et vivifiees de sa substance, quand elles seront ainsi eslevees, par dessus toutes choses terrestres, pour attaindre iusque au Ciel, et entrer au Royaulme de Dieu, ou il habite. Contentons nous donques, d'avoir le pain et le vin, pour signes et tesmoignages, cherchans spirituellement la verité, où la parolle de Dieu promet que nous la trouwerons" (Bürki, "La Sainte Cène . . . Calvin," Coena Domini \textit{I}, 360).

\textsuperscript{1204} Thompson, "Palatinate Liturgy," 64-65. "Auf daß wir nun mit dem waren himmelbrodt Christo gespeiset warden, so laßt uns mit unsern hertzen nicht an dem eusserlichen brodt und Wein haften, sonder unsere hertzen und glauben aber sich in dem himel erheben, da Christus Jesus ist, unser fürsprecher zur rechten seins himlischen vaters, dahin uns auch die artickel ours christlichen glaubens weisen, und nicht zweifelen, daß wir so warhaftig durch die würckung des heiligen geists mit seinem leib und blut an unsern seelen gespeist und getrenckt warden, als wir das heilig brodt und tranck zu seiner gedechnuß empfangen" ("Das Abendmahl nach der Kurpfälzischen Ordnung," in \textit{Coena Domini I}, 519-20).

\textsuperscript{1205} Especially question and answer 79, which confesses that "we through the Holy Spirit's work, share in his body and blood, as surely as our mouths receive these holy signs in his remembrance" ("The Heidelberg Catechism," in Ecumenical Creeds and Reformed Confessions [Grand Rapids: CRC Publications, 1988], 48).
\end{footnotes}
disposition could subscribe to it, claiming its "common ground" according to their own further exposition. This may apply even to its common *pneumatological* ground.

Whether this "hedging" applies with unmitigated warrant to the pneumatological expressions in the liturgy is not here determined. What *is* readily determined is that the frequency and richness of references to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Palatinate liturgy, particularly in its Communion Prayer and *sursum corda*, far surpass the same in Calvin's liturgy. Indeed, in Calvin's liturgy, references to the Holy Spirit are conspicuously *lacking*.

Friedrich Lurz likewise observes the richness of the pneumatology in the Palatinate liturgy. He makes two distinctive points of interest to this study. The first is that, unlike Bucer, the preparers of the Palatinate liturgy seem not to have been aware of the liturgies of the early church. In their refreshed liturgical context, a generation removed from the initial reforms, they formed a fresh *epicletic element*, which preeminently concerned not the sacramental gifts, or elements, but those gathered around them who would receive them. Secondly, Lurz ascribes the pneumatological expression in Palatinate liturgy as being derived from the influence of

---


1207 For a caution concerning Bierma's discussion, based on Rohls', based on Bullinger's *Second Helvetic Confession*, 1566, see footnote 871 above.

1208 See discussion in Chapter 6 above.

1209 Lurz, "Durch die Kraft des Heiligen Geistes," 24-25. Such an expression accords with Bucer's *Censura* of the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic prayer of Thomas Cranmer's 1549 Prayer Book. See discussion above. As has been demonstrated elsewhere in this study, however, accents in Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper would seem to allow for a prayer over the gifts, given Calvin's emphasis on the sacraments as *instruments*. Again, would that Calvin had been invited to offer an assessment that we might have his direct response to such a prayer. For Bucer, see Thompson, *Liturgies*, 238-40, and discussion above at footnote 584.
Erastus, physician and one-time spiritual advisor to Frederick III in Heidelberg. He was also the author of a treatise on the Lord's Supper, published in Heidelberg in 1562.\textsuperscript{1210} Erastus? Not Calvin, given the affinity of these expressions with Calvin's own? Erastus? Not Calvin, given that Olevianus once studied with Calvin in Geneva?

Given that the pneumatology of the Palatinate liturgy so surpasses the pneumatology of Calvin's liturgy, questions about other liturgies of the Reformed tradition broadly construed readily arise. Already Thomas Cranmer's appropriation of his exposure to reformed sacramental doctrine in its application to liturgical reform has been broached. Apparently drawing on diverse resources,\textsuperscript{1211} Cranmer fashioned a eucharistic prayer that included an epiclesis reminiscent of the Orthodox liturgy:

"Heare us (o merciful father) we besech thee: and with thy holy spirite & worde, vouchsafe to bl┼resse and sanc┼tifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christ."\textsuperscript{1212} But what of other Reformed communion prayers of the sixteenth century

\textsuperscript{1210} Lurz, "Durch die Kraft des Heiligen Geistes," 26-27, with reference to Thomas Erastus, \textit{Gründlicher Bericht, wie die Word Christi, Das ist mein Leib} (Heidelberg: Ludwig Lück, 1562). Regrettably, Erastus' treatise was unavailable for consideration so informed comment cannot be offered here. The suggestion piques interest: Given Erastus' theological affinity with Zurich, would these expressions belong to Erastus? Especially given their glimmer of a sacramental instrumentalism, albeit pneumatological instrumentalism? Furthermore, given that these expressions so accord with Calvin's, is it not reasonable to attribute them to Calvin's influence upon Olevianus, given that Olevianus once studied theology with Calvin?

\textsuperscript{1211} See Thompson, \textit{Liturgies}, 227ff.

and beyond? What is the measure of their pneumatological richness, the theological tenor of their expression? What of the prayers employed in the Reformed communions of Poland and Hungary? What of France and Scotland? And what of each of these communions' descendants? That is, what is the derivation and development of pneumatological euchology in the Presbyterian tradition, up to and including the current *Book of Common Worship*? What about the prayers of the Mercersburg Movement in nineteenth century America, and the debate between its protagonists and antagonists? What of the fresh liturgical expressions introduced by Jean-Frédéric Ostervald in Neuchâtel in the eighteenth century, and Eugène Arthur François Bersier in Paris in the nineteenth century?

---

1213 Preliminary research in this early period would well regard the collection of essays in *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Change and Continuity in Religious Practice*, ed. Karin Maag and John D. Witvliet (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004); and in *Christian Worship in Reformed Churches Past and Present*, ed. Lukas Vischer (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003); and the critical editions of some primary sources, with their introductory material in *Coena Domini I*, ed. Irmgard Pahl (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1983).


1216 I am grateful to John Witvliet for having once passed along to me (in 2002) an unpublished piece entitled "Jean-Frédéric Ostervald (1663-1747), Reformed Liturgist: A Brief Summary of Current Historical Research." This piece contains an excellent summary of current research, just as its title suggests, and thus a store of bibliographic material. See also Martin I. Klauber, "Confession, Creeds, and Catechisms in Swiss Reformed Theology (1675-1734)," *Westminster Theological Journal* 57, no. 2 (1995), 403-413; Bruno Bürki, "Beispielhaft reformierte Form der Liturgie de Neuchâtel," in *Liturgiereformen I, Biblische Modelle und Liturgiereformen von der Frühzeit bis zur Aufklärung*
This spate of questions is raised with an air of amiable ignorance, intended to suggest a sequel to this study. The study at hand, particularly in its final pages, is a mere prolusion.


1217 Bersier's life and work is a recent scholarly interest of Arlo D. Duba, who presented a paper, "Eugène Arthur François Bersier (1831-1889) and His Liturgy of 1874," to the Historical Research Seminar of the North American Academy of Liturgy in January 2007 (Toronto, Ontario). See also Stuart Ludbrook, "La communion des saints dans les cantiques du Pasteur Eugène Bersier (1831-1889)," Hymnographie (2000), 105-120.
CONCLUSION

The front matter of this work includes an epigraph: three quotations from Calvin, all of which are ultimately deeply liturgical. The first comes from Calvin's Genevan liturgy itself: God in Christ is about to offer us a most precious gift, says Calvin. That we may duly receive it, with passion, "let us lift up our spirits and our hearts on high." The second is taken from his Institutio, from 1543. It captures Calvin's liturgical passion, expressed in a most personal way: These are the promises of Christ, says Calvin; that his flesh is the food of the soul, and his blood its drink. Therefore, I offer my heart, my soul, the very center of my being to him to be so nourished. Christ commands me in the Supper to take, eat and drink his body and his blood under the signs of bread and wine: I do not doubt that he gives them to me, just as he promised, and that I receive them. The third is the phrase Calvin put upon his seal, a phrase that is, again, a most personal testament of his piety—even his liturgical piety: Cor meum tibi offero domine prompte et sincere. My heart, my soul, the very center of my being I offer to you, Lord, promptly and sincerely, with ardent zeal, with passion, that you might nourish it, sustain it, quicken it, and gladden it with the good gifts of bread and wine, body and blood. My heart I offer to you, Lord, so that with my heart so nourished and gladdened, imprinted with the gift of your grace, I might grow and increase daily in the faith that is at work in every good deed.
Ironically, not one of these quotes bears mention of the Holy Spirit, and yet not one of these quotes is duly understood without Calvin's conception of the work of the Holy Spirit, the secret and incomprehensible power of the Holy Spirit. For it is by the Spirit that we are prompted to gather at the Lord's Table, and prompted in faith to seek Christ there. It is by the Spirit that Christ proffers to us the food and drink of our souls under the gifts of bread and wine, and it is by the Spirit that we receive them. It is only by faith, which we could not possibly conjure on our own behalf but is itself wholly a gift of the Holy Spirit, that we have the capacity and desire to offer our hearts, promptly and sincerely, to be sustained and to be of service. So none of these quotations is so rich as it may be without a concept of the power and grace of the Holy Spirit.

In part, this is the point of the study that is now drawn to a conclusion. While it is true that very little ink is needed to put Calvin's references to the Holy Spirit in his liturgy to a printed page, it is also true that the Spirit imbues every element of its celebration, of its ethos. In his expositions on the Lord's Supper—whether in instructional works such as the catechisms, or polemical works such as his treatises addressed to Westphal and Heshusius—Calvin does not speak long before the Spirit enters into his discourse. For Calvin, in the sacrament, as in all creation, nothing good transpires apart from the work of the Holy Spirit: Christ's invitation is not spoken and is not heard, one's ears are not opened and heart is not moved, and the mouth of faith is kept from tasting and seeing that the Lord is good—good indeed.

The question that prompts the study at hand is the provenance of Calvin's emphasis on the Spirit's role regarding believers' participation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It is that persistent, pneumatological impulse present in Calvin's
expositions of the sacrament—present in so many Reformed liturgies since Calvin's Geneva, though not present in Calvin's liturgy itself—that has motivated this study. The question has been, Whence? What was the impetus for Calvin for so robust an expression in his theological expositions, even if not his liturgical one?

In considerations of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the past, seemingly facile answers have been given: with respect to the influence of one of his contemporaries, or a particular church father, or his exegetical or pastoral work. While this study has not been undertaken to negate these answers as untrue, it has undertaken to demonstrate that such answers are best qualified and more complexly construed. Calvin's emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to the Lord's Supper is a confluent assimilation of his emerging doctrine of the Trinity, the thought of his contemporaries, and the thought of his predecessors, all critically discerned, each stream influencing another as they come together. So this study is not definitive in the sense of identifying one definitive source, one moment of epiphany.

Furthermore, there are other tributaries that could have been explored, so this study is not definitive in the sense of presuming to identify every element that would render an answer to the question at hand as complex as it could possibly be. For one, Calvin's Christology is broached in this exploration, but not worked up as a distinct study.\footnote{For example, Christology is the starting point of Jean Cadier's exposition of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper: Jean Cadier, Chapitre 2: "Le fondement christologique de la doctrine calviniste de la Céne," \textit{Le Doctrine Calviniste de la Saint Cène}, 14-21. Oberman also explores its significance in his article "The 'Extra' Dimension in the Theology of Calvin," 48-53. Jason Zuidema offers a fine study of Peter Martyr Vermigli's doctrine of Word and sacrament that is rooted in Christology: Jason Zuidema, \textit{Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) and the Outward Instruments of Divine Grace}, Reformed Historical Theology, vol. 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008). Calvin and Vermigli are clearly cut from the same theological cloth.} The gestures here are significant and worthy, but this locus could merit its
own focus. The Christology of Oecolampadius and Zwingli appear to have distinct nuances, particularly as it relates to their expressed doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In Zwingli's discussion, John 6:63—"the flesh profits nothing"—figures prominently, and in Oecolampadius,' Colossians 3:1—"fix your minds on things above, where Christ is, seated at the right hand of the Father." Thus, sursum corda! says Oecolampadius. Farel appears to capture Oecolampadius' vision liturgically, and then Calvin following on him: "let us lift up our hearts!" But Calvin's apparent assimilation of this Christological emphasis occurs even as he is engaging, for example, the works of Bucer and Melanchthon, whose Christology has its own nuance. At this time, too, he his forced to address the accusations of Arianism put forth by Caroli, and later the polemical barbs of Westphal and Heshusius.

For another, Calvin appropriates Augustine's definition of sacraments as "visible words." An entire study could be developed centered on this definition in tandem with a consideration of Calvin's sacramental pneumatology. Necessary for such a study would be a consideration of Augustine's initial claim and its rhetorical context, then Calvin's appropriation of this definition in its rhetorical context. Further, a consideration of Calvin's emphasis on the Holy Spirit with respect to "Word," perhaps taken up as follows: 1) with respect to Christ, the Word made flesh, incarnated in the womb of the Virgin Mary "by the power of the Holy Spirit." 2) The Holy Spirit with respect to the Word of God, proclaimed by the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, and now by those

---

1219 Oecolampadius, De genuina verborum, Biiii-r.

1220 One engaged in such a study would do well to ruminate on Randall Zachman's recent work, Image and Word in the Theology of John Calvin (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007).

1221 As in, e.g., the Catechismus ecclesiae Genevensis (1545).
uniquely ordained for such proclamation among God's people today: those who proclaim God's words are God's instruments, God's very mouthpieces, who speak not their own word, but God's Word. This emphasis comes to fruition in the Sunday service: In the Reformed liturgy, classically understood and constructed, the minister ascends from the table to pulpit and there offers a prayer for the Holy Spirit prior to the reading and preaching of the Word. If one approached Calvin's pneumatology of the sacrament, of "the visible word," from the perspective of this epiclesis that precedes the reading and preaching of the Word, what would one discover?

Thus, in the end, one hope is that this study would incline others to give complex answers to questions that require them. Another is that this study would invite a more critical reading of Calvin's sacramental pneumatology in relation to that of his contemporaries, particularly Zwingli and Bucer and Farel, and even Oecolampadius, who is so often left out of the scene. Ultimately, the hope is that this study would engender for at least one scholar an attentive interest in the pneumatological euchology in orders for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the Reformed tradition, a tradition too often understood by those without and within as "the frozen chosen" who partake of a mere symbol. No, with hearts aflame, breaking forth with wonder, we experience this mystery with Calvin:

Christ prononce que sa chair est la viande de mon ame, et son sang le breuvage: ie luy offer donc mon ame pour estre repeue de telle nourriture. Il me commande en sa saincte Cene, de prendre, manger et boire son corps et son sang sous les signes du pain et du vin: ie ne doute pas qu'il ne me donne ce qu'il me promet, et que ie ne le receivoit222 —arcana Spiritus virtute.

---

1222 Inst. 1560 4.17.32.
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