
Pro Rege

Volume 40 | Number 3

Article 3

March 2012

Two Kingdoms and Reformed Christianity: Why Recovering an Old Paradigm is Historically Sound, Biblically Grounded, and Practically Useful

David VanDrunen

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

VanDrunen, David (2012) "Two Kingdoms and Reformed Christianity: Why Recovering an Old Paradigm is Historically Sound, Biblically Grounded, and Practically Useful," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 40: No. 3, 31 - 38.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol40/iss3/3

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Digital Collections @ Dordt. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Dordt. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

Editor's Note: This article was written in response to several *Pro Rege* articles critiquing Dr. VanDrunen's position on the two kingdoms doctrine.

The Two Kingdoms and Reformed Christianity: Why Recovering an Old Paradigm is Historically Sound, Biblically Grounded, and Practically Useful



by David VanDrunen

One of the most impressive and attractive things about Reformed Christianity to many people is its interest in the whole world God created and its desire to serve him faithfully in all vocations. Reformed Christians have always been convinced that no task, however seemingly insignificant, is morally or religiously neutral but must be pursued from hearts of faith, according to God's will, and for God's glory.

Dr. David VanDrunen is the Robert B. Strimple Professor of Systematic Theology and Christian Ethics at Westminster Seminary California.

Stated this way, such a perspective is inspiring but remains at a rather general level. The Reformed tradition has not been monolithic in how its adherents have explained it theologically or tried to work it out specifically and concretely. One way of working out the details that became very popular over the last century, particularly in North American Dutch Reformed circles, is what is sometimes called neo-Calvinism, or neo-Kuyperianism. This itself has not been a monolithic movement, but it is united by a number of common concerns. It draws general inspiration from the thought and labors of Abraham Kuyper, sees the kingdom of Christ permeating the many spheres of human endeavor, and calls for the redemptive transformation of these spheres by the Christians active within them.

Reformed Christianity was around for a long time before the emergence of neo-Calvinism, however. It cannot hurt to inquire about how Reformed Christians looked at their responsibilities in the broad world of human culture in the Reformation and several centuries thereafter. Such an inquiry at least helps us, as Reformed Christians, to understand the richness of our own tradition better and may even give us constructive insights that have escaped from view.

In recent years I have argued that much of the Reformed world over the past century has lost sight of an older Reformed paradigm for thinking about Christianity and culture, the so-called Two

Kingdoms doctrine. I have also suggested that this doctrine is different in some significant respects from the popular neo-Calvinist paradigm yet has solid biblical foundations and would be helpful to recapture and rework for contemporary Reformed thought.¹ This proposal has received a fair bit of attention in some Reformed circles and beyond, for which I as an author can only be grateful. The reaction has been mixed, generating enthusiastic support, cautious interest, and vigorous attack.² The pages of *Pro Rege* have perhaps given it as much attention as any publication—though in a decidedly negative direction. With one exception, the articles have been not only critical but even hostile and have treated me less as a Reformed interlocutor than as an enemy to be held at bay and, along the way, have not given a very accurate picture of my claims.³

I am grateful for the opportunity to present a brief description and defense of my proposal in *Pro Rege*. Even if it is not persuasive, in whole or part, for those in neo-Calvinist circles, wrestling seriously with its ideas should at least help to sharpen and clarify why they hold the views they do. In the brief space I have, I argue that the Two Kingdoms doctrine has rich historical precedent in the Reformed tradition, that its basic tenets are built on a compelling biblical foundation, and that it is of great practical usefulness for Reformed Christians wishing to think well and act wisely in the church and in their various vocations.

In short, the Two Kingdoms doctrine strongly affirms the biblical truth that God rules all things in his Son, and it also affirms that he rules the church (on the one hand) and all other human institutions (on the other hand) in two distinct ways, reflecting his distinct purposes in redemption and providence. This means, furthermore, that Christians are to pursue the full scope of cultural vocations with obedience, excellence, and godliness, but also that redemptive transformation is not the correct grid for understanding this work. The Two Kingdoms doctrine provides a solid theological foundation for what I believe most Reformed people already know at some level, namely, that there are good and excellent ways of pursuing all tasks in life for God's glory, but often not a *uniquely Christian* way that believers are burdened with having to discover. The doctrine encourages us to take seriously not only the

antithesis that exists between Christians and non-Christians but the real commonality among us due to God's providential will that we live and work together in peace in his created world.

Historical Precedent

A common myth of recent years is that the Two Kingdoms doctrine is not historically Reformed, but is only a Lutheran idea. One might argue whether it is a helpful and biblical doctrine, but there is no reasonable doubt that it was a common feature of Reformed theology for a very long time. In this section I provide some evidence for this claim, which I have defended at length in *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*.

A first thing to note is that the Reformed Two Kingdoms doctrine is not the same thing as Augustine's Two Cities paradigm. By the "two cities," Augustine referred not to any earthly institutions but to two distinct peoples with different destinies. On the one hand, the city of God consists of all Christians, now on pilgrimage in this world and destined for everlasting life. They are characterized by love of God above any created thing. On the other hand, the earthly city consists of all unbelievers, destined for everlasting death. They are characterized by love of created things above the creator. The two cities mingle in this world and share much in common.

The Reformers shared Augustine's basic Two Cities perspective, but the Two Kingdoms doctrine that emerged in Reformed circles got at a different issue. Whereas the Two Cities described two peoples with different eschatological destinies, the Reformed Two Kingdoms doctrine described how God rules the world. One kingdom, sometimes known as the "civil kingdom" (which I now prefer to call the "common kingdom"), pertains to how God providentially sustains and governs the created order, particularly through human institutions such as the state. The other kingdom, sometimes known as the "spiritual kingdom" (which I now prefer to call the "redemptive kingdom"), refers to God's work of redemption through the Lord Jesus Christ, by which he establishes his church and rules his people unto everlasting life. Whereas Augustine's Two Cities idea envisions each person as a member of one city, and one city only, the Two Kingdoms

doctrine envisions Christians as participants in both kingdoms. Christians, along with all other persons, live under God's providential rule as they undertake their ordinary vocations, but Christians are also members of the church and thus also citizens of Christ's heavenly kingdom, which will endure forever.

Whereas the Two Cities described two peoples with different eschatological destinies, the Reformed Two Kingdoms doctrine described how God rules the world.

Already with John Calvin we find the Two Kingdoms doctrine explicitly at work. In Book 3 of his *Institutes*, for example, he writes, "Let us observe that in man government is twofold: the one spiritual, by which the conscience is trained to piety and divine worship; the other civil, by which the individual is instructed in those duties which, as men and citizens, we are bound to perform. . . . The former species has reference to the life of the soul, while the latter relates to matters of the present life, not only to food and clothing, but to the enacting of laws which require a man to live among his fellows purely, honourably, and modestly. . . . We may call the one the spiritual, the other the civil kingdom."²⁴ His reference to the "life of the soul" may sound a bit ethereal, but this distinction between the kingdoms had very concrete application, particularly when it came to distinguishing the work of church and state. The church's authority is a "spiritual government," says Calvin, and is "altogether distinct from civil government," due to the "distinction and dissimilarity between ecclesiastical and civil power."²⁵ When he later explains the work of civil government, he refers back to his Two Kingdoms distinction and warns against people who "imprudently confound these two things, the nature of which is altogether

different," for "the spiritual kingdom of Christ and civil government are things very widely separated."²⁶

As the Reformed tradition matured and developed over the next couple of centuries, the Two Kingdoms doctrine remained standard material. One of the most eminent Reformed theologians of the seventeenth century, Francis Turretin, provides a good example of how the doctrine had become incorporated into Reformed Christology as well as its theology of the church and its view of civil society. When Turretin begins his discussion of the kingship of Christ (Turretin too wished to labor *pro Rege*) he writes, "Before all things we must distinguish the twofold kingdom, belonging to Christ: one natural or essential; the other mediatorial and economical." This is unfamiliar language for those untrained in scholastic theology, but its meaning is rather simple and resembles Calvin's claims above. God, through Christ his Son, rules the world in a twofold manner. The Son's "natural or essential" kingdom is "over all creatures," while the "mediatorial and economical" kingdom is "terminated specially on the church." The former, in other words, pertains to his rule over the whole world through creation and providence, while the latter pertains to his rule over his church through the work of redemption.⁷ Turretin later explicitly uses this distinction to explain the difference between civil and ecclesiastical authority. Among many differences he mentions, he says that the former is grounded in God's work of creation and can be held by any person, while the latter is grounded in Christ's work of redemption and should be held only by Christians.⁸

This promotion of the Two Kingdoms doctrine, with its practical application for life in church and society, did not die after the seventeenth century. At the close of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, in fact, Abraham Kuyper was still utilizing its categories. This may seem a surprising claim (and to some even outrageous), given that Kuyper is often portrayed as providing the great antidote and alternative to the Two Kingdoms doctrine. Kuyper was indeed an innovative thinker in some respects, under whose inspiration the neo-Calvinist/neo-Kuyperian movement has labored, but to slot Kuyper as an opponent of the Two Kingdoms doctrine is a significant historical error. This is most evident, I believe, in his doctrine of common grace.

For Kuyper, common grace involves God's work of preserving this world, preventing human depravity from breaking out in full measure, permitting a degree of cultural cooperation between believers and unbelievers, and enabling the fallen human race to develop, in some measure, the potentialities for creative cultural labor with which God endowed them at creation. In contrast, special grace pertains to God's work of redeeming a people for himself and accomplishing the work of new creation. Kuyper's theology of common grace raises many interesting issues, but I wish to highlight here simply one thing: he grounds common grace in the work of Christ as creator of all things, and special grace in the work of Christ as redeemer. Kuyper continues to use the old Reformed distinction, seen in Turretin, between the Son as mediator of creation and as mediator of redemption.⁹ As Kuyper's colleague Herman Bavinck put it, in language echoing that of Turretin and other earlier Reformed theologians, "the kingship of Christ is twofold."¹⁰ Though Kuyper was not using the terminology of "two kingdoms," his distinction between common grace and special grace, rooted in the twofold kingship and mediatorship of Christ, reflected the standard categories of his Reformed forbears.

That a Two Kingdoms doctrine was part of the Reformed tradition for many centuries cannot be seriously doubted. Further, that the more recent emphasis upon the *one* kingdom of God and the redemptive transformation of all social spheres according to the terms of this kingdom is, at least to some degree, in tension with this earlier tradition also seems to me an inevitable conclusion (for which I have argued at length elsewhere). But does the Two Kingdoms doctrine find support in Scripture, and is it still practically useful even though we live in a social context so very different from Reformed believers of previous centuries?

Biblically Grounded

In this section I address the first of these two questions. Yes, the Two Kingdoms doctrine is well grounded in Scripture. In fact, Scripture requires us to embrace some version of this doctrine. I present here a very concise defense of this claim, which is worked out much more fully in my book *Living in God's Two Kingdoms*.

When God created the world, he made human beings in his image and commissioned them to be fruitful and multiply, to fill the earth and subdue it, and to exercise dominion over the other creatures (Gen 1:26-28). Instead of obeying God, Adam and Eve failed their probation and came under God's judgment (Gen 2-3). From a wide-angle vantage point, the New Testament explains that from the beginning, God had intended the human race not only to exercise its great task in this world, but even to attain and rule the "age to come." But while our sin prevented us from achieving this, God sent his Son in our place, and through his obedient life and death, and victorious resurrection and ascension, he has already entered the age to come on our behalf and leads us there in his train (Heb 2:5-10). Not by striving to obey where Adam failed, but by embracing the Lord Jesus Christ by faith, we are right with God and become fellow heirs with Christ of this glorious new creation. Christ is the Last Adam (Rom 5:15-19; 1 Cor 15:21-22, 45-49), and his labors in this world, rather than our own, must be our great confidence.

God did not accomplish his purposes in Christ immediately after the fall into sin, however, but ordained a long human history and requires his people to continue laboring faithfully in this world. One helpful way to see the importance of the Two Kingdoms doctrine for understanding believers' place and task in the midst of this history is to turn to the biblical covenants, a crucial theme in traditional Reformed theology.

The first major account of God establishing a covenant is found in Genesis 8:20-9:17, following the great flood. God makes this covenant with the entire world—with Noah and all his descendants as well as with "every living creature." In it he promises *preservation* of the universe. He will uphold cosmic regularity as well as human social life, while refraining from destroying the earth again with a flood. It is important to note that God does not promise redemption in this covenant. It says nothing about the forgiveness of sins or everlasting life in a new creation. God promises to restrain the forces of evil, not to conquer them. And he commits himself to do this as long as the earth endures. The Noachic covenant is therefore a covenant of preservation, or common grace. This covenant, I believe, is the for-

mal establishment of the *common kingdom*. By it God providentially rules the entire universe and upholds the basic structures of family (Gen 9:1, 7) and just social life (Gen 9:6) for the human race as a whole.

This is a wonderful work of God, but he also had much grander plans for history than merely preserving the world: he also intended to redeem a people for himself and to bring about the new creation. This divine plan begins to come into focus with the next major covenant Scripture records, the covenant with Abraham. As evident already in Genesis 15 and 17, and especially as interpreted in the New Testament (see especially Galatians 3:15-29), through this covenant God promised not preservation of the whole world but justification and everlasting life through a coming Messiah. Christ's coming was a great fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant (Luke 1:72-73) (not of the Noahic covenant). Christians today, who have faith in this Messiah, are heirs of the promises to Abraham (Gal 3:7-9, 29). The Abrahamic covenant, I believe, marks the formal establishment of the *redemptive kingdom*. By it God sends his Son, gathers a redeemed people to himself, and brings about the new creation where Christ and his people will rule forever.

In these two covenants, therefore, we find God's two kingdoms. Through the common kingdom, administered by the Noahic covenant, God providentially rules the whole world and upholds the ordinary structures and institutions of human life for the benefit of all people. Through the redemptive kingdom, administered originally through the Abrahamic covenant and ultimately now through the new covenant, God gathers his people and redeems them unto the everlasting life of his new creation.

That God's people are called to live in both kingdoms is evident as we look at key moments in biblical history. Abraham himself, as a citizen of the redemptive kingdom, maintained his faith in God's promises and worshiped him alone in the midst of the polytheistic paganism of his day. Yet as a citizen of the common kingdom, he continued to live among his pagan neighbors, trading with them (Gen 23), making covenants with them (Gen 21:22-34), and even entering military alliances with them when necessary (Gen 14). He had to learn the hard way that marriage and family relationships, whether

of believer or pagan, were legitimate and to be honored (Gen 12:10-20; 20:1-13).

Things worked much differently during Israel's tenure in the Promised Land under the Mosaic law. To accomplish some special purposes, God set his people apart from the rest of the world for a time (see Gal 3:15-4:7). But when he sent them into exile in Babylon, he commanded them to resume living in ways similar to the ways Abraham lived. While maintaining their distinctive faith and an unshakable hope in the fulfillment of God's redemptive promises, they were to build homes, plant fields, marry, and have children in Babylon. They were even to seek the peace and prosperity of Babylon, the very city that had demolished their land and

*Because Christ has a
twofold kingship, we
Christians have a twofold
citizenship.*

temple (Jer 29:1-14). Daniel and his three friends exemplified this way of life. They refused to worship any god but the Lord (Dan 3; 6) and longed for an end to their exile (Dan 9) but undertook faithful, law-abiding service in the Babylonian and Persian courts (Dan 1:19-20; 6:1-4) after receiving a Babylonian higher education (Dan 1:3-5, 17).

Abraham and the Babylonian exiles remain important examples for us as New Testament Christians. Having accomplished the work given him by the Father, Christ the God-Man has ascended and been given all authority on heaven and earth (Matt 28:18-20; Eph 1:20-23). As Reformed theologians have traditionally recognized, Christ exercises this kingly rule in a twofold manner. The Noahic covenant is still in effect, and Christ providentially upholds and governs all the world (Col 1:17; Heb 1:3). Simultaneously, Christ is building his church and thereby bringing to fruition all the promises of the Abrahamic covenant (Matt 16:18-19; Gal 3:23-29). Because Christ has a twofold kingship, we Christians have a twofold citizenship. By his redeeming grace we are members of his church

and citizens of heaven (Phil 3:20); our very lives are hidden in Christ in heaven, where he is seated at God's right hand (Col 3:1-3). At the same time, by God's common grace under the Noahic covenant, we are citizens of earthly societies, attached to particular communities, nations, businesses, families, and ethnic groups, all of which are significant for our present lives but none of which define our identity as Christians. God continues to establish civil magistrates for the benefit of all human beings, and Christians are to submit to them (this was true even of the often brutal Roman government) (Rom 13:1-7; Tit 3:1; 1 Pet 2:13-14). Marriages among unbelievers are valid and continue on even if one spouse converts to Christianity (1 Cor 7:10-14). Christians work alongside unbelievers (1 Thes 4:11-12). We are called to take every thought captive to Christ and to be transformed by the renewing of our minds (2 Cor 10:5; Rom 12:1-2) as well as to live in peace with others as far as possible (Rom 12:18). Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and thus neither are we, yet God calls us to remain in this world for a time (John 17:16; 18:36). Like Abraham before them, Christians are sojourners (1 Pet 2:11; cf. Gen 12:10; 15:13; 20:1; 21:34; 23:4); like Daniel and his friends, Christians are exiles (1 Pet 1:1, 17; 2:11). We work with diligence, excellence, and charity within the structures of this present world while we eagerly await the return of our Lord and the revelation of the new creation, whose citizens we already are.

This has been only a brief look at the biblical story and obviously has not come close to examining every relevant text, but I suggest that the evidence points to the insight of the earlier Reformed tradition in developing the Two Kingdoms doctrine and thinking about issues of Christianity and culture in light of it. There is one king, the Lord Jesus Christ, but his kingship is twofold. Therefore, I also suggest that more recent Reformed thinkers who have spoken in terms of one kingdom of God that penetrates all spheres of life have not quite captured the biblical picture. And I judge the now common Reformed language of redemptively transforming all areas of life to be likewise deficient biblically. Christians are by all means to pursue excellence in every vocation and to love their neighbors thereby, but the institutions and structures of this world are under God's providential governorship and only temporary, as

indicated by the Noahic covenant. They are not subject to redemption and do not belong to the new creation.

Practically Useful

Despite what I have suggested as the biblical deficiency of some important ideas of contemporary neo-Calvinism, it has impressively inspired a great many Reformed Christians over the past century to take interest in the whole of God's created world and to pursue faithful obedience across the spectrum of human vocations. Rightly conceived, the Two Kingdoms doctrine should help to maintain this admirable achievement, while also offering some helpful correctives and enriching biblically insights. In this last section I reflect on a few areas where I believe the Two Kingdoms doctrine can be especially useful.

A first point is brief but important. The Two Kingdoms doctrine should help Reformed Christians maintain that often elusive balance between being actively engaged in a variety of cultural vocations and setting the true hope and love of their hearts upon their unseen heavenly inheritance. The New Testament could not be more insistent that a godly heavenly-mindedness must be at the center of true Christian piety (e.g., Matt 6:19-21; Col 3:1-4). Neo-Calvinism at least carries the risk of—and I fear has often resulted in—an overemphasis upon cultural accomplishments in this world at the expense of remembering that the world in its present form is passing away (1 Cor 7:29-31).¹¹ The Reformed Two Kingdoms doctrine, I suggest, should help to avoid both the harmful fundamentalist temptation to view mundane occupations as necessary evils and the dangerous temptation to lose sight of a proper heavenly-mindedness because of a disproportionate fear of being dualistic or the like. To see ordinary cultural vocations through the lens of the common kingdom (and Noahic covenant) means we can recognize both their God-ordained, God-honoring character and their temporary and provisional character.

Another practically useful thing about the Two Kingdoms doctrine is how it explains the significant differences between church and state. Scripture makes clear that God has ordained both church and state (e.g., Matt 16:18-19; Rom 13:1-7), but their

differences are striking. The state wields the sword (Rom 13:4), while the church's "weapons" are only the word, sacraments, and a non-coercive discipline (e.g., 1 Cor 5:4-5; 2 Cor 10:3-5). The state enforces justice against wrongdoers (e.g., Rom 13:3-4), while the church shuns retribution and instead pursues repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation (e.g., Matt 18:12-35; Gal 6:1-2). God raises up people of all sorts of religious background to hold legitimate political office (e.g., Rom 13:1-2), but requires that only mature and godly Christians can hold ecclesiastical office (e.g., 1 Tim 3:1-7). To see state and church as two aspects of one kingdom of God cannot do justice to this biblical evidence. The redemptive kingdom of Christ does not advance by the point of the sword or retributive justice (e.g., Matt 5:38-42)! The state enforces retributive justice against evildoers, and people of whatever religious belief can legitimately hold political office—because the state is grounded in the common kingdom of the Noahic covenant,

*There is no unique
"Christian" standard for
being a good accountant,
farmer, or physician.*

which God established to do justice (Gen 9:6), for all people (Gen 9:9). To the church, on the other hand, Christ entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to gather a people defined not by enforcement of justice but by the forgiveness and reconciliation achieved through Christ's atonement (Matt 16:18-19; 18:15-20; 1 Cor 5:4-5; Gal 6:1-2). This Two Kingdoms doctrine, therefore, helps guard against both Anabaptist and theocratic tendencies. On the one hand, against Anabaptist traditions it affirms the legitimacy and God-ordained character of the state and its work of pursuing justice. On the other hand, against theocratic temptations it refuses to identify the state and its work with the advance of Christ's redemptive kingdom through the ministry of the gospel. What a useful doctrine this is in the days I write this essay, when presidential candidates are tramping through Iowa just before the caucus,

seeking the public endorsement of churches and pastors.

Extending this point a bit is another area in which the Reformed Two Kingdoms doctrine is very useful. The doctrine helps to explain why people of various religious professions can occupy not only political office but also the range of other cultural vocations. The marriages of non-Christians are valid in God's eyes. Unbelievers can be accountants and farmer and physicians, and Christians in these fields can work alongside them, under no compulsion to form their own ghettos of cultural labor. Peaceful co-existence is the rule. The church, on the other hand, pleads with all to join its ranks, yet requires faith and repentance for membership. The reason is that people function as husbands, wives, accountants, farmers, and physicians under Christ's common rule through the Noahic covenant, while they enter the church under Christ's redemptive rule through the covenant of grace.

Along similar lines, the Two Kingdoms doctrine helps maintain a proper biblical balance in another important area. On the one hand, the doctrine explains why there is no neutral realm of human existence. Even the most mundane and seemingly insignificant areas of life are encompassed by the Noahic covenant and thus accountable before God, under his lordship and law. Christians must maintain critical vigilance in all pursuits, recognizing the pervasive effects of sin and twisting of truth. On the other hand, the doctrine reminds us that under the Noahic covenant God sustains a *common* moral standard for ordinary human vocations. There is no unique "Christian" standard for being a good accountant, farmer, or physician. In his creation and providence God formed the world in a certain way, thereby establishing the truths of mathematics, agriculture, and anatomy. Christ's incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection did not change these truths. The result of good farming is a good crop, whether by believer or unbeliever. The result of good surgery is the patient's recovery, whether the surgeon professes Christ or not. True indeed, Christians should have very different subjective motivation as they undertake their work, and they ought to be more diligent and wise in doing so (if only this were more true in practice!). But the objective standards of excellence for Christian and non-Christian in their

common vocations are the same.

In light of this, the Reformed Two Kingdoms doctrine offers much grist for reflection on questions about education. For one thing, the doctrine compels Christian parents to ensure that their children learn to see the entire world as God's creation and under his lordship. Whether in chemistry or history or economics, the structures of the natural world and activities of human life transpire under the auspices of God's universal covenant with Noah. At the same time, the doctrine explains why unbelievers have so many amazing insights into this world and have achieved such great things in the various academic fields. The Noahic covenant is for all people, and God's providential common grace enables great accomplishments across cultures and religious professions. Christians have much to learn from unbelievers. Moses was trained in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 7:22), and Daniel and friends in the language and literature of the Babylonians (Dan 1:4, 17)—and God put such learning to great use. There is an important role, it would seem, for a specifically Christian education for our children, as well as an imperative to learn from the accomplishment of the broader world and to seek truth, as Calvin put it, wherever it might be found.¹²

Conclusion

The Reformed tradition has left us a rich legacy of biblical reflection across the spectrum of Christian theology. One aspect of that legacy is the Two Kingdoms doctrine. Though this doctrine has been obscured in recent generations, and though some contemporary Reformed writers have reacted to it with alarm, it draws deeply from Scripture and offers considerable assistance in explaining and illuminating the world in which God calls us to live. By maintaining the uniqueness of the church and its ministry, the responsibility of Christians to pursue the range of human vocations, and the legitimacy of laboring in peace and charity alongside unbelievers in these vocations, the Two Kingdoms doctrine holds great promise for guiding us in our post-Christendom world. May Christian scholars be in the lead in applying this promise and evaluating its implications for the next generation of Reformed Christianity.

Endnotes

1. For the most extensive and developed arguments, see David VanDrunen *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms: A Study in the Development of Reformed Social Thought* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); and David VanDrunen, *Living in God's Two Kingdoms: A Biblical Vision for Christianity and Culture* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010).
2. The reviews in major scholarly journals of which I am aware are found in *Journal of Law and Religion* 26.2 (2011): 695-700; *Journal of Church and State* 53.1 (2011): 122-24; *Journal of Theological Studies* 62.1 (2011): 392-96; and *Studies in Christian Ethics* 24.2 (2011): 260-62. As expected, these are of rather dispassionate nature.
3. See Timothy P. Palmer, "Calvin the Transformationist and the Kingship of Christ," *Pro Rege* 35 (March 2007): 32-39; Timothy P. Palmer, "The Two-Kingdom Doctrine: A Comparative Study of Martin Luther and Abraham Kuyper," *Pro Rege* 37 (March 2009): 13-25; Carl Zylstra, "Serious Education for Serious Christians," *Pro Rege* 39 (June 2011): 39-42; Carl E. Zylstra, Review of David VanDrunen, *Living in God's Two Kingdoms: A Biblical Vision for Christianity and Culture*, in *Pro Rege* 40 (September 2011): 43-44. A more serious, though still critical, engagement with an earlier journal article of mine is found in Jason Lief, "Is Neo-Calvinism Calvinist? A Neo-Calvinist Engagement of Calvin's 'Two-Kingdoms' Doctrine," *Pro Rege* 37 (March 2009): 1-12.
4. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols., trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), 3.19.15.
5. Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.11.1, 3.
6. Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.20.1.
7. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, 3 vols., trans. George Musgrave Giger, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1992-97), 2.486.
8. Turretin, *Institutes*, 3.278-80.
9. All of these points can be found in a very abridged translation of a much larger work: Abraham Kuyper, "Common Grace," in *Abraham Kuyper: A Centennial Reader*, ed. James D. Bratt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 165-201.
10. Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 4, ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 371-72.
11. See also Calvin P. Van Reken, "Christians in This World: Pilgrims or Settlers?" *Calvin Theological Journal* 43 (2008): 234-56.
12. Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.2.15.