

LUTHER AND CALVIN
ON
CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICS

by

Donald Sinnema

Institute for Christian Studies
Toronto, Ontario

A student paper presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of a seminar on the religious, political and social thought of
Martin Luther, at the Toronto School of Theology, June, 1976.

distributed by
The Association for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship,
229 College Street, Toronto, Ontario M5T 1R4

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
I. LUTHER	2
The Foundation of Civil Government	2
God Sovereign over Political Government	6
Politics Not Inherently Evil	6
The Christian Subject	7
The Christian Ruler	8
The Distinctiveness of Christian Rule	9
Politics and the Gospel	11
The Christian State	12
Political Millenarianism	13
II. CALVIN	14
The Foundation of Civil Government	14
God Sovereign over Political Government	16
Politics Not Inherently Evil	18
Political Millenarianism	19
The Christian Subject	19
The Christian Ruler	21
The Distinctiveness of Christian Rule	22
Politics and the Gospel	22
The Christian State	23
Conclusion	24
Notes	
Bibliography	

Heinrich Bornkamm has placed before modern Christians the challenge "to rethink Luther's own political conceptions in terms of the possibilities and tasks of the present age."¹ To bring to focus a comparison of the political thought of Luther and Calvin, I wish to take up Bornkamm's challenge by posing to these two Reformers a modern question. The question in broad terms is, What is the relationship between Christianity and politics? Their answers are elicited from the main writing of each about political matters, Luther's Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed (1523), and Calvin's discussion of "Civil Government" in his Institutes (ch. 6 in the 1536 ed.; Bk. IV, ch. xx in the 1559 ed.). Although both Luther and Calvin wrote in response to particular problems of their day, our question confronted them, too, even if in a different form.

The relationship between Christianity and politics is evident most fundamentally at the foundations of civil government. Thus, upon analysis of the basic structure of Luther's and Calvin's political thought, the implications of our question, such as, Are Christians subject to the state?, Can Christians be involved in politics?, What is Christian about their involvement?, Can there be a Christian state?, will become most apparent.

I. LUTHER

The Foundation of Civil Government

1. The key to Luther's view of the foundation of civil government is his two kingdom--two government doctrine. Although this doctrine grew from the ground of St. Augustine's formulation of the two cities,² Luther develops his doctrine in a unique way, partly in reaction to the problems of the medieval hierarchical system with its confusion of powers--the church exercising political authority in some territories and the state extending its authority over certain faith matters such as heresy--and partly in reaction to the Anabaptist rejection of Christian involvement in civil government.

2. To understand Luther's position, Bornkamm has emphasized that kingdom (Reich) and government (Regiment) be distinguished, but not separated or played off against each other.³ Kingdom indicates the realm of lordship and government the mode of lordship. In general, Luther's usage of these terms in Temporal Authority supports that conclusion.

3. Luther's conception of the two kingdoms was adopted from St. Augustine's model of the two cities. In his City of God, Augustine contrasts the City of God and the earthly city; the one is good, the other evil.⁴ Of particular importance for Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms is Augustine's statement:

I classify the human race into two branches: the one consists of those who live by human standards, the other of those who live according to God's will. I also call these two classes the two cities, speaking allegorically. By two cities I mean two societies of human beings, one of which is predestined to reign with God for all eternity, the other doomed to undergo eternal punishment with the Devil.⁵

In the same way, Luther sharply distinguishes between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world. All mankind is divided into two classes of people, true believers and unrighteous non-Christians. The true believers belong to the kingdom of God and the non-Christians to the kingdom of the world.⁶ The two groups are mutually exclusive, and Luther consistently contrasts the two in principle. Those in the kingdom of God are true believers (278), real Christians (279), righteous (totally justified) men (279) who do no evil (280,282), and those who belong to the kingdom of the world are evil (281), unrighteous and lawless (279). The distinction corresponds to the simple opposition between good and evil, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. By drawing an antithesis between men rather than within men, this distinction does not take account of Christians who fail to live a faithful Christian life.

4. The righteous Christians of the kindom of God do of their own accord more than the law demands (279). Therefore they need no temporal law or sword to restrain them, for "there is nothing but the unadulterated doing of right and bearing of wrong" (279). It is impossible that the temporal law or sword should find any work among them (279). They live by the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount that call for love of one another and suffering, rather than resistance of injustice done to themselves (282). Thus God's kingdom is a kingdom of forgiving, of yielding, of loving and of sacrificing.⁷ In this narrow sense of the Sermon on the Mount, Luther speaks of the gospel as the gospel of the kingdom of God, teaching, governing and upholding God's kingdom (278).

The unrighteous people of the kingdom of the world, on the other hand, do nothing that the law demands (279). They need the temporal law and sword to restrain them outwardly from doing evil and reducing the world to chaos (279, 281). They are like savage wild beasts which need to be bound with chains, in contrast to the righteous who are like tame animals which are harmless even without chains (280).

5. To the two-kingdom doctrine Luther relates his two-government doctrine. To rule over the two kingdoms, God ordained two governments: a spiritual government over the kingdom of God, and a temporal (weltliche) government over the kingdom of the world (281). This particular combination is not found in St. Augustine. Luther considered his theory of the two governments as one of his own main contributions.⁸

The spiritual government over true Christians consists of rule by the gospel (281), by the precepts of Matthew 5 to love one's enemies and not resist evil (282). By the spiritual government the Holy Spirit produces Christians and righteous people under Christ (281). Temporal government, on the other hand, consists of rule by the temporal law and sword (281). God subjected the wicked to the law and the sword in order to restrain them from practising their wickedness (280) and maintain an outward peace (281). Thus temporal government bears a strictly negative role. In restraining wickedness, it is coercive and punitive in character.

6. The ruler of the spiritual government is God or Christ alone (301, 307). He is the Supreme King of his kingdom and rules by his Holy Spirit alone, without law (283, 291). The clergy are only God's servants in the exercise of spiritual government. Their office is not a matter of authority but simply of service, and their ruling is nothing more than the ruling of souls by the preaching of God's Word (299, 307). The ruler of the temporal government, however, is man who rules by authority from God (301). God's wrath uses human rulers to judge the wicked (303). In accord with Romans 13, Luther emphasizes that temporal rulers are also God's servants and must be esteemed (289, 293).

7. Corresponding to the two kingdoms and governments are two kinds of law (gesetz) (295). Christians are governed by nothing except God's word (307); the wicked are governed by man-made laws or human

ordinances (295, 301). Luther speaks of such temporal law only in the sense of the punitive first function of the law (280).

8. Corresponding to the character of the two laws, the extent of the authority of the two governments also differs. Spiritual government rules inwardly by God's Word and Spirit; temporal government rules outwardly by the temporal law and sword (290,299). For Luther, to rule inwardly means to rule only over internal matters and to rule outwardly means to rule only over external matters (cf. 300). The inward rule of spiritual government extends to the soul and matters which concern the salvation of souls (296). God alone has authority over the soul (295). The outward rule of temporal government extends only to the body, property and external affairs on earth (295, 300, 301). The temporal government may not coerce the soul; it can only force outward compliance (297, 298). Its rule over the kingdom of the world is limited to outward rule. On this account Luther often polemicized against the medieval confusion of spiritual rule over external affairs and temporal rule over the soul (299).

Luther's distinction between inward/outward, internal/external has reference only to the extent of government authority; it does not characterize the extent of the realm of the two kingdoms. By saying that spiritual government rules only inwardly over the kingdom of God, Luther does not imply that the kingdom of God is only internal. Christians certainly exist also externally as bodies. And by saying that temporal government rules only outwardly over the kingdom of the world, he does not imply that the kingdom of the world is only external. Unbelievers to be sure exist also internally as souls.

Luther's discussion of heresy provides an interesting case concerning inward and outward rule. Heresy belongs to the evil kingdom of the world, but it is also a spiritual matter, an inward matter of the heart (304, 305). Attempts to restrain heresy by outward force only strengthens it in the heart, while merely weakening its outward expression. Thus temporal government will not succeed in dealing with heresy. It is rather the function of the bishops to fight heresy by tearing it out of the heart by the word.

In this case spiritual government has jurisdiction also over the souls of the wicked. Thus spiritual government rules inwardly (never outwardly) not only over the kingdom of God but also over the kingdom of the world. This case also shows that temporal government rules only outwardly over the kingdom of the world. It has no jurisdiction over matters like heresy, for it can not rule inwardly over the kingdom of the world. As we shall see in our discussion of the Christian subject, Luther also allows for an outward rule by temporal government over the kingdom of God.

9. Luther's two governments relate to church and state only to a limited extent. His spiritual government refers to the church only in the limited sense of the rule of the clergy over spiritual matters. The church as the community of God's people is covered better by his concept of the kingdom of God. His temporal government refers to the state not in the sense of a political realm but in the sense of a

ruling body which punishes crime. The external world ravaged by sin is the political realm. Luther does not have in mind the broad modern conception of a welfare state.

10. The structure of Luther's political thought outlined above is clear in his Temporal Authority. Nevertheless, Luther did not write the treatise as a systematic analysis of civil government, because his concern was rather with concrete historical problems. Thus he does not always use his terms in a consistent way. We will focus on three examples of his unsystematic use of terminology.

a. Sometimes Luther uses "kingdom of the world" in the sense of temporal government, but he never uses "temporal government" in the sense of the evil kingdom of the world. In his discussion of the Christian himself enduring evil and injustice but resisting evil and punishing injustice for his neighbour's sake, Luther states that "at one and the same time you satisfy God's kingdom inwardly and the kingdom of the world outwardly" (286). By "kingdom of the world" he obviously means satisfying the demands of temporal government outwardly.

b. Besides using "kingdom" in the phrase "kingdom of the world" as the designation for the wicked class of unbelievers, Luther sometimes uses the term to refer to the realm of external things. He states on one occasion:

That is, over what is on earth and belongs to the temporal, earthly kingdom, man has authority from God; but whatever belongs to heaven and to the eternal kingdom is exclusively under the Lord of heaven (301).

The phrase "temporal, earthly kingdom" (zeitlichen irdenischen reich) does not mean the same as the evil "kingdom of the world."

c. Luther uses the terms "world" (Welt) and "worldly" (weltlich) in a positive as well as negative sense. The statement that Christ came to "begin God's kingdom and establish it in the world" (278) does not speak of the world as evil, but as creaturely reality. "World" in the phrase "kingdom of the world" is used in a negative way. In this sense, "the world is God's enemy" (303). "Worldly" in the phrase "temporal (weltliche) government" is a positive term designating earthly rule by man. In the phrase "worldly princes" it can have either a positive meaning indicating those who rule in temporal government (306), or a negative meaning, the opposite of a wise Christian prince (303, 308).

On the basis of this picture of the basic structure of Luther's political thought, we may investigate some of its implications for our question of the relationship between Christianity and politics.

God Sovereign Over Political Government

1. By his two-government doctrine, Luther maintains an emphasis on God's sovereignty over all government. Civil government was ordained by God (275, 276). It was he who provided this government for unbelievers, and subjected them to the sword in order to preserve the world (280). Civil government is one of the two governments by which God rules.

2. Did God ordain the temporal government at the time of creation or only after the Fall because of sin? Luther is not explicit in the matter, but one may assume that in his view the harmonious freedom of the pre-Fall situation needed no temporal government to restrain unbelievers, and so at that time no actual temporal government existed.⁹ Luther does say, however, that the "law of this temporal sword has existed from the beginning of the world" (276, cf. 286). In Cain's case God even suspended it, but after the Flood reestablished and confirmed it (276). We may conclude that although the law of the sword was for Luther a creational ordinance of God, it was not actually put into effect until after the Fall. If sin had not come, temporal government would never have been needed.

Politics Not Inherently Evil

1. Luther's distinction between kingdom and government prevents the conception of politics as inherently evil. Temporal government is not (necessarily) part of the evil kingdom of the world, but rather was ordained by God to rule over it. Its rule over evil does not imply that temporal government is evil in itself.

2. If the good-evil distinction is expressed only in the distinction of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world, the question arises whether Luther in Temporal Authority takes sufficient account of (good and) evil within temporal government. Is it not common that rulers of temporal government themselves belong to the kingdom of the world as unbelievers? Luther was certainly aware of the difference between a good and evil ruler. There are tyrants, and there are a few wise and upright princes although they are rare (303). Part Three of Temporal Authority is even based on the distinction between a Christian prince and a worldly prince (308). The worldly prince exercises lordship and proceeds with force, whereas the Christian prince does not. This difference is not, however, theoretically accounted for in the basic structure of Luther's two kingdom--two government doctrine.

Luther more clearly resolves the question later in his Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved of 1526. There he drops the emphasis on the division of mankind into two exclusive classes and makes a distinction between office and the person holding it.¹⁰ A political calling and occupation may thus be legitimate and godly while the person occupying it may be wicked. The distinction between the kingdom of God

and the kingdom of the world does not affect the goodness of the offices, which are God ordained, but only the person within the office. Here the difference between good and evil in temporal government is given adequate theoretical foundation.

The Christian Subject

1. Because of the Anabaptist tendency to reject civil government when they maintained that Christians live in the freedom of the gospel, the question whether Christians are subject to political authority was a real issue that Luther had to face. Theoretically, according to the basic structure of Luther's two kingdom--two government doctrine, Christians are subject only to spiritual government, not to temporal government. But for life in the concrete world filled with wickedness, the matter is not that simple. Luther was confronted by the clear statements of Romans 13: 1 and I Peter 2:13 that all souls must be subject to the governing authority (283, 284), and so he was forced to add a refinement to his basic structure. He introduced the distinction between the Christian for himself and the Christian for his neighbor (284). Christians for themselves are not subject to the law and sword (281), for they have no need of it and should not have it (285). They all are alike subject to one another, and can be subject to no authority but Christ (307). On the other hand, the Christian for the sake of his neighbor is subject to temporal government in order to help preserve peace and restrain the wicked from harming his neighbor. In such a relationship the Christian "submits most willingly to the rule (regiment) of the sword, pays his taxes, honors those in authority, serves, helps, and does * all he can to assist the governing authority, that it may continue to function and be held in honor and fear" (284). For his neighbor the Christian is under obligation to serve and assist the sword by whatever means he can (285). Christians for and among themselves are to be governed by the gospel and must suffer injustice toward themselves; for the sake of others Christians are to be governed by love and must tolerate no injustice toward the neighbour (286).
2. Luther thus concedes that everyone, in accord with Romans 13:1 must submit to the governing authority. Nevertheless his terms "submit/subject" concretely mean something different for non-Christians than for Christians. For the non-Christian, to submit or be subject to the governing authority means to be outwardly restrained by it from doing evil deeds (280). For the Christian it means to serve the governing authority by doing all he can to assist it (284). The Christian submits for the sake of his neighbour, but he himself is not restrained by temporal government, because doing no evil he does not need to be. By this equivocal use of "be subject", Luther maintains an adherence to Romans 13: 1 and I Peter 2: 13. Nevertheless, his view allows an active subjection to the law and sword of the governing authority only in the case of non-Christians. Only over

them can there be an active exercising of civil authority.

3. If Christians are subject, does this mean that there is an outward rule by temporal government over the kingdom of God? Luther's basic position is that neither temporal nor spiritual government can rule outwardly over God's kingdom because there is no need of it. Nevertheless, Luther does at times leave open the possibility of such external rule by temporal government. In a discussion of Romans 13:1 that every soul be subject, he says that Paul is speaking of subjection not in matters of faith but only in external things (300). This applies also to Christians submitting for the sake of their neighbours, but not to Christians among themselves. Thus temporal government has an external jurisdiction over submitting Christians, even though no restraint is involved. And external rule over Christians means external rule over the kingdom of God. Later in his development, Luther became more explicit about external rule over Christians. In Whether Soldiers (1526), he states that as far as body and property are concerned, Christians are subject to worldly rulers and owe them allegiance.¹¹

4. What about the subjection of unfaithful Christians to temporal government? Luther has no place in his two government--two kingdom doctrine for such people who are Christian but do not live a Christian life, because they do not fit neatly into either of the two exclusive classes of mankind. They belong neither among the totally wicked of the kingdom of the world, nor among the totally righteous of the kingdom of God. In his Temporal Authority, Luther concedes that true Christians who live a Christian life are very few (280, 281) but he takes no account of the other Christians. We may suppose that they are subject to the external rule and restraint of temporal government insofar as they are evil.

The Christian Ruler

1. We may now turn to Luther's position on the question, "Can Christians be actively involved in politics?" Luther's distinction between the Christian for himself and the Christian for his neighbour provides the basis for Christian political involvement. Although for himself a Christian has no need of temporal government and no need to bear the temporal sword, for the sake of his neighbour's protection and peace in the world he is "under obligation to serve and assist the sword by whatever means [he] can, with body, goods, honor and soul" (285). Therefore if there is a lack of hangmen, constables, judges or princes, he should if qualified offer his services and seek the position (285). In addition to a number of Biblical examples, especially Romans 13: 1 confirms acceptance by Christians of callings in civil government (289). This text emphasizes that the governing authority is ordained by God and that he is God's servant. That the governing authority is God's servant means that through this calling he may serve God (290). In fact, it would be

"fine and fitting if all princes were good, true Christians. For the sword and authority, as a particular service of God, belong more appropriately to Christians than to any other men on earth" (290). Government authority should be esteemed as high as any other God instituted calling.

Just as one can serve God in the estate of marriage, or in farming or a trade, for the benefit of others-- and must so serve if his neighbour needs it--so one can serve God in government, and should there serve if the needs of his neighbour demand it (290).

Also the callings ancillary to temporal rule, such as constable, hangman, jurist, lawyer are each a divine service (293). They can and should be filled by Christians.

2. A calling in temporal government is, however, not every Christian's task. There are other offices by which God may also be served, and each person must attend to the duties of his own calling (291). That is why Christ and the apostles did not bear the sword. They were so busily occupied with the spiritual sword, the Word, that they had to leave the temporal sword to others. (291).

3. Thus we see that Luther strongly encouraged Christian involvement in politics. For him politics certainly need not be "dirty". Luther firmly rejected the Anabaptist position which denied that Christians may actively participate in government. The Anabaptists did acknowledge that the magistracy was established by God to control evil, but did not allow Christians to have such a calling. For them Christians must live by the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, loving their enemies and not resisting evil, just the opposite of the civil ruler's task.¹² To such a position Luther countered by saying that if civil government is "God's work and creation, then it is good, so good that everyone can use it in a Christian and salutary way" (289).

The Distinctiveness of Christian Rule

1. We may now inquire of Luther how Christians are involved in politics. Does Christianity affect their manner of temporal rule?

In Temporal Authority Luther definitely talks of a "Christian manner" of bearing the sword (285). As God's good work the sword can be used "in a Christian and salutary way" (289, 294). The distinguishing feature of the Christian manner by which a Christian prince rules is (service motivated by love. A Christian is the servant of all (284). He serves and helps the temporal authority not for his own good but only for the sake of his neighbour. Such service is a work of love. "If he did not so serve he would be acting not as a Christian but even contrary to love" (284). The Christian does not

need the temporal authority to help and serve himself, but it should rather have need of him (285). Therefore it would be good if all princes were Christians (290).

2. The Christian manner becomes clearer when Luther in Part Three gives suggestions for those who would like to be "Christian princes and lords" (308). Here he teaches not "how a temporal prince is to live, but how a temporal prince is to be a Christian, such that he may also reach heaven" (310). Luther contrasts the wise Christian prince with the worldly prince or tyrant (303, 308). Worldly princes exercise lordship and proceed with force. They do what is good for themselves and think they should be served and should rule by force. They spend much time at their princely amusements, dancing, hunting and so on (310). The Christian prince, on the other hand, must set aside any intent to exercise lordship or to proceed with force. His works of ruling must be done in love. "They are done in love, however, when they are directed wholeheartedly toward the benefit, honor, comfort, and salvation of self" (308).

Luther gives the prince who would be a Christian four kinds of advice "on what his attitude should be toward all laws, counsels, judgements and actions" (309). These might be called Luther's Christian political principles:

(1) The Christian prince must devote his attention to his subjects rather than to his personal interests. He must use his office to serve and protect them to the end that they, not he, benefit from his rule (310).

(2) He must beware of the high and mighty and of his counselors who may give untrustworthy and flattering advice. The reins of government must firmly be kept in his own hands (311), and he must use his own judgement. God alone is to be trusted.

(3) He must deal justly with evildoers. This must be done in a wise and prudent way so that he can punish without injury to others (313). In a just war this means that "it is both Christian and an act of love to kill the enemy without hesitation...until he is conquered," but then "one should offer mercy and peace to those who surrender and humble themselves" (315). He should not go to war against an overlord. In this case he must suffer wrong for God's sake rather than resist by force. We may note that here the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount are applied to civil government.

(4) He must also act in a Christian way toward God, by subjecting himself to him in full confidence and by praying for wisdom (316).

If all this advice is taken, "the prince's job will be done right, both outwardly and inwardly; it will be pleasing to God and to the people" (316).

3. Although in Temporal Authority Luther could definitely speak of a Christian manner of ruling, in the later development of his political

thought he withdrew from this position altogether. He began to distinguish between the Christian as Christian and as world person.¹³ In Whether Soldiers (1526), Luther stated that soldiers ought to fight "not as Christians, but as members of the state and obedient subjects".¹⁴ In the same work he stated:

A Christian is a person to himself; he believes for himself and for no one else. But a lord and prince is not a person for himself, but on behalf of others.... It would indeed be good if he were also a Christian and believed in God, for then he would be saved. However, being a Christian is not princely, and therefore few princes can be Christians.¹⁵

In his Sermons on Matthew V-VII (1530-1532), Luther is more precise:

A prince can surely be a Christian, but as a Christian he cannot rule....The person is surely a Christian, but the office of prince has nothing to do with his Christianity.¹⁶ *

In these statements of his mature position, Luther no longer speaks of a Christian prince as Christian or of a Christian manner of rule. Although he maintained that "even if princes are not Christians they ought to do what is right and good according to God's outward ordinance,"¹⁷ this mature position paved the way for a separation of Christianity and politics.

Politics and the Gospel

1. For Luther there is no integral relationship between the gospel itself and politics. That is a consistent outworking of Luther's fundamental gospel/law antithesis. The gospel is constitutive for the kingdom of the world.¹⁸ To rule the kingdom of the world by the gospel, by the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, would mean an abolition of rule by the law. That would spell chaos (281). Thus the gospel has no place in politics.

2. Not the gospel but love (for the neighbour) is the norm which obligates Christian political involvement.

In what concerns you and yours, you govern yourself by the gospel and suffer injustice toward yourself as a true Christian; in what concerns the person or property of others, you govern yourself according to love and tolerate no injustice toward your neighbour. The gospel does not forbid this; in fact, in other places it actually commands it (286).

Such a statement makes clear that love must govern politics, not the

gospel. Love in politics means to seek justice, to tolerate no injustice, to resist evil. The gospel, on the other hand, teaches the Christian to suffer injustice. The gospel does not seek justice. It does not use the temporal law and sword. It applies only to the kingdom of God (Christians themselves) which has no need for justice.

3. Luther does sometimes give slight indications of a relationship of the gospel to politics, but these are rare exceptions to the rule. At the end of the above quotation, he says that the gospel commands that the Christian suffer injustice as well as tolerate no injustice according to love. The gospel itself thus commands love in politics. A second indication is Luther's instruction that the Christian prince not go to war against his overlord, but rather suffer wrong (314). In this matter the gospel teaching to suffer injustice determines the Christian manner of politics.

4. Although the gospel for Luther has no inherent place in politics, reason certainly has. To rule wisely, a prince must rely on his untrammelled reason or understanding, rather than on law books and jurists. Reason is "the highest law and the master of all administration of law" (309). Written laws arose from reason and the justice written in man's heart. Therefore they should be kept subject to reason (319).

The Christian State

1. According to Luther's position in Temporal Authority, a Christian government or state is in principle impossible. This is so for two reasons. First of all, such a Christian state would presuppose that all in it are true Christians. The present world, however, is evil, and there are scarcely any true Christians in it (281). On that score a Christian state is impossible. But even "if all the world were composed of real Christians, that is, true believers, there would be no need for benefits from prince, king, lord, sword or law. They would serve no purpose....Where there is nothing but the unadulterated doing of right and bearing of wrong, there is no need for any suit litigation, court, judge, penalty, law, or sword" (279). In such a situation no state at all would be possible, because "among Christians there shall and can be no authority; rather all are alike subject to one another," with only Christ as superior (307). If all were Christians, a "Christian state" would be a contradiction of terms.

Secondly, such a Christian state would presuppose rule of the world by the gospel, by the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. Since the gospel prescribes love of enemies and the suffering of injustice, rule by the gospel would exclude rule by temporal law and sword. "He who loves his enemies and is perfect leaves the law alone and does not use it to demand an eye for an eye" (293). If anyone would attempt to rule the present world by the gospel, it would be reduced to chaos.

He would be loosing the ropes and chains of the savage wild beasts and letting them bite and mangle everyone.... But take heed and first fill the world with real Christians before you attempt to rule it in a Christian and evangelical manner....It is out of the question that there should be a common Christian government over the whole world, or indeed over a single country or any considerable body of people, for the wicked always outnumber the good. Hence a man who would venture to govern an entire country or the world with the gospel would be like a shepherd who put together in one fold wolves, lions, eagles, and sheep....The sheep would doubtless keep the peace and allow themselves to be fed and governed peacefully, but they would not live long, nor would one beast survive another (281, 282).

2. By presupposing that a "common Christian government" means rule by the gospel, Luther can allow no Christian state. Had he conceded that a Christian government involves rule by the (Christian) principle of justice, he might have been open to a Christian government even over a world inhabited by unbelievers. But his separation of justice and gospel prevented him from moving to this position.
3. Luther's rejection of a Christian state does not mean that he opted for the modern secular version of the state. He maintained a strong call for Christian involvement. Also, the anti-Christian process of secularization became dominant only later. Luther's rejection of a Christian state, however, may have been a factor in the movement towards secularization.

Political Millenarianism

1. By his rejection of a Christian state in the sense of rule by the gospel, Luther's main intention was to oppose every kind of political millenarianism, the attempt to establish the kingdom of God externally on earth. His position was directed especially against the more radical Anabaptists who thought that they could live as Christians in this world under the rule of the gospel alone.
2. Luther was correct inasmuch as no political order as such is identical with the kingdom of God. Yet, by rejecting the possibility of a Christian state, he ran the danger of denying that the kingdom of God as the realm of his rule must extend over all of creation, including the political order. Without being triumphalistic, that calls for a Christian politics, directed by the God-given norms of love and justice.

II. CALVIN

Calvin's basic view of civil government was worked out already in the 1536 edition of his Institutes. In later editions the final chapter on "Civil Government" (De politica administratione) (Bk. IV, ch. xx) was only slightly expanded from that of the first edition.¹⁹

The Foundation of Civil Government

1. Like Luther, Calvin introduces his discussion of civil government with a distinction between spiritual government and political government. Calvin, however, expresses the two government doctrine in a slightly different way. Instead of distinguishing "kingdom" (regnum) and "government" (regimen), he generally uses the two terms interchangeably,²⁰ so that his two government doctrine is at the same time a two kingdom doctrine. In Calvin both terms have reference more to the mode of lordship than to the realm of lordship. Their meaning is that of Luther's "government."

2. Although in other places Calvin speaks of two kingdoms in Augustine's (and Luther's) sense of an opposition between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan (cf. IV, xi, 5), in his discussion of political government the two kingdoms both have a positive meaning. Both are good, not one good and the other evil. With such a two-kingdom doctrine Calvin stands closer to Melancthon than to Luther. In his Apology of the Augsburg Confession of 1531, for example, Melancthon states:

This entire topic concerning the distinction between the kingdom of Christ (regni Christi, geistlichen Reiches Christi) and a political kingdom (regni civilis, weltlichen Reiches) has been explained to advantage in the literature of our writers, that the kingdom of Christ is spiritual, to wit, beginning in the heart the knowledge of God, the fear of God and faith, eternal eternal righteousness, and eternal life; meanwhile it permits us outwardly to use legitimate political ordinances of every nation in which we live, just as it permits us to use medicine or the art of building, or food, drink, air.²¹

3. At the basis of Calvin's two government-kingdom doctrine lies a two-sided anthropology. Calvin expresses it in this way: "There are in man, so to speak, two worlds, over which different kings and different laws have authority" (III, xix, 15). These two worlds in man may be characterized as inner/outer, soul/body, forum of conscience/outer forum, inner mind/outer behavior, pertains to future eternal life/pertains to present fleeting life. This is clear in his discussion

of the two governments in Book III, xix, 15 and Book IV, xx, 1,2.²²
(See also II, ii, 13 where Calvin distinguishes heavenly and earthly things and includes government in the latter class.)

4. To this two-sided anthropology Calvin relates the two governments.

...there is a twofold government in man: one aspect is spiritual, whereby the conscience is instructed in piety and in reverencing God; the second is political, whereby man is educated for the duties of humanity and citizenship that must be maintained among men. These are usually jurisdiction (not improper terms) by which is meant that the former sort of government pertains to the life of the soul, while the latter has to do with the concerns of the present life--not only with food and clothing but with laying down laws whereby a man may live his life among other men holily, honorably, and temperately. For the former resides in the inner mind, while the latter regulates only outward behaviour. The one we may call the spiritual kingdom, the other, the political kingdom. Now these two, as we have divided them, must always be examined separately;...

(III, xix, 15)

This in short is the fundamental structure of Calvin's political thought.

5. In his 1555 Harmony of the Gospels, Calvin qualified his distinction between spiritual and civil government somewhat. Commenting on Christ's words, "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's," in Matthew 22:21, Calvin states:

You should rather take pains to give God the worship He requires of you, and at the same time render to men what is their due. Perhaps that distinction hardly seems to apply, because properly speaking when we do our duty towards men we thereby fulfil our obedience to God. But to get His message across to the man in the street Christ is content to distinguish the spiritual Kingdom of God from the political order and round of current affairs.²³

Because of his concern that the distinction not become a separation, Calvin emphasized that to obey civil government is to obey God.

6. Calvin's distinction between the spiritual and political governments or kingdoms is identical to the distinction between church and state only in the sense of their mode of rule, not their realm. Thus spiritual government means ecclesiastical government (IV, iii-xi). There are indications, however, that Calvin does not strictly want to equate the spiritual kingdom with the church. He says, for example, "Spiritual government, indeed is already initiating in us on earth certain beginnings of the Heavenly Kingdom" (IV, xx, 2). The church on earth does not yet exist in the perfection of the spiritual kingdom.

God Sovereign Over Political Government

1. Calvin strongly maintains that God is sovereign over both the spiritual and the political governments. Although God is the sole ruler of the conscience and soul (IV, x, 5,7; commentary on Mt. 22:21), civil magistrates are not the sole ruler over earthly matters. God is sovereign even over their rule.

In this connection there is for Calvin an ambiguity with regard to Christ's rule. Christ is usually mentioned in relation to the spiritual kingdom. "Christ's spiritual kingdom and the civil jurisdiction are things completely distinct" (IV, xx, 1). But does Christ not also rule over political kingdoms? In one instance Calvin says that rulers must "submit to Christ the power with which they have been invested, that he alone may tower over all" (IV, xx, 5). This he also clearly affirms in his 1555 Harmony of the Gospels when commenting on Matthew 17:24.

For, though his kingdom be spiritual, still we must maintain, that as he is the only Son of God, he is also the heir of the whole world, so that all things ought to be subject to him, and to acknowledge his authority.²⁴

* The relationship between these two rules of Christ Calvin does not appear to have worked out theologically.

3. What is the relationship between the highest lordship of God and the lordship of civil rulers? Josef Bohatec has pointed out that Calvin pictures the relationship according to the principles of the absolute state, and that above all he has in view the French state of the sixteenth century.²⁵ Of course any tyrannical features are eliminated. In accord with this model, "God retains supreme command, to which all human duties are (as we say) subordinate"²⁶. "The Lord is the King of Kings, who, when he has opened his sacred mouth, must alone be heard, before all and above all men; next to him we are subject to those men who are in authority over us, but only in him" (IV, xx, 32).

Also in accord with the absolute state model, Calvin calls civil rulers such names as God's "ministers", "representatives", "vice-gerents", "vicars", "deputies" (IV, xx, 4,6). They have a mandate from God, and have been invested with his authority (IV, xx, 4). All they do should be done on his authority (IV, xx, 10). Civil rulers have been ordained as ministers of divine justice (IV, xx, 6), and exercise judgement not for man but for the Lord (IV, xx, 6,10). It is their business to serve him in their office (IV, xx, 4). "Since they have been chosen by God and do his business, they are answerable to him," Calvin says in commenting on Rom. 13: 4.²⁷ To him they must render account of the administration of their charge (IV, xx, 6; II, viii, 46). Nothing is more acceptable to the Lord than their obedience (IV, xx, 10).

4. Whatever forms civil government takes, they are all ordained of

God, because according to Romans 13:1 there is no power except from God (IV, xx, 7). Even tyrants, who may perform not a whit of the prince's office, have their authority solely from him, "although dictatorships and unjust authorities are not ordained governments."²⁸ They who rule unjustly and incompetently have been raised by God to punish the wickedness of the people (IV, xx, 25).

5. God has appointed bounds to magistrates (IV, xx, 25). When they exceed these limits by commanding anything against God, their power is abrogated (IV, xv, 32). In such exceptions they are not to be obeyed. The subject must then obey God rather than men.

6. Thus, according to Calvin's absolute state model, God rules the outward world through the civil rulers.

For God was pleased so to rule the affairs of men, inasmuch as he is present with them and also presides over the making of laws and the exercising of equity in courts of justice (IV, xx, 4; also commentary on Romans 13: 1).

Subjects show obedience to God himself when they obey the civil ruler (IV, xx, 22; also commentary on Mt. 22:21, above p. 15). On the other hand, to resist the magistrate is to resist God himself (IV, xx, 23). When subjects reject the magistrates, they "cast off God that he may not reign over them" (IV, xx, 7).

7. God's sovereignty also has a major place in the origin of political government. In the Institutes Calvin does not treat this question, but according to Bohatec's analysis, Calvin puts forward three causes for the origin of the state. The occasional cause is human sin, the efficient cause is divine favor and the final cause is the preservation of the human race.²⁹ Thus Calvin does not make a dilemma of whether the civil government originated because of sin or because of God's providence. In this light we must understand Calvin's remark in the Institutes that "it has not come about by human perversity that the authority over all things on earth is in the hands of kings and other rulers, but by divine providence and holy ordinance" (IV, xx, 4). This statement does not mean to deny that it was because of sin that God first ordained civil government. The remark is directed against what Calvin considered to be the Anabaptist perversion of regarding civil rule as sinful in itself.

Because Calvin regards the state to have originated not simply because the wicked had to be restrained after the Fall, but also because it was a gift of God's providence, he can speak of very positive functions of civil government.

[It] has to do with the concerns of the present life-- not only with food and clothing but with laying down laws whereby a man may live this life among other men holily, honorable, and temperately (III, xix, 15).

Its function among men is no less than that of bread, water, sun, and air; indeed, its place of honor is far more excellent. For it does not merely see to it, as all these serve to do, that men breathe, eat, drink, and are kept warm, even though it surely embraces all these activities when it provides for their living together (IV, xx, 3).

On the more negative side, the civil government also prevents public offences against religion, prevents public peace from being disturbed, and so on (IV, xx, 3). With his positive stress Calvin differs from Luther who emphasized only the negative punitive function of civil government.

Politics Not Inherently Evil

1. Because civil government is God ordained, it is not inherently evil. This Calvin firmly maintained over against what he considered to be the Anabaptist position by stressing that civil government and the Christian religion are not incompatible. To that end Calvin found it necessary to join to his Institutes the topic on civil government (IV, xx, 1). In later editions of the Institutes, this topic has its theological place among the external means of grace.

2. Calvin shows in detail why civil government and spiritual government are not at variance (IV, xx, 2). This he illustrates in two ways. First, "spiritual government, indeed, is already initiating in us upon earth certain beginnings of the Heavenly Kingdom." In other words, the spiritual kingdom, as already present, does not wipe out the earthly life of man. Secondly, one purpose of civil government is to cherish and protect outward worship of God. Although it provides for only a public manifestation of religion (consistent with his relating of civil government to the outer side of life), this shows a very close connection between the two governments.

3. Calvin counteracts the notion of civil government as sinful also by emphasizing that the office of the magistrate is a "holy" or "righteous" calling (IV, xx, 4,6), or a "holy ministry" (IV, xx, 7).

No one ought to doubt that civil authority is a calling, not only holy and lawful before God, but also the most sacred and by far the most honorable of all callings in the whole life of mortal man (IV, xx, 4).

He calls it a most holy office, since magistrates serve as God's deputies (IV, xx, 6). By calling it "the most sacred and by far the most honorable of all callings", Calvin does not mean to place the magistracy above spiritual callings within the church, because it is only the most sacred and honorable "in the whole life of mortal man" (mortalium). As the phrase "this mortal and fleeting life" (IV, xx, 2)

indicates, what is mortal is not included within the spiritual kingdom.

4. Calvin considers civil rule to be one of God's gifts on the basis of the reference to "ruling" in Romans 12:8 (IV, xx, 4). It is apparent that in the 1536 edition of the Institutes Calvin interpreted this "ruling" to refer only to civil rule. In the 1539 edition, however, he qualified his interpretation by adding:

For even though Paul is there speaking specifically of a council of sober men, who were appointed in the primitive church to preside over the ordering of public discipline..., yet because we see the civil power serving the same end, there is no doubt that he commends to us every kind of just rule (IV, xx, 4).

In his 1540 commentary on Romans, Calvin makes the same qualification.³⁰

Political Millenarianism

1. Although Calvin asserts that civil and spiritual governments are not antithetical, he also strongly maintains that they are completely distinct (IV, xx, 1). This distinctness is emphasized also in his commentary on John 18:36, "My kingdom is not of this world", where he points out that the kingdom of Christ is not earthly and that Christ did not strive for civil power on earth.³¹ In this way Calvin was able to oppose political millenarianism. This attempt to "enclose Christ's kingdom within the elements of this world", Calvin sees as the error especially of the Jews (IV, xx, 1).

2. Although Calvin does not explicitly mention the Anabaptists, he certainly also has them in mind. When Calvin published his first edition of the Institutes in 1536, the issue was very sensitive, because of the recent attempt in 1535 by fanatical Anabaptists at Munster to set up a spiritual kingdom on earth. With this episode fresh in memory, Calvin directed many remarks against the Anabaptists in his discussion of civil government.

The Christian Subject

1. To the question whether Christians are subject to civil government, Calvin answered with a simple appeal to Romans 13:1, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers", and to passages such as Titus 3:1 and I Peter 2: 13-14 (IV, xx, 23). In commenting on Romans 13:1, Calvin asserts, "By mentioning every soul Paul removes every exception, lest any should claim to be immune from the common submission to obedience."³² Every soul thus includes all Christians.

2. Calvin states several other reasons why everyone including

Christians must be subject. One reason is because the magistrates have been appointed by God's ordination.³³ Another is that it betrays ignorance to think that Christians are perfect and need no civil government over them to restrain them (IV, xx, 5). This argument certainly differs from that of Luther, who maintained that Christians themselves (viewed as totally justified) have no need of civil government because they do not sin. Calvin's more positive view of the magistrate's function allows him to speak of Christians as subject to civil government even when they do not need to be restrained. Luther, however, had a different rationale for the same practical end, when he introduced the Christian necessity of being subject for the sake of others.

3. Calvin's view of Christian freedom did not prevent him from asserting that Christians are subject to civil rule. Christian freedom is a matter of the inner conscience, not outward actions. Especially against the Anabaptists Calvin warns:

We are not to misapply to the political order the gospel teaching on spiritual freedom, as if Christians were less subject, as concerns outward government, to human laws, because their consciences have been set free in God's sight; as if they were released from all bodily servitude because they are set free according to the spirit (III, xix, 15).

The freedom in Christ must be kept within its own limits. Thus "spiritual freedom can perfectly well exist along with civil bondage (IV, xx, 1; also commentary on Mt. 22:21).

Because of his position on freedom of the conscience, Calvin was confronted by a difficulty in Romans 13:5, "Be in subjection not only to avoid God's wrath, but also for the sake of conscience" (III, xix, 5; IV, x, 3; IV, xx, 22). Although this text affirms that Christians are subject, it appears to say that the conscience is bound by civil laws. That would violate Calvin's correlation of the conscience only with the spiritual kingdom. He resolves the problem by stating that "subjects should be led not by fear alone of princes and rulers to remain in subjection under them..., but because they are showing obedience to God himself when they give it to them; since the ruler's power is from God" (IV, xx, 22). Therefore the conscience is subject also in this instance to God himself, not to human laws.

4. What is the extent of the Christian's obedience to civil rule? Like all subjects, Christians are subject "in so far as public obedience is concerned" (IV, xx, 25). Only in matters of outward behaviour are they subject, not in matters of the conscience. If the civil ruler exceeds these limits and commands anything against God, he must not be obeyed (IV, xx, 32). God is the highest authority and in such cases must be obeyed rather than men. But in outward matters even a tyrant must be obeyed, because they too have their authority solely from God (IV, xx, 24-27). Because of their divine ordination they cannot be totally tyrannical.

There has never been a tyranny, nor can one be imagined, however cruel and unbridled, in which some portion of equity has not appeared. God never allows His just order to be destroyed by the sin of men without some of its outlines remaining unobscured.³⁴

5. May Christian subjects engage in politics in their capacity as subjects? For fear of anarchy Calvin rejects any possibility of political action by private citizens.

Moreover, under this obedience I include the restraint which private citizens ought to bid themselves keep in public, that they may not deliberately intrude in public affairs, or pointlessly invade the magistrates' office, or undertake anything at all politically. If anything in a public ordinance requires amendment,... let them commit the matter to the judgement of the magistrate (IV, xx, 23).

Only on command of the ruler may citizens act politically, but then they act not as private citizens but on public authority. Calvin did not think in terms of democratic involvement of citizens.

The Christian Ruler

1. In the Institutes, Calvin does not specifically address himself to the question of whether Christians may be actively involved in political rule. In the shadow of the Munster episode, he was more concerned about the obligations of Christians to be subject to the governing authorities than about the obligations of Christians to be involved in ruling. Nevertheless his position on the matter is clear.

2. Although seldom in his chapter on "Civil Government", Calvin does occasionally refer to Christian princes or magistrates (Christiani principes, IV, xx, 9; magistrats Chrestiens³⁵), or godly magistrates (pii magistratus, IV, xi, 4, commentary on Rom. 12:8). The notable scarcity of such references is because Calvin's attention is upon all magistrates, not just those who are Christian. Thus he presupposes the existence of the Christian magistrate. In sixteenth century Europe, it could be assumed that magistrates would generally be Christians.

3. Over against the Anabaptist rejection of Christian involvement in civil government, Calvin firmly maintains that such government is not "a thing polluted, which has nothing to do with Christian men," and which "has to do with business foreign to a Christian man" (IV, xx, 2). Because it is a lawful calling approved of God, and a holy ministry by which God may be served (IV, xx, 4), the office of magistrate may certainly be occupied by Christians. The Bible also provides examples of holy men who occupied civil offices. Some of those whom Calvin mentions are David, Josiah, Hezekiah, Joseph, Moses and Joshua (IV, xx, 4).

The Distinctiveness of Christian Rule

1. Since Calvin's emphasis is upon the duties of all magistrates, he pays no special attention to a distinctive Christian manner of ruling. Because all are ordained of God, because all including tyrants are servants of God, and because all are called to fulfill the obligations of their office in a manner obedient to God, Christian magistrates are not in any of these ways special.

2. Yet all magistrates do not carry out the obligations of their calling in the same way. There is certainly a difference between the magistrate who truly is what he is called, a father of his country, shepherd of his people, guardian of peace, protector of righteousness, and avenger of innocence, and the magistrate who is careless about his task and tyrannizes his people (IV, xx, 24).

3. What would most characterize a Christian manner of ruling is obedience in doing the duties of the magistrate's office. The magistrate has responsibilities to God and to his subjects. In the 1536 edition Calvin talks of two functions that magistrates must carry out (IV, xx, 9). First, they must do justice.

We see, therefore, that they are ordained protectors and vindicators of public innocence, modesty, decency, and tranquillity, and that their sole endeavor should be to provide for the common safety and peace of all.

Secondly, they must execute judgement, which means "to withstand the boldness of the impious to repress their violence, to punish their misdeeds." In the 1559 edition, Calvin subsumed these two functions under the category of duties of the Second Table of the Law, i.e. duties toward men. At the same time he also mentioned the duties of the First Table, i.e., a concern for piety.³⁶ This must be the first concern of magistrates, but his duty is "especially enjoined" by God upon Christian magistrates. "They should labour to protect and assert the honor of him whose representatives they are" (IV, xx, 9). Thus Christian magistrates have all the more obligation to preserve the Christian religion. This they must do not first by virtue of their membership in the Christian church, but in their office of civil magistrate.³⁷

Politics and the Gospel

1. The only times that Calvin makes reference to the gospel in his discussion of civil government is when he speaks about misapplications of gospel teaching to political affairs. Against the Anabaptists he denies that the freedom promised by the gospel means that Christians need not acknowledge the civil magistrate (IV, xx, 1). The spiritual freedom of the gospel is a matter of the conscience alone and does not

free the Christian from subjection in civil matters (III, xix, 15; commentary on I Peter 2:13). Calvin also denies that the gospel brings a perfection in this life which is incompatible with civil subjection (IV, xx, 5). These references leave the impression that for Calvin, like Luther, the gospel has no real place in politics, although he is not at all clear on the matter.

The Christian State

1. In his view of civil government, Calvin keeps in view the ideal of a Christian state.³⁸ He occasionally uses the term "Christiana politia" (IV, xx, 3, 14), or "Christiana respublica."³⁹ In one instance he mentions the "common society of Christians" (communem Christianorum societatem, IV, xx, 17). Unlike Luther, Calvin does not consider a Christian state to be a state which is ruled by the precepts of the gospel alone rather than by temporal law and the sword. For him a Christian state certainly involves rule by law. He introduces his discussion of civil law by stating that he has "undertaken to say with what laws a Christian state ought to be governed" (IV, xx, 14; also section 3).
2. Calvin rejects the idea that a Christian state is to be ruled only by the Mosaic judicial laws of the Old Testament (IV, xx, 14). These judicial laws, along with the Old Testament ceremonial laws, were given for the Jews, but they have been abrogated. The Old Testament moral law, however, has not been abrogated, because it is "the true and eternal rule of righteousness, prescribed for all men of all nations and times" (IV, xx, 15). For Calvin a Christian state would be ruled by the "common laws of nations" (IV, xx, 14). Every nation is free to make such laws for itself as long as these laws are "in conformity with that perpetual rule of love", which is enjoined by the moral law (IV, xx, 15). Because the moral law is "nothing else than a testimony of natural law and of that conscience which God has engraved upon the minds of men" (IV, xx, 16), all nations have common laws, all with the goal of natural equity, though these laws may differ in form. The laws of a Christian state then would be distinctive in nothing more than in a closer conformity to the rule of love.
3. Because a Christian state, like all states, is ruled by common judicial laws and not by the precepts of the gospel, Calvin sees no threat of political millenarianism in a Christian state, as Luther had feared. Thus he could positively work toward this ideal.

Conclusion

1. Most of the practical emphases arising from Luther's and Calvin's political thought are similar, because of their common reaction against the Anabaptist rejection of political involvement and the medieval confusion of political and ecclesiastical powers. Both Luther and Calvin emphasize God's sovereignty over political affairs, and deny that politics is evil because political government is ordained by God. Both assert that Christians are subject to the governing authorities, although for different reasons--Luther saying that Christians are subject for the sake of their neighbours, and Calvin saying that all including Christians are subject simply because civil government is God ordained. Both call for Christians to be involved in political rule, and both view a Christian manner of ruling as distinctive, although Luther in his maturity withdrew from speaking of Christian politics as Christian. In the matter of the possibility of a Christian state, Calvin is positive, but Luther negative because of his conception of a Christian state as rule by the gospel alone.

2. The fundamental structures of their political thought are also basically similar. Although their formulations of what constitutes the two kingdoms and how the kingdoms relate to the two governments differ, the crucial similarity is that both speak of two governments by which God rules over creation, one political, the other spiritual. This is understandable because of the enduring formative power of the medieval background in which church and state were the two dominant societal institutions. Luther and Calvin stand apart from the medieval background by their emphasis on the distinction between the two governments, thus avoiding the medieval confusion of spiritual and political powers. At the same time they stand apart from the Anabaptists by emphasizing that the two governments cannot be separated or made antithetical.

3. Luther's and Calvin's two government structure does allow them to assert God's sovereignty over politics, but we may question whether such a structure allows a truly integral relationship between Christianity and politics. Although they make many refreshing statements about God's rule over political government or about Christian involvement in politics, in the final analysis the kingdom of God stands on one side and politics on the other. For Luther, the kingdom of God (Christians) as such does not need political government; for Calvin, the kingdom of God is restricted to matters of the inner life. Neither can speak of political activity as integral to the kingdom of God. We may ask, if Christ's redemption is cosmic and if his kingdom extends over all of life, does not the political sphere of life also have an integral place within his kingdom?

NOTES

- ¹Heinrich Bornkamm, Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms (Philadelphia, 1966), p. 37.
- ²Ibid., p. 18.
- ³Ibid., p. 17.
- ⁴St. Augustine, City of God, edited by David Knowles (Harmondsworth, 1972), XI, 1, XIV, 28.
- ⁵Ibid., XV, 1.
- ⁶Luther, Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed in T. Tappert ed. Selected Writings of Martin Luther, 1520-1523 (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 278, 295, 308. Hereafter, references to this work will be incorporated into the text.
- ⁷Heinrich Bornkamm, Luther's World of Thought (St. Louis, 1965), p.245.
- ⁸F.E. Cranz, An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society (Cambridge, 1959), p. 159.
- ⁹Cf. Bornkamm, Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms, p. 34; Luther's World of Thought, p. 243.
- ¹⁰Cranz, op. cit., p. 169; Selected Writings of Martin Luther, vol. III, p. 440.
- ¹¹Op. cit., vol. III, p. 439.
- ¹²Franklin Littel, The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism (New York, 1964), p. 102, 103.
- ¹³Cranz, op. cit., p. 169.
- ¹⁴Selected Writings, vol. III, p. 439.
- ¹⁵Ibid., p. 462.
- ¹⁶Cited by Cranz, op. cit., p. 172.
- ¹⁷Selected Writings, vol. III, p. 462.
- ¹⁸G. Ebeling, "The Necessity of the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," in Word and Faith, (Philadelphia, 1963), p. 388, 389.
- ¹⁹John T. McNeill's "Introduction" to his edition of Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion (Philadelphia, 1960), p. lxvi.
- ²⁰Institutes, III, xix, 15. Calvin also uses the term "politia" to refer to civil government. Hereafter, references to the Institutes will be incorporated into the text.

- ²¹Triglot Concordia, The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church. (St. Louis, 1921), pp. 329, 331.
- ²²III, xix on "Christian Freedom" and IV, xx on "Civil Government" were in the 1536 ed. of the Institutes both part of the same chapter, and thus were closely linked. In later editions these parts became separated.
- ²³John Calvin, A Harmony of the Gospels (Grand Rapids, 1972), vol. III, pp. 26, 27. Underscoring is mine.
- ²⁴Ibid., vol. II, p. 370.
- ²⁵Josef Bohatec, Calvins Lehre von Staat und Kirche (Aalen, 1961), p. 187.
- ²⁶Harmony of the Gospels, vol. III, p. 27.
- ²⁷John Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians (Grand Rapids, 1960), p. 282. Calvin's commentary on Romans was first published in 1540.
- ²⁸Ibid., p. 281.
- ²⁹Bohatec, op. cit., p. 171.
- ³⁰Op. cit., p. 270.
- ³¹John Calvin, The Gospel According to St. John 11-21, and the First Epistle of John (Grand Rapids, 1961), p. 209.
- ³²Op. cit., p. 280.
- ³³Ibid., p. 281.
- ³⁴Commentary on I Peter 2:14 (published in 1551). The Epistle of Paul The Apostle to the Hebrews and The First and Second Epistles of St. Peter (Grand Rapids, 1963), p. 271. The same view can be found in the commentary on Romans 13: 3.
- ³⁵Bohatec, op. cit., p. 626.
- ³⁶This obligation to prevent "public offences against religion" had already been mentioned elsewhere in the 1536 edition (cf. IV, xx, 3). Calvin emphasized this obligation in the face of persecutions of Protestant Christians in France under the reign of Francis I, to whom the Institutes was dedicated.
- ³⁷Bohatec, op. cit., p. 627.
- ³⁸Bohatec, op. cit., p. 626.
- ³⁹In the index of the 1536 ed. of the Institutes. Cf. John Calvin, Opera Selecta, vol. 1, p. 283.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- St. Augustine. Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans. Edited by David Knowles. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Bente, F. ed. Triglot Concordia; The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. St. Louis: Concordia, 1921.
- Bohatec, J. Calvins Lehre von Staat und Kirche. Aalen: Scientia, 1961.
- Bornkamm, H. Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms in the Context of his Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- . Luther's World of Thought. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1965.
- Cranz, F.E. An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society. Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1959.
- Calvin, John. A Harmony of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark and Luke. Edited by D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance, 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- . Institutes of the Christian Religion. Edited by J.T. McNeill, 2 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- . On God and Political Duty. Edited by J.T. McNeill. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1956.
- . Opera Omnia, vol XLIX. Brunsvigae: Schwetschke, 1892.
- . Opera Selecta, Edited by P. Barth and W. Niesel, 5 vols. Monachii in Aedibus: Kaiser, 1926-1936.
- . The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter. Edited by D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1963.
- . The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians. Edited by D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- . The Gospel According to St. John 11-21, and the First Epistle of John. Edited by D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Ebeling, G. "The Necessity of the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," in Word and Faith. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.
- Gerrish, B.A. "John Calvin on Luther," in Interpreters of Luther. Edited by J. Pelikan. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Littell, F.H. The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Luther, Martin. Selected Political Writings. Edited by J.M. Porter. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- . Selected Writings. Edited by T.G. Tappert. 4. vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- . Werke. Vol. 11. Weimar, 1900.
- Mueller, William. Church and State in Luther and Calvin. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954.