



[www.PreciousHeart.net/ti](http://www.PreciousHeart.net/ti)

Volume 3 – 2011

---

---

**Legalism: Subverting the Doctrine of  
Divine Grace for a Theology of Works**

Jedidiah Kwarne Rydell Blake<sup>1</sup>

Introduction ..... 1  
I. Legalism Subverts the Glory of God..... 3  
II. The Bondage Associated with Legalism..... 6  
III. True Christian Piety ..... 9  
Conclusion..... 11

**Introduction**

Legalism in the Church repudiates the doctrine of divine grace for a theology of works that is “subversive both of the glory of God, in bestowing righteousness, and of the certainty of salvation.”<sup>2</sup> What, however, is legalism? Whereas, according to C. E. B. Cranfield, the Greek language does not have a word for “legalism,” several scholars since the Reformation believe that the Apostle Paul sometimes uses the expression “works of the law” to denote those works performed by Jewish legalists which are viewed as meritorious vis-à-vis salvation (Rom. 3:19-20, 27-28; 4:1-5; Gal. 2:16; 3:1-5, 10).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Jedidiah Kwame Rydell Blake, B.A., M.Div., Th.M., member, First Baptist Church in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA: [rydellblakes4@msn.com](mailto:rydellblakes4@msn.com).

<sup>2</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1953), 90.

<sup>3</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, The Library of Christian Classics, vol. 20 (Philadelphia: [Footnote continued on next page ... ]

Although the expression itself refers to the law *in toto* and its demands,<sup>4</sup> E. Lohmeyer, in a helpful essay, adds that the phrase “works of the law” stresses the general context in which these works are performed—that is, the motive behind the actions—rather than the specific actions which satisfy the demands of the law.<sup>5</sup> In elevating the minutiae of the law above fidelity to the covenant, Second Temple Judaism, for example, became susceptible to the charge of legalism.<sup>6</sup> In short, legalism suggests man’s reliance on the flesh instead of submission to the Spirit to establish his own righteousness before God. It is “a slavish following of the law in the belief that one thereby earns merit...and also entails a refusal to go beyond the formal or literal requirements of the law.”<sup>7</sup> As Paul asked the Judaizers in his Epistle to the Galatians, “Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the Law, or by hearing with faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun by the

---

Westminster, 1960), 804. Daniel P. Fuller, “Paul and ‘The Works of the Law,’” *Westminster Theological Journal* 38 (1975-76): 28-42; Charles H. Cosgrove, “The Mosaic Law Preaches Faith: A Study in Galatians,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 39 (1976-77): 153-55; Ernest de Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), 120. Douglas J. Moo, “‘Law,’ ‘Works of the Law,’ and Legalism in Paul,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 45.1 (Spring 1983): 85, 91-96. Other scholars contend that the expression “works of the law” suggests works generated by the law. According to this view, these works are evil. See Paul L. Owen, “The ‘Works of the Law’ in Romans and Galatians: A Defense of the Subjective Genitive,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007): 553-77. Scholars who espouse the New Perspective on Paul believe that the term stresses boundary markers such as circumcision, dietary laws, and Sabbath observance which distinguish Jews from Gentiles and lead to exclusivism. See James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2008); N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992); idem, *Justification: God’s Plan and Paul’s Vision* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2009).

<sup>4</sup> Stephen Westerholm, *Israel’s Law and the Church’s Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 106-21; Thomas R. Schreiner, “‘Works of Law’ in Paul,” *Novum Testamentum* 33 (1991): 217-44; Moo, “Law in Paul,” 73-100.

<sup>5</sup> Cited in Moo, “Law in Paul,” 91. See Ernst Lohmeyer, “Gesetzeswerke,” *Probleme paulinischer Theologie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, n.d.): 33-73.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, “Law,” in *New Bible Dictionary*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., ed. D. R. W. Wood et al (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 676.

<sup>7</sup> Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), 990.

Spirit, are you now being perfected by the flesh?” (3:2-3). Legalists also make conformity to regulations not sanctioned by the Scriptures (cultural taboos, for example) a test of spirituality and a standard for communion in the Church. This teaching of human merit in salvation, however, “destroys our praise of God for having bestowed righteousness”<sup>8</sup> and granted assurance of salvation, undermines the sufficiency of Christ in the work of redemption, minimizes the work of faith while simultaneously extolling human autonomy, and places its adherents in bondage to the law, a bondage that manifests itself as anxiety, despair, and weakness.

### **I. Legalism Subverts the Glory of God**

“Perverse confidence in the flesh...destroys our praise of God for having bestowed righteousness.”<sup>9</sup> As Calvin explains, man is “destitute and devoid of all good things ... and lacks all aids to salvation. Therefore, if he seeks resources to succor him in his need, he must go outside himself and get them elsewhere.”<sup>10</sup> Constantly, however, human beings are deluded into seeking sufficiency within themselves and apart from Christ. Calvin deplors this human conceit. He states, “We are by nature too inclined to attribute everything to our flesh—unless our feebleness be shown, as it were, to our eyes—we readily esteem our virtue above its due measure.”<sup>11</sup> This self-exaltation is rooted in mankind’s failure to ascribe to the Creator-Redeemer the glory due to his name. Calvin adds, “Hence we are lifted up into stupid and empty confidence in the flesh; and relying on it, we are then insolently proud against God himself, as if our powers were sufficient without his grace.”<sup>12</sup>

In the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector (Lk. 18:9-14), for example, the Pharisee, in his perverse haughtiness, extols his own righteousness because of his religious zeal and external morality instead of acknowledging his spiritual bankruptcy and need for right standing before God. Yet in his legalistic mind, the Pharisee derided others who were not as “spiritual” as he. The parable was told, Luke

---

<sup>8</sup> Calvin, *Institutes*, ed. McNeill, 788.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 703, 788.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 850.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 703.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

says, to “some people who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and viewed others with contempt” (v. 9). The Pharisee, in his legalistic reasoning, thanks God that he is “not like other people: swindlers, unjust, adulterers, or even like [the] tax collector [praying beside him]. I fast twice a week,” he says; “I pay tithes of all that I get” (vv. 11-12). For him, righteousness was mere moralism, in the words of Calvin, a “boasting about the merit of works.”<sup>13</sup> Righteousness, however, is more than ethical behavior. It refers to God’s saving justice which, through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, effects eschatological vindication for all believing humanity, leading to a reordering of life not only vertically but also horizontally. Throughout the gospels, those who acknowledge their poverty and who do not work to establish their own righteousness before God are open to God’s gracious work. George Ladd elucidates this idea:

Here is the very heart of Jesus’ ethical teaching: the renunciation of self-attained righteousness and the willingness to become like children who have nothing and must receive everything. The scribes were unwilling to lay aside their pride in their righteousness to become nothing that they might receive the gift of God’s righteousness. So long as they considered themselves to be righteous (Mk.2:17; Lk. 18:9), they felt no need of God’s gift. In contrast to the self-righteous Pharisee stands the tax collector, who cast himself entirely upon God’s mercy. He had nothing: no deeds of righteousness, no acts of merit. He was therefore open toward God. “This man went down to his house justified” (Lk. 18:14), declared righteous by God.<sup>14</sup>

Legalism, in short, leads to condemnation.

St. Augustine joins in this condemnation of merit theology. He writes,

Let human merits, which perished through Adam, here keep silence, and let God’s grace reign through Jesus Christ.... The saints attribute nothing to their merits; they will attribute all to thy mercy alone, O God.”<sup>15</sup>

All the glory accrues to God alone who justifies. The Bishop of Hippo adds, “When man sees that all the good that he has, he has not from himself but from his God, he sees that all that is praiseworthy in

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 788.

<sup>14</sup> George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed., ed. Donald A. Hagner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1993), 77-78.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 789.

himself arises not from his own merits but from God's mercy."<sup>16</sup> What is accounted for righteousness then is faith in Christ which alone does justice to God. By faith we mean, "a firm and certain knowledge of God's benevolence toward us, founded upon the truth of the freely given promise in Christ, both revealed to our minds and sealed upon our hearts through the Holy Spirit."<sup>17</sup>

Other Pauline texts address this human conceit, merit theology, which causes human beings to glory in their works rather than in the Lord. In Romans 1-3, Paul emphasizes that both Jews and Gentiles have failed to attain to God's righteousness. With reference to Abraham's justification, Paul insists that the patriarch was not justified by works, for then he would have grounds for boasting, but not *coram Deo* (Rom 4:2). Rather, he "believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness" (v. 3). Next, the Apostle contrasts those who work for a wage that is due with others who believe in God for the gift of justification (vv. 4-5), and it is this faith that appropriates the objective work of salvation and continues to trust in the word of promise that glorifies God. As Martin Luther says, "Faith is a living, daring confidence in God's grace. Through faith a man comes to take pleasure in God's [word]; thus he gives to God the honor that is His."<sup>18</sup> In Romans 4, the discussion concerning justification by faith and works righteousness precludes all boasting (cf. Rom 3:27-28; 9:30-10:8). Paul also highlights this idea in Romans 9 where he explains that "Gentiles, who did not pursue righteousness, attained righteousness, even the righteousness, which is by faith; but Israel, pursuing a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Why? Because they did not pursue it by faith, but as though it were by works" (vv. 30-32; cf. Rom 10:3). Schreiner in his critique of Jewish legalism adds a helpful comment: "The critique against legalism in the NT should not be understood as an attack against 'Jews' and an indication of ant-Semitism. Legalism is due to pride, and the desire for self-exaltation, which is a problem common to all humanity, not just the Jews."<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 551.

<sup>18</sup> Martin Luther, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. J. Theodore Mueller (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1976), xvii.

<sup>19</sup> Schreiner, "Law," 676.

In short, the self-vindicating legalist is turned in on himself (*in curvatus in se*) instead of oriented to God (*coram Deo*) and, in his pride and boasting, pursues his own righteousness through his devotion to the law and confidence in religious heritage. As Paul warned the Philippians, though, the Church should guard against reliance on the external trappings of religion (which he describes as “dung”) instead of our union with Christ, who has circumcised our hearts so that we may worship God in faith and piety. “Beware of the dogs,” Paul wrote, “beware of the evil workers, beware of the false circumcision; for we are the true circumcision, who worship in the Spirit of God and glory in Christ Jesus and put no confidence in the flesh” (Phil 3:2-3). “Confidence in the flesh” refers to Paul’s religious zeal, his Jewish ancestry, and his Pharisaic religious training which were simultaneously a source of great pride to Paul before his conversion on the Road to Damascus and a hindrance to grace (Phil 3:4-7).

Similarly, the Judaizers extolled circumcision to “promote a sense of prideful attainment in the religious life that they might have a ground of glorying. But these external distinctions and grounds of glorying no longer appealed to Paul because the world had been crucified to him and he to the world.”<sup>20</sup> George Ladd is on target when he says that “this human pride and boasting is an affront to the very character of God, who alone must receive glory and before whom no human being may boast (I Cor 1:29). The only object for a person’s boasting is God himself (I Cor 1:31; 2 Cor 10:17).”<sup>21</sup>

## II. The Bondage Associated with Legalism

Legalism enslaves, but Christ frees us from all that binds us, among others, sin (Rom 3: 20; 6:6-7) and death (Rom 5: 12, 21; I Cor 15:56-57). Freed from sin’s dominion, we now live under the reign of grace. As Alan Tomlinson explains, “Those who have been released from the ‘sin-master’ are those who have been freely given to God (grace-manumission) as is evident from Romans 6:15-24.” On the other hand, those who have been emancipated under the law “owe *paramone* to the old master, namely, sin. The so-called manumission

---

<sup>20</sup> Ladd, *A Theology*, 510.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 544.

in keeping with law does not release from the legal ownership of the old master, whereas grace-manumission truly releases from the old master and gives the ex-slave to God.”<sup>22</sup>

This bondage to the law and the despair associated with legalism is best demonstrated in the narrative concerning Jesus and his encounter with the rich young ruler (Mk 10:17-21). This man begins the dialogue by enquiring how he can obtain “eternal life,” a reference to the eschatological life recorded in Daniel 12:2, which signifies participation in God’s sovereign rule over all his creation. Clearly, this question was not a case of faith questing for understanding (*fides quaerens intellectum*); it was not prompted by a desire to fulfill an imperative. As Helmut Thielicke adduces, “On the contrary, he apparently takes the imperatives of God seriously for the very purpose of attaining to the indicative of salvation by keeping them.”<sup>23</sup> In this regard, he has inverted, as it were, the order of salvation (*ordu salutis*) and is, therefore, destined to fail. Indeed, it was a sense of failure and crisis that precipitated his encounter with the Savior.<sup>24</sup>

Notwithstanding his moral scrupulosity, the rich young ruler senses his spiritual inadequacy. Although he confesses that he has kept the commandments from his youth up, we infer that it was not mixed with faith but was merely observance of the letter of the law, that is, a legalistic preoccupation. Indeed, when Jesus commands the ruler to sell all his possessions, give to the poor, and follow him, the Lord was reminding the ruler that his actions were not motivated by faith which pleases God, for the “one thing” he lacked was not the keeping of an additional law. When Jesus remarked that the ruler lacked “one thing,” he was exposing the young ruler’s legalism that had ensnared him all his life and pointing him to the obedience of faith, which saves and emancipates (Rom 1:5; 16:26). Thielicke observes,

The critical point [was] obviously that the rich young ruler, for all his ethical and religious idealism, was ultimately self-centered. For him, obedience and

---

<sup>22</sup> I am indebted to Alan Tomlinson (classroom notes) for these ideas. Dr. Tomlinson serves as professor of New Testament at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Kansas City, Missouri.

<sup>23</sup> Helmut Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, vol 1: Foundations, ed. William H. Lazareth (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 258.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

action were a kind of self-development and self-enrichment. They might almost be called the cultural extension of his outward standard of living.<sup>25</sup>

Regrettably, when Jesus highlighted the fundamental issue—radical faith in God’s saving justice—the ruler disobeys the Lord’s command and goes away sorrowing. The man’s earlier zeal for the letter of the law, juxtaposed with his present failure and his spurning of a life of commitment to the Lord, underscores his previous efforts as “a sublimated egoism which does not fear, love, and trust in God above all things, but serves only . . . ego.”<sup>26</sup> This is the garb of legalism.

In Colossians 2, Paul suggests that demons may operate through moral or religious codes. This influence seeks to hold believers captive to legalism (Col 2:20-23) and may disseminate false doctrines supported by human traditions. The source of such deception, according to the Apostle Paul, is “seducing spirits” (I Tim 4:1). According to Paul, the law, “our tutor to lead us to Christ,” may readily imprison us owing to the weakness of the flesh (Rom 8:3; Gal 3:23-24). Slavish attempts to obey invariably leads to bondage. Stanley Grenz warns that,

this occurs as persons seek stability and structure for their lives through a scaffolding of laws, which rather than drawing us to community with God, actually becomes a false god – that is, the source of a false sense of meaning, security, and identity.<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, legalism is always associated with a spirit of oppression, a spirit of fear, a spirit of doubt, and profound despair, a state of affairs similar to Luther’s distresses in the cloister.

Are we currently experiencing similar conditions in our churches? Today we seem to be more concerned about paper transfers of membership than evidence of faith and piety in the lives of believers, righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. We seem to be more concerned about clothing than inner beauty. We seem to be more concerned about orders of service than liberty in the Spirit. We seem to be more concerned about the use of jewelry than reflecting the

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 259.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Stanley J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1994), 234-35.



beauty of Christ. We seem to be more concerned with studying discipleship materials than with truly mentoring others.

### III. True Christian Piety

In true Christian piety, however, motive behind an action transcends the action itself. Jesus, in his denunciation of the Pharisees, repeatedly stressed the need for pure motives in our actions. Outwardly, the scribes and Pharisees appeared to be circumspect, but inwardly they were motivated by the approval of men.

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs which on the outside appear beautiful, but inside they are full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. So you, too, outwardly appear righteous to men, but inwardly you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness (Matt 23:27-28).

As Thielicke notes, the Pharisees “act[ed] on the basis of ossified legalism and feverish casuistry.”<sup>28</sup>

Instead of being concerned about the weightier provisions of the law such as justice and mercy and faithfulness, the scribes and Pharisees were more concerned about paying tithes of mint and dill and cummin - little herbs used for seasoning food (Matt 23:23). What the Lord desires from his children is filial piety – what Calvin calls *pietas* – and not burnt offerings, that is, merely ritualistic, external religion. Over time, “burnt offerings,” as Thielicke suggests, become “a ‘work’ which merely represents me and in which I need not be totally involved.”<sup>29</sup>

*Pietas*, on the hand, involves trust and reverence. Calvin defines it as “that reverence joined with love of God which the knowledge of his benefits induces.”<sup>30</sup> The theologian explains that until human beings

recognize that they owe everything to God, that they are nourished by his fatherly care, that He is the Author of their every good, that they should seek nothing beyond him—they will never yield him willing service. Nay, unless they establish their complete happiness in him, they will never give themselves truly and sincerely to him.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, 20.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 260.

<sup>30</sup> Calvin, *Institutes*, ed. McNeill, 41.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

Love, in other words, is the “fulfilling of the law.” Augustine must have had this in mind when he affirmed, “Love, and do what you want” (*Dilige et fac quod vis*).

Thielicke rightly maintains that “the commandment of love is thus the end of casuistry.”<sup>32</sup> Legalism, therefore, has no place in the Church. David Atkinson is helpful on this point. He writes, “There is no place for legalism in the faith of the people of God. A cold adherence to the strict letter of law takes law outside the covenant of grace, at the heart of which is a relationship of generous love, which law is intended to safeguard and, through the exercise of obedience, to deepen and enrich.”<sup>33</sup>

With the coming of Christ and the inauguration of the messianic age, the law *kata pneuma* instead of *kata sarka* assumes a qualitatively new role in the lives of believers. Jeremiah had prophesied that the day was coming when God would inaugurate a new covenant with his children, at which time the Law would no longer be an external code, but rather would be inscribed on the hearts of his people (31:33). The inwardness of the law would be accomplished by the work of the Spirit, a dispensation of righteousness and life (2 Cor 3:6ff). For the people of God, the demands of the Law have been fulfilled in the work of Christ so that “Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to everyone who believes” (Rom 10:4). As Barry Joslin explains, the Law “is no longer seen as an intimidating external set of regulations, but has been internalized as a blessing of God that renews and changes the heart. It is no longer ruling over the people, but through Christ it becomes an internal blessing and delight that insures obedience.”<sup>34</sup>

Redemption, therefore, involves a transformation in the spirit of obedience. As adopted sons and daughters of the heavenly Father, we revel in pleasing him as a child pleases his parents. Jesus sometimes addressed God by using the Aramaic word *abbā*, and he also encouraged his disciples to do so. With the use of this word, Paul stressed the idea that believers are no longer slaves, but sons of God.

---

<sup>32</sup> Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, 456.

<sup>33</sup> David Atkinson, *The Message of Ruth: The Wings of Refuge* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1983), 78.

<sup>34</sup> Barry Clyde Joslin, *The Theology of the Mosaic Law in Hebrews 7: 1-10* (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005), 271.

“For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. For you did not receive the spirit of bondage again to fear but you received the Spirit of adoption by whom we cry ‘Abba, Father.’” (Rom 8:14, 15; see also Gal 4:4-6). The word *abbā* was used by children and is equivalent to the English word, “Daddy.” “*Abbā* represents the new relationship of confidence and intimacy imparted to men and women by Jesus.”<sup>35</sup> Jesus’ own use of *abbā* is an expression of filial obedience to and unique communion and relationship with the Father. As the *μονογενής υἱός* (only begotten Son), Jesus interprets the Father for us. Consequently, “if God is our Father through the Son and for his sake, then he can only be called ‘Abba, dear Father’ (Rom 8:15; 2 Cor 3:17) under the inspiration of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of freedom.”<sup>36</sup>

Through our union with Christ, our hearts have been set free to love, worship, and adore our Creator-Redeemer. As Calvin reminds us “in Christ [God] offers all happiness in place of our misery, all wealth in place of our neediness; in him he opens to us the heavenly treasures that our whole faith may contemplate his beloved Son, our whole expectation depend upon him, and our whole hope cleave to and rest in him.”<sup>37</sup> What more can we ever desire? No counterfeit piety can satiate the hungry soul; no slavish adherence to external law can fill our empty hearts. Christ is all we need. In commenting on Psalm 73:25, Calvin wrote of this longing:

I know that Thou by thyself, apart from every other object, art sufficient yea, more than sufficient for me, and therefore I do not suffer myself to be carried away after a variety of desires, but rest in and am fully contented with thee. In short, that we may be satisfied with God alone, it is of importance for us to know the plenitude of the blessings which he offers for our acceptance.<sup>38</sup>

## Conclusion

Legalism is formalistic piety which appeals to our self-indulgent culture that treasures autonomy. It is informed by an optimistic anthropology that minimizes sin and that breeds schism, anxiety, and

---

<sup>35</sup>Ladd, *Theology*, 85.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Calvin, *Institutes*, ed. John T. McNeill, 850.

<sup>38</sup>John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 155.

fear and that destroys praise of God for his work of salvation. Legalism is mere ritual.

We must, however, act from the heart. Colossians 3:22-23 notes,

Slaves, in all things obey those who are your *masters* on earth, not with external service, as those who *merely* please men, but with sincerity of *heart*, fearing the Lord. Whatever you do, do your work heartily (ἐκ ψυχῆς), as for the Lord rather than for *men*.”

In the words of Calvin, this would be a case of “freedom of conscience willingly obeying without compulsion of the law.”<sup>39</sup> With reference to this heart service, Jesus reminded his disciples that when they prayed they should “go into [their] room and pray in secret. And [their] Father who sees in secret will repay [them]” (Matt 6:6).

Luther adds, “Faith alone justifies and fulfills the law; and this because faith brings us the Spirit gained by the merits of Christ.”<sup>40</sup> It is the Spirit who gives liberty to for faith and piety. Luther says, “The Spirit, in turn, gives us the happiness and freedom at which the law aims; and this shows that good works really proceed from faith. That is Paul’s meaning in [Romans] chapter 3 when, after having condemned the work of the law, he sounds as if he had meant to abrogate the law through faith, i.e., we fulfill it by faith.”<sup>41</sup>

We need to recover a doctrine of divine grace in our understanding of salvation. This doctrine excludes merit, magnifies sin, and attributes salvation (justification, sanctification, and glorification) to the absolute sovereignty of God’s grace. Like Jonathan Edwards, I believe that any teaching that minimizes God’s absolute sovereignty and man’s total dependence is “repugnant to the design and tenor of the gospel.”<sup>42</sup>



[www.PreciousHeart.net/ti](http://www.PreciousHeart.net/ti)

---

<sup>39</sup> Calvin, *Institutes*, ed. McNeill, 836-37.

<sup>40</sup> Martin Luther, “Preface to Romans,” in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Anchor Books, 1961), 22.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> Harold P. Simonson, ed., *Selected Writings of Jonathan Edwards* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1970), 9.