

What Is the Faith that Justifies?

E. Calvin Beisner, R.E.
Knox Theological Seminary Chapel
October 22, 2002

Scripture reading: Romans 3:19-31

Historians of doctrine call justification by faith alone—*sola fide*—the “material principle of the Reformation.” More than any other doctrine, it distinguishes the Reformers’ understanding of the gospel from the Roman Catholic understanding. A gospel that proclaims that a man is justified before God by faith alone, apart from the works of the law, is *materially different* from a gospel that declares that a man is justified before God by faith plus anything, whether his own works, or the works of the church. Indeed, it alone is truly gospel; it is *good news*. Anything else, far from *good news*, is bad news, for it proclaims a standard that only one Man in all of history has met and therefore condemns all others to hell. This is why for generations of well-informed Protestants this doctrine of *sola fide* was worth dying for—and many indeed earned the martyr’s crown by refusing to renounce it.

Today, that doctrine is under attack even within Reformed circles. My saying so should not prompt you to look for articles in Reformed theological journals or popular magazines or at Reformed websites bearing titles like “Four Reasons Why I Renounce *Sola Fide*” or “A Biblical Critique of the Doctrine of Justification By Faith Alone.” No, error cloaks itself in the language of orthodoxy. Those who are the greatest threat to *sola fide* do not explicitly reject the doctrine by name, as Roman

Catholics do, but affirm it while redefining its terms. My aim today is to warn you of one such threat and to subject it to critique. But first let us examine our text, long recognized by the Reformed community as the *locus classicus* of the doctrine of *sola fide*.

The Apostle Paul in Romans 3:19-20 concluded his case against law keeping as a means of right standing before God. It is a case that he had built relentlessly from 1:18 right through 3:18. He raised it to vindicate his declaration in 1:16-17 that the gospel “is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith [*or perhaps* “beginning and ending in faith”], as it is written, ‘The righteous shall live by faith.’” Salvation, Paul asserted, was by belief—by voluntary assent to understood propositions.

How did the gospel operate powerfully to save? By communicating the information to which belief assented, for as he explained in 10:17, “faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ.” Without a message, there is nothing to be believed. The gospel, therefore, is the power of God to salvation to all who believe because it gives them something to believe.

What is the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel “from faith to faith”? Is it God’s inherent righteousness, the holiness that is of His essence and is expressed in His law? No, for God’s essential righteousness on the one hand was revealed in His law, not only in the gospel, and on the other hand was not engendered by faith. No, this “righteousness of God” was a righteousness adhering to men, as Paul wrote: “The righteous shall live by faith.”

Paul’s great question in these opening chapters of the Epistle to the Romans was, “How can a man be just in the sight of God? How can he be righteous?” He answered that this righteousness of God—perhaps we would better translate it this “righteousness *from* God”—is obtained by faith from beginning to end.

The whole of 1:18-3:20 was the first element of Paul’s vindication of this grand assertion of the good news. The righteousness from God that made a man “just” could not come from law keeping, for men “by their unrighteousness suppress the truth” (1:18); “Claiming to be wise, they become fools, and exchange the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles” (1:22-3), “they do not see fit to acknowledge God” and are “filled with all manner of unrighteousness” (1:28-9). Even those who self-righteously condemn others for such evils “practice the very same things” (2:1), so that “all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law” (2:12). Indeed, “None is righteous, no, not one; no one understands; no one seeks for God” (3:10-11), and so the law stops every mouth, holding all the world accountable and guilty before God, “For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight, since through the law comes knowledge of sin” (3:19-20). Is the law the power of God to salvation to everyone who believes it? Absolutely not! On the contrary, through the law comes

only the knowledge of sin.

This was pictured in the great ceremony of covenant renewal that Moses instructed Israel to enact just before entering the Promised Land, recorded in Deuteronomy 27-30. Having written the Ten Commandments on whitewashed stones and placed those stones on Mt. Ebal, Moses divided Israel into two groups of six tribes each. Half of Israel stood on Mt. Ebal and half on Mt. Gerizim. Half shouted blessings and half curses. On which mountain stood those who shouted the curses? On Mt. Ebal, for “Cursed be anyone who does not confirm the words of this law by doing them” (Deuteronomy 27:26). Mt. Ebal represented the law with its curses, Mt. Gerizim the gospel with its blessings.

This message Paul powerfully confirmed in Romans. The law, though holy, righteous, and good, and though it promised life to all who kept it (Deuteronomy 30:19), “proved to be death” not only to the Apostle but to all others, “For sin, seizing an opportunity through the commandment, deceived [them] and through it killed [them]” (Romans 7:10-12). Certainly, then, the righteousness *from* God could not come *through* the law.

“But now,” Paul went on, “the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from the law, although the Law and the Prophets bear witness to it—the righteousness of God *through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe*” (3:21-22). Is this righteousness ours by some mixture of faith and law keeping? Certainly not, “for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, and are justified by his *grace* as a *gift*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a propitiation by his blood, *to be received by faith*” (3:23-25). *Sola fide* is linked inseparably to *sola gratia*, for if this righteousness from God were to have been received by faith *plus* works, then it would no longer have been “by his grace as a gift.” It would, as Paul would shortly explain, have been a merited reward, for “to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due” (4:4). He would make the same point again much later in the epistle, writing in 11:6 of the remnant of believing Israel, “chosen by grace,” “But if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works; otherwise grace would no longer be grace.” If something is obtained by works, then it is a matter of debt and not of grace; if it is given by grace, it is not of debt and therefore not of works.

Such a gospel seemed scandalous in Paul’s day, and it seems scandalous today. Why? While later, in chapter 6, Paul would answer the charge that it promoted antinomianism—the foolish notion that since we are saved by grace alone through faith alone we can declare our faith and then scoff at God’s law—in our present text he focused on a different charge: that it would make God out to be unjust because he justified the unjust. Romans 3:25-26 makes sense only on the assumption of just such an understanding of the gospel. The gospel is that God justifies—declares righteous—those who believe it, without reference to any righteous works they have done or ever will do! Only if that is the case does the charge to which these two

verses answer make sense. It was scandalous to say that God would call anyone righteous who was not righteous; that He would declare the unjust to be just. Surely that would be to accuse God of falsehood! But no, said Paul. God’s justice was perfectly served by His putting Christ Jesus forward “as a propitiation by his blood.” “This was to show God’s righteousness”—now not the righteousness *from* God but the righteousness inherent *in* God—“because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins. It was to show his righteousness at the present time, so that he might be just and the justifier of *the one who has faith* in Jesus.” How could the just God declare the unjust just? By punishing the sins of the unjust in Christ on the cross, and imputing the righteousness of Christ to the one who believes in Him.

On this basis alone was boasting excluded. If works had been any part of the condition of our justification, every justified man could boast that he had put God in his debt and earned justification at least in part as a wage. A law, or principle, of justification *even partly by works* could never exclude such boasting. But the law, or principle, of justification by faith alone could and did. “For we hold,” Paul wrote, “that one is justified by faith apart from works of the law” (3:28). And, just as he had said in 1:16 that the gospel was the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, “to the Jew first and also to the Greek,” so here he added, “He will justify the circumcised by faith and the uncircumcised through faith” (3:30). Those who had the law could never boast in their law keeping as the condition of their justification; those who did not have the law could never excuse themselves on that ground. No, the condition of justification was the same for both: faith.

Faith in Jesus Christ’s atoning work, apart from the works of the law. Faith alone. *Sola fide*. **That** is gospel. That and nothing less. That and nothing more. **That** is the power of God for salvation for everyone who believes. That was what liberated Martin Luther from his years of spiritual bondage when in the torment of his guilty conscience he had sought to appease God by a combination of good works and self-flagellation but had always known himself to have fallen short. That was what liberated John Newton from the guilt of a slave trader and enabled him to write the hymn “Amazing Grace.” That, and that alone, can liberate any one of us from the death that is the wages of even a single sin. “For the *wages* of sin”—**remember the connection between wage and works!**—“the *wages* of sin is death, but the *free gift* of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord” (6:23).

I began by saying that this doctrine, this gospel of justification by faith alone, is under attack in Reformed circles. Now, who in the Reformed community denies it? In so many words, no one. But by changing the definition of terms, one can reject in substance what one embraces in name. That, in my judgment, is what Norman Shepherd, the author of *The Call of Grace: How the Covenant Illuminates Salvation and Evangelism* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2000), has done, and unfortunately many have embraced his thinking. Having read *The Call of Grace* with some care, I find myself forced to agree with a reviewer who wrote, “Although Shepherd makes use

of much orthodox terminology, . . . he has articulated a doctrine of justification that is persistently ambiguous and that redefines the relationship of faith and works in a way at odds with the . . . biblical doctrine.”¹

Let me say before I offer my criticisms that I am strongly sympathetic to Shepherd’s anti-antinomianism and his urgent call for Christians (Reformed and otherwise) to recognize the centrality of the covenant to Biblical theology, soteriology, ecclesiology, sacramentology, and ethics. But because I am sympathetic to those concerns I consider the book dangerous. Its serious flaws of exegesis, logic, definition, and doctrine will, I fear, not only hinder Shepherd’s own attempt to return covenantal obedience to its rightful, high place in Christian teaching but also predispose many of his readers, or readers only of his critics, to be suspicious of anyone who emphasizes the covenant or obedience.

What are some problems with Shepherd’s view of justification? The first is *ambiguity*, and it leads into the second, outright *falsehood*.

In *The Call of Grace*, Shepherd writes, “Without a living, active, penitent, and obedient faith, Israel could not remain in the Promised Land.”² Here he fails to clarify the relationships among faithlessness, disobedience, and exclusion from the Promised Land. Were exclusion and disobedience both the consequences of faithlessness? Or was exclusion the consequence of both faithlessness and disobedience? The former is monergism—redemption as the work of God alone—and *sola gratia*; the latter is synergism—redemption by man’s cooperation with God—and the denial of *sola gratia*.

Shortly he writes, “The law does not set forth a works/merit principle in opposition to grace and faith. It testifies to the grace of God revealed in Jesus Christ.”³ The ambiguity here is in Shepherd’s failure to explain *how* the law testifies to the grace of God revealed in Jesus Christ. Does it do so as something external to the covenant of grace and by revealing the impossibility of anyone’s justifying himself by his own obedience, or as a subset of the covenant of grace and by revealing the requirements, obedience to which will justify? The former again is monergism and *sola gratia*; the latter, synergism and justification by faith plus works. But Shepherd does not say in which of these senses the law testifies to the grace of God. More serious than the ambiguity, however, is the problem that in this instance Shepherd writes of the relationship between law, works, and merit, on the one hand, and grace and faith, on the other, in precisely the opposite way the Apostle Paul wrote of it. While Shepherd says “The law does not set forth a works/merit

principle in opposition to grace and faith,” Paul wrote, as we have already heard, “to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due” (Romans 4:4) and “if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works; otherwise grace would no longer be grace” (11:6). If something is obtained by works, then it is a matter of debt and not of grace; if it is given by grace, it is not of debt and therefore not of works. Paul, in opposition to Shepherd, expressly joined law, works, and merit (debt) and placed them in opposition to grace and faith.

It soon becomes apparent that Shepherd subsumes works under faith—makes works a part of faith. He writes, “The Mosaic covenant embodies promises, and promises can be received only by faith.”⁴ For Israel, the promises came wrapped in the garment of the Mosaic law. That is why faith in these promises also entailed faithfulness with respect to the commandments. Obedience is simply an expression of faith in the promises of God, not an alternative to faith.”⁵ But (1) It simply is not true that promises can be received only by faith. Every contract for mutual benefit involves promises from each party to the other, each promise conditioned upon the fulfillment of certain obligations that are not simply faith; they are meritorious works. Shepherd’s problem is that he *subsumes obedience into faith*, making it part of the *condition* of justification, rather than carefully maintaining the dependence of both obedience and justification on faith but of neither on the other. (2) The third sentence is vague: “That is why faith in these promises also entailed *faithfulness* with respect to the commandments.” The relationship of entailment between A and B may be any of several kinds. A entails B if A and B are identical; “If A then A” is a valid inference by the law of identity. By causation, A entails B if A is a necessary and sufficient condition of B: “If A then B. A. Therefore B” is a valid inference by *modus ponens*. By inclusion, A entails B if all A are B, even if not all B are A: “All A are B. C is A. Therefore C is B” is a valid inference by *modus ponens*. What Shepherd’s third sentence does not tell us is whether the entailment is that of identity, cause, or inclusion. The first equates faith and works and destroys the whole Biblical teaching of justification by faith alone apart from the works of the law (Romans 3:28). The third subsumes works under faith and likewise destroys *sola fide*. Only the second maintains the Biblical distinction between faith and works and the Biblical doctrine that works are the necessary consequence of faith and so upholds the Biblical teaching of justification by faith alone apart from the works of the law. What Shepherd’s sentence, taken by itself, does not tell us is which of these Shepherd means by it. Yet the fourth sentence *seems*, taken in its most natural grammatical and lexical sense, to interpret the third as expressing the entailment of identity: “Obedience is simply an expression of faith in the promises of God, *not an*

¹David VanDrunen, “Justification By Faith in the Theology of Norman Shepherd,” *Katekōmen* (Greenville Theological Seminary newsletter), 14:1 (Summer 2002), 23-6 at 23.

²Norman Shepherd, *The Call of Grace: How the Covenant Illuminates Salvation and Evangelism* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2000), 30.

³*Ibid.*, 31-2.

⁴Shepherd makes the same point when he writes, “But what is promised cannot be earned or merited. It is received as a gift of pure grace.” *Ibid.*, 52.

⁵*Ibid.*, 32.

alternative to faith.” If obedience is “not an alternative to faith” then it must *be* faith; that is, the entailment relationship between faith and obedience must be the entailment of identity. But this equates faith and works and so denies that justification is by faith apart from the works of the law.

With his confidence that obedience is itself a part of faith, Shepherd proceeds to interpret a key Old Testament text, Leviticus 18:5, in precisely the opposite way from how Paul interpreted it.

The law is a gracious gift that embodies wisdom for living. ‘Now choose life, so that you and your children may live. . . . The LORD is your life’ (Deut. 30:19-20). This is also the thrust of Leviticus 18:5, ‘Keep my decrees and laws, for the man who obeys them will live by them. I am the LORD.’ This verse does not challenge Israelites to earn their salvation by their good works. Rather, it offers to all who are covenantally loyal and faithful the encouragement and assurance that they will live and prosper in the land. This is the Lord’s promise to them, a promise to be received with a living and active faith.⁶

First, while Shepherd assures us that Leviticus 18:5 “does not challenge Israelites to earn their salvation by their good works,” Paul wrote, “For as many as are of the works of the Law are under a curse; for it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who does not abide by all things written in the book of the Law, to perform them.’ Now that no one is justified by the Law before God is evident; for, ‘The righteous man shall live by faith.’ However, **the Law is not of faith**; on the contrary, ‘He who practices them shall live by them’” (Galatians 3:10-12). To live by the commandments of the law is not to live by faith. Second, that the law embodies wisdom for living does not entail that it is the means of life; it is instead the means of death because of sin in the flesh (Romans 7). Third, Shepherd needs to distinguish carefully between definition (the law defines holiness and holy action) and cause (the law makes one holy). The former is true; the latter is false, but unfortunately Shepherd seems to affirm it.

His failure to define terms adequately appears also in his treatment of how faith and repentance relate. He writes, “Paul calls his hearers not simply to faith, but to faith and repentance.”⁷ Shepherd here and elsewhere fails to take adequately into account the epistemic (mental) essence of repentance.⁸ “But,” as Gordon Clark has

pointed out, “etymologically *repentance* means a change of mind, not necessarily restricted to specifically moral matters. It can include a change of mind with reference to all theology, and . . . repentance, though not colloquially [that is, not in common parlance, but properly], surely includes the belief that Jesus is Lord.”⁹ When Peter told his listeners on Pentecost what they must do to be saved from God’s judgment, he said, “You [plural] repent for the remission of your [plural] sins . . .” (Acts 2:38, my translation).¹⁰ He did not mention faith. Why not? Because repentance is faith, and faith is repentance. When Paul and Silas told the Philippian jailer what he must do to be saved, they said, “Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you shall be saved. . . .” (Acts 16:31). They did not mention repentance. Why not? Because faith is repentance, and repentance is faith.

Shepherd fails to solve the problem when he adds, “Repentance includes turning away from sin and making a new beginning. When Paul defends his ministry before King Agrippa, he says, ‘First to those in Damascus, then to those in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and to the Gentiles also, I preached that they should repent and turn to God and prove their repentance by their deeds’ (Acts 26:20). Faith and repentance are indissolubly intertwined with one another.”¹¹ Again Shepherd’s failure to define terms carefully leads him into trouble. For X to *include* Y is not the same thing as for X to *be proved by* Y, and neither of those is the same as for X and Y to be indissolubly intertwined. Yet Shepherd writes as if these phrases were interchangeable. Paul precisely did *not* say that repentance *includes* turning away from sin; he said that it is *proved by* deeds (i.e., in this case, turning away from sin).¹² The repentance itself is a mental act (*metanoia*), unobservable to men except indirectly through its fruit in outward profession or action¹³ but directly observable to God. The deeds are the *consequence* of this mental act. But to confuse deeds and repentance is no less mistaken than to confuse the dropping of a billiard ball into its pocket with the striking of a cue ball by a stick. Cause and effect are distinct from each other, even if the former necessarily entails the latter.

intentional action rooted in the affirmation of some truth.)

⁹Gordon H. Clark, *Faith and Saving Faith*, 2d ed. (1983; Jefferson, MD: Trinity Foundation, 1990), 59-60.

¹⁰This translation is designed to make explicit the implicit causal connection between repentance and remission, signaled by the plural verb *repent* and the plural pronoun *your* modifying *sins*, on the one hand, and the implicit causal disjunct between baptism and remission signaled by the singular verb *be baptized* and the singular pronoun *each*, on the one hand, and the plural pronoun *your* modifying *sins*, on the other hand.

¹¹Shepherd, *Call of Grace*, 47.

¹²We should note, by the way, that it is possible to repent in the wrong direction. One may repent of doing what is right and begin doing what is wrong. Of course it is not typical to use the word this way, but it is possible.

¹³We cannot even be sure, based on profession and action, that we rightly infer repentance in the one whose profession and action we observe. It is always possible that he is feigning faith in order to gain our confidence so that he can later take advantage of us. Jeremiah 17:9-10.

⁶Ibid., 36.

⁷Ibid., 46.

⁸He does the same when he writes, “. . . it is not enough to ask the sinner for a simple act of faith. The evangelist must also demand repentance.” Ibid., 68. Likewise, “It is both striking and significant that the Great Commission in neither Matthew nor Luke speaks of calling upon sinners to believe. Faith is not mentioned specifically, but only by implication. What is explicitly asserted is the call to repentance and obedience.” Ibid., 104. As we shall see momentarily, neither repentance nor obedience can be understood rightly except as mental acts, acts of belief. (For who can conceive of an irrational, nonvolitional creature obeying? Obedience is not mere outward action, possible for robots, but

Yet Shepherd's failure to sustain this distinction leads to increasingly evident divergence from the doctrine of justification by faith apart from the works of the law when he writes, "faith produces repentance, and repentance is evident in the lifestyle of the believer. Thus, the obligations of the new covenant include not only faith and repentance, but also *obedience*."¹⁴ The last sentence obscures the question whether faith and repentance (or we might say "faith, that is, repentance"), on the one hand, and obedience, on the other, are included among "the obligations of the new covenant" *in the same or different senses*. Faith (which includes repentance) is included in the obligations of the new covenant *as a condition of justification*; *obedience* is included in the obligations of the new covenant not as the condition of justification but *as the inevitable fruit of faith*. Shepherd's treatment makes it appear that the two (faith and repentance, on the one hand, and obedience, on the other) are included in the same sense, i.e., that obedience is a condition of justification. That in turn contradicts Paul's teaching that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law.

One more quotation will illustrate the extent to which failure to define clearly the logical and causal relationships among the various elements of his system leads Shepherd into serious trouble. He writes that "faith, repentance, obedience, and perseverance are indispensable to the enjoyment of [the] blessings [of the covenant]. They are conditions, but they are not meritorious conditions."¹⁵ But as we have seen, while Scripture explicitly denies merit to faith (which includes repentance), it explicitly attaches merit to obedience (works). As Paul wrote in Romans 4:3-5: "For what does the Scripture say? 'And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness.' Now to the one who works, his wage is not reckoned as a favor, but as what is due. But to the one who does not work, but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned as righteousness . . ." A reward for obedience is reckoned of *debt*, not of *grace*. Further, "if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works, otherwise grace is no longer grace" (Romans 11:6). If by grace, then not by works; if by works, then of debt, not of grace. But it is certain that by *works* in these passages Paul denotes obedience to the law. If obedience, therefore, is a condition of justification, then it is by definition (because it equals works) a meritorious condition. It does not cease to be meritorious simply because Shepherd says it is not. It is meritorious because Scripture says it is.

The only way to avoid the conclusion that justification is the merited effect of works is by denying that works (obedience) are a condition of justification. Shepherd, however, does not agree. He thinks instead that "what must be challenged in the Roman Catholic doctrine [which is that we are justified partly by grace through faith and partly by merit through works] is the very idea of merit itself. God

does not, and never did, relate to his people on the basis of a works/merit principle."¹⁶ But while it is certainly true that God has never *granted salvation to His people* on the basis of a works/merit principle, it is not true that God has never *related to them* on the basis of such a principle. It was precisely on the basis of their merit that He condemned them: "the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). But this means that merit and obedience are inseparable, which is why the solution to the problem of how salvation can be gift, not reward, of grace, not of debt (Romans 11:5-6; 4:4-5), is not to assert (as Shepherd does)¹⁷ that the works that derive from faith are not meritorious but rather to assert (as Shepherd denies) that works are not a condition of justification but, like justification, a consequence of faith.¹⁸

There are other problems in *The Call of Grace*, such as teaching baptismal remission, but they are topics for another day. Suffice it to say for the present that Shepherd's doctrine of justification, despite his affirming justification by faith alone in words, deviates dangerously from that doctrine by making obedient, meritorious works a part of faith rather than the fruit of faith and a condition of justification rather than a concomitant consequence with it of faith. That is not good news; it is bad news, because it means that our justification depends not solely on what Christ has done for us on the cross but also on what we must do in obedience to the law. That way lies the undoing of the Reformation—and with it, the undoing of the peace with God that comes only from knowing that we have been justified by faith, not by the works of the law (Romans 5:1; 3:28).

In contrast to Shepherd's ambiguous and mistaken notions, let us at Knox Theological Seminary sound the clear and unmistakable trumpet of the Reformation and of Scripture itself: *sola fide*, justification by faith alone.

¹⁶Ibid., 60.

¹⁷ . . . if we do not reject the idea of merit, we are not really able to challenge the Romanist doctrine of salvation at its very root. Either we have to grant that the good works of the believer are indeed meritorious, allowing us to boast in our own personal achievement, or we have to deny that the good works of the believer are really good. In that case, we are saying that sanctification amounts to nothing. If we do not challenge the idea that good works are meritorious, the necessity for sanctification and the fact that believers do perform good works always represent a threat to salvation by grace." Ibid., 61-2.

¹⁸Shepherd as much as acknowledges the meritorious nature of obedient works when he writes elsewhere, "A Reformed pastor . . . has the great joy and delight of publicly acknowledging the work that the Holy Spirit is doing in the lives of the people to whom he is ministering. Hebrews 6:10 says that 'God is not unjust; he will not forget your work and the love you have shown him as you have helped his people and continue to help them.'" Ibid., 88. If God's remembering the work and love is a matter of justice, then it is also a matter of what is due (Romans 4:4, where *due* translates the Greek *opheilema*, which see also in Romans 13:7, a verse to which many theologians, including John Calvin [*Institutes* III.vii.3], appeal in defining justice). Apparently, then, God's recognition of their work and love is expressed not in His justifying them but in something beyond justification—in the varying rewards that the servants of God will receive in the future life.

¹⁴Shepherd, *Call of Grace*, 47.

¹⁵Shepherd, *Call of Grace*, 50.