Duplex Regnum Christi

Beeke, Jonathon David

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

university of groningen

Duplex Regnum Christi

Christ's Twofold Kingdom in Reformed Theology

PhD thesis

to obtain the degree of PhD at the
University of Groningen
on the authority of the
Rector Magnificus prof. E. Sterken
and in accordance with
the decision by the College of Deans.

This thesis will be defended in public on

Thursday 28 March 2019 at 11.00 hours

by

Jonathon David Beeke

born on 18 December 1979
in St. Catharines, Ontario, CANADA

Supervisors

Prof. H. van den Belt
Prof. G. van den Brink

Assessment Committee

Prof. R. H. Reeling Brouwer
Prof. D. VanDrunen
Prof. E. van 't Slot

To my wife, Allyson

Tu supergressa es universas

Contents

Acknowledgments

Writing a dissertation is not for the faint of heart, but neither is it for those who lack friends and supporters. This work would never have seen the light of day were it not for the many persons who came alongside me to encourage, support, and challenge in countless ways. For all of this I am deeply grateful and desire to express my heartfelt appreciation.

First, I am indebted to my primary surpervisor, Prof. Dr. Henk van den Belt. Throughout the several years that Dr. van den Belt has worked with me on this project, he has not only demonstrated his wide knowledge and abilities in all things Reformation and post-Reformation, but perhaps more importantly modeled for me what a wise, caring, and patient teacher-mentor looks like. In the words of Bugenhagen referring to Luther, Dr. van den Belt, you have been to me as a "father doctor." For this I am thankful. Second, I owe a great deal to my secondary supervisor, Prof. Dr. Gijsbert van den Brink; the comments, suggestions, and advice you gave certainly strengthened the argument and flow of this work. While any remaining errors or deficiencies are certainly my own, this dissertation was greatly improved due to the longsuffering and careful labors of my two supervisors.

Others too took an interest in my work, and in a variety of ways offered their support. I am thankful for the extensive libraries of Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary (PRTS), Westminster Theological Seminary (WTS), and Princeton Theological Seminary (PTS) from which I was able to attain many of the resources used for this project. I owe special thanks to Laura Ladwig, librarian at the William Perkins Library, who always kept a keen eye out for any book or resource related to my topic— and, I'm told, she does this for the projects of numerous other researchers. Others have contributed by reading through draft versions of either the whole work or separate chapters: Ryan Hurd, Brennen Winter, Dr. Adriaan Neele, Michael Borg, and Ian Macleod, thank you for the conversations, advice, and suggested areas for improvement you willingly provided. Thank

List of Abbreviations

CO   *Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*. 59 vols. *Corpus Reformatorum*, vols. 29–87. Ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, E. Reuss. Brunswick and Berlin: Schwetschke & Son, 1863–1900.

COR   *Ioannis Calvini opera omnia denuo recognita et adnotatione critica instructa notisque illustrata.* Geneva: Droz, 1992–.

RC   *De regno Christi: Libri Duo 1550*. Ed. F. Wendel. Martini Buceri Opera Latina, 15. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955.

FTO   *Francisci Turrettini Opera*, 4 vols. Edinburgh: John D. Lowe, 1847.

IET   *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. 3 vols. Trans. George M. Giger. Ed. James T. Dennison Jr. Phillipsburg: P&R, 1992–97.

Inst.   *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Trans. Ford Lewis Battles. Library of Christian Classics 20–21. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960.

Institutes (1536)   *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536). Trans. and ed. F. L. Battles. 1975; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

LW   *Luther's Works*. 56 vols. Ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut Lehmann. St. Louis: Concordia, 1955–1986.

NPNF1   *A Select Library of the Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: First Series*. Edinburgh; Grand Rapids: T&T Clark; Eerdmans, 1989.

OS	*Ioannis Calvini opera selecta*. 5 vols. Ed. Peter Barth, Wilhelm Niesel, and Dora Scheuner. Münich: Kaiser, 1926–1962.
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*. 166 vols. Ed. J.-P. Minge. Paris: Minge, 1857–1886.
PRRD	*Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2003.
WA	*D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. 72 vols. Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1883–2007.

Chapter One: Introduction, Historical Method, and Statement of the Argument

1.1. Introduction

The kingly rule and reign of Jesus Christ has always been an integral part of the Christian church's confession. Indeed, one of Christianity's earliest creedal statements confesses that Jesus Christ—who is "truly God of true God" (*Deum verum de Deo vero*), and who, having been made man, suffered, died, and was buried, and afterward ascended into heaven and was made to sit at the right hand of the Father—will gloriously come a second time to exercise his royal judgment over both the living and the dead. Immediately following this summary position on the doctrine of Christ, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed concludes, "[Jesus Christ's] *kingdom shall have no end*."[1] At the heart of this early creed's christological statement lies an abbreviated explanation of Christ's person and work. And yet, this statement was never meant to be exhaustive. Arguably, each successive generation of the Christian church has, to some degree, sought to define who this Jesus Christ is, together with the effects or benefits of his work.

Jesus Christ's person and work as viewed throughout the history of the church is a rich and vast subject. This historical study will concentrate on one aspect of this broader subject—namely, Protestantism's various formulations regarding the kingly character of Christ's work as it relates to his person, and what Protestants believed this kingly rule meant for the

---

[1] The Latin reads: "*cuius regni non erit finis*." See Heinrich Denzinger and Adolfus Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum: Definitionum Et Declarationum Derebus Fidei Et Morum*, 32d ed. (Barcinone: Herder, 1963), 67 (italics mine). The original Greek is as follows: "οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος." See Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes*, 3 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890), 2:57.

church as well as for the political leader and his or her subjects. Even more narrowly, this study focuses on the formulations of representative sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Protestant figures. In particular, this work examines what, especially in the Lutheran context, has been traditionally called the "doctrine of the two kingdoms," or, as it finds expression in seventeenth-century Reformed authors, the *duplex regnum Christi* (the twofold kingdom of Christ). Before delving into our study, however, it is necessary to situate the present work within the secondary scholarship related to the topic at hand; thus, I will first outline major contributions to this topic within Lutheranism, and then follow this with a sketch of more recent scholarship within the Reformed tradition. Following this overview of secondary scholarship, I will argue for the relevance of this particular dissertation, indicate what are the major research questions and the method of historical investigation of this study, and finally summarize the main arguments and outline of this work.

1.2. Overview of Secondary Scholarship

1.2.1. Scholarship on the Two Kingdoms within Lutheranism

Long before the Lutheran two-kingdoms distinction was labeled a "doctrine"—presumably coined by Karl Barth in 1922—dogmaticians and historians alike have struggled to determine the precise relationship between what Martin Luther called the "two realms" of God.[2] Ideed, even in Luther's

---

[2] To my knowledge Luther himself did not attach the designation "doctrine" (*Lehre* or *doctrina*) to his distinction of the two kingdoms; rather, the term "two-kingdoms *doctrine*" is thought to derive first from Karl Barth, who, in 1922, labeled the Lutheran distinction the doctrine of the two kingdoms. See Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*, trans. and ed. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 154. Admittedly, continued use of this label may give the impression that Luther presented a systematic and wholly consistent application of the two kingdoms. While recognizing that this term is in itself anachronistic, I continue to use the term "two-kingdoms doctrine" to denote Luther's formulation for several reasons: (1) Luther critically and biblically reflected upon his distinction and presented it as a general teaching—also a viable translation of *Lehre*—for the welfare of the church; (2) this label's use is so pervasive throughout the secondary literature that it has become a verbal shorthand for a complicated subject (cf. James Estes, *Peace, Order and the Glory of God: Secular Authority and the Church in the Thought of Luther and Melanchthon, 1518–1559,* Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions CXI, ed. Andrew C. Gow [Leiden: Brill, 2005] 38n97); and (3) the

day there was confusion over this distinction. Surprised that there would be confusion on this topic Luther writes, "There are two kingdoms, one the kingdom of God, the other the kingdom of the world. I have written this so often that I am surprised that there is anyone who does not know it or remember it."[3] Nearly five hundred years later, the exact meaning of Luther's two-kingdoms and two-governments doctrine (*Zwei-Reiche-Lehre* and *Zwei-Regimenten-Lehre*) remains a hotly contested question. This somewhat enigmatic question has continued to plague Lutheran scholarship, and answering this has proven to be a daunting task. Surely the staggering collection of Luther's writings—over one hundred and twenty volumes in the Weimar edition—and the countless monographs, articles, and collected essays devoted to this Reformer must give pause to those who interpret him.[4] As if this were not enough to scare away the neophyte, the subject of our study, Luther's two kingdoms, sits high atop this ever-increasing mountain of literature. The following overview is therefore necessarily selective.

Beginning in the mid-nineteenth and into the twentieth century, it was fairly common to politicize Luther's thought; Lutheran scholars often illegitimately equated the two-kingdoms doctrine with the radical separation of church and state, arguing that each sphere is autonomous in its own right (often labeled *Eigengesetzlichkeit*).[5] Once each realm was thought to have

connections between Luther's thought and the more systematic formulations of the Protestant orthodox are thus made more explicit. For an appropriate caution, see Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology*, 154–55.

[3] *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1883–1993), 18:389 (hereafter *WA*). Quotation taken from Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, eds. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut Lehman (Philadelphia and St. Louis: Fortress and Concordia, 1955–86), *An Open Letter On the Harsh Book Against the Peasants*, 46:69 (hereafter *LW*).

[4] Thomas Brady's comments reflect this justified fear: "Here stand the great editions, range on range, topped by the frowning Karakoram of the Weimarana, which dares the scholar to mount its slopes. There is the scarred plain of criticism…further on are the dry beds of bibliography, down which rush without warning, once a year, the floods of new literature. The wanderer longs for a quiet vale, furnished modestly with a few texts and aids, and watered by brevity, clarity and simplicity. A forbidding—but not forbidden—landscape." See Thomas A. Brady Jr., "Luther and Society: Two Kingdoms or Three Estates? Tradition and Experience in Luther's Social Teaching" *Lutherjahrbuch* 52 (1985): 197.

[5] The term *Eigengesetzlichkeit* is thought to be first used by Reinhold Seeberg in his *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (1917). Ernst Troeltsch and Hermann Jordan also echoed this view with their use of the similar *eigene Gesetze*. For more on this history see the

its own autonomy, the perverted use of Luther's two kingdoms by the Nazism of the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP) was not an illogical step.[6] As William Wright notes, "The rise of National Socialism in Germany provided the context for the ultimate application of the concept of the double autonomy of the worldly spheres of life."[7]

Reacting against this application of Luther's two kingdoms, but not recognizing it as a spurious interpretation, critics such as Reinhold and H. Richard Niebuhr, Karl Barth, and Johannes Heckel labeled Luther's thought respectively as "cultural defeatism," "law-gospel quietism," and "Augustinian dualism."[8] Barth, for example, opines:

> Lutheranism has to some degree paved the way from German paganism, allotting it a sacral sphere by its separation of creation and the Law from the Gospel. The German pagan can use the Lutheran doctrine of the authority of the state as a Christian justification of National Socialism, and by the same doctrine the Christian in Germany can feel himself summoned to recognize National Socialism. Both these things have actually happened.[9]

---

survey provided by William Wright, *Martin Luther's Understanding of God's Two Kingdoms: A Response to the Challenge of Skepticism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 18–23.

[6] Lazareth notes especially the notorious *Ansbacher Ratschlag* (*Ansbach Counsel—June 1934*) and its connection with Hans Sommerer, Paul Althaus, and Werner Elert who all supported the racist Aryan Paragraph (1933). See William H. Lazareth, *Christians in Society: Luther, the Bible, and Social Ethics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 8–9. Lazareth does note, however, that only a small number of Lutheran theologians "actually espoused the Nazi Party line," despite the common perception that it was the Lutheran worldview which contributed to German National Socialism.

[7] Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, 31.

[8] For more on Reinhold Niebuhr and Heckel see the remainder of Lazareth's chapter. Niebuhr's position is articulated in his *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. II (New York: Scribner's, 1941), and Heckel's critique is in his *Lex Charitatis: Eine juristische Untersuchung über das Recht in der Theologie Martin Luthers*, #36 of Abhandlungen der Bayerischer Akademie der Wissenschaften (München: Beck, 1953). Heckel's work has been recently translated as *Lex Charitatis: A Juristic Disquisition on Law in the Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by Gottfried G. Krodel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010). For more on H. Richard Niebuhr and his critique see his *Christ and Culture* (London: Faber and Faber, 1952), 154–191, who labels Luther's position as dualistic, which is, in Niebuhr's opinion, logically connected to cultural conservatism.

[9] Karl Barth, *Eine Schweizer Stimme, 1938–1945* (Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1948), 122. English is from Helmut Thielicke, *Theological Ethics: Volume 1:*

More recent research rightly criticizes this interpretation. Especially after World War II, there was a growing tendency to recognize the pervasive character of Luther's two kingdoms throughout the whole of his theology. Particularly instrumental in this more holistic interpretation was the significant work of Heinrich Bornkamm, who writes, "It is self-evident that all the other threads which link Luther's two kingdoms doctrine with the whole of his theology call for an equally careful examination, not in order to protect the doctrine from criticism but because it will be illuminated by each of these relationships."[10] In this interpretive context, Luther's two-kingdoms distinction was examined in connection with his many other paradoxes or dualisms. Brian Gerrish, for example, thought of the two kingdoms as a worldview wherein grace and works, theology and philosophy, and spirit and body are all connected.[11] In contradistinction to the Barthian *Königsherrschaft Christi* (royal rule of Christ), some Lutheran scholars especially recognized the connection between Luther's law-gospel distinction and the two kingdoms. These scholars argued that conflating the two kingdoms under one redemptive umbrella (as Barth would have it) is paramount to conflating law with gospel.[12] According to Gerhard Ebeling, maintaining the two-kingdoms distinction is necessary for the proclamation

---

Foundations, ed. by William H. Lazareth, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 1:368–369. Cf. Lazareth, *Christians in Society*, 11–12.

[10] Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms in the Context of his Theology*, trans. Karl H. Hertz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 31.

[11] Brian Gerrish, *Grace and Reason* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 119. Here Gerrish writes, "All the 'doublets' we have listed come back, in the last analysis, to this crucial doctrine. …Luther is thinking of the two kingdoms as two dimensions of existence." One could further add Luther's twofold distinction between *Deus revelatus* and *Deus absconditus*, as well as his *theologia crucis* and *theologia gloriae*.

[12] See the essays in *God and Caesar Revisited*, Lutheran Academy Conference Papers No. 1, ed. John R. Stephenson (Shorewood, MN: Luther Academy, 1995). Ulrich Asendorf writes, "From the Lutheran standpoint, however, this new viewpoint [as expressed by the *Königsherrschaft Christi*] represented a crude misunderstanding of the two kingdoms as well as a mixing of the kingdoms and subsequently of law and gospel." See his "The Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," 11. Similarly, John Stephenson writes, "But the two kingdoms doctrine is not identical…with the mere separation of civil from ecclesiastical power, for this facet of the Lutheran heritage grows out of the law-gospel distinction apart from which it has no subsistence." See his "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine," 60. On Barth see especially his critique of the Lutheran law-gospel hermeneutic in his essay "Gospel and Law" in *Community, State, and Church: Three Essays*, intro. Will Herberg (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1968), 71–100.

of the gospel message (which deals with the judgment of God [*coram Deo*]), a matter closely related to but distinct from the judgment of the world (*coram mundo*).[13] The necessity of retaining this distinction has been more recently underscored by Robert Kolb and Charles Arand, who note the connection between Luther's affirmation of two kinds of righteousness (passive and active) and two dimensions of reality.[14]

From this all-too-brief survey on the interpretation of the two kingdoms in Lutheran scholarship, at least one thing is evident: understanding Luther's two kingdoms is crucial for a proper understanding of his whole theology. In addition, a correct understanding of Luther's interpretation on this point is vital for understanding the positions of those later theologians who depended on him. While more recent scholarship on Luther and the two kingdoms notes that he often identified the spiritual kingdom with gospel (and its corollary of passive righteousness), and the civil kingdom with law (and its corollary of active righteousness), this discussion is often disconnected from the reformer's thoughts on the original created order. As I will later argue, if recent scholarship is correct in linking Luther's two-kingdoms distinction with his law-gospel distinction, and assuming that the whole of his theology is instructive for the understanding of this one doctrine, it is important to also examine Luther's two-kingdoms theology in connection with his comments on Adam's prelapsarian state.[15] In fact, a recurring point of interest throughout this

---

[13] Gerhard Ebeling, "The Necessity of the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," in *Word and Faith*, trans. James W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), 386–406.

[14] See Robert Kolb and Charles P. Arand, *The Genius of Luther's Theology: A Wittenberg Way of Thinking for the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 26 who write, "The distinction between the two kinds of righteousness allowed the reformers without qualification to extol the gospel by removing human activity as a basis for justification before God. At the same time, it clarified the relationship of the human creature to the world in which God had placed him or her to live a life of 'active righteousness' for the well-being of the human community and the preservation of the environment. The two kinds of righteousness, however, are inseparable from one another. The passive righteousness of faith provides the core identity of the person; the active righteousness of love flows from that core identity out into the world." See also Robert Kolb, "Luther on the Two Kinds of Righteousness," in *Harvesting Martin Luther's Reflections on Theology, Ethics, and the Church*, ed. Timothy J. Wengert, Lutheran Quarterly Books (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 38–55.

[15] Protestant theologians in the Western church have typically held that human beings can be considered as to their possible fourfold state (*status*): as creatures before the

study is the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century formulations of Christ's mediatorial rule in light of their theological stances regarding man's possible fourfold state (*status integritatis*, *status corruptionis*, *status gratiae*, and *status gloriae*). This comparison, largely overlooked in secondary scholarship, has significant implications for detailing lines of continuity and discontinuity not only between Luther's formulation of the two kingdoms and that of later Reformed theologians, but also for tracing lines of continuity and discontinuity from Augustine onward.

1.2.2. Scholarship on the Two Kingdoms within the Reformed Tradition

While a large body of scholarship exists on Luther and the two kingdoms, comparatively little attention has been given to the early Reformed distinction of Christ's twofold kingdom. Even more neglected is a historical consideration of the Protestant orthodox formulations of the *duplex regnum Christi* and the manner in which they relate to those of the early Reformers.[16] Depite this significant dearth in secondary scholarship, within

---

fall, as creatures affected by sin, as creatures redeemed by grace, and as creatures in life eternal. Most often this fourfold distinction was related to human freedom or contingency in its fourfold state, best known by its four Latin denominations: (1) *posse peccare et non peccare* (Adam's *status integritatis* pre-fall), (2) *non posse non peccare* (man's *status corruptionis*; *post lapsum et ante conversionem*), (3) *posse non peccare* (man's *status gratiae*; *post lapsum et post conversionem*), and (4) *non posse peccare* (man's *status gloriae*). Cf. Willem J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde, eds., *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 44–45; 53. This fourfold distinction has its roots in Augustine, who, comparing the states and wills of the first Adam and the resurrected, glorified believer, writes, "…we must consider with diligence and attention in what respect those pairs differ from one another,—to be able not to sin, and not to be able to sin; to be able not to die, and not to be able to die; to be able not to forsake good, and not to be able to forsake good." See Augustine, *A Treatise On Rebuke and Grace*, vol. 5, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings, ed. Philip Schaff (1887; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 485 (Chap. 33). Augustine's four stages of the Christian life as found in his *Enchiridion* (under sin without any conviction, under the law with conviction, under faith or grace in this life, and in perfect glory) may also be considered a source for this fourfold state. See Augustine, *The Enchiridion of Augustine: Addressed to Laurentius: Being a Treatise on Faith, Hope, and Love* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1900), 154–156 (Sect. CXVIII).

[16] As this dissertation argues, it was not the case that a monolithic doctrine of the *duplex regnum Christi* existed in Protestant orthodoxy. Not only must one account for the

the past two decades a marked interest in the two-kingdoms distinction has surfaced in Reformed circles, particularly within the North American academy and church.[17] Adherents to this distinction are commonly labelled "R2K" or "Reformed Two-Kingdom" advocates. More recently, others outside the North American context have weighed in on this discussion.[18]

To some degree this renewed interest in the Reformed understanding of the two kingdoms is in response to a transformationalist reading of the early Reformers.[19] In his work *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, David VanDrunen critiques the neo-Calvinist concern to redeem all aspects and institutions of creation. He argues that although neo-Calvinist scholars often "hail [this concern] as 'Reformational' and as

particular Lutheran and Reformed emphases, but there were also various ways of articulating the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom within the Reformed tradition.

[17] Of those advocating a Reformed understanding of the two kingdoms, particularly noteworthy are the writings of David VanDrunen, Robert Godfrey, Michael Horton, and Darryl Hart. See especially David VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms: A Study in the Development of Reformed Social Thought*, Emory University Studies in Law and Religion, gen. ed. John Witte Jr. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); David VanDrunen, "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine and the Relationship of Church and State in the Early Reformed Tradition," *Journal of Church and State* 49 (2007): 743–763; David VanDrunen, "The Two Kingdoms: A Reassessment of the Transformationist Calvin," *Calvin Theological Journal* 40 (2005): 248–266; David VanDrunen, "The Context of Natural Law: John Calvin's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," *A Journal of Church and State* 46, no. 3 (2004): 503–525; Robert W. Godfrey, "Kingdom and Kingdoms," *Evangelium* 7 (2009): 6–9; Michael Horton, "Why Two Kingdoms?: Dual Citizenship on the Eve of the Election," *Modern Reformation* 9/5 (October 2009): 21–25, 28; Darryl Hart, *A Secular Faith: Why Christianity Favors the Separation of Church and State* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006); Darryl Hart, "Two Kingdoms: A New or Old Idea? Review of *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms by David VanDrunen*," in *Ordained Servant* 19 (2010): 150–153.

[18] See for example, Willem J. Ouweneel, *The World is Christ's: A Critique of Two Kingdoms Theology* (Toronto: Ezra Press, 2017).

[19] Confessing his reliance on Calvin and the Reformed tradition, Albert Wolters writes, "The terms 'reconciled,' 'created,' 'fallen,' 'world,' 'renews,' and 'Kingdom of God' are held to be cosmic in scope.... All other Christian worldviews, by contrast, restrict the scope of each of these terms in one way or other. Each is understood to apply to only one delimited area of the universe of our experience, usually named the 'religious' or 'sacred' realm. Everything falling outside this delimited area is called the 'worldly,' or 'secular,' or 'natural,' or 'profane' realm. All of these 'two-realm' theories, as they are called, are variations of a basically *dualistic* worldview, as opposed to the *integral* perspective of the Reformational worldview, *which does not accept a distinction between sacred and secular 'realms' in the cosmos*. See Wolters, *Creation Regained: A Biblical Basis for a Reformational Worldview* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998 repr.), 10 (italics added). For another representative of the transformationalist position see Henry R. Van Til, *The Calvinist Concept of Culture* (1959; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001).

drawn from the thought of Calvin in particular," Calvin, in fact, "identified only the church with the redemptive kingdom of Christ and denounced the claim that civil government was a part of Christ's kingdom."[20] VanDrunen argues that "in [Abraham] Kuyper's wake, and in significant degree under his inspiration, a great deal of subsequent Reformed theology moved in a direction decisively different from that of the earlier Reformed tradition" with respect to natural law and the two-kingdoms doctrine.[21] VanDrunen's aim therefore is to set the historical record straight by unearthing the Reformed doctrines of natural law and the two kingdoms "long neglected by the heirs of the Reformed tradition."[22]

Not surprisingly, this articulation and advocacy of a Reformed version of the two-kingdoms doctrine has not been without its detractors; it is indeed an understatement to acknowledge that contemporary debates abound (both online and in print) concerning this doctrine.[23] Reformed

---

[20] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 4.

[21] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 276. See especially Chapters 7 and 9 within this work, "An Ambiguous Transition: Abraham Kuyper on Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms" and "The Kuyperian Legacy (I): Herman Dooyeweerd and North American Neo-Calvinism" respectively. In these chapters VanDrunen argues that "Kuyper stood ambiguously in the Reformed two kingdoms tradition, belonging there in many important respects but inspiring a legacy that wished to read him and use him in a quite different way" (302). According to VanDrunen, while many aspects of Kuyper's theology comport with the two kingdoms framework, especially four areas of tension demonstrate an inconsistency within his thought: (1) his language and rhetoric used to educe support for his political party; (2) his prioritizing of the organic church over the institutional; (3) his various use of the adjective "Christian" and subsequent "Christianization" of culture; and (4) his appeal to *Christ* as mediator of both creation and redemption (whereas, as VanDrunen argues, it is more proper to speak of the *Son* as creator and *Christ* as Redeemer) (311–314). Cf. David VanDrunen, "Calvin, Kuyper, And 'Christian Culture,'" in *Always Reformed: Essays in Honor of W. Robert Godfrey* (Escondido, CA: Westminster Seminary California, 2010), 135–153.

[22] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 14.

[23] Many examples of online blogs or articles can be referenced here to demonstrate the intensity of this debate. For the sake of conciseness, one must suffice. After evaluating the legitimacy of a two-kingdoms reading of the early Reformers, one blog writer scathingly writes, "We will cheerfully admit that 2K advocates have some legitimate concerns, particularly that the mission and witness of the church not be hijacked by political and cultural agendas. But in this instance the cure is worse than the disease. While 2K theology may well scratch the itch of Christians who need a theological excuse to remain silent in current cultural conflicts, it is both less than biblical and less than faithful to the decided weight of the Reformed tradition." See William B. Evans, "The Two-Kingdoms Theology

proponents of the two-kingdoms doctrine have been charged with advocating a distinctively Lutheran teaching, and critics of the doctrine have been faulted for missing an essential doctrine of Reformed theology. Some, trying to navigate between these two polarized camps, have proposed a middle or "third way," [24] whereas others have attempted to downplay the significance of the two-kingdoms paradigm altogether, suggesting its utility for today is not readily apparent.[25]

  Of those critical of the Reformed appropriation of the two-kingdoms doctrine, perhaps the most pointed charges are made by John Frame in his *The Escondido Theology*. Frame writes, "These positions [including the R2K distinction] are an idiosyncratic kind of teaching

---

and Christians Today," *The Aquila Report*, www.theaquilareport.com/the-two-kingdoms-theology-and-christians-today-2/ (accessed June 27, 2018).

  For in-print examples, see for example the exchange between David VanDrunen and Nelson D. Kloosterman concerning the position of Herman Bavinck: VanDrunen, "'The Kingship of Christ is Twofold': Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms in the Thought of Herman Bavinck" *CTJ* 45 (2010): 147–164; Kloosterman, "A Response to 'The Kingdom of God is Twofold': Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms in the Thought of Herman Bavinck by David VanDrunen," *CTJ* 45 (2010): 165–176. John Wind's essay outlines many of the disagreements revolving around the two kingdoms; he argues that many of the common criticisms are misinterpretations or misreadings of VanDrunen, and that the "fundamental divide between VanDrunen and his critics is rooted in differing conceptions of the covenantal framework of Scripture." Without commenting on the validity of Wind's claim, the essay does support one aspect of this work (namely, the interconnection between covenant and Christ's kingdom and rule). See John Wind, "The Keys to the Kingdoms: Covenantal Framework as the Fundamental Divide Between VanDrunen and His Critics" *Westminster Theological Journal* 77/1 (2015): 24.

  [24] Ryan McIlhenny, "A Third-Way Reformed Approach to Christ and Culture: Appropriating Kuyperian Neo-Calvinism and the Two Kingdoms Perspective" *MAJT* 20 (2009): 75–94. McIlhenny's essay has been republished as "Christian Witness *As* Redeemed Culture," in *Kingdoms Apart: Engaging the Two Kingdoms Perspective* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2012), 251–275.

  [25] See Simon P. Kennedy and Benjamin B. Saunders, "Characterizing the Two Kingdoms and Assessing Their Relevance Today" *CTJ* 53.1 (2018): 161–173. After reviewing the works of Matthew Tuininga and W. Bradford Littlejohn (viz., Tuininga's *Calvin's Political Theology* and Littlejohn's *The Peril and Promise of Christian Liberty* as noted below), the authors of this article conclude, "In its day, magisterial two kingdoms theology served an important role in furthering the cause of the gospel and ensuring that the individual Christian understood his or her relationship to God and to temporal authority." Nevertheless, despite the seeming importance of this doctrine in the seventeenth century, the authors believe "the two kingdoms may not be as felicitous for ethics and political theology as they are sometimes made out to be and that further work is necessary to convincingly demonstrate the utility of two kingdoms theology for today" (173).

peculiar to the Escondido school. Those who teach them are a faction, even a 'sect.' And I believe that, taken in the plain sense of the terms, these positions are all unbiblical."[26] Very much in line with Frame's scathing analysis, Willem Ouweneel's *The World is Christ's* is purportedly the "first coherent book-length critique by a single author of an increasingly ubiquitous 'Two Kingdoms Theology.'"[27] As the author of this volume states, a primary aim in his writing of the work is "to refute the two-kingdoms model as conceived and articulated by David VanDrunen and some congenial thinkers."[28] Ouweneel, at times quite dismissive in his approach, believes the fundamental and underlying problem to the entire two-kingdoms structure is the "catastrophic scholastic nature-grace dualism."[29]

More nuanced in his criticism of the R2K position is James Smith who, in his article "Reforming Public Theology: Two Kingdoms, or Two Cities?" admits he "will be defending something like a Kuyperian, neo-Calvinist emphasis on culture-making as a redemptive activity" in contradiction to the two-kingdoms framework. Smith's primary argument here is that advocates of two-kingdoms theology are following a decidedly Lutheran (as opposed to Augustinian) theology.[30] W. Bradford Littlejohn is also more careful in his critique, arguing in his short guide *The Two Kingdoms: A Guide for the Perplexed* that "both the R2K advocates and their critics have largely missed something much richer, more fundamental,

---

[26] See John Frame, *The Escondido Theology: A Reformed Response to Two Kingdom Theology* (Lakeland, FL: Whitefield Media Productions, 2011), xxxix. By "Escondido theology," Frame implies that all faculty members and those associated with Westminster Seminary in California (located in Escondido, California) advocate this "unbiblical" two-kingdoms doctrine.

[27] Ouweneel, "Foreword [by Joseph Boot]" in *The World is Christ's*, xiii.

[28] Ouweneel, *The World Is Christ's*, 4.

[29] This refrain is repeated throughout the work. This is how Ouweneel, for example, interprets Luther's use of two regiments (i.e., Luther was "still under the strong influence of scholasticism"). See Ouweneel, *The World Is Christ's*, 184–186 (the quotation is from 185). An example of Ouweneel's dismissive approach is found in pages 11–12; he laments that too much has centered on the historical in this debate. He writes, "This is not my approach; it is a blind alley. First, what is the profit gained by it? We can go on for decades arguing what Luther, Calvin, or Kuyper said, or did not say, or intended to say" (12).

[30] James K. A. Smith, "Reforming Public Theology: Two Kingdoms, or Two Cities?" *CTJ* 47 (2012): 125.

and more liberating and insightful for the church today: the original Protestant two-kingdoms doctrine, as articulated by such giants as Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Richard Hooker."[31]

On the other hand, advocates of the so-called two-kingdoms doctrine, such as David VanDrunen in his work *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, argue that this teaching is a "classic Reformed theological paradigm," affirmed by "the better part of four centuries [of] Reformed thinkers."[32] Further affirming the value of this distinction, Matthew Tuininga's extensive study on Calvin argues that Calvin's political engagement was an expression of his commitment to the two-kingdoms doctrine; contrary to the "common portrayal of Calvin as a revolutionary or socio-political transformationalist," the expressed goal of Tuininga's work is to "recover Calvin as a relevant voice for contemporary Christian political theology."[33]

1.3. Relevance of this Study

Much of the contempary debate surrounding the two-kingdoms doctrine, as is so often the case in arguments, hinges upon matters of definition and terminology. Precisely what is meant by a *spiritual* kingdom of Christ that is distinct from a *civil* kingdom? And yet, while a portion of this academic

---

[31] W. Bradford Littlejohn, *The Two Kingdoms: A Guide for the Perplexed*, Davenant Guides (np: The Davenant Trust, 2017), 6–7. Littlejohn's dissertation on Richard Hooker also addresses the two-kingdoms doctrine. Using Richard Hooker's quarrel with Thomas Cartwright as his test case, Littlejohn argues that "VanDrunen is right to single out the doctrine of the two kingdoms, a common theme in Luther scholarship but generally ignored among the Reformed, as the fulcrum of Reformational political thought; however, both his descriptive account of this theme and his prescriptive appropriation of it run into a number of difficult tensions." See W. Bradford Littlejohn, "The Freedom of a Christian Commonwealth: Richard Hooker and the Problem of Christian Liberty" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2013), 4. Littlejohn's dissertation is published as *The Peril and Promise of Christian Liberty: Richard Hooker, the Puritans, and Protestant Political Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017).

[32] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 13; 1. See also a more theological defense given by David VanDrunen in his *A Biblical Case for Natural Law* (Grand Rapids: Acton Institute, 2006).

[33] Matthew J. Tuininga, *Calvin's Political Theology and the Public Engagement of the Church: Christ's Two Kingdoms*, Cambridge Studies in Law and Christianity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 1; 9.

dispute (especially within the Reformed camp) has been historical in nature—that is, asking the questions, "What did the Reformed say about Christ's two kingdoms?" and "Why have they held this (these) position(s)?"—this contemporary debate has been waged largely upon premises grounded in systematic theology—that is, asking questions such as, "How must one think of Christ's kingdom?" and "How must one's formulation fit within a Reformed system of thought?"[34] Surely these two sets of questions, while necessarily related, are very different in nature. It is therefore necessary at the outset to distinguish the descriptive from the prescriptive questions.

As secondary scholarship within the Reformed tradition has principally revolved around the latter prescriptive question, three significant areas, addressed in this study, have been for the most part overlooked: (1) the (especially seventeenth-century) Reformed understanding of the twofold royal reign of Christ as it relates to his person and mediatorial work within a twofold covenantal framework (i.e., the prelapsarian covenant of works and postlapsarian covenant of grace); (2) the degree to which the understanding of the twofold kingdom developed and matured in the formulations of those following the early Reformers; and (3) the terminology of the doctrine itself. Certainly each of these areas are related: because the contemporary discussion has left out any extensive study of the development of the *duplex regnum Christi* in Reformed thought, the connection between this doctrine and Christ's person and work has not been sufficiently noted. Furthermore, because an adequate study of this doctrine's development is yet lacking, the terminology itself—so often assumed and presented as monolithic throughout the Reformed tradition—needs to be addressed and evaluated.

To raise here but two examples that will be discussed later, Luther's nomenclature of "two kingdoms" (*zwei reiche* or *duo regna*) was *not*

---

[34] See the systematic treatment by David VanDrunen, *Living in God's Two Kingdoms: A Biblical Vision* for *Christianity* and *Culture* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010). To my knowledge, this is the only full-length study relating covenant and the two-kingdoms doctrine, a subject related to this study. Nevertheless, VanDrunen's treatment differs from this dissertation as he adopts a biblical-theological approach whereas this study is categorized more aptly as intellectual history.

employed by Calvin,[35] who for the most part spoke of a "twofold kingdom" (*duplex regnum*); likewise, Calvin's distinction of a "spiritual" and "civil" kingdom or government was not the favored expression of the majority of Reformed orthodox theologians, who most often distinguished between Christ's essential kingdom (that is, the kingdom Christ possesses naturally or essentially as he is God) and his mediatorial kingdom (that is, the kingdom bestowed by the Father upon Christ as God-man). Perhaps owing to the persistent tendency to reproduce a mixture of Luther's and Calvin's terms and definitions as representative of the entire Reformed tradition, the majority of contemporary Reformed interpreters have narrowed their observations concerning the two kingdoms to the Christian's interaction with the world, or more precisely, the relationship of the Christian church to the state.[36] While this relationship is very much related to the Reformed understanding of Christ's twofold kingdom, it certainly was not *all* that Reformed theologians said on the subject—indeed, in the case of the Reformed orthodox, this was not even principally the case.

1.4. Research Questions

Certainly one must investigate *what* a particular tradition holds to be true of a certain topic *before* one questions whether a systematic formulation or deduction concerning that topic falls within that same tradition. The intent

---

[35] It should be noted that Luther did at times speak of a "duplex regnum." In an electronic search of the Weimar edition of his works, four instances of the phrase "duplex regnum" could be found. In contrast to this, forty-three instances of the phrase "duo regna" were found.

[36] See, for example, Daryl Hart, *A Secular Faith*. While the two-kingdoms distinction does not figure prominently in this work, he does assume this distinction undermines the especially American-evangelical conception that Christianity must inform politics. After noting the Lutheran development of the "Augustinian doctrine of the two kingdoms," Hart thus writes, "Calvinists also understood a fundamental difference between the spiritual realities administered by the church and the worldly affairs governed by the state. Calvin even argued that after the coming of Christ, to confuse the two, to mix religion and politics, was to violate the order of the *seculorum*—it was to engage in a historical anachronism and try to reproduce the theocratic administration of Old Testament Israel" (244). See also Torrance Kirby who argues Calvin's two-kingdoms theology was significant in shaping and defining the early modern public sphere: "A Reformed Culture of Persuasion: John Calvin's 'Two Kingdoms' and the Theological Origins of the Public Sphere," in *Calvin@500: Theology, History, and Practice* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2011).

of this dissertation is to ask the former descriptive question: "What did the Reformed, and especially the Reformed orthodox, teach concerning the *duplex regnum Christi*?" Perhaps even more importantly, this study will investigate factors addressing *why* Reformed theologians held the positions they did. These questions are in themselves a massive undertaking, ones that require a degree of selectivity. My aim then is not to engage and dialogue with contemporary interpreters as to the prescriptive question; in other words, it is not my intention to argue for or against a certain systematic position that should or should not be held by the Reformed community. Rather, my aim is to balance both comprehensive and more narrow historical investigations, and thus evaluate this most basic question: *What did the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Reformed teach concerning Christ's twofold kingdom, and why did they teach what they did?*

In order to narrow this broader research question, more specific research questions will help shape the contours of this study. An important question asked is, "What terms did the early Reformers and Reformed orthodox use in their description of Christ's twofold reign, and how did they develop or change over time?" If a change in terms is noted, what is the significance of this? A further recurring research question asks, "What was the favored place or *locus* where the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom was treated?" Like the previous question, if this changed over time, is this significant? Another question that helps direct this study asks, "What motivating factors helped shape the Reformed and Reformed orthodox articulation of Christ's twofold kingdom?" To what degree did exegesis, doctrinal concerns, polemics, or socio-political matters inform their formulations?[37] Finally, this study is concerned with the intersection of the twofold kingdom of Christ with other doctrines; specifically, how does the *duplex regnum Christi* relate to other Reformed doctrines such as the historic fall of Adam—i.e., "Was the *duplex regnum* distinction operative prior to the fall into sin?"—the mediatorial work of Jesus Christ, and covenant theology?

---

[37] Admittedly, this is too large of a question to be fully answered in this study. Nevertheless, some conclusions as to primary motivating factors are given.

1.5. Method of Investigation and Outline of Study

In their useful reference work, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods*, James Bradley and Richard Muller outline four common approaches or patterns used by historians in their presentation of the history of doctrine: (1) the general/special pattern, (2) the special or diachronic model, (3) the great thinker model, and (4) the integral, synchronic, or organic model. Bradley and Muller conclude it is this final model that best encapsulates the church historian's task: "While it was developed primarily by historians of doctrine, this model holds the most promise for reconceptualizing the task of the church historian on a broader scale."[38] This approach, while complex and often hard to emulate, forces the historian to engage in "broader dialogue" with factors that the more reductionist patterns often overlook. An adequate account of the development of the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom must not then employ a simple "periodizing grid," or even a "topical grid"; our aim is rather to follow this synchronic method and demonstrate that "[its] location of meaning lies in the interaction of ideas, in a particular period as understood by particular individuals, but always as contributory to the larger development."[39]

In many respects, the following study falls within the "history of doctrine" subcategory. In order to follow the synchronic method as described here, this study attempts to situate the seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox conception of the *duplex regnum Christi* within the doctrine's organic heritage. It is imperative then that one begin by exploring the intellectual origins of the *duplex regnum Christi*. Thus, Part One will set the historical lens at its widest point and consider some of the patristic, medieval, and early Protestant precursors to the *duplex regnum Christi* of Reformed orthodoxy. Although the thought of these patristic and medieval figures or concepts is not a primary focus of this study, the formulations of John Chrysostom, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, the medieval two swords

---

[38] James A. Bradley and Richard A. Muller, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 31; the four models are outlined in pp. 26–32.

[39] Bradley and Muller, *Church History*, 32.

construct(s), and William of Ockham influenced to varying degrees the Reformers' and Reformed orthodox theologians' understanding of Christ's royal reign and power. While it is necessary to note this connection, the patristic and medieval influences articulated in this section are introductory in nature and largely rely on secondary scholarship and brief selections of primary source material.

Since the aim of this study is to demonstrate the continuity and development of the *duplex regnum Christi* within the Reformed tradition, the principal focus of Part One is the early magisterial Reformers' understanding of Christ's rule. In order to focus my investigation more narrowly, particular attention in this first part will be given to the contributions of Martin Luther (1483–1546), Martin Bucer (1491–1551), and John Calvin (1509–1564). As such, this section of my dissertation is, for the most part, arranged chronologically—i.e., a separate chapter is devoted to the thought of Luther, and another chapter considers the thought of Bucer and then Calvin. While these two chapters are more narrowly focused on these three Reformers, even so the investigation was restricted to major primary source writings (i.e., Luther's *Temporal Authority*, Bucer's *De Regno Christi*, and Calvin's *Institutes*) along with the aid of releveant secondary scholarship. As a primary research question sought to relate the doctrine of Christ's twofold reign with Adam's historic fall and the subsequent promise of grace, these chapters also incorporate material from especially Luther's and Calvin's commentaries or sermons on Adam's prelapsarian state.

The intention of Part One is not to posit any one of these Reformers as the benchmark of Protestant theology, but to situate each within their intellectual context, and thus be able to trace elements of continuity and discontinuity regarding the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom. In doing so we can ask the necessary *what* and *why* questions: what did these Reformers say about Christ's kingdom, and why did they formulate their theological reflections on this subject in the manner they did? It should be further noted here that this section, with its emphasis on the three representatives listed above, cannot boast to be a comprehensive analysis of early Protestant thought; other early Reformers, such as Heinrich Bullinger and Philipp Melanchthon (to name but two), are drawn upon only in a

limited manner in this study. For this reason it is recognized at the outset that further and more concentrated reflection is necessary in this area.

Part Two will narrow the historical lens, focusing in this section on the respective two phases of early and high orthodoxy.[40] Whereas early Reformed orthodoxy (ca. 1565–1640) was marked by the summarizing and synthesizing attempts of its representatives, high orthodoxy (ca. 1640–1725) manifested more of a polemical defense of Reformed theology. My aim in this section is to trace the *duplex regnum Christi* throughout the two phases of early and high orthodoxy (1565–1725), noting areas of continuity as well as areas of development or discontinuity.

Although the time span of this dissertation's second part—some 150 years—is significantly less than that of Part One, nevertheless the historical analysis also cannot account for every particular within this period. Since the nature of the historian's task demands selectivity, as in Part One, in Part Two I will concentrate on at least two representative figures associated with three major intellectual centers of early and high orthodoxy.[41] The three centers I investigate here, each from a different country in Europe, and each boasting an influential academy or university in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, are Leiden, Geneva, and Edinburgh. Thus, theologians such as Francis Junius (1545–1602) and Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639);[42] Francis Turretin (1623–1687) and Bénédict Pictet (1655–1724);[43] and Johannes Scharpius (1572–1648) and David Dickson (1583–

---

[40] Some have noted that Reformed orthodoxy can be roughly divided into three periods: early, high, and late orthodoxy. Cf. Richard Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* [*PRRD*], vol. I. *Prolegomena to Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2003), 1.1(A.2) [30–32].

[41] See the extended discussion on historical method given in Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, vol. 1, *Regarding Method* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[42] Junius and Walaeus served as Professors of Theology at Leiden University respectively from 1592–1602 and 1648–1676.

[43] Turretin was Professor of Theology at the Genevan Academy from 1653–1687, and Pictet from 1686–1724.

1662)[44] will figure largely in this second part, although numerous comparisons will be made with their contemporaries.[45]

The selection of these representative theologians as connected to an influential school in Europe has the clear advantage of embedding the historical investigation within a particular socio-historical context. As indicated, the selection of the three schools, each from a different European country, was purposefully made in order to account for diverse socio-political contexts. Thus, each chapter in Part Two of the dissertation will begin by providing a summary socio-political context so that the representative theologians may be considered in their unique relevant milieus. As will be seen, the political stability of Geneva, Leiden, and Edinburgh all varied to some degree. While it is difficult to pinpoint an exact correlation between the level of political stability of a theologian's country and his explication of Christ's twofold kingdom, the question will be asked to what extent this correlation is evident.

Furthermore, I have chosen to investigate representative theologians associated within a particular university or academy as it readily allows for a compelling case for or against what one scholar calls "institutional continuity."[46] The premise assumed here is that investigating institutional continuity, "grounded in texts, lectures, administrative documents and policies, institutionally funded publications, student disputations and examinations, inaugural orations," is a helpful means of assessing the continuity-discontinuity question "within models of pedagogical transmission, adoption, and publication."[47] In addition, not only is this method helpful in determining diachronic continuity within a particular

---

[44] Scharpius served as Professor of Theology at Edinburgh University from 1630–1648, and Dickson served in this same post from 1650–1662.

[45] The writings of Jerome Zanchi (1516–1590), Lucas Trelcatius (1542–1602), Andrew Melville (1545–1622), William Perkins (1558–1602), Amandus Polanus (1561–1610), Johann Heinrich Alting (1583–1644), Alexander Henderson (1583–1646), Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588–1638), Johannes Wollebius (1589–1629), Samuel Maresius (1599–1673), Edward Leigh (1602–1671), and Franz Burmann (1628–1679), among others, will be used to some degree.

[46] Cf. Todd Rester, "*Theologia Viatorum*: Institutional Continuity, Theological Pedagogy, and the Reception of a Prolegomenal Framework in Bernhardinus De Moor's 'Commentarius Perpetuus,'" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2016), 14–16.

[47] Rester, "*Theologia Viatorum*," 15; 14.

academic institution (i.e., the adoption and reception of dogmatic material within an institution's faculty over time), but it is also helpful when considering synchronic continuity between faculties of separate academic institutions. Thus, the contributions of these six theologians listed here, considered within the intellectual and social milieu of their respective universities or academies, will arguably constitute ample evidence upon which a case can be made for or against a unified, albeit developed (or refined), understanding of Christ's royal power and reign.

Unlike Part One, this second section will not be arranged chronologically. After an introductory chapter to Part Two that introduces the various terms and concepts of the *duplex regnum Christi*, Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight will each provide a brief introduction to the cultural and political backgrounds to the three representative intellectual centers of Leiden, Geneva, and Edinburgh. These chapters will in turn examine the *duplex regnum Christi* as presented by representative theologians and ministers connected to the three intellectual centers in question. As such, the focus of the research is on any dogmatic or systematic theology work written by the respective theologian, or on any available academic disputation. For each author I consulted the original Latin sources and any available English translations, searching their works especially in two areas: any treatment of the *munus triplex* and descriptions of the civil magistrate's role. In primary sources available in digital format, I conducted electronic searches for Latin variations of the terms *duplex regnum*. After observing a repeated connection of several key Scripture passages with the doctrine in question (such as 1 Corinthians 15:24–28 and Matthew 28:18), my indices searches not only centered on the subjects related to Christ's kingly office, but also these relevant Scriptures. Throughout the three chapters devoted to the three centers and the Reformed orthodox understanding of the *duplex regnum Christi* I underscore the importance of Christology (focusing on the person of Christ) and covenant theology (focusing on the mediatorial work of Christ). As made plain in the overarching thesis of this work described in the next section, in order to demonstrate the continuity and discontinuity of the early Reformers and Reformed orthodox on the *duplex regnum Christi*, one must account for the ongoing discussion of the person and work of Jesus Christ.

1.6. Statement of the Argument

The primary argument of this work is that the Reformed orthodox portrayal of the twofold kingdom of Christ (distinguished most often as the *regnum essentiale* and *regnum mediatorium*) stands in continuity with the early Reformers' articulations, and yet there is in the second half of the sixteenth century, and even into the seventeenth century, significant and ongoing development regarding the *duplex regnum Christi*.[48] More specifically, I argue that in contrast to the early Reformers—particularly Luther and to a lesser extent Calvin—the Reformed orthodox more closely connected the *duplex regnum Christi* to a consideration of the person and work of Jesus Christ as mediator; with this more explicit christological grounding of the *duplex regnum Christi*, the Reformed orthodox thus understood Christ's unified royal power and reign in a covenantal context. In other words, whereas early Protestant representatives perceived of the two kingdoms (or twofold kingdom) predominantly in an ecclesiological and/or political context, increasingly the Reformed orthodox thought of the twofold kingdom in a christological and therefore covenantal framework. I further argue that polemical, exegetical, and doctrinal concerns were three primary motivating factors behind this development by the Reformed orthodox, and that the refinement of this doctrine was not principally instigated due to varying political concerns.

This dissertation does *not* argue that a substantial divide existed between Calvin and the Reformed orthodox concerning the twofold reign of Christ; nevertheless, I will argue that the more recent reassessment and corrective of the "Calvin versus the Calvinists" thesis must not overlook the continuing development of doctrine that existed in Reformed theology.[49] As

---

[48] On the terms employed by the orthodox concerning the *regnum Christi* see Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally From Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 259–261.

[49] For an overview of this debate and the literature on this subject see especially Richard Muller, "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy, Part 1 and 2," in *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology, gen. ed. David Steinmetz (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 63–102.

Richard Muller has often stressed, Calvin was not, nor must he be posited as, the benchmark of seventeenth-century Reformed theology.[50] Thus, while an organic connection exists between Calvin's theology and that of his Reformed orthodox counterparts, the differences in method and terminology should not be simply brushed aside. To some degree secondary scholarship has recognized this ongoing development in the more mature seventeenth-century formulations of covenant theology, but the Reformed orthodox refinement of the twofold kingdom of Christ has not been sufficiently acknowledged or documented.

Finally, while this dissertation will concentrate on the christological and covenantal aspects of Christ's kingdom, it will become evident throughout that the Reformed orthodox, in their presentation of Christ's twofold kingdom, upheld the distinct purposes of church and magistrate as set forth by the early Reformers. Much of secondary scholarship has wrestled with the perceived inconsistency that existed on this matter; if, on the one hand, the Reformed distinguished the twofold kingdom of Christ as to its redemptive and non-redemptive characters, how could they legitimately attribute certain religious responsibilities to the magistrate?[51]

Throughout the first essay Muller evaluates what he sees as five reactions or responses to Reformed orthodoxy. The first four responses, with representatives such as Brian Armstrong, Basil Hall, Hans Emil Weber, and Heinrich Heppe, can be summarized – with varying degrees and for varying reasons – under the one heading of divorcing Calvin from his followers. The fifth response critically reassesses this older "Calvin versus the 'Calvinists'" argument, arguing that substantial continuity (which also evidenced development) existed between the early sixteenth-century Reformers and their seventeenth-century successors. See also the collection of essays in Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999). Also helpful is the second chapter entitled "The State of Scholarship: From Discontinuity to Continuity" in Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, Reformed Historical-Theological Series (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 10–25.

[50] Muller writes, "To very little purpose, several recent studies have set "Calvin against the Calvinists"—as if Calvin were the only source of post-Reformation Reformed theology and as if the theology of the mid-seventeenth century ought for some reason to be measured against and judged by the theology of the mid-sixteenth century." See Muller, *PRRD*, 1:1.1(C.4) [45].

[51] Thus, VanDrunen points at the seeming inconsistency in Calvin's thought, stating, "…theory and practice seem less clearly harmonious when Calvin ascribes various religious functions to civil magistrates." VanDrunen posits Calvin's desire for order as a plausible solution that may explain why "the same Calvin who would not allow the kingdom of Christ to have anything to do with the civil kingdom also ascribe[d] distinctly religious

As indicated earlier, arguably this tension is more pronounced if one relies exclusively on Calvin's language concerning the twofold kingdom. I argue, however, that the Reformed orthodox did not limit Christ's mediatorial rule and power to the visible or even to the invisible church; it will become evident in Part Two of this work that the majority of the Reformed orthodox did not distinguish Christ's mediatorial kingdom from his essential kingdom on the basis of scope or boundary, but on the basis of the mode of Christ's governance (i.e., covenantal administration). Thus, Christ's essential kingdom and mediatorial kingdom comprise *one kingdom that is universal in scope*, but the two aspects of this kingdom are administered according to different covenantal arrangements, each then with a very different purpose and end. Before developing this argument further, it is necessary first to investigate early Protestant thought on Christ's royal power. In order to do so, I begin with a shorter chapter outlining patristic and medieval sources that influenced the early Reformers on this subject.

---

functions to the civil magistrate." See VanDrunen, "A Reassessment of the Transformationist Calvin," 261–263.

Part I: Early Magisterial Reformers and the *Duplex Regnum Christi*

Chapter Two: Laying the Patristic and Medieval Foundation

I.2.1. Introduction

In order to attain some sense of the "larger development" of the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingship, and to approximate the historian's ideal integral approach as explained in the introductory chapter, we must first account for some of the key patristic and medieval precursors, thus laying the intellectual foundation for the early Reformers' and Reformed orthodox understanding of Christ's kingship. Certainly the early Reformers and Reformed orthodox theologians did not derive their theology (including their theology of Christ's kingly reign) independent of any other source or influence.[1] Stressing his reliance on reputable theologians of the past, Francis Turretin, for example, prefaced his multi-volume work with the following comment, "Let other books, then, be condemned by their novelty. I do not want this statement to justify mine. I avoided it most diligently lest it should contain anything new, a stranger from the word of God and from the public forms received in our churches, and nothing is built up there that is not confirmed by the vote of our most proven theologians of highest reputation."[2] In similar fashion, Calvin claims his reliance on the early church fathers, stating in the preface to his *Institutes*, "Moreover, they ['our adversaries'] unjustly set the ancient fathers against us (I mean the ancient

---

[1] This thesis has been articulated by Heiko Oberman, who argued for an organic relationship between the medieval and Reformation church. See especially Heiko Augustinus Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought*, 1st Fortress Press ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).

[2] Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, 3 vols., trans. George M. Giger, ed. James T. Dennison Jr. (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1992–97), 1:xlii (hereafter *IET*). Cf. Francis Turretin, *Francisci Turrettini Opera*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: John D. Lowe, 1847), 1:xxvi [hereafter cited as *FTO*]).

writers of a better age of the church) as if in them they had supporters of their own impiety. If the contest were to be determined by patristic authority, the tide of victory—to put it very modestly—would turn to our side."[3]

In this chapter, I have chosen to focus on five figures of the early and medieval church: John Chrysostom, Augustine of Hippo, pope Boniface VIII, Thomas Aquinas, and William of Ockham.[4] These figures (two from the early church and three from the medieval church) were chosen in order to provide a window into the long historical development leading up to the Reformation and Reformed orthodoxy. As seen below, each figure was instrumental in the doctrinal development of the twofold kingdom of Christ; in the case of Chrysostom and Augustine, theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries explicitly relied on their testimony to express this doctrine, whereas the expressions of Aquinas and Ockham are important as they help provide the historical context that especially the Reformers thought important when considering this doctrine. Constrained by the limits and purpose of this study, however, the treatment provided here is necessarily skeletal, selective, and introductory in nature; despite this, however, the following survey demonstrates that there was an organic relationship—whether real or perceived—between the early/medieval church and the Protestant/Reformed orthodox church on the issue of Christ's twofold kingdom.

---

[3] Cf. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols., Library of Christian Classics, no. 20–21 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), prefatory address to King Francis, (1:18). Unless otherwise indicated future references to the 1559 English translation of the *Institutes* will be from the Battles edition [hereafter *Inst.*]. True to their aims, James Dennison has identified some 3200 quotations or references from "classic, patristic, medieval, Jewish, Socinian, Lutheran, Arminian, Anabaptist, and Reformed authors" in the work of Francis Turretin, and Anthony Lane, drawing on the comprehensive tabulation of R. J. Mooi, lists over 3200 citations of the fathers in Calvin's corpus. See respectively Turretin, *IET* 3:647; A. N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999), 28n.96.

[4] In this same vein, William Wright has argued persuasively that Luther's formulation of God's two kingdoms was largely due to the influence of Italian rhetorical humanism, especially as mediated through Lorenzo Valla (1405–1457). Wright argues Luther appropriated the rhetorical skepticism of Italian humanism, but applied this only to matters of "this world"; certainty can only be had in the revelation of an incomprehensible God as expressed in Scripture. See Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, chs. 2–3.

I.2.2. John Chrysostom: "The Scripture acknowledges two kingdoms of God"

While the Reformers and Reformed orthodox were selective in what they appropriated from the patristic fathers, they regularly relied upon their christological definitions and distinctions, especially as ironed out by Chalcedon (451). In large part due to the christological controversies leading up to Chalcedon's formulation, John Chrysostom (c. 347–407), a favored and often-quoted author of the Reformation and post-Reformation era theologians, was one of the earliest theologians to employ a two-kingdoms distinction. Chrysostom succinctly outlined his distinction in his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 15:24.

Commenting on this much-debated passage (a verse that describes Christ's future handing over of his kingdom to the Father, of which the meaning was debated both in the patristic and Reformed orthodox periods),[5] Chrysostom made the following assertion:

> But what is this, "When He shall deliver up the kingdom?" The Scripture acknowledges two kingdoms of God, the one by appropriation (οἰκείωσιν [in Latin translations as *ex conjunctione seu proprietate*]), the other by creation (δημιουργίαν [in Latin translations as *ex creatione*]). Thus, He is King over all, both Greeks and Jews and devils and His adversaries, in respect of His creation: but He is King of the faithful and willing and subject, in respect of His making them His own.… This kingdom then [the kingdom of appropriation] He doth "deliver up," i.e., "bring to a right end."[6]

---

[5] Cf. Augustine, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Trinitate*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina v. 50–50A (Turnholti: Brepolis, 1968), i, 8 for Augustine's comments on the debated exegesis of this text. Sections below indicate that Junius, Walaeus, Polyander, Alting, Turretin, Scharpius, and Dickson all used this passage from 1 Corinthians in their description of the *duplex regnum Christi*.

[6] The original of the second line in this quotation is as follow: "Βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ δύο οἶδεν ἡ Γραφὴ, τὴν μὲν κατ᾽ οἰκείωσιν, τὴν δὲ κατὰ δημιουργίαν." See John Chrysostom, *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Chrysostomi In Divi Pauli Epistolam ad Corinthios Priorem Homiliae XLIV*, ed., Frederick Field (Oxonii: T. Combe, 1847), Homily 39 (498).

In arguing for this distinction between Christ's two kingdoms, Chrysostom countered the claims of his "enemies," who argued that the existence of God as triune being was a temporary phenomenon. Although in this context he did not mention his "enemies" by name, Chrysostom most likely had the likes of Marcellus of Ancyra (d. 374) in mind, who taught that upon the deliverance of the Son's kingdom to the Father at the consummation, the Logos will be reabsorbed into the monadic *prosopon* of the Godhead, which will once again exist as absolute unity.[7]

According to Chrysostom, Christ's end-time deliverance of his kingdom to the Father does not mean he will give up his deity, nor does the Son's future handing over of the kingdom to the Father mean that the Father, prior to the consummation, is not already a king or does not currently possess a kingdom. Rather, as Chrysostom argues, the Son—equal to the Father and the Holy Spirit—is king over all creation, and this kingdom is eternal (referencing Daniel 7:14). And yet, despite possession of this all-inclusive and eternal kingdom, the Son is given special authority over particular "faithful and willing" subjects. Quoting from Psalm 2:8 and Matthew 28:18, Chrysostom notes that Christ's "kingdom of appropriation" has both a beginning and an end. Furthermore, unlike his eternal kingship over creation (which the Son holds equally with the Father and Spirit), in his kingdom of appropriation the heathen are given to the Son as an inheritance. In other words, distinct from Christ's kingship over the heathen as creator, Chrysostom held that the Father gives the Son particular authority over the heathen when they are made his own (i.e., when they are made faithful and

---

Cf. Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians*, in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus ... Series Graeca* (Parisiis: J.-P. Migne, 1857–66), LXI: 341 (hereafter *PG*). For the English, see Chrysostom, *A Select Library of the Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: First Series* (Edinburgh; Grand Rapids: T&T Clark; Eerdmans, 1989), 12:239–240 (hereafter *NPNF1*).

[7] See Chrysostom, *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Chrysostomi In Divi Pauli Epistolam ad Corinthios Priorem Homiliae XLIV*, 492; Chrysostom, *NPNF1*, 12:237, for the reference to Chrysostom's "enemies." For more on Marcellus of Ancyra, see J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, second edition (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), 240–243. Marcellus's position ought to be distinguished from Sabellianism; explaining Marcellus's thought, Kelly writes, "[The] externalization of the Logos does not, of course, result in His becoming a second hypostasis; His coming forth or procession…is described as an extension or expansion (cf. the verb πλατύνεσθαι) of the Monad, and the reign, or kingdom, of Christ—not, we observe, of the Logos as such—will come to an end" (241).

willing). As Chrysostom clarifies, it is this kingdom of appropriation that Christ delivers up to the Father (or brings to perfection) at the eschaton, the power of death and the Devil over this kingdom being then finally and conclusively broken.[8]

Chrysostom's distinction between Christ's two kingdoms—his kingdom of creation and kingdom of appropriation—was interestingly picked up by at least two patrologists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In his 1567 theological dictionary drawn from Scripture and the church fathers, Johannes Arquerius (Jean L'Archer [c.1516–1588])—an early reformer and pastor of Héricourt near the French-Swiss border—referenced Chrysostom's thirty-ninth homily on 1 Corinthians to justify an entry entitled "the two kingdoms of God" (*regna Dei duo*).[9] Nearly a century after Arquerius produced his reference work, Johann Caspar Schweizer (1619?–1684), a Reformed theologian and professor of theology in Zurich, also compiled an alphabetic thesaurus in which he explained the phrases, rites, doctrines, and heresies of the Greek fathers.[10] Under the entry "βασιλέια," Schweizer (or Suicer) relied extensively upon Chrysostom's homilies to support a standard seventeenth-century understanding of God's kingdom. According to Schweizer, God's kingdom is threefold (*triplex*), distinguished as his *regnum potentiae*, *regnum gratiae*, and *regnum*

---

[8] Chrysostom, *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Chrysostomi In Divi Pauli Epistolam ad Corinthios Priorem Homiliae XLIV*, 498; Chrysostom, *NPNF1*, 12:239–240. Chrysostom explains prior to this, "For 'do not,' saith [the Apostle Paul], 'because thou hast heard that He will abolish all rule, and authority and power,' to wit, the devil, and the bands of demons, (many as there are,) and the multitudes of unbelievers, and the tyranny of death, and all evils: do not thou fear as though His strength was exhausted. For until He shall have done all these things, "He must reign;" not saying this, that after He hath brought it to pass He doth not reign; but establishing this other, that even if it be not now, undoubtedly it will be. For His kingdom is not cut off; yea, He rules and prevails and abides until He shall have set to right all things." Chrysostom, *NPNF1*, 12:237.

[9] Johannes Arquerius, *Dictionarium Theologicum, Ex Sacrosanctis Bibliis Veteris Translationis Et S. Patribus...* (Basel: Johannes Oporinus, 1567), 479–480. For more on L'Archer, see Aug. Chenot, "Jean L'Archer: Ministre a Héricourt 1563–1588," *Bulletin historique et littéraire*, 33 no. 11 (1884): 481–493.

[10] Johann Caspar Schweizer, *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus e patribus graecis ordine alphabetico exhibens quaecunque phrases, ritus, dogmata, haereses ...*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: J. Henricus Wetstenius, 1682). Schweizer's references are from an eight-volume edition of Chrysostom's works compiled by Sir Henry Savile in 1612.

gloriae.[11] Explaining Christ's kingdom in particular, Schweizer argued there is patristic precedence (referencing Chrysostom) for making a distinction between the natural or essential kingship of Christ—which Christ possesses, in equality with the Father and the Spirit, over all creatures—and his personal or economical kingship.[12] Although Chrysostom did not employ the more technical distinctions of Schweizer when composing his homilies on 1 Corinthians, it is at least interesting to note that some contemporaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries themselves assumed that there was an organic connection between their own formulations of Christ's kingdom and that of the fourth-century Archbishop of Constantinople.

I.2.3. Augustine of Hippo: An Eschatological Tension Between Two Cities

Perhaps the greatest patristic authority that Reformed and Reformed orthodox theologians alike looked to was Augustine of Hippo (354–430). With the resurgence of ancient and classical sources owing to the *ad fontes* cry of humanism, Augustine's work was particularly esteemed by theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[13] Calvin, for example, would only depart from Augustine with great reluctance, choosing rather to make broad claims of affirmation; he writes, "If I wanted to weave a whole volume from Augustine, I could readily show my readers that I need no other language than his."[14]

It is not surprising then that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theologians often referenced Augustine's *City of God* (426) when juxtaposing the two kinds of people subject to God's divine rule.[15] In *De*

---

[11] This distinction—along with its variations—is further explained in Chapter Five.

[12] Schweizer writes, "Hic etiam *de Christi regno* pauca veniunt producenda. Illud duplex est; a. Alterum *naturale*, seu *essentiale*, vel *universale*, quod cum Patre & Spiritu sancto in omnes exercet creaturas. b. Alterum *personale*, quod etiam *oeconomicum* & *mediatorium* appellatur." See Schweizer, *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus*, I:668.

[13] See especially A. S. Q. Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility Of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[14] Calvin, *Inst*. 3:22:8. See Lane, *John Calvin*, 38.

[15] See Cornelis van der Kooi and Gijsbert van den Brink, *Christian Dogmatics: An Introduction*, trans. Reinder Bruinsma with James D. Bratt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017),

civitate Dei, Augustine differentiated humanity into two contrasting groups expressed by two separate loves: the church as opposed to all others. Commencing his writing shortly after the sacking of Rome—the *City of God* was the product of thirteen years of labor—Augustine argued in this monumental work that two cities, the *civitas Dei* and the *civitas terrena*, exist in antithetical relation.[16] According to Augustine, the stark opposition of these two cities or communions is a reality evident throughout all of history; as David VanDrunen notices, Augustine's two cities stand in perpetual tension. Furthermore, the tension of the two cities is an eschatological reality. As VanDrunen further notes, Augustine's *civitas Dei* and *civitas terrena* are divided ultimately as to their respective ends or goals (*telos*), and thus "there is no overlapping or dual membership."[17] Contrasting the two aims of the separate cities' citizens, Augustine wrote,

---

632–636, who discuss briefly the use of Augustine for the doctrine of the two kingdoms. For more on the reception and use of Augustine by the early Reformed, see Irena Backus, "Ulrich Zwingli, Martin Bucer and the Church Fathers," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2001), II:627–660. Backus notes that Zwingli, for instance, possessed Augustine's eight-volume *Opera* published in 1505–1506, as well as the 1515 Basel edition of Augustine's *De civitate Dei* and *De Trinitate*. Backus further notes that Zwingli referenced Augustine's writings 512 times within his own works. Contrary to the claims of this section, James Smith argues that Augustine's *City of God* is misappropriated by more recent advocates of the "two-kingdoms" doctrine. He argues, "Thus, Luther's two kingdoms are not Augustine's two cities; nor are they an extension or supplement or translation. They are different animals. Therefore, regarding this key question, Calvinists and neo-Calvinists are faced with a choice: to be Augustinian or to be Lutheran. They cannot be both." See his "'Reforming Public Theology," 122–137 (quotation from p. 128). While Smith is certainly correct in noting that Augustine's two cities are not identical to Luther's formulation, he fails in drawing an organic connection that allows for both continuity and discontinuity. Chapter Three will make the argument that Luther's two-kingdom theology is simultaneously an overlay of three dualities (one of these dualities being akin to the eschatological tension as taught by Augustine). Thus, while there is indeed discontinuity between Augustine and Luther on this point, it is not that their teachings are completely "different animals."

[16] English citations are taken from Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods, intro. Thomas Merton (New York: The Modern Library, 1950) [referenced by book and section number]. For further material on Augustine and *De civitate Dei* see especially Johannes van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's* City of God *and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities* (Leiden: Brill, 1991).

[17] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 27. VanDrunen's first chapter is especially helpful in assessing the many precursors to the Lutheran and Reformed formulations of the two-kingdoms doctrine; for much of this chapter I rely on and am indebted to VanDrunen's work.

"The one [city] consists of those who wish to live after the flesh, the other those who wish to live after the spirit; and when they severally achieve what they wish, they live in peace, each after their kind."[18]

Augustine believed the opposition of the two cities originated in the corruption of the unclean faction of angels that occurred at the beginning of time. Just as God in creation separated light from darkness, calling only the light good, so also the corrupt angels—that "unholy company"—separated themselves from the righteousness of God, determining to follow an evil course.[19] With Adam's diabolical deception, there arose then the formation of two cities: "Cain was the first-born, and he belonged to the city of men; after him was born Abel, who belonged to the city of God."[20] For Augustine it was significant that Cain was the one who built a worldly, temporal city, whereas Scripture does not record Abel's building of a material dwelling place. Rather, the saints below possess a heavenly city and are for the present sojourners on earth, waiting for the promised kingdom to be given to them.[21] As Augustine continued to unpack throughout his work, the eschatological tension of the two cities exists throughout all of human history, culminating in the climactic final judgment that will forever polarize the two cities' subjects. According to Augustine, eternal and fiery damnation awaits those who belong to the earthly city, whereas the believing saints are assured everlasting felicity.

---

[18] Augustine, *City of God*, XIV:1.

[19] Augustine, *City of God*, XI:9–20.

[20] Augustine, *City of God*, XV:1. Interestingly, Luther's formulation is strikingly similar to Augustine's here: "We must divide the children of Adam and all mankind into two classes, the first belonging to the kingdom of God, the second to the kingdom of the world. Those who belong to the kingdom of God are all the true believers who are in Christ and under Christ, for Christ is King and Lord in the kingdom of God, as Psalm 2 [:6] and all of Scripture says." See *LW* 45:88; *WA* 11:249. Elsewhere, Luther specifically credits Augustine and follows him in this area: "For Christ also calls Abel righteous and makes him the beginning of the church of the godly, which will continue until the end (Matt. 23:35). Similarly, Cain is the beginning of the church of the wicked and of the blood-thirsty until the end of the world. Augustine treats this story in a similar way in his book *The City of God*." See *LW* 1:252; *WA* 42:187. See also Chapter 5 of Lazareth, *Christians in Society*, entitled "Cain and Abel: Law Judges before God."

[21] Augustine, *City of God*, XV:1; cf. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini in Iohannis Evangelium tractatus CXXIV*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 36 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954).

Augustine's kingdom theology is not only developed in his *City of God*, but also treated in his exegetical writings; here he sets down an additional foundational layer for future Reformed interpreters. Francis Turretin, for example, cites Augustine's "Tractate 115" from his *On the Gospel of St. John* as evidence of the *present* reality of Christ's eschatological kingdom.[22] In his exegesis of John 18:33–40, Augustine notes Jesus did not say to Pilate, "'But now is my kingdom not' here, but [he said it] 'is not from hence.'" Seemingly contradicting his above-noted statements concerning the un-mixed division of the earthly and heavenly cities, Augustine continues, "For His kingdom is here until the end of the world, having tares intermingled therewith until the harvest; for the harvest is the end of the world."[23] Despite this present coexistence of these two kingdoms, however, Augustine reaffirms their radical divergence: "They were therefore of the world, so long as they were not His kingdom, but belonged to the prince of this world. Of the world therefore are all mankind, created indeed by the true God, but generated from Adam as a vitiated and condemned stock; and there are made into a kingdom no longer of the world, all from thence that have been regenerated in Christ."[24]

While the Reformers and Reformed orthodox adopted Augustine's eschatological antithesis in their descriptions of Christ's reign—even at times employing the language of two cities—it will become evident in the following chapters that they stressed much more positively the divine origin of the civil government alongside that of the spiritual.[25] Furthermore, whereas Augustine emphasized the line of division marked by the contrasting loves of the two cities, the Reformed orthodox in particular underlined the *singular* nature of Christ's kingdom, albeit one that is administered according to a twofold covenantal arrangement.

---

[22] Turretin, *IET* 2:489; *FTO* 2:429.

[23] Augustine, *On the Gospel of St. John* in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (Edinburgh; Grand Rapids: T&T Clark; Eerdmans, 1989), 7:424.

[24] Augustine, *NPNF1*, 7:424.

[25] Cf. VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 60–61.

I.2.4. Pope Boniface VIII and the Medieval Two-Swords Construct: Spiritual and Temporal Authority

A third, more negative, precursor to the Reformed and Reformed orthodox teaching concerning the *regnum Christi* is found in the medieval concept of the "two swords," most commonly associated with Pope Boniface VIII's *Unam Sanctam* (1302).[26] Although variations existed within this paradigm, the general assumption of the two-swords theory (based on Luke 22:38) was that Christ invested his representatives on earth with authority—his representatives wielded swords that exercised spiritual and temporal power.[27] In Pope Boniface VIII's estimation, both swords were given to the vicar of Christ, Christ's earthly representative and possessor of supreme authority under Christ. But since the pope was too holy, he could not administer the temporal sword; he therefore had to delegate this power to civil magistrates.

John Witte notes that even in Luther's day many of the "strong German bishops and ecclesiastical princes" operated on this hierarchical assumption.[28] The two-swords construct thus assumed that the lower orders are to be governed by intermediaries on behalf of the superior. As Boniface writes, "If, therefore, the earthly power can err, it shall be judged by the spiritual; and if a lesser power err, it shall be judged by a greater. But if the supreme power err, it can only be judged by God, not by man."[29] Lost is the antithesis of Augustine's *City of God*; the Reformers and Reformed orthodox ultimately rejected this theory, despite acknowledging that there are two distinct authorities representative of Christ's twofold government.

---

[26] "Unam Sanctam" in *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss, 3 vols. (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2003), I:745–747.

[27] VanDrunen notes Pope Gelasius I set forth a version of the "two swords' doctrine" in a letter to Emperor Anastasius (dated 494); the primary difference he sees between Gelasius and Boniface is that the latter placed both swords in the hands of the church, whereas the former placed them in the hands of the church and state respectively. See VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 32–36.

[28] John Witte, Jr. *Law and Protestantism: The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 109.

[29] "Unam Sanctam" in *Creeds and Confessions*, I:747; cf. VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 35–36.

I.2.5. Thomas Aquinas: "That the Office of Governing the Kingdom Should Be Learned from the Divine Government"

Although Thomas Aquinas (c.1224–1274) died shortly after his fiftieth year, his relatively brief lifespan left its indelible mark on the course of the Western church.[30] The "Angelic Doctor" (*doctor angelicus*) is most well-known for his two *summae* (his *Summa theologiae* and *Summa contra Gentiles*);[31] less familiar, however, is his opusculum addressed to the King of Cyprus, *De regno*, in which he defends a version of the two-swords theory based upon his definition of a true king and his kingdom.[32]

Drawing upon Aristotle's teaching concerning final causality, Thomas explains in *De regno* that a thing's governance is determined and defined by the same thing's end; "to govern," he therefore writes, "is to lead the thing governed in a suitable way towards its proper end (*ad debitum finem*)."[33] Thus, as Thomas gives example, a ship's captain governs the activity related to the ship's navigation because it is the captain's prerogative to lead the ship to its desired end—i.e., to a safe harbor. And yet, according to Thomas, some ends are higher than others; naturally, the

---

[30] For more on Aquinas's life and thought see Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: The Person and His Work*, Vol. I, trans. Robert Royal (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 2005); James A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas D'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Work* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1974). Also helpful is Eleonore Stump's succinct synopsis of Thomas's life in *Aquinas*, Arguments of the Philosophers (New York: Routledge, 2003), 1–32.

[31] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, ed. Thomas Gilby, 61 vols. (London and New York: Blackfriars and McGraw-Hill, 1964–80); S. Thomae De Aquino, *Summa Contra Gentiles* (Rome: Editio Leonina Manualis, 1934).

[32] Thomas, *Opera Omnia Iussu Impensaque, Leonis XIII. P. M. Edita* (Romae: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1882), 42: 83–191 (cited according to book and chapter). English citations are from Thomas, *On Kingship, to the King of Cyprus* (Westport, Conn: Hyperion Press, 1979). For more on this work see Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, I:169–171. Torrell identifies several historical problems when dealing with this text: (1) it is unsure who exactly the work was addressed to—Torrell notes three possible intended recipients depending on the date attributed to the work (c. 1267); (2) the authenticity of Thomas's hand in writing the work cannot be verified beyond Book II, 8 (formerly II, 4); and (3) the work, like his *Summa theologiae*, was never completed.

[33] Aquinas, *On Kingship*, I, 15. For more on Aristotelian teleology, and Thomas's appropriation of Aristotle, see Jordan D. Watts, "Natural Final Causality at the University of Paris from 1250–1360" (PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 2015), 112–155.

authority associated with the higher end is superior to that authority associated with the lower end.[34] Continuing his nautical illustration, Thomas reasons that the proper end of the ship's captain is superior to that of the ship builder, and thus it is the captain who must direct the construction of the ship performed by the carpenter.

But Thomas not only argued that there were varying ends with corresponding authorities, he also presupposed there was *one* continuum upon which every end, and consequently every authority, could be placed. While all things for Thomas find their end in God (i.e., *ultima beatitudo*), this continuum is made up of penultimate and ultimate ends.[35] According to Thomas, there are good things pertaining to this life that one strives after (health, things necessary for sustaining life, and learning), but there is preeminently a good external to the man (*bonum extrinsecum homini*) that one desires—namely, the *visio Dei*. Humanity's collective ultimate end is not health, money, or knowledge of truth, for then, he argues, respectively the physician, economist, or teacher would have to be made king.[36] As Thomas argues, since man's ultimate end is external to him, so also is ultimate government. His rationale why this ultimate government resides in Christ alone is worthy of fuller quotation:

> But because a man does not attain his end, which is the possession of God, by human power but by divine according to the words of the Apostle (Rom 6:23): "By the grace of God life everlasting"— therefore the task of leading him to that last end does not pertain to human but to divine government. Consequently, government of this kind pertains to that king who is not only a man, but also God, namely, our Lord Jesus Christ, Who by making men sons of God brought them to the glory of Heaven. This then is the government which has been delivered to Him and which "shall not be

---

[34] Thomas writes, "Now the higher the end to which a government is ordained, the loftier that government is." See Aquinas, *On Kingship*, I, 15.

[35] Although not original to him, I am drawing the language of "ultimate" and "penultimate" from David VanDrunen, who explains it more fully. See, for example, his "The Importance of the Penultimate: Reformed Social Thought and the Contemporary Critiques of the Liberal Society" *Journal of Markets & Morality* 9/2 (Fall 2006): 219–49.

[36] Aquinas, *On Kingship*, I, 15.

> destroyed" (Dan 7:14), on account of which He is called, in Holy
> Writ, not Priest only, but King. As Jeremiah says (23:5): "The king
> shall reign and he shall be wise." Hence a royal priesthood is
> derived from Him, and what is more, all those who believe in
> Christ, in so far as they are His members, are called kings and
> priests.[37]

Immediately following this defense of Christ's exclusive dominion over the
ultimate, Thomas affirms—in agreement with the two-swords doctrine—
that Christ's spiritual authority is invested in his ecclesiastical
representative:

> Thus, in order that spiritual things might be distinguished from
> earthly things, the ministry of this kingdom has been entrusted not
> to earthly kings but to priests, and most of all to the chief priest, the
> successor of St. Peter, the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff. To
> him all the kings of the Christian People are to be subject as to our
> Lord Jesus Christ Himself. For those to whom pertains the care of
> intermediate ends should be subject to him to whom pertains the
> care of the ultimate end, and be directed by his rule.[38]

Several things pertinent to this study of Christ's twofold kingdom can be
said by way of concluding this section on Thomas. First, he distinguished
between a twofold government defined by a twofold end—namely, an end
pertaining to this life and an end pertaining to the life to come. Second, all
of government, including government of temporal affairs, must direct
towards the one ultimate end (i.e., the *visio Dei*). Third, temporal and
spiritual government exist upon one continuum, with spiritual government
superseding that of temporal government. Fourth, Jesus Christ is the
supreme authority as he alone enables the attainment of the final end. Fifth,
the vicar of Christ, whose primary care concerns the ultimate end, exercises
supreme authority on earth on Christ's behalf. Later chapters will
demonstrate that Thomas's position was not adopted *in toto* by the
Reformed and Reformed orthodox—certainly the Reformed did not hold
that the vicar of Christ excercised supreme authority on behalf of Christ, and

---

[37] Aquinas, *On Kingship*, I, 15.
[38] Aquinas, *On Kingship*, I, 15.

the Reformed orthodox did not like Thomas place temporal and spiritual government on one continuum, with the spiritual superseding the temporal—even though a degree of continuity can arguably be detected.

I.2.6. William of Ockham

The final precursor briefly dealt with in this chapter is William of Ockham, who in the final years of his life wrote a great deal on political issues. In his *A Short Discourse on Tyrannical Government* (c.1340), Ockham denied the validity of the medieval two-swords theory—even labeling it heretical. He argued instead that the power to make societal laws resides in the common people, a right established by divine law. This power is then transferred to the civil leader (emperor) by the people.[39] Interestingly, Ockham delineates this power as a postlapsarian reality; before the Fall, all things were had in common and thus there existed a common *dominium*, but after the corruption of humanity a particular lordship (*dominium proprium*) was necessary. In other words, Ockham believed the power to appropriate or administer the temporal realm was granted by God as a necessary restraint of sin, a position strikingly similar to Luther after him.[40] Ockham therefore

---

[39] For example, after citing Augustine's exegesis of John 18:36 (Jesus' statement, "My kingdom is not of this world"), Ockham argues Peter himself did not claim temporal authority. Ockham writes, "It was useful for spreading the faith in blessed Peter's care, and for his reputation, that he should not claim temporal jurisdiction and rights of secular persons or assert that they were his subjects, but allow rulers of the world to enjoy their honors, following the example of Christ who (according to blessed John Chrysostom) 'did not deprive the world of its providence and rule.'" See William of Ockham, *A Short Discourse on Tyrannical Government*, ed. Arthur Stephen McGrade, trans. John Kilcullen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 2.16. Ockham also argues Pope John XXII's position is "unreasonable," "erroneous," and "heretical," for "it must first be known that the power of making human laws and rights was first and principally in the people; and hence the people transfer[red] the power of making the law to the emperor" (3.14). See also his *Dialogus inter magistrum et discipulum de imperatorum et pontificium potestate*, translated as *On the Power of Emperors and Popes*, trans. Annabel S. Brett (Durham: University of Durham, 1998). For more on Ockham's position see John Kilcullen, "The Political Writings," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*, ed. Paul Vincent Spade (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 305–25; VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 36–42. For the formative influence of Ockham's nominalist thought mediated through Gabriel Biel see especially Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (1963; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000 repr.).

[40] See especially *A Short Discourse on Tyrannical Government*, 3.7.

argued from Romans 13:1 (like Luther would later do) that God establishes the empire directly; temporal authority does not necessitate the mediation of the church, as Boniface VIII and Thomas believed. According to Ockham, there is a clear distinction between the authority given to the church and that given to the state; the clergy are responsible for spiritual matters, whereas the emperor is responsible for worldly concerns.[41]

While the political versus ecclesiastical slant of Ockham most likely influenced Luther's thought (the subject of the next chapter), Wright argues that Luther's concerns—like the concerns of the Reformed orthodox—were much broader than Ockham's: "Luther's broader view of Christian reality as existence in two separate realities or kingdoms did not issue from Ockham's treatment of the two swords." Wright continues, "There is no evidence that [Ockham] taught about such a distinction or connected it with law versus grace, visible versus invisible, or active versus passive righteousness."[42] Nevertheless, Ockham's repudiation of the medieval two-swords theory was likely instrumental for the more specifically political aspects of Luther's two-kingdoms distinction.[43]

I.2.7. Conclusion

The Lutheran two-kingdoms doctrine and the Reformed orthodox *duplex regnum Christi* distinction were not articulated without any historical precedent. Rather, they were developed with significant intellectual contribution (both positive and negative) from the early and medieval church. Chrysostom's two kingdoms, Augustine's two cities, the medieval two swords, and Ockham's critique of the medieval papacy are all examples

---

[41] Kilcullen summarizes Ockham: "In *spiritual* matters (i.e., matters relating to eternal salvation and peculiar to the Christian religion) that are *of necessity* (as distinct from those that are supererogatory or merely useful), the pope *regularly* has over Christian believers (not unbelievers) full authority on earth. In temporal matters he regularly has no authority at all (though he is entitled by divine law to a reasonable supply of temporal goods, not necessarily in the form of property, for this sustenance and for carrying out his duties." Kilcullen, "The Political Writings," 313.

[42] Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, 109.

[43] Wright comments: "Luther may have been influenced by Ockham when he addressed the specifically political aspects of his understanding of the two kingdoms." See Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, 109.

of this contribution. As such, the recognition of a duality in Christ's royal work is something that goes beyond the Protestant centuries—indeed, it is part of the history of the catholic church. As seen in the short overview of Chrysostom, for example, theologians of the fourth century already taught that the Son has both an eternal kingship and an appropriated kingship (the former over all creation, but the latter held temporarily over the faithful). To suggest that a two-kingdoms framework is particular only to the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, and has no organic connection to the early or medieval church, fails to do justice to the historical data.[44] And yet, as important as these early precursors were, Protestant theologians refined their belief in the duality of Christ's royal reign in significant ways. The following chapters seek to answer how. In what ways did the Reformers and Reformed orthodox relate the existence of Christ's regal authority to their theology of God, Jesus Christ, man, salvation, and the church? More specifically, what contributions did theologians make to this distinction in the sixteenth century, and how did these differ from those made in the seventeenth century? After recognizing the significant contribution of Martin Luther in the next chapter, the subsequent chapters trace the development of this doctrine as a particulary Reformed teaching. In doing so we can then ask questions such as, "What is the relationship or influence of specific Reformed perspectives, like that of covenantal theology, for the development of the twofold-kingdom doctrine?" Before considering the Reformed tradition, however, it is important to consider first this doctrine in Luther's theology.

---

[44] *Pace* Smith, "Reforming Public Theology," 122–137.

Chapter Three: Martin Luther and the Two-Kingdoms Doctrine

I.3.1. Introduction

This chapter[1] transitions to consider perhaps the most influential—and likely most controversial—figure concerning the doctrine of the two kingdoms, namely, Martin Luther.[2] Introducing his 1958 monumental essay on the subject, Heinrich Bornkamm suggested that in the prior two or three decades the doctrine of the two kingdoms "has been one of the most debated aspects of Luther's theology."[3] Certainly since the mid-1900's this much-debated discussion has not slackened; indeed, if Bornkamm then believed this topic "produced an almost unmanageable quantity of literature," surely the present landscape is even more confusing.[4] To some extent we have

---

[1] Parts of this chapter rely on a previous article of mine. I thank the editor of *Westminster Theological Journal* for allowing me to use this here. Cf. Jonathon Beeke, "Martin Luther's Two Kingdoms, Law and Gospel, and the Created Order: Was There a Time When the Two Kingdoms Were Not?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 73 (2011): 191–214.

[2] It is particularly in the relating of church and state that Luther's two-kingdoms distinction sparked the greatest debate. Historically, Luther has been accused of being both too conservative and too liberal; beginning with his contemporary Thomas Müntzer, many have criticized Luther for allowing the state an authoritarian role, whereas others, beginning with Peter Frarin in 1566, have suggested Luther allowed for the overthrow of civil order. At the heart of this debate lies Luther's two-kingdoms distinction. Cf. David M. Whitford, "*Cura Religionis* or Two Kingdoms: The Late Luther on Religion and the State in the Lectures on Genesis," *Church History* 73 no. 1 (March 2004): 41. For a more detailed account of this debate, see also the compilation of essays in *Lutheran Churches – Salt or Mirror of Society? Case Studies on the Theory and Practice of the Two Kingdoms*, ed. Ulrich Duchrow (Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977). As an aside, it can be noted here that Whitford's essay is in response to the thesis argued by James M. Estes that Luther's position shifted from the 1520's to the 1530's. Estes believes Luther's mature thought and Melanchthon's *cura religionis* were substantially similar and evolved in dialogue with each other. For Estes's contribution see his *Peace, Order and the Glory of God*, *passim*.

[3] Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms*, 1.

[4] Bornkamm, *Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms*, 3.

already noted the labyrinth of interpretations (or as Johannes Heckel described it in 1957, a "garden of errors" [*Irrgarten*]) that seeks to untangle Luther's exact understanding of the two kingdoms.[5] Already we have seen the errors of a reductionist or politicizing interpretation of Luther's thought, and therefore our task is to reflect accurately the whole of Luther's position. Given its significance within Luther's corpus, as well as its ever-growing consideration in secondary literature, it is impossible in this chapter to give a fully detailed, exegetical presentation of Luther's understanding of the two kingdoms; I must therefore rely on the summaries of others.[6] And yet, as this chapter seeks to accomplish, it is imperative to assess these secondary source formulations on the basis of selections from the German Reformer himself.

In order to arrive at a coherent and comprehensive evaluation of Luther's two-kingdoms doctrine, this chapter is divided into three primary sections. First, drawing on more contemporary studies of this doctrine, I will sketch a conceptual framework of Luther's two kingdoms. This section's aim is to answer terminological questions (i.e., to answer what Luther meant by *zwei Reiche* and *zwei Regimente*), and to argue for the multidimensional, complex character of Luther's two-kingdoms distinction. After providing this interpretive (more systematic) grid, the second section will draw on an early treatise of Luther (*Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed*), a work wherein the Reformer employs and applies his distinction just prior to the rise of the Peasants' Rebellion of 1524–1525. The concern of this section is to evaluate the preliminary definitions of the prior section by comparing them with the Reformer's own writings.

The third and final section will map Luther's two-kingdoms distinction alongside his teaching concerning the created order, especially considering his exegetical comments on the prelapsarian condition of Adam. Our primary concern in this final section will be to determine whether

---

[5] Johannes Heckel, "Im Irrgarten der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre. Zwei Abhandlungen zum Reichs-und Kirchenbegriff Martin Luthers," *Theologische Existenz Heute* 55 (1957): 3–39.

[6] A helpful analysis is found in W. D. J. Cargill-Thompson, *The Political Thought of Martin Luther*, ed. Philip Broadhead (Sussex and New Jersey: Harvester Press and Barnes & Noble, 1984). Especially pertinent is chapter 3 entitled "The *Zwei-Reiche-* and *Zwei-Regimente-Lehre*."

Luther used the distinguishing characteristics of the two-kingdoms doctrine to understand Adam's prelapsarian state. A significant question raised in this section asks whether Luther attributed a different use to the relative function of God's law before Adam's revolt as compared to the postlapsarian period, and if so, why this is important for his distinction. This section serves at least three purposes: (1) As we will rely largely on Luther's Genesis lectures, written much later in Luther's life, this section allows for a window into the reflections of a more "mature" Luther. (2) The placement of these two discussions side by side, a connection often overlooked in secondary scholarship, arguably allows for a fuller understanding of Luther's thought on the two-kingdoms distinction. (3) Finally, as later chapters will also investigate this developing doctrine in terms of Adam's sinless condition, we will be able to assess areas of continuity and discontinuity. This chapter concludes with summary observations and considerations as to how these arguments relate to the overarching thesis of this work.

I.3.2. Luther and the Two Kingdoms: A Conceptual Framework

I.3.2.1 Terminological Considerations and Three Dualities

In 1525, Luther seemingly was baffled that people did not know of or remember his teaching regarding the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world; in his own estimation, he had written about the two kingdoms so often that he was certain that no confusion should remain.[7] And yet, as already seen, many contemporary scholars regard this doctrine to be one of the most confusing aspects of Lutheran studies. This long history of attempting to untangle Luther's thought is in part owing to the slipperiness of the terms he used. Luther was not trained to be a systematician in the modern sense; his terms (*Reich*, *regnum*, *regiment*, *Welt*, *weltlich*) were not precisely defined or used in a univocal way throughout his writings.[8] The

---

[7] See Chapter 1.2.1. for the relevant quotation.
[8] Cf. Estes, *Peace, Order and the Glory of God*, 38n98. Timothy Wengert's analysis of Philipp Melanchthon's "Politics" is helpful in this regard. Wengert argues

terms "*Reich*" and "*regnum*," most often translated as "kingdom" or "realm," carry multiple (often overlapping) connotations, and Luther was not overly concerned to specify which meaning he intended. Much like their English translations ("kingdom" and "realm"), *Reich* and *regnum* can mean (1) the spatial boundaries of a domain; (2) the activity of a ruler (i.e., the ruler's reign or sovereignty); or (3) the subject(s) that are ruled.[9] *Regiment*, often translated as "government" or "governance," is a bit more nuanced in that it specifies the mode of rule or government, but its meaning too can be complicated given that a ruler's governance is often mediated through officials.[10]

Melanchthon "formalized" Luther's argument in his debate over the Erasmian attempt to conflate law and gospel, or the two kingdoms. Thus, rather than Melanchthon representing a significant shift from Luther's theology, Wengert argues Melanchthon's position was one of clarification, fully consistent with Luther's thought. In dependence on Luther, and on the basis of Colossians 2:23, Melanchthon argues for the existence of two kingdoms. Wengert quotes from Melanchthon's 1528 *Scholia*: "Therefore let us carefully discern these two kingdoms: the kingdom of the world and the kingdom of Christ, as we have urged many times up to this point. The kingdom of Christ is found in the hearts of the saints who according to the gospel believe that they have been received into grace on account of Christ, who are renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit and taste eternal life, who show forth their faith in good works and on account of God's glory do good to all, so that they invite many to knowledge of the gospel. They tolerate all things, nor do they allow themselves to take up arms in a desire for vengeance against those who have injured them. They obey the magistrates with great care, they hold public offices (if such are entrusted to them) with vigilance and courage. If duty demands, they punish the guilty and fight in battle. However, they do not rush in to seize public offices of their own accord, but if forced by their calling they take them up. Furthermore, the kingdom of the world, as I have often said, is a legitimate order that defends peace with the authority of magistrates, with laws, judgments, punishments and war." As Wengert effectively demonstrates, the debate Melanchthon had with Erasmus was not over "good letters" or the merits of rhetoric (a profitable enterprise in itself), but over the nature of the gospel. See Timothy J. Wengert, *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness: Philip Melanchthon's Exegetical Dispute with Erasmus of Rotterdam*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology, ed. David C. Steinmetz (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), ch. 7 [the quotation is from page 131]. Cf. Philipp Melanchthon, *Scholia in Epistolam Pauli Ad Colossenses* (Wittenberg: np, 1528), 69v*.

⁹ Robert C. Crouse, "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities: Mapping Theological Traditions of Church, Culture, and Civil Order," (PhD diss., Wheaton College, 2016), 39.

¹⁰ Cargill-Thompson notes the conceptual distinction (albeit an overlapping one) between *Reich* (realm) and *Regiment* (government): "In a sense the second is contained in the first or is a particular expression of the first, for the idea of '*Reich*', as we have seen, involves the idea of government, so that the two kingdoms are at once two realms and two orders of government. Nevertheless, at the risk of introducing a degree of precision which is perhaps somewhat alien to Luther's own mode of thought, it is possible, for purposes of analysis, to draw a distinction between the concept of the *Zwei-Reiche* in the broader sense of the two

Alongside this complexity of language, Luther's two-kingdoms doctrine is often mischaracterized as it entails three dualities—at times overlapping—that are not always properly understood. Drawing upon both Bornkamm and Cargill-Thompson, Robert Crouse has summarized the three dualities that together comprise Luther's two-kingdoms doctrine; he notes the first two are "parallel" dualities, and the final is an antithesis. The first duality recognizes that God has created two realms—earthly and spiritual—corresponding to the two human natures (body and soul).[11] Crouse notes that it is both "visibility" and "relationality" that distinguish these realms; in the earthly realm the human being operates and has relations openly and externally in the sight of and with others (*coram hominibus*), whereas in the spiritual realm the person operates and has relations invisibly and with God alone (*coram Deo*).[12] Crouse further notes that this first duality has a creative, rather than salvific, foundation. In this sense, all people (including prelapsarian Adam and Eve) belong to both realms.

The second duality corresponds to the first. Just as there is an earthly and spiritual realm, so too God has instituted an earthly and spiritual government (*das weltliche Regiment* and *das geistliche Regiment*). Crouse describes this dual governance as follows: "Spiritual government is exercised invisibly by God alone in direct relationship with the human soul or conscience through the Word. Earthly government is God's rule exercised visibly and indirectly through other human persons, targeted at the human body."[13] Admittedly, God's earthly governance is most often

---

realms of human existence, and that of the *Zwei-Regimente* in the sense of the two orders of government which God has instituted for these two realms of existence." Cargill-Thompson does warn, however, that this precision is "not reflected…in Luther's vocabulary." See his *The Political Thought of Martin Luther*, 42.

[11] The earthly and spiritual realms are respectively *das weltliche Reich* and *das geistliche Reich*.

[12] Crouse, "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities," 35–36. Crouse has seemingly adopted the terminology of *coram hominibus* (although he misspelled it as "*coram homnibus*") and *coram Deo* or *coram mundo* from Cargill-Thompson. As referenced in Section 1.2.1., Gerhard Ebeling also employed these descriptors in reference to Luther's two-kingdoms distinction. This is arguably a legitimate connection as Luther himself used these terms; for example, commenting on Genesis 10:8-9, Luther writes, "*Nam Moses diserte distinguit duos conspectus, alterum coram Deo, alterum coram hominibus. Quod igitur coram Deo bonum et iustum est, id mundus semper iudicat malum et iniustum.*" See *WA* 42:401.

[13] Crouse, "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities," 37.

associated with a sinful or fallen context (and the consequent need for the sword), and yet this dual governance, Crouse suggests, also finds its foundation in God's created order. This is an aspect that we will return to later in this chapter.

The third and final duality Crouse notes is an antithesis of "two peoples," an antithesis resulting from humanity's fall into sin. While the previous dualities admit of complementary or overlapping existence in two realms and under two governances, Luther's stark, eschatological contrast of the kingdom of God (*Reiche Gottes* or *Reich Christi*) and kingdom of Satan or of the world (*Teufels Reich* or *Reich der Welt*) denies any such corresponding existence.[14] Rather, in this duality there exists a clearly defined people redeemed by God as separate from a people under the power and sway of the Devil.[15]

Summarizing these three dualities, Crouse suggests that all three—two realms, two rules, and two peoples—are often collectively and equivocally referred to as Luther's "two-kingdoms doctrine," especially as the term *Reich* can legitimately refer to each duality.[16] And yet, despite his commendable desire to defend a holistic and comprehensive interpretation of Luther's two-kingdoms thought (in contrast to some who would argue it to be an ad hoc and semi-coherent response to the political and social pressures of the 1520s),[17] in the end Crouse fails to acknowledge that Luther's two-kingdoms thought is a simultaneous overlay of all three dualities. In other words, as argued more fully in the final section of this

---

[14] Crouse, "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities," 38.

[15] As Heiko Oberman argues in his monumental biography of the German Reformer, both Christ and the Devil were equally real for this man; in brushing aside this cosmic war, one inevitably brushes aside the hermeneutical key for understanding Luther. A modern Luther "in the mild glow of constant progress toward Heaven" is certainly anachronistic; what Oberman argues for in his unconventional biography is a Luther who lived "*sub specie aeternitatis*," one who constantly experienced the angst of the imminent, chaotic Last Days and the Devil's real and threatening presence. See Heiko A. Oberman, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil*, trans. Eileen Walliser-Schwarzbart (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989), especially 12 and 104.

[16] Crouse, "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities," 40–41.

[17] Crouse is closely following William Wright here who calls Luther's two kingdoms a "worldview." Cf. Crouse, "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities," 31.

chapter, without the presence of *each* of these three dualities held in tandem, Luther's own writings on the two kingdoms are unintelligible.

In order to substantiate his claims, Crouse argues that most basic to Luther's two-kingdoms thought is his distinction between "internal" (invisible) and "external" (visible), a distinction that is foundational to all of creation. Crouse thus argues, "The Edenic beginning of the two realms makes clear that Luther did not conceive of the two kingdoms strictly as the opposition of God to Satan or righteousness to sin. The original duality is not the result of sin; the two realms are more basic even than soteriology…. The two kingdoms are *built into creation*."[18] While it is certainly the case that Luther spoke of a bodily (visible) and spiritual (invisible) existence of sinless Adam and Eve, and of their earthly or external/public relationships as distinct from their spiritual or internal/private relationships, this is not the sum of Luther's two-kingdoms doctrine. Indeed, Luther's distinction is much more complex than a simple division of reality into external/internal categories. In the end, Crouse fails to provide any evidence where Luther specifically speaks of a *zwei-Reiche* and *zwei-Regimente* arrangement as existing prior to the entrance of sin, language that he saves for a postlapsarian context.

I.3.2.2 Further Conceptual Considerations

Crouse's analysis of the three dualities in Luther's two kingdoms thought provides a useful summary, and yet it is requisite to consider other descriptions of this distinction in order to grasp its full-orbed nature. John Witte gives a succinct summary of the two kingdoms (quoted here at length):

> God has ordained two kingdoms or realms in which humanity is destined to live, the earthly kingdom and the heavenly kingdom. The earthly kingdom is the realm of creation, of natural and civic life, where a person operates primarily by reason and law. The heavenly kingdom is the realm of redemption, of spiritual and eternal life, where a person operates primarily by faith and love.

---

[18] Crouse, "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities," 42 (italics added).

> These two kingdoms embrace parallel forms of righteousness and justice, government and order, truth and knowledge. They interact and depend upon each other in a variety of ways. But these two kingdoms ultimately remain distinct. The earthly kingdom is distorted by sin, and governed by law. The heavenly kingdom is renewed by grace and guided by the Gospel. A Christian is a citizen of both kingdoms at once and invariably comes under the distinctive government of each. As a heavenly citizen, the Christian remains free in his or her conscience, called to live fully by the light of the Word of God. But as an earthly citizen, the Christian is bound by law, and called to obey the natural orders and offices of household, state and church that God has ordained and maintained for the governance of this earthly kingdom.[19]

Assuming for the present Witte here presents a reliable summary of Luther's two kingdoms, it is immediately apparent that this can only be true given a fallen context. The earthly kingdom "distorted by sin" and "governed by law"; the heavenly kingdom, "renewed by grace" as the "realm of redemption" and thus ordered by "Gospel"; the presence of "faith"; the label of a "Christian"—all of these designations presume the historic entrance of sin through Adam's disobedience and the subsequent promise of redemption accomplished by the incarnate Jesus Christ. In short, presumably before sin, the multifaceted dimension of human life was uniquely integrated and centered in the *one* kingdom of God, a kingdom or realm wherein was inextricably interwoven earthly and spiritual existence. With the presence of sin, however, an *un*natural antithesis arose, resulting in God's two kingdoms.

---

[19] Witte, *Law and Protestantism*, 5–6; 105–106. Wright wrongly accuses Witte of politicizing Luther's two kingdoms since he "compared Luther's view of two kingdoms to Oliver Wendell Holmes's view of American law." See Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, 19n12. Witte's point, however, is not that Luther's two kingdoms equaled Holmes's jurisprudence, but that there was certainly an overlap in their respective positions such that both positively valued the existence of natural law. Cf. John Witte, Jr. "Between Sanctity and Depravity: Law and Human Nature in Martin Luther's Two Kingdoms," *Villanova Law Review* 48 no. 3 (2003): 727–762. Wright fails to acknowledge the holistic interpretation Witte proposes of the two kingdoms as evidenced in the cited quotation.

Before turning to Luther himself to verify the validity of this interpretation, it is helpful to note the comprehensive character Witte further attributes to the two-kingdoms framework. Far from being a simple political division between church and state, or even a categorization of things external vs. internal, he argues Luther's two-kingdoms doctrine was simultaneously a distinct ontology and anthropology.[20] Furthermore, he argues this doctrine "drew to itself" a distinctive ecclesiology, epistemology, and soteriology. First, as seen already with Crouse's analysis, all of reality—all things visible and invisible—is comprehended in Luther's two-kingdoms language. Luther's "ontological picture" then views reality as consisting of a heavenly, spiritual kingdom (wherein, given sin, only believers are members of this kingdom), and an earthly, natural kingdom (wherein both believers and unbelievers are members), both of which are governed by God. Secondly, Witte notes the two kingdoms entail a twofold nature of the redeemed Christian—as Luther often asserted, the Christian is *simul iustus et peccator*, simultaneously bound and free, "flesh and spirit, sinner and saint, 'outer and inner man.'"[21] As such, the Christian is a dual citizen (*Bürger zweier Reiche*) in the present age. Were Luther simply to emphasize the ontological distinction between the antithetical reigns of Christ and the Devil, his position would not be much different than Augustine's. And yet, Luther firmly held to the Christian's dialectic nature. As a justified saint, the Christian is a heavenly citizen, incorporated by the gospel; but as a sinner, the Christian remains an earthly citizen, called to obey the laws as set by earthly powers.[22]

---

[20] For what follows see Witte, *Law and Protestantism*, 89–105.

[21] For Luther's use of this language see for example his *The Sermon on the Mount* (1532) where, in his exegesis of Matt. 6:33 ("But seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well") he writes, "For our condition in the kingdom of Christ is *half sin and half holiness*. What there is in us that belongs to faith and to Christ is completely pure and perfect, since it is not our own but Christ's, who is ours through faith and who lives and works in us. But what is still our own is completely sinful. Yet under Christ and in Him it is concealed and blotted out through the forgiveness of sins; and daily it is put to death through the same grace of the Spirit, until we have died to this life altogether." See *LW* 21:205 (italics added); *WA* 32:469.

[22] In his 1539 disputation on Matt.19, 21, Luther states, "The Christian *qua* Christian moves within the first table of the law, but he also exists apart from the kingdom of heaven as a citizen of this world. Hence he has a dual citizenship, being subject to Christ through faith and to the emperor through his body." Cf. John R. Stephenson, "The Two

Thirdly, Luther taught the hidden church, the *communio sanctorum*, is wholly identified with the spiritual reign of Jesus Christ. On the other hand, the visible church is a mixed group, comprised of saints and sinners, and thus belongs for the present to the earthly kingdom.[23] Fourthly, Luther distinguished between the epistemological bases of law and gospel, of reason and faith, and he united these to the earthly and spiritual kingdoms respectively. Finally, Luther held there were two forms of righteousness, an "active" or proper righteousness and a "passive" or alien righteousness, which, in turn, corresponds to two types of justification: the former avails a civil righteousness before humans (*coram hominibus*), but the latter a spiritual righteousness before God (*coram Deo*).[24] As Witte demonstrates, Luther's two-kingdoms theory is thus connected to the whole of his theology.[25]

As necessary as this conceptual overview is for understanding Luther's teaching of God's two kingdoms, yet an element of caution must be employed: one must not conclude from the above overview that Luther used the two-kingdoms distinction as a systematic grid for organizing his theology. Rather, Luther assumed that it was basic for understanding human existence in a fallen world. For Luther, Christian or unbeliever; home, church, or state; one's vocation; the source of knowledge; relationships

---

Governments and the Two Kingdoms in Luther's Thought," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 34 (1981): 329. The Latin text reads, "*Christianus ut christianus est in prima tabula, solus extra regnum coelorum est civis huius mundi. Ergo habet utrumque politeuma, subiectus Christo per fidem, subiectus Caesari per corpus*." See *WA* 39.2:81, 16–18.

[23] For more on Luther's view of the church see especially Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Shultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), chapters 22–24 entitled "The Church as the Community of Saints;" "The Office of the Ministry;" and "The True Church and the Empirical Church."

[24] Cf. Luther's sermon *Two Kinds of Righteousness* (1519), in *LW* 31:297–306; *WA* 2:145–152. He writes, "There are two kinds of righteousness, just as man's sin is of two kinds. The first is alien righteousness (*iustitia aliena*), that is the righteousness of another, instilled from without. This is the righteousness of Christ by which he justifies through faith." Defining the second, he writes, "The second kind of righteousness is our proper righteousness (*iustitia propria*), not because we alone work it, but because we work with that first and alien righteousness."

[25] Arguably, Witte's summary is not holistic enough. Glaringly absent in his summative evaluation is any mention of how this doctrine affects Luther's eschatology. Luther's eschatological angst (*Anfechtungen*) cannot be overlooked in this regard, an angst that provoked much of Luther's definitive language of the Kingdom of God as opposed to the Kingdom of Satan.

between husband and wife—in short, everything is in one way or another subsumed under the sovereign, providential rule of God as expressed in his two kingdoms. At the heart of Luther's two-kingdoms doctrine thus lies his pastoral concern for a clear presentation of law and gospel, a message that affects every area of life.[26]

I.3.3. Luther and the Two Kingdoms: *Temporal Authority* (1523)

It is imperative then that Luther's holistic aim not be set aside when examining his particular treatises and writings that address the two-kingdoms doctrine. One such work is his *Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed* (1523).[27] As the subtitle suggests, Luther's concern in this work was to define and thus limit the boundaries of the secular ruler. *Temporal Authority* is divided into three parts: first, Luther defends the divine origin of the temporal authority; next, in the bulk of the treatise, he argues that life, property, and external affairs (as distinct from the inward activities of the soul and conscience) are the domain of the temporal government; and thirdly, Luther concludes with directives that the wise prince should follow.

It is important to note that this particular treatise was written shortly after Luther's return to Wittenberg—following his "abduction" and stay at Wartburg Castle—and just prior to the outbreak of the so-called "Peasants' War" of 1524–1525. Returning to Wittenberg, Luther witnessed the more radical tendencies of Karlstadt and his followers, as well as the attempts of his benevolent protector Frederick the Wise to curtail such reforms.[28]

---

[26] Cf. David C. Steinmetz, *Luther in Context*, 2nd ed. (1995; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 112–125.

[27] While emphasis here rests upon this one work (originally *Von weltlicher Oberkeit*, found in *WA* 11:229–281), Luther refers to and utilizes the two-kingdoms concept throughout his writings. For a sampling of such references, see Hugh Thomson Kerr, ed., *A Compend of Luther's Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943), 213–232. One must use Kerr's work with caution, however, as quotations are placed in *locus* format (something foreign to Luther), and they are divorced from their literary and historical contexts.

[28] Cf. Carl Trueman, "Luther and the Reformation in Germany" in *The Reformation World*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (London; New York: Routledge, 2000), 85–89.

Written within this broader context of political uncertainty, Bornkamm further notes that Luther was particularly prompted to write his *Temporal Authority* due to two seemingly unrelated events. First, Luther had recently received a copy of Count John Henry von Schwarzenberg's acclaimed work on capital punishment, *Lex Bambergensis* (1507). In a 1522 letter, Luther expressed to Schwarzenberg his approval of the work except "when you make the point that the use of the sword by temporal authorities can be made to agree with the gospel." He then indicated his express purpose to "publish a little book [*Schriften*] on this subject especially."[29] Presumably, Luther's *Temporal Authority* was this expected *Schriften*. Secondly, Luther's newly translated New Testament was forbidden by authorities in Ducal Saxony, and remaining copies were to be confiscated.[30] Both events, coupled with the looming threat of political crisis due to more radical calls for reform, caused Luther to question critically the proper functions of the God-given temporal authority.

Nearly three years after composing *Temporal Authority*, Luther reflected back on his work, boldly declaring, "Indeed, I might boast here that not since the time of the apostles have the temporal sword and temporal government been so clearly described or so highly praised as by me."[31] True to his word, Luther did elevate the office of the temporal leader, arguing from passages such as Romans 13:1, 1 Peter 2:13–14, Genesis 4:14–15, and Genesis 9:6 that the sword of judgment wielded by such leaders is a God-appointed sword.[32] Although Luther stated, "The law of this temporal sword has existed *from the beginning of the world*," he is clear that the temporal

---

[29] Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther in Mid-Career: 1521–1530*, trans. E. Theodore Bachmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 112.

[30] Bornkamm, *Luther in Mid-Career*, 113.

[31] *LW* 46:95; *WA* 19:625. The quotation comes from Luther's *Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved* (1526).

[32] Luther made the same point in his exegesis of Psalm 82, stating, "But Moses calls them [princes] gods because all the offices of government, from the least to the highest, are God's ordinances, as St. Paul teaches (Rom. 13.1); and King Jehoshaphat says to his officials (2 Chron. 19.6): 'Consider, and judge rightly; for the judgment is God's.' Now, because this is not a matter of human will or devising, but God Himself appoints and preserves all authority, and if He no longer held it up, it would fall down, even though all the world held it fast – therefore it is rightly called a divine thing, a divine ordinance." See *LW* 13:44; *WA* 31.1:191–192.

sword or government was instituted by God *because* of sin, as a necessary restraint on sin, and thus inaugurated by God in a postlapsarian context.[33] Because the sword serves this particular function, Luther held that Christians, members of Christ's kingdom, do not need the temporal government; because they are already righteous in Christ, they do not require the constraining, compelling function of the law as their desire excels the demands of the law.[34] Luther thus argued that it is unbelievers, those who strictly belong to the kingdom of the world, who are bound by the temporal government. The Christian, however, is not *bound* by law but willingly subjects him- or herself to it. The very different righteousness practiced by each, touched on above, thus follows: "For this reason God has ordained two governments: the spiritual, by which the Holy Spirit produces Christians and righteous people under Christ; and the temporal, which restrains the un-Christian and wicked so that—no thanks to them—they are obliged to keep still and to maintain an outward peace."[35] In brief, the operation of the Holy Spirit in the spiritual government produces righteousness in Christians before God (*coram Deo*), whereas the temporal government merely ensures righteousness before humans (*coram hominibus*).[36]

---

[33] *LW* 45:86 (italics added); *WA* 11:247. See note 76 below.

[34] *LW* 45:89; *WA* 11:249–250. Luther writes, "If all the world were composed of real Christians, that is, true believers, there would be no need for or benefits from prince, king, lord, sword, or law. 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. For this reason it is impossible that the temporal sword and law should find any work to do among Christians, since they do of their own accord much more than all laws and teachings can demand, just as Paul says in I Timothy 1 [:9], 'The law is not laid down for the just but for the lawless.'"

[35] *LW* 45:91; *WA* 11:251.

[36] Luther writes, "For this reason one must carefully distinguish between these two governments. Both must be permitted to remain; the one to produce righteousness, the other to bring about external peace and prevent evil deeds. Neither one is sufficient in the world without the other. No one can become righteous in the sight of God by means of the temporal government, without Christ's spiritual government." See *LW* 45:92; *WA* 11:252. Cf. Luther's *Commentary on Psalm 82* (1530), *LW* 13:72; *WA* 31.1:218, where he writes, "Thus we see that, over and above the righteousness, wisdom, and power of this world, there is need for another kingdom, in which there is another righteousness, wisdom, and power. For the righteousness of this world has an end, but the righteousness of Christ and of those who are in His kingdom abides forever."

But external peace or righteousness, the righteousness that is practiced before humans, is also a concern of the Christian. While Luther claimed the sword has no place among Christians themselves, the Christian must nevertheless promote the welfare of the temporal government. Specifically, this is necessary for the welfare of the community. He writes, "You are under obligation to serve and assist the sword by whatever means you can…[f]or it is something which you do not need, but which is very beneficial and essential for the whole world and for your neighbor."[37] Here Luther's directive is particularly forceful: when it comes to the Christian's personal concerns, this is the realm of gospel matters (or matters of God's inward kingdom), a realm that includes suffering abuse. But when it comes to one's neighbor, the good of the public, this is the realm of justice (or matters of the earthly kingdom). Luther thus writes:

> In the one case, you consider yourself and what is yours; in the other, you consider your neighbor and what is his. 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 neighbor. The gospel does not forbid this; in fact, in other places it actually commands it.[38]

This fits the dialectical nature of the Christian as discussed above; the believer is, as it were, "two persons." John Stephenson comments, "Luther accordingly distinguishes between two persons present within each believer:

---

[37] *LW* 45:95; *WA* 11:254. In his *On War Against the Turk* (1529), Luther also makes this point. After years of pressure, Luther is compelled to present his position on the ever-present threat of war from the Turkish forces. While in his 1518 *Explanations of the Ninety-five Theses* Luther argues that to fight against the Turks is paramount to opposing God, who visits iniquities with this rod (see *LW* 31:91–92; *WA* 1:535), he modified his position based on his assertion that the temporal government must protect the common welfare of its subjects. Thus, war *should* be waged on the Turks, but not under the ensign of the church; the pope's soldiers crying "*Ecclesia! Ecclesia!*" is nothing other than an affirmation of the Devil's *ecclesia*. Rather, war against the Turks, who hurt the interests of the community, ought to be conducted "at the emperor's command, under his banner, and in his name." Cf. *LW* 46:183–185; *WA* 30.2:128–130. For more on Luther and the Turkish threat see Gregory J. Miller, "Luther on the Turks and Islam," in *Harvesting Martin Luther's Reflections on Theology, Ethics, and the Church*, ed. Timothy J. Wengert, Lutheran Quarterly Books (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 185–203.

[38] *LW* 45:96; *WA* 11:255.

the Christian as he exists before God and for himself (*Christperson*), and the Christian in society (*Weltperson*), clad in a particular office (*Amt*)—for example, that of parenthood or governmental authority—which entails responsibility for others."[39] Christ's words of Matthew 5:39 ("Do not resist evil") apply then *only* to Christ's followers in the sense that they must not use the sword for their own welfare (as *Christperson*); this directive of Christ does not, however, negate the sword's legitimate use. The Christian is to support and even to participate in a proper application of the sword for the public good. And yet, this support of legitimate authority is to be conducted by the Christian as *Weltperson*. According to Luther, Romans 13 and Matthew 5 are in this manner reconciled.[40]

According to Luther, it follows then that leaders of the spiritual kingdom (God's shepherds) must not intrude on the domain reserved for leaders of the secular kingdom (God's executioners or hangmen), and vice versa.[41] Luther, however, believed that the bishops and princes of his day completely turned things "topsy-turvy"; he thus complains, "[The bishops and princes] neatly put the shoe on the wrong foot: they rule the souls with iron and the bodies with letters, so that worldly princes rule in a spiritual way, and spiritual princes rule in a worldly way."[42] While the bishops illegitimately rule souls by the sword, the princes dishonestly allow all manner of avarice and insurrection. This mingling of the two kingdoms is nothing less than the work of the Devil, as Luther adamantly avers:

> Constantly I must pound in and squeeze in and drive in and wedge in this difference between the two kingdoms, even though it is written and said so often that it becomes tedious. The devil never stops cooking and brewing these two kingdoms into each other. In

---

[39] Stephenson, "The Two Governments and the Two Kingdoms in Luther's Thought," 328.

[40] As indicated in the "Introduction" to Luther's *Temporal Authority* in *LW*, "many of Luther's sincere followers were perturbed about the scriptural injunction, 'Do not resist evil' (Matt. 5:39)." Was this a wholesale submission such that no resistance to secular leaders was possible? Cf. *LW* 45:77.

[41] *LW* 45:113; *WA* 11:268. "It pleases his divine will that we call his hangmen gracious lords, fall at their feet, and be subject to them in all humility, so long as they do not ply their trade too far and try to become shepherds instead of hangmen."

[42] *LW* 45:109; 116. *WA* 11:265; 270.

the devil's name the secular leaders always want to be Christ's masters and teach Him how He should run His church and spiritual government. Similarly, the false clerics and schismatic spirits always want to be the masters, though not in God's name, and to teach people how to organize the secular government. Thus the devil is indeed very busy on both sides, and he has much to do. May God hinder him, amen, if we deserve it![43]

In his exegesis of Psalm 101, Luther pointed to King David as an excellent example of a godly prince who wisely distinguished the two kingdoms; in spiritual matters David was a servant of the Lord, but in secular matters he judiciously ruled his people, thus promoting public justice. As Luther more fully develops in the final section of *Temporal Authority*, the judicious ruler must rely on reason, the equitable application of natural law, when dealing with his temporal realm.[44] This, of course, should not be for the ruler's own welfare, but for the public good. This model is precisely how Luther interpreted David's kingship, an assertion he proves from David's statement in Psalm 101:5a, "I destroy him who secretly maligns his neighbor."[45] Put simply, for matters not related to the soul, it is reason, law, and the voice of the heathen that are to be heard, but for internal matters, it is faith, gospel, and the voice of Scripture that is to be obeyed.[46]

---

[43] *LW* 13:194–195; *WA* 51:239.

[44] Luther's use of natural law in connection with the two kingdoms is an interesting study deserving more consideration. The common misconception of Luther that he was altogether against reason needs to be challenged. Rather, Luther believed reason had a specific place and served a specific purpose as he writes at the end of *Temporal Authority*, "Therefore, we should keep written laws subject to reason, from which they originally welled forth as from the spring of justice. We should not make the spring dependent on its rivulets, or make reason a captive of letters." See *LW* 45:129; *WA* 11:280. See also the helpful section in VanDrunen, *Natural Law*, 62–66. Also helpful, but more critical, is Carl E. Braaten, *Principles of Lutheran Theology*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 151–166. Braaten's primary concern is to distinguish an ecumenical basis for human rights, transcending the Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic traditions. He writes, "We have argued that the law (he does admit natural law has a "latent deism") is the common denominator for an ecumenical theology of human rights" (157; 159).

[45] *LW* 13:197–208; *WA* 51:241–250. For more on Luther's commentary on Psalm 101 (1534/35) see Estes, "Peace, Order, and the Glory of God," 193–205.

[46] Estes summarizes Luther's position on the value of heathen words: "Whoever wants to learn how to rule well in secular matters should read Homer, Virgil, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Livy, and the others who were God's heathen 'prophets' in secular affairs just as

From this overview of Luther's two kingdoms it is evident that he distinguished the two realms based on their two very different concerns: echoing the same distinction as found in Thomas in the previous chapter, Luther taught that the spiritual kingdom concerns itself with ultimate concerns as it relates to the gospel, whereas the earthly kingdom concerns itself with penultimate matters as it relates to the law. Although our analysis concentrated on Luther's 1523 treatise on *Temporal Authority*,[47] the importance of this distinction for Luther is clearly indicated in later works as well; thus, in his 1526 treatise *Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved*, Luther wrote:

> For God has established two kinds of government among men. The one is spiritual; it has no sword, but it has the word, by means of which men are to become good and righteous, so that with this righteousness they may attain eternal life. He administers this righteousness through the word, which he has committed to the preachers. The other kind is worldly government, which works through the sword so that those who do not want to be good and righteous to eternal life may be forced to become good and righteous in the eyes of the world (*coram mundi*). He administers this righteousness through the sword. And although God will not reward this kind of righteousness with eternal life, nonetheless, he still wishes peace to be maintained among men and rewards them with temporal blessings.[48]

According to Luther, to confuse the two kingdoms is to confuse law and gospel. Obedience to the law promises temporal rewards, whereas the gospel promises everlasting life. It is for this reason that Luther believed he must consistently "pound in and squeeze in and drive in and wedge in this difference between the two kingdoms."[49]

Moses, Elijah, Isaiah and others were his prophets in spiritual matters." See Estes, *Peace, Order and the Glory of God*, 204; cf. *LW* 13:199ff; *WA* 51:243ff.

[47] Highlighting the importance of this work, Bornkamm wrote of Luther's *Temporal Authority*, "This treatise of Luther's contains the sum total of his political ethics. Basically he did not alter it later on." See Bornkamm, *Luther in Mid-Career*, 117.

[48] *LW* 46:99–100; *WA* 19:629.

[49] *LW* 13:194; *WA* 51:239.

I.3.4. Luther on the Two Kingdoms and the Created Order

But was this "wedge" between law and gospel present from the beginning of time? Indeed, one must tread carefully to make the case that, on Luther's own terms, there was a time when the two kingdoms were not. In his book on Luther's two kingdoms, William Wright makes the following sweeping assertion, "The two kingdoms were part of God's creation ordinance."[50] Wright points to the following quotation from Luther as evidence: "Man was created for his physical life in such a way that he was nevertheless made according to the image and likeness of God—this is indication of another and better life than the physical…. Thus Adam had a twofold life: a physical and an immortal one."[51]

William Lazareth also seems to believe that Luther taught the two-kingdoms distinction was present throughout all of human history (i.e., even before the Fall). This is evident as Lazareth fails to distinguish the ethical demands placed on sinless Adam from those placed on his sinful descendants. For Lazareth, the historical and ethical (that is, matters *coram hominibus*) have always had a distinct *telos* from the spiritual and religious (that is, matters *coram Deo*). In Lazareth's estimation, since "religious synergism" is not possible after the Fall, neither is it possible before the Fall. Thus, he must assume that holy Adam was assured and could attain eschatological life entirely upon the basis of an evangelical promise. This is precisely how Lazareth interprets Luther's distinction between prelapsarian and postlapsarian law: "Luther is keen to rescue God's pre-fall command from antinomianism without resorting himself to an unevangelical legalism in treating the primal and eschatological law of creation (*lex non scripta*)."[52] To determine if Wright's and Lazareth's analysis on this question is correct, we turn now to Luther's exegesis of Adam's prelapsarian condition.[53]

---

[50] Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, 119.
[51] Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, 119. The quotation is from Luther's Genesis commentary found in *LW* 1:57; *WA* 42:43.
[52] Lazareth, *Christians in Society*, 65; 73.
[53] For this material see *WA* 42:1–176.

Indeed, at times it seems as though Luther suggested that a two-kingdoms framework began with creation:

> In a certain way we indeed have a free will in those things that are beneath us. By the divine commission we have been appointed lords of the fish of the sea, of the birds of the heavens, and of the beasts of the field. These we kill when it pleases us; we enjoy the foods and other useful products they supply. But in those matters that pertain to God and are above us no human being has a free will; he is indeed like clay in the hand of the potter, in a state of merely passive potentiality, not active potentiality. For there we do not choose, we do not do anything; but are chosen, we are equipped, we are born again, we accept, as Isaiah says (64:8): "Thou art the Potter; we Thy clay."[54]

Although the above comment is found in Luther's exegesis of Genesis 2:7, one must question whether he has a prelapsarian or postlapsarian condition in mind. In other words, is Luther here denying "active potentiality" to sinless or sinful humanity? Is he here likening Adam's condition to fallen humanity's, and thus insinuating that Adam had a bound will? It is significant to note that Luther had already introduced Adam's fall in his earlier comments of Genesis 1:11 and 26, suggesting one must not simply assume a sinless Adam is in view here.

To complicate the matter further, Luther often spoke of his own personal creation alongside that of Adam's; as the first article of his *Small Catechism* teaches, belief in God the Father as creator of heaven and earth includes the belief "that God has created *me* together with all that exists."

---

[54] *LW* 1:84–85; *WA* 42:64. In his exegesis of the first two chapters of Genesis, Luther often moves back and forth from Adam's good creation to the post-fall context. The quotation given here must be understood in context: Luther is cautioning against the danger of synergism, an application he derives from the statement that Adam was "a dead and inactive clod before he is formed by the Lord." Just prior to this quotation then Luther writes, "This helps us to learn something about the properties of free will, a subject with which our opponents concern themselves so extensively." It is imperative to determine which context Luther is describing here. From the reference to his opponents and the frequent reference to "we" being in a state of *passive* potentiality, it seems evident that Luther is describing a post-fall state. Even though his comments are in the context of Genesis 2:7, he is here not describing Adam's condition. This does not seem to be the same interpretation as found in Lazareth, *Christians in Society*, 65–66.

With this emphasis on the creation of the individual, Luther continues, "God protects *me* against all danger and shields and preserves me from all evil. And all this is done out of pure, fatherly, and divine goodness and mercy, without merit or worthiness of mine at all!"[55] Johannes Schwanke concludes that Luther here "links God's grace in the doctrine of creation with the doctrine of justification."[56] Yet, Schwanke is not careful to distinguish Adam's sinless condition from fallen humanity's; on Schwanke's terms, both prelapsarian Adam and sinful Luther (or any descendent of fallen Adam) need to hear the good news of justification. But was it the case that righteous Adam, apart from any merit or activity of his own, received God's fatherly and divine protection from all danger and temptation? More precisely, did Luther teach this? To better assess this question we turn now to a fuller analysis of Luther's comments on creation as found in the first several chapters of his Genesis lectures.[57]

According to Luther, the Genesis account recorded by Moses is to be believed as accurate. The creation of the world and all creatures in the space of six days is not a didactic allegory; it literally took place.[58] Adam's good and perfect creation is confirmed in the first chapters of Scripture. He

---

[55] *BC*, 354–55.1–2 (italics added).

[56] Johannes Schwanke, "Luther on Creation," in *Harvesting Martin Luther's Reflections on Theology, Ethics, and the Church*, ed. Timothy J. Wengert, Lutheran Quarterly Books (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 89.

[57] The Genesis lectures (*Enarrationes in Genesin*) reflect a full decade (1535–45) of the mature Luther's thought and are therefore an excellent source of material. It should be noted, however, the Genesis material is the stenographic notes of Luther's students, later edited and published in four volumes. On this basis Peter Meinhold, in his *Die Genesisvorlesung Luthers und ihre Herausgeber* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936), argued that these lectures were compromised due to the editing of later Melanchthonian supporters and are therefore not to be trusted. More recent scholars, however, have argued for the veracity and benefit of studying the Genesis lectures. Cf. Oberman, *Luther*, 166–67; John A. Maxfield, *Luther's Lectures on Genesis and the Formation of Evangelical Identity* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2008). Especially helpful is Maxfield's introduction "Why the Genesis Lectures?" wherein he notes Luther himself wrote a preface and postscript to the first edition of the Genesis lectures, thus signaling his approval of this work. See also David Whitford, "*Cura Religionis* or Two Kingdoms," 42–43n9.

[58] *LW* 1:5; *WA* 42:5. Here Luther writes against Augustine's belief of instantaneous creation, "We assert that Moses spoke in the literal sense, not allegorically or figuratively, i.e., that the world, with all its creatures, was created within six days, as the words read. If we do not comprehend the reason for this, let us remain pupils and leave the job of teacher to the Holy Spirit."

was a real man who had feet, eyes, and ears just as any man or woman does today, and yet Luther affirms he was holy and innocent; he was "intoxicated with rejoicing toward God and [he] was delighted also with all the other creatures."[59] As if to stress Adam's sinless state, Luther conjectures, "Before sin Adam had the clearest eyes, the most delicate and delightful odor, and a body very well suited and obedient for procreation."[60] Luther was convinced of the glorious creation of Adam; this man possessed the clearest intellect, memory, and will, and his "eyes were so sharp and clear that they surpassed those of the lynx and eagle…[and] he was stronger than the lions and the bears."[61] Without sin, Luther thought it may have even been possible that an infant, as is the case with chickens, could walk immediately after birth.[62]

　　　To the modern mind, Luther's imaginative and idyllic portrayal of sinless Adam is at best humorous; many would think it laughable. Yet, for Luther, an Adam who could "command a lion with a single word" was very different than the Adam who became "disfigured by the leprosy of sin."[63] Nowhere is this stark difference so clearly outlined as in Luther's discussion of the *imago Dei*; Luther stated, "My understanding of the image of God is this: that Adam had it in his being and that he not only knew God and believed that He was good, but that he also lived in a life that was wholly godly; that is, he was without the fear of death or of any other great danger, and was content with God's favor."[64] Luther cautioned against the medieval interpretation of the *imago Dei*, which, following Augustine, believed it to be in the soul's threefold power: memory, intellect, and will. This is a "dangerous opinion," opined Luther, for on this basis the Devil could also be said to possess the image of God. Rather, Adam's creation as the *imago Dei* was "something far different," something "unknown" to us, a foreign excellence that we can only relatively know because of our constant

---

[59] *LW* 1:94; *WA* 42:71.
[60] *LW* 1:100; *WA* 42:76.
[61] *LW* 1:62; *WA* 42:46.
[62] *LW* 1:102; *WA* 42:78.
[63] *LW* 1:64; *WA* 42:48.
[64] *LW* 1:62–63; *WA* 42:47.

experience of the opposite.[65] The *imago Dei* for Luther was much more comprehensive than the medieval interpretation; it encompassed the whole of Adam's life, his obedience before God (*coram Deo*) and his neighbor (*coram hominibus*). In fact, even Adam's perfect knowledge and dominion over the natural realm was part of this glorious image of God.

Luther's holistic interpretation of the *imago Dei* is closely connected to his discussion of Adam's original righteousness (*iustitia originalis*). While created holy and upright, maintenance of the *imago Dei* was entirely dependent on Adam's continued obedience. Thus, Luther defined original righteousness in terms of Adam's works of obedience: "If we follow Moses, we should take original righteousness to mean that man was righteous, truthful, and upright not only in body but especially in soul, that he knew God, that he obeyed God with the utmost joy, and that he understood the works of God even without prompting."[66] Paralleling his discussion of the *imago Dei*, Luther conceived of original righteousness in terms of Adam's obedience both before God (*coram Deo*) and before all humanity (*coram hominibus*); Luther writes, "It is part of this original righteousness that Adam loved God and His works with an outstanding and very pure attachment; that he lived among the creatures of God in peace, without fear of death, and without any fear of sickness; and that he had a very obedient body, without evil inclinations and the hideous lust which we now experience."[67] In the commission of original sin, however, Adam lost this original righteousness, thus destroying the *imago Dei*. Original sin is not simply concupiscence; rather, it is the complete reversal of God's plan for Adam.[68] For Luther, there is then an absolute divide between the

---

[65] *LW* 1:60–63; *WA* 42:45–47.
[66] *LW* 1:113; *WA* 42:86.
[67] *LW* 1:113; *WA* 42:86.
[68] Luther paints a bleak picture of fallen humanity: "Original sin really means that human nature has completely fallen; that the intellect has become darkened, so that we no longer know God and His will and no longer perceive the works of God; furthermore, that the will is extraordinarily depraved, so that we do not trust the mercy of God and do not fear God but are unconcerned, disregard the Word and will of God, and follow the desire and the impulses of the flesh; likewise, that our conscience is no longer quiet but, when it thinks of God's judgment, despairs and adopts illicit defenses and remedies. These sins have taken such deep root in our being that in this life they cannot be entirely eradicated, and yet the wretched sophists do not mention them even with a word. Thus, as it always is with

condition of sinless Adam and the condition of sinful humanity in fallen Adam. What could be accomplished by Adam's joyful obedience (i.e., a righteous condition before God and neighbor) could no longer be accomplished by the obedience of his descendants.

Luther's exegesis of Genesis 2:16–17, which relates God's command not to eat of the forbidden tree, illustrates most effectively the great difference he saw between the pre- and postlapsarian periods.[69] Interestingly, it is in his interpretation of this passage that Luther speaks of the prelapsarian establishment of the two estates—namely, church and home (the civil estate was unnecessary in this context).[70] It is important for Luther

---

correlatives, original sin shows what original righteousness is, and vice versa: original sin is the loss of original righteousness, or the deprivation of it, just as blindness is the deprivation of sight." *LW* 1:114; *WA* 42:86.

[69] The passage reads, "And He commanded him, saying: Eat from every tree of Paradise, but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil do not eat." For what follows see *LW* 1:103–110; *WA* 42:79–83.

[70] Church, home, and state (or the *ordo ecclesiasticus*, *ordo economicus*, and the *ordo politicus*) were the three estates or hierarchies Luther outlined by which God governs creation after the fall. Luther writes, "The first government (*Regiment*) is that of the home, from which the people come. The second is that of the 'state' (*civitas*), that is, the country, the people, princes, and lords, which we call the temporal government. These [two governments] embrace everything—children, property, money, animals, and so on. The home must produce, whereas the city must guard, protect, and defend. Then follows the third, God's own home and city, that is, the Church, which must obtain people from the home and protection and defense from the state. These are the three hierarchies ordained by God, the three high divine governments, the three divine, natural, and temporal laws of God." As quoted in John Witte, *Law and Protestantism*, 93; cf. *WA* 50:509. Cf. Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology*, 245–47. An all too common assumption, reproduced here by Lohse, is that Luther thought of the three orders (including the order of temporal government) as present from the beginning of creation. Kolb and Arand also make this assertion, but do not cite any positive reference; they write, "In his earlier years, Luther tended to treat this order [temporal government] as a postlapsarian necessity. But in his later years he recognized the human need for organization in society." Cf. their *Genius of Luther's Theology*, 61. The impression given here is that Luther did allow for civil government before the fall, whereas even in his later years he believed this to be a postlapsarian result. Paul Althaus argues along similar lines, stating, "Thus everything that Luther understands as secular government has a basis antecedent to the dominion of sin, that is, in the elementary necessities of this life." See his *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (1965; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 48. Luther consistently denied that the state has precedence before sin; in 1530, for example, Luther writes, "God will not have the world desolate and empty but has made it for men to live in, to till the land and fill it, as is written in Genesis 1:29, 30. *Because this cannot happen where there is no peace* [presumably, before the fall there was peace], He is compelled, as a Creator, preserving His own creatures, works, and ordinances, to institute and preserve government and to commit to it the sword and the laws." See Luther's

that the church was established before the home; this priority, he believed, demonstrates the promise of eschatological life for the prelapsarian, secular (physical) realm of the home.[71] Yet, as Luther was careful to point out, the church was established by a command of God; it was instituted by his law. The commanding word of God was Adam's Bible, a brief sermon as it were "written on a tablet [*tabula*]"—a likely allusion here to the Decalogue.[72] Luther believed God's command was specifically given to Adam on the sixth day. Adam would have then dictated this word of God to Eve, and then gathered the next day, the Sabbath, not around the tree of life, but around the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. If Adam had continued in his innocence, each Sabbath he would have gathered his family around this tree, the temple-grove that symbolized God's command. Luther described the nature of this hypothetical worship as follows:

> He would have admonished his descendants to live a holy and sinless life, to work faithfully in the garden, to watch it carefully, and to beware with the greatest care of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This outward place, ceremonial, word, and worship man would have had; and later on he would have returned to his working and guarding until a predetermined time had been fulfilled,

---

Commentary on Psalm 82, *LW* 13:45 (italics added); *WA* 31.1:192. For more on the three orders see *LW* 41:177–178 (*WA* 50:652–653); *LW* 3:217 (*WA* 43:30); *LW* 13:369–371 (*WA* 31.1:409–411).

More helpful in this regard is Mickey L. Mattox's *"Defender of the Most Holy Matriarchs": Martin Luther's Interpretation of the Women of Genesis in the* Enarrationes in Genesis, *1535–45*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, ed. Andrew C. Gow (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 87–91; 253–54. Relying on Bornkamm, Mattox correctly distinguishes between the dominion over creation and the government between and among humans. Dominion over creation was given to both male and female pre-fall, as Luther often asserts, but the establishment of the state is clearly for him a necessary result of sin.

[71] After describing the institution of the Sabbath in Genesis 2:3, Luther comments, "Adam would have lived for a definite time in Paradise, according to God's pleasure; then he would have been carried off to that rest of God which God, through the sanctifying of the Sabbath, wished not only to symbolize for men but also to grant to them." From this Luther concludes that secular and sacred (or physical and spiritual) were wed together: "Thus the physical life would have been blissful and holy, spiritual and eternal." See *LW* 1:80; *WA* 42:60. Compare this also with *LW* 1:103–04 where Luther claims that the church was created before the creation of Eve (and thus, before the creation of the home). "Thus the temple is earlier than the home, and it is also better this way." See *WA* 42:79.

[72] *LW* 1:105; *WA* 42:80.

when he would have been translated to heaven with the utmost pleasure.[73]

Luther did not imagine that Adam would have remained in his original created state, but that he would have been translated to a future life—assuming that he "faithfully," "carefully," and with the "greatest care" maintained his perfect obedience. Specifically, Adam was to continue his faithful service both in physical activities (tilling and guarding the garden) and spiritual duties (obeying the divine command not to eat of the forbidden tree). If Adam were to stray in the joyous demands set before him, duties that involved his activity both *coram Deo* and *coram hominibus*, the promised eschatological life would be cut off. Although Luther often described sinless Adam as one who found great joy in the performance of these duties, Luther did not shy away from the fact that Genesis 2:16–17 contains the verbal phrase "and the Lord commanded [*et praecepit Dominus*]."[74] While delighting in God's word, Adam was nevertheless called to obey this word. In the garden then it was *active* obedience that was required of Adam. No substitute, no blood sacrifice, was necessary. Luther wrote, "Only this [God] wants [of Adam]: that he praise God, that he thank Him, that he rejoice in the Lord, *and that he obey Him by not eating from the forbidden tree*."[75]

But, Luther asked, was it really possible that Adam's state was based to some degree on his obedience? Could it be true that God gave holy and righteous Adam a law to follow? Luther confessed that he once doubted this doctrine (*doctrina*) due to the shaking of a fanatic.[76] It may seem from 1

---

[73] *LW* 1:106; *WA* 42:80.

[74] *LW* 1:107; *WA* 42:81.

[75] *LW* 1:106 (emphasis added); *WA* 42:81. Luther does seem to contradict himself, especially on the subject of pre-fall sacrifice. He writes, "…on [the seventh day Adam] would have given his descendants instructions about the will and worship of God; he would have praised God; he would have given thanks; he would have *sacrificed*, etc." *LW* 1:79 (italics added); *WA* 42:60. Compare this to: "For [God] does not prescribe the slaughter of oxen, the burning of incense, vows, fastings, and other tortures of the body" (*LW* 1:106; *WA* 42:81).

[76] The reference here is most likely to John Agricola, the context being the Antinomian disputes. Cf. Maxfield, *Luther's Lectures on Genesis*, 153. Cf. *WA* 42:81, "*Porro hic monendi estis contra Pseudoprophetas, per quos Satan sanam doctrinam varie conatur depravare. Recitabo autem exemplum meae Historiae, quomodo a fanatico spiritu sub initia huius doctrinae sim vexatus.*"

Timothy 1:9—here Paul writes, "no Law has been given to the just"—and Romans 4:15, where Paul also writes, "Where there is no Law, there is also no transgression," that since Adam was just, no law was given to him. The logic continues: if there was no law given to Adam, then Adam's commission of original sin was really no sin at all! Luther condemns this as the scheming of the Devil (*studium Diaboli*). His answer to this devilish syllogism is consistent with our above analysis: the law Paul speaks of is altogether different from the law given to Adam. Luther states, "For nothing else follows from this [syllogism] than that the Law given to the unrighteous is not the same Law that was given to righteous Adam."[77] The law Paul speaks of, the law that condemns and kills, the law that states no person shall be justified by the works of the law, is a law inaugurated upon the commission of sin. Following Luther's own reasoning, it seems then that prelapsarian law could justify a person; that is, Adam's obedience to the law originally given him could demonstrate his righteousness. Although Luther does not state this explicitly here, his argument assumes this to be true, for, as he notes, the Antinomian fanatic fails on two accounts: "The first consists in this, that the Law before sin is one thing and the Law after sin is something else; the second consists in this, that 'righteous' does not have the same meaning after sin and before sin."[78] While Luther does not expand this point here, in keeping with his reasoning, it is not too much to say that the difference in righteousness he speaks of is the introduction of an *alien* righteousness imputed to Adam after the fall.

Until this point we have enumerated several distinctions Luther made concerning the state of Adam. According to Luther, Adam was created righteous, being the very image of God. And yet, while it was his joy to do so, Adam was required to maintain this righteousness by his active observance of God's law. His obedience directly affected his right relationship with God. No intermediary was given to act on his behalf. Based in part upon his complete and continued obedience, Adam could

---

[77] *LW* 1:109; *WA* 42:83.

[78] *LW* 1:109–110; *WA* 42:83, "*Est itaque in hoc Argumento vicium compositionis et divisionis, quia mutilus textus adducitur. Deinde est ibi dublex aequivocatio: Prima in eo, quod aliud est lex ante peccatum, et aliud post peccatum, Secunda, quod iustus quoque non eodem modo dicitur post peccatum, et ante peccatum.*"

expect a future, blessed life. Furthermore, as Luther makes clear, the creation of the church in paradise—an undivided and perfect church at that time—was the visible manifestation of Adam and Eve's promised consummate end. But it is also the case that Luther taught death would follow should Adam disobey God's law.[79] And yet we must question how all of this relates to Luther's broader distinction of God's two kingdoms.

Earlier in this chapter I addressed three overlaying dualities that characterized Luther's two-kingdoms distinction: two realms, two governances, and two peoples. This was also viewed in connection with aspects of Luther's theology. The unifying thread that seems to make sense of these three dualities, as well as the paradoxes within Luther's theology (i.e., law/gospel, active/passive righteousness, civil/spiritual justification), is not their simple existence, but their distinct purposes. In other words, basic to Luther's two-kingdoms distinction is not the natural existence of distinct visible/invisible realms (*pace* Crouse and Wright) embedded in creation, but the very different purposes behind such realms in a postlapsarian context. It is the different purpose of spiritual vs. earthly government, the different *telos* of law vs. gospel or active vs. passive righteousness that is most basic to Luther's two-kingdoms theology.

As seen from Luther's exegesis of Genesis, this radical difference of visible and invisible was absent from the sinless, paradisal church. Eschatological tension did not then exist because sinless Adam and Eve were not *simul iustus et peccator*. Earlier we demonstrated that Luther's distinction between the two kingdoms is tied to the distinction between law and gospel; the law's end is an active, external righteousness with temporal (penultimate) benefits, whereas the gospel grants a passive, spiritual righteousness with eternal (ultimate) benefits. Granting that this is fundamental to Luther's two-kingdoms distinction, a contradiction arises when applying this criterion to his comments on the prelapsarian order: the government of the Edenic unified kingdom was one that expressly connected law to the attainment of eschatological rest. To my knowledge

---

[79] Luther could not be clearer on this point: "Therefore if Adam had obeyed this command [to not eat of the forbidden tree], he would never have died; for death came through sin." *LW* 1:110; *WA* 42:83.

Luther never explicitly stated whether or not his two-kingdoms distinction applied to the prelapsarian created order; to assume like Crouse and Wright that it does, however, pits Luther against himself, signaling either a misunderstanding of his two-kingdoms distinction or of his doctrine of creation.

I.3.5. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing analysis, the assumption that Luther conceived of a natural, created distinction between the secular and spiritual kingdoms needs to be challenged. Earlier we alluded to Wright's, Lazareth's, and Crouse's defense of such an assumption; according to Wright, the two-kingdoms distinction was "basic to [Luther's] understanding of God's creation of man." The two parts of human life, the physical life of "eating, drinking, begetting, growing," and the spiritual life of the "quickening spirit," are for Wright evidence enough to assert a prelapsarian distinction of two kingdoms.[80] Embedded in this assumption is perhaps the fear of injecting a theology of works into the prelapsarian order; if the two-kingdoms distinction is so closely connected to that of law and gospel, it follows that if unmerited grace was operative in sinless Adam's case, a two-kingdoms framework existed from the beginning of time.

It is certainly the case that Luther's postlapsarian distinction of the two kingdoms denies a synergistic religion; indeed, Luther could not be clearer in his denial that fallen human beings are able to help their standing before God. According to Luther, the sinner's justification is based on grace alone, made possible through the perfect obedience of Jesus Christ. And yet, this radical distinction between law and grace is not reflected in Luther's analysis of sinless Adam. Rather, quite the opposite seems to be the case. Together with his spiritual duties of obeying God's prohibitions, Adam's physical and visible duties (guarding and tilling the garden)—his obedience to God's law—were in a real way connected to his promised attainment of future, heavenly life. To be sure, Luther held that this eschatological life

---

[80] Wright, *God's Two Kingdoms*, 118–19.

was based upon God's free and gracious promise to Adam. Nevertheless, Adam's realization of this promise was dependent on his obedience.

What Luther saw as a radical difference between the pre- and postlapsarian worlds was presented by later Protestant theologians in a much more systematic and covenantal framework. And yet, although the terminology continued to develop and change into the seventeenth century, a great deal of continuity is evident when comparing the content of Luther's postlapsarian two-kingdoms theology with later formulations. Luther's underlying concern in making his distinction of God's two kingdoms so sharp was to highlight the gospel message of free grace to fallen sinners; this, we will see, was also the case with later Reformed representatives. At the same time, numerous discontinuities will become apparent, especially as later Reformed orthodox theologians are considered. Despite the more holistic and soteriological aims of Luther's two-kingdoms thought, this distinction most often surfaced within an ecclesiological or political context. The emphasis of his two-kingdoms theology thus seems to lie in safeguarding the role or purpose of the church (or individual Christian) from that of the governing authorities. Later Reformed orthodox theologians, however, shifted the discussion of kingship and governance to the area of christology; as argued in Part Two, discussion of the person and work of Christ seems to be the favored place where this topic came to be treated. Before discussing these differences, the next chapter considers the contributions of two more significant early Reformers.

Chapter Four: Martin Bucer and John Calvin on Christ's Kingdom

I.4.1. Introduction

Recent scholarship has ably demonstrated that the two-kingdoms doctrine is not unique to Martin Luther. While indebted to and at times dependent on Luther, Calvin also advocated a two kingdoms—or more properly for Calvin, a twofold kingdom—distinction.[1] In his 1536 edition of the *Institutes*, Calvin, mirroring the same incredulity expressed by Luther as seen in the previous chapter, writes, "But whoever knows how to distinguish between body and soul, between this present fleeting life and that future eternal life, will without difficulty know that Christ's spiritual Kingdom and the civil jurisdiction are things completely distinct."[2] With Luther, Calvin believed the distinction he was making was fundamental to the Christian faith, and that it ought to be obvious to all who believe in Jesus Christ.

But were Luther and Calvin overly optimistic in their respective analyses of how Christ's kingship and governance ought to be perceived and taught? As already discussed with Luther, Calvin's theology of Christ's twofold kingdom was not a simplistic distinction between external (visible)

---

[1] As already indicated in Chapter One, and as will be seen throughout this chapter, Calvin's description of Christ's kingdom is nearly always in the singular; that is, he spoke of a *twofold kingdom* of Christ rather than *two kingdoms*. Calvin maintained this singularity of Christ's kingdom already in his 1536 *Institutes*.

[2] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536), trans. and ed. F. L. Battles (1975; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 6.35 [207] (hereafter *Institutes* [1536]). Cf. *Inst.*, 4.20.1 (2:1486). References to Calvin's original writings will cite from *Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. Guilielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, and Eduardus Reuss, 59 vols., *Corpus Reformatorum*, vols. 29–87 (Brunsvigae: C.A. Schwetschke et filium, 1863-1900) [hereafter *CO*]; *Joannis Calvini Opera Selecta*, eds. Petrus Barth and Guilelmus Niesel, 5 vols. (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1926-52) [hereafter *OS*]. The quotation here is from *OS* I:258–259.

and internal (invisible) things.[3] Indeed, it was more complex and holistic than this. In this chapter therefore I seek to articulate more fully and clearly Calvin's gospel-centered twofold-kingdom theology. Several questions will govern the direction of this chapter: How did this distinction fit within Calvin's understanding of the nature and task of the church? Furthermore, does Calvin's description of a distinct spiritual and civil kingdom presuppose the historic fall of humanity into sin, as well as the subsequent promise of redemption through the mediation of Jesus Christ? If so, does this realization help elucidate Calvin's meaning of a twofold kingdom? And finally, for Calvin, what is the role of civil government, and how does this factor into his twofold-kingdom distinction? This chapter will also much more briefly consider the contributions of Martin Bucer (1491–1551), an often overlooked colleague of Calvin. Various points of commonality and distinction will be noted between these two Reformers.

In order to address these questions, this chapter is divided into five major sections. Before providing a fuller examination of Calvin's views, this chapter will first briefly examine Martin Bucer's *De Regno Christi*; while Bucer never expressly used the terminology of "*duplex regnum*" within this work, it is clear that he, like Calvin, assumed a distinction was to be made between the "Kingdom of Christ" and the "kingdoms of this world."[4] As Matthew Tuininga suggests, it is important to consider Bucer's development—"reminiscent of Luther's two kingdoms theology"—when understanding Calvin's thought "because it was within the context of

---

[3] Matthew Tuininga helpfully argues against the tendency to make this simplistic distinction. He writes, "Calvin does not say here [*Institutes* 3.19.15] that one kingdom is invisible and unmediated while the other is outward and mediated, as some have argued. The fundamental distinction here is not a distinction of visible and invisible realms, in that sense. Rather, when Calvin compares a government that pertains to the soul with a government that pertains to the present life he is thinking primarily of an eschatological distinction between what is eternal in the human being (i.e., the soul) and what is passing away (i.e., the mortal body). When he says that one kingdom resides in the inner mind while the other pertains to outward behavior he is contrasting a power that transforms and orders people by regenerating them inwardly (proclamation of the gospel) with a power that can only coerce or manipulate (civil government)." See Matthew Tuininga, "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine, Part Two: John Calvin," *Reformation 21*, www.reformation21.org/articles/the-two-kingdoms-doctrine-part-two-john-calvin.php#sthash.6s3LPJvK.dpuf (accessed July 31, 2015).

[4] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 115.

Bucer's influence that Calvin worked out his own views."[5] Next, I will discuss Calvin's treatment of the twofold kingdom as found in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, noting here its place and significance in the 1536 edition of the *Institutes*, and commenting on its subsequent development, expansion, and definitive placement in the final 1559 edition. After establishing the redemptive and non-redemptive characteristics that Calvin attributes to the spiritual and civil kingdoms respectively, in the third section, I will contrast this with his treatment of sinless Adam's state, focusing here on Calvin's commentary and sermons on Genesis. The question this section addresses is whether Calvin's twofold kingdom arrangement is necessarily postlapsarian, and, if so, why this is important. Fourth, this chapter will examine several concrete ways in which Calvin's twofold kingdom theology was implemented in the ecclesiastical and political life of Geneva; the question raised here is whether or not Calvin was consistent in the application of his theology (or, better yet, whether his *ideal* for Geneva was consistent with his theology, assuming he could not implement everything he desired). Fifthly and finally, based on this theological and contextual reading of Calvin, I will draw several systematic conclusions concerning Calvin's twofold-kingdom theology.

I.4.2. Martin Bucer: *De Regno Christi*

Martin Bucer's last and final work, *De Regno Christi*, was given by the Strasbourg Reformer as a "New Year's gift" to the young King Edward VI (it was presented in 1550, but not published until 1557).[6] After decades of service as a churchman in Strasbourg—several of these years had

---

[5] Tuininga, *Calvin's Political Theology and the Public Engagement of the Church*, 56.

[6] See the editorial comments in Wilhelm Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, The Library of Christian Classics v. 19 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 157–158. In the dedicatory preface to Edward VI, Bucer acknowledges the tradition of theological instructors giving some token of appreciation to the king at the beginning of the year. He thus presents this "small service" to the king, thanking him for welcoming him and his colleague Paul Fagius (both exiled from Strasbourg), for providing him a teaching position as Regius Professor of Theology at Cambridge, and for supplying him a gift of twenty pounds whereby Bucer could buy a stove to warm his "frail body, exhausted….by age and broken by sickness" (174–175).

overlapped with Calvin when the latter was banished from Geneva—Bucer composed this work after also being exiled from his home country. In summary, this gift to the English king represents Bucer's plan so that the Reformation might penetrate every aspect of English life.[7] As Van 't Spijker notes, although some have labelled this a utopian work, nevertheless "the deepest motives of his theology and work come to their full development here."[8] While much more can be done exploring Bucer's views, only a brief analysis is possible here; consideration of this mature theological statement thus provides us with a momentary glimpse of the Strasbourg Reformer's thought.

De Regno Christi is divided into two books of unequal length. Especially in the opening chapters of Book One, Bucer outlines what he thought is common to and what distinguishes the "Kingdom of Christ" and the "kingdoms of this world." He notes that this theological distinction is necessarily acknowledged at the outset in order that "we may more clearly and surely realize what the nature and power of the Kingdom of Christ are, and what is necessary for its restoration among us."[9] In the remainder of Book One, Bucer gives his theological conception of the church as well as Christian government. The bulk of the work is contained in Book Two; here Bucer provides a series of laws meant to guide the Christian prince in

---

[7] Martin Greschat describes Bucer's intention in writing *De Regno Christi* as follows: "He aspired to nothing less than the radical, comprehensive renewal of England that was to begin with religious reform and would be followed by a reshaping of social and moral conditions, as well as a recasting to the economic and administrative structures of the country." See Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 239.

[8] Willem Van 't Spijker, "Bucer's Influence on Calvin: Church and Community," in David F. Wright, ed. *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 43. Pauck implied that *De Regno Christi* is utopian in his book *Das Reich Gottes auf Erden* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1928), something for which he was severely criticized. He defended this opinion, clarifying that he believed Bucer's work to be utopian, not because Bucer intended it as such—indeed, Bucer believed his program of Reformation was implementable—but because "a critical historian cannot come to any other conclusion about the feasibility of Bucer's program of social reform than that it was largely unrealistic and, in this sense, Utopian." See Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 164n16.

[9] Martin Bucer, *De regno Christi: Libri Duo 1550*, ed. F. Wendel, Martini Buceri Opera Latina, 15 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955), 6 [hereafter *RC*]. Cf., Martin Bucer, *De Regno Christi Iesu servatoris nostri...* (Basel: Johannes Oporinus, 1557), 16. English is from Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 179.

establishing the Christian religion in his realm. These laws include statements on the sanctification of Sundays, poor relief, education, marriage and divorce, and the judicial system.[10] Indeed, as Wilhelm Pauck comments, *De Regno Christi* contains a "program that is remarkable because it advocates the reformation of religion not only in the context of worship and the Church but also [as it] relates it to the whole common life."[11] As the whole of this work cannot be examined, several items are especially critical for our consideration. First, it is important to reflect on the names (and the significance of these names) that Bucer associates with the kingdom of Christ. Second, the points of commonality and points of distinction that Bucer gives between the kingdom of Christ and kingdoms of this world merit attention. Within this subsection, some expression must be given to the specific role Bucer attributed to the magistrate in implementing the restoration of the kingdom of Christ—the expressed goal of *De Regno Christi*.

I.4.2.1. Bucer's Terminology and Its Significance

In the first chapter of *De Regno Christi*, Bucer delineates three names that Scripture ascribes to Christ's kingdom: "the Kingdom of God," "the Kingdom of Christ, the beloved Son of God," and "the Kingdom of Heaven."[12] Bucer was confident that these names themselves, given as they were by God, were "most appropriate, descriptive, and meaningful," and

---

[10] Pauck suggests that Bucer must have written his work hastily as there are many repetitions throughout, and large sections (such as the section on marriage and divorce [largely omitted in his translation!]) were supposedly reduplicated from earlier treatments. See Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 159. Selderhuis argues, however, that "evidence for this supposition is…lacking." He rather believes that Bucer wrote this long regulatory section on marriage with the specific context of England in mind. See Herman J. Selderhuis, *Marriage and Divorce in the Thought of Martin Bucer*, Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, vol. 48, trans. John Vriend and Lyle D. Bierma (Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999), 113n245.

[11] Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 163.

[12] Although the English translation provides one scriptural passage for each name (respectively Matthew 6:33, Ephesians 5:5, and Matthew 3:2), these verses are included in square brackets in the critical edition, indicating they were not originally included. Cf. Bucer, *RC*, 4; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 176–177.

that a study of them would aid in a clear grasp or fuller understanding of Christ's kingdom.

With the nomenclature "Kingdom of God," Bucer believed that since God alone is "good, wise, and powerful (*solus Deus bonus sit, solus sapiens, solus potens*)," these attributes are also rightly predicated of his kingdom or rule. Goodness, wisdom, and power may be exercised to some degree in earthly kingdoms or rule, but these virtues are found in greater fullness and perfection (*plenius atque perfectius*) in Christ's kingdom since "only in his Kingdom can those things which ought to be done by royal rule be plainly perceived."[13] For Bucer, the third term, *regnum coelorum*, clearly articulates that Christ's kingdom neither consists of nor originates from this world, but it is of heavenly origin where King Jesus sits at the Father's right hand. Reminiscent of Luther's language, and referencing Philippians 3:20 and John 15:19, Bucer remarks that although the kingdom of Christ is within us who are of this world, "our citizenship (πολίτευμα) ought to be in heaven, as God has chosen us from this world."[14] This third term also indicates that Christ's kingdom revolves around a gospel invitation: through faith in Jesus Christ, participants are, with resurrected bodies, assured of an eternal, blessed, and enjoyable life with God.[15] This, as noted later in this chapter, is a theme that Calvin emphasized in his description of Christ's kingdom.

Bucer gives his lengthiest explanation of the second descriptor, the "Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, Beloved Son of God." He notes here that the same virtues implied in the title "Kingdom of God" are also wrapped up in this second name—for indeed, the Son is "of the same nature as the Father"—but more specifically this designation highlights the humble nature of Christ's kingdom that he incurred in his incarnation. Rejected and despised in every way, this lowly king's followers were "unsophisticated,

---

[13] Bucer, *RC*, 4; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 177.

[14] Bucer, *RC*, 6; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 179. Luther's theology had considerable influence on Bucer's (as did the thought of Erasmus). Bucer first met Luther after hearing the German Reformer's Heidelberg Disputation in 1518. Selderhuis notes that Bucer "intensely" studied the works of Luther, especially the so-called three "Reformation Hauptschriften" of 1520. See Selderhuis, *Marriage and Divorce*, 54–55.

[15] Bucer, *RC*, 6; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 179.

inept, and inexperienced in the affairs of men," and who, like their master, were "sorely afflicted with hunger, thirst, and all manner of injury."[16] Despite this "deep humiliation and rejection"—indeed, in the very midst of his extreme want and affliction—Bucer yet notes that this humbled king "truly reigned and exercised wonderful power, not only over all material and spatial things and bodies, but also over minds (*animi*)."[17] In other words, although King Jesus humbled himself even to the point of death (succumbing to the judgment of Pontius Pilate's power [*publica potestas*]), nevertheless he maintained universal power. This regal authority, Bucer specified, was not limited to the material or spatial, but it comprehensively extended to the immaterial/spiritual as well. Indicative of this all-encompassing power, Bucer notes not only how the "true citizens of the Kingdom" followed Jesus Christ "most eagerly wherever he went," but also how Jesus with a simple nod or word controlled his enemies "who were furiously intent upon killing him."[18] And yet, comprehensive as this kingdom is, for Bucer the goal of Christ's kingdom centers on the church; its purpose is for the gathering and final salvation of God's elect people through the gospel message, such that they might "live well and happily both here and in the time to come."[19] As further elaborated in Part Two of this dissertation, Bucer's definition aligns with the characterization of Christ's twofold kingdom as given by many of the Reformed orthodox.

I.4.2.2. Points of Commonality and Distinction and the Role of the Magistrate in Restoring Christ's Kingdom

Bucer devoted the second chapter of *De Regno Christi* to seven comparisons between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdoms of this world; he opines "if these examples are religiously considered…it will easily be seen what

---

[16] Bucer, *RC*, 5; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 177; 178.
[17] Bucer, *RC*, 5; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 178.
[18] Bucer, *RC*, 5; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 178.
[19] Bucer, *RC*, 54; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 225. Special note should be given to the concise definition Bucer here gives to the kingdom of Christ. Provided here is a summary of this definition. Bucer's recurring use of the phrase "live well and happily (*bene beateque vivant*)" is further noteworthy. This is likely a phrase owing to Bucer's humanist training. Cf. Selderhuis, *Marriage and Divorce in the Thought of Martin Bucer*, 51–52.

the Kingdom of Christ has in common with the kingdoms of the world, and what is proper to the Kingdom of Christ, and how they are conjoined and how they should serve each other in mutual subordination."[20] Each of the seven comparisons has a parallel structure in which Bucer suggests a point of commonality and point (or points) of distinction. Thus, for example, in the first comparison Bucer notes that the kingdom of Christ and the kingdoms of the world both have one person who exercises power of government. This difference is apparent, however: the kings of the world must use representatives as they cannot be everywhere present, whereas Christ, though he chooses to "use ministers, and specific kinds of offices for his work of salvation," does not need representatives since he is present with his people everywhere and at all times.[21] In the third comparison, Bucer mentions the necessity of discipline in both kingdoms, and yet in the *regnum mundi*, rulers are (as directed by God) to use "beatings, whippings, prison, exile, and various forms of execution" to rid the commonwealth of open and rebellious persons. Such means are not operative in the *regnum Christi*, however. Rather, "chains of repentance" and the "word and Spirit" lead the curable person back to Christ, whereas unrepentant persons are left in their evil ways.[22]

Particularly interesting are Bucer's second and seventh comparisons; within these two points, Bucer summarizes what he believes to be the role of the civil leader in relation to Christ's kingdom. Already in the spring of 1533, nearly twenty years prior to his writing of *De Regno Christi*, Bucer formulated sixteen articles for the city of Strasbourg that expressed his desire for the city's policies; the last three articles addressed the civil magistrate. Article 14 reads as follows:

> The civil authorities, who exercise the sword and the highest outward power, are servants of God; they ought, therefore, to direct all their abilities, as God in his law has commanded and as the Spirit

---

[20] Bucer, *RC*, 20; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 191.
[21] Bucer, *RC*, 6–7; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 179–180.
[22] Bucer, *RC*, 9; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 181. For a full-length treatment of the importance of discipline in Bucer's thought, see Amy Nelson Burnett, *The Yoke of Christ: Martin Bucer and Christian Discipline*, Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, vol. 26 (Kirksville: Northeast Missouri State University, 1994).

of Christ himself teaches and urges in all whom he leads, to the end that through their subjects God's name be hallowed, his kingdom extended and his will fulfilled—so far as they can serve thereto by virtue of their office alone. Therefore the spirit of those who want the authorities not to concern themselves at all with Christian activity, is a spirit directed against Christ our Lord, and a destroyer of all good.[23]

Although Bucer was not successful in implementing this ideal in Strasbourg, it nonetheless summarizes well his position respecting the magistrate's role in religion, a position that was not altogether different from what he proposed in the second chapter of *De Regno Christi*.[24]

Bucer's second point of commonality and distinction between Christ's kingdom and the kingdoms of this world is a strong defense of the God-ordained duty given to the civil leader "to establish and promote [*instituere et referre*] the means of making their citizens devout and righteous." As Bucer emphasizes, kings of this world ought to suffer "dangers, exile, and even death itself" for the purpose of shepherding God's people in this way. Referring to 1 Corinthians 10 and 13, he states that the magistrate's goal is thus the "building of their faith and salvation," and not their "destruction."[25] And yet, despite this common goal shared by the administration of these kingdoms, Bucer is careful to distinguish the limitations of the kings of this world. Comparing the earthly king's work to that of a farmer—who cuts down useless trees, rids the field of briars and thorns, and prunes and nourishes the plants in the field—Bucer restricts the magistrate's role to external matters in the "field of the Lord" (i.e., magistrates are not able "to purge the hearts of men" or "endow them with

---

[23] As quoted by Martin Greschat, "The relation between church and civil community in Bucer's reforming work," in David F. Wright, ed. *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 17. It is likely that Bucer had the likes of Antonius Engelbrecht in mind who argued, on the basis of Luther's *On Secular Authority*, that civil leaders should not use the public sword in defense of the church or to promote its wellbeing. See Tuininga, *Calvin's Political Theology*, 57.

[24] Tuininga notes that although the sixteen articles were formally adopted by the city of Strasbourg, they were never practically implemented. See Tuininga, *Calvin's Political Theology*, 57.

[25] Bucer, *RC*, 7; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 180.

true piety and righteousness").[26] In contrast to the earthly king's role, it is only "Christ our King" who, through his death, gives inward life to the seed; it is "he himself alone who regenerates his subjects, and leads those dead in their sins to a life of righteousness."[27]

In his seventh and final comparison of worldly kingdoms to Christ's kingdom, Bucer indicates that they are to practice mutual submission one to the other. He writes, "Just as the kingdoms of the world are subordinated to the Kingdom of Christ, so also is the Kingdom of Christ in its own way subordinated to the kingdoms of this world."[28] Using Christ's earthly life as an example, and drawing on Romans 13, Bucer believed that the kingdom of Christ—and in this context he clearly identifies the "kingdom of Christ" with those in the church[29]—must subject itself to the state (*respublica*) not only by paying taxes, but also by patiently observing its laws, yielding to even unjust judgments, and diligently meeting all duties given them by the civil authorities.

In contrast to the subjection exercised by the church, Bucer gives a lengthier treatment of the earthly kingdoms' submission to the kingdom of Christ. This, Bucer clarifies, is the case of "true kingdoms" and "true kings"—it does not describe the action of tyrannical leaders. Much like Heinrich Bullinger and others who drew upon Old Testament kings (e.g., David, Hezekiah, and Josiah) as examples,[30] Bucer claimed that although

---

[26] Burnett writes, "Bucer certainly granted the Christian magistrate an important place in promoting the spiritual welfare of its subjects, but in the exercise of Christian discipline its tasks were limited and largely punitive. Through its use of civil discipline, it was to prevent, deter, or punish that which hindered true doctrine and piety. By taking action against those who deviated in faith or morals, it kept the church from harm. The magistrate also had more positive, although indirect, supervisory responsibilities. …But Bucer emphasized that these responsibilities and the motives underlying civil discipline *were quite different from* the pastoral duties and goals of the ministers in exercising Christian discipline." Burnett, *The Yoke of Christ*, 7.

[27] Bucer, *RC*, 8; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 180.

[28] Bucer, *RC*, 14; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 186.

[29] This is clear from the preceeding phrase "Christ wills that *his own*" (italics mine).

[30] Using the examples of "holy kings and princes" from the Old Testament, Bullinger, in the *Second Helvetic Confession*, affirmed "that the care of religion [*religionis cura*] belongs especially to the holy magistrate." *SHC*, XXX. In his *Decades*, Bullinger expounds this argument further. Using the likes of Solomon, Asa, and Josiah, Bullinger argued that the care and ordering of religion does not belong to bishops alone. Contrary to

kings may help establish and restore the church when it is vitiated and depraved, on the other hand, when its ministers are established in their rightful office, true kings "humbly hear the voice of Christ from the ministers and respect in them the majesty of the Son of God, as [these ministers] administer not their own but only the words and mysteries of Christ, the words and mysteries of eternal life."[31] Citing Isaiah 49, Bucer believed that true kings are thus to guard, nourish, and foster true religion, taking care that "suitable priests" hold office and that Christ's subjects are catechized in the way of obedience.[32]

Bucer acknowledged that this ideal of the "true king" was not always a reality; indeed, for many years in the early church, God willed that "worldly tyrants" ruled instead with the intent that "the citizens of the Kingdom of Christ [i.e., Christ's elect]" should acknowledge and rely on the powerful authority and reign of Jesus Christ. Bucer concluded that this rule of Christ, sometimes more present or visible than at other times, outlasts and outshines the fading power and authority of "petty governments." Christ

---

those who might relegate these examples to the old covenant, Bullinger responds, "The men of this opinion ought to prove, that the Lord Jesus and his apostles did translate the care of religion from the magistrate unto bishops alone: which they shall never be able to do." Cf. *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*, vol. I, ed. Thomas Harding, intro. George Ella and Joel R. Beeke (1552, 1849, Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2004 repr.), II:7, 326. As mentioned in Chapters 7 and Chapter 8 respectively, both Francis Turretin and David Dickson also followed this line of argumentation from the example of Old Testament kings.

[31] Bucer, *RC*, 16; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 188.

[32] Bucer, *RC*, 17, 19; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 188, 190. Isaiah 49:23a was commonly used to argue for the magistrate's role in religion. This particular interpretation of this passage carried over into the seventeenth century. Thus, Johannes Wollebius, commenting on the power of the church as opposed to that of the magistrate, held that the object of the former is "the members of the Church only," concerning itself with the "soul," whereas the magistrate's power has as its object "any man" and concerns itself with the "body and outward goods." Wollebius continued, however, affirming that the magistrates "are the Churches [*sic*] nursing-fathers, as they are the keepers of the two Tables of the law, as they preserve Churches and Schools, and defend the Truth." See Johannes Wollebius, *The Abridgment of Christian Divinity: So exactly and Methodically compiled, That it leads us, as it were, by the hand To the Reading of the Holy Scripture, Ordering of Common-Places, Understanding of Controversies, Clearing of some Cases of Conscience*, trans. Alexander Ross. 2nd ed. (London: T. Mab for John Saywell, 1656), 226–227. Cf. Johannes Wollebius, *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* (Oxford: H. Hall, 1657), 178–179.

"our King," Bucer ensures, "gathers, protects, and feeds his flock in the midst of wolves," a reality that will endure until the end of the world.[33] Throughout his description of the *regnum Christi*, it is clear that Bucer distinguished a citizenship of the world as distinct from a citizenship of Christ's kingdom. The former was for Bucer natural and temporary; the latter supernatural and everlasting. Much like Calvin's description that will be considered next, Bucer's primary line of demarcation between these two kingdoms centers on the gospel: entrance into the kingdom of Christ is by hearing and believing the gospel.[34] Nevertheless, Bucer stressed (even more so than Calvin) that the kings and leaders of the worldly kingdoms ought to concern themselves with the care, protection, and promotion of religion. Apparently for Bucer, and for Calvin as will be seen, these beliefs did not involve self-contradiction.

I.4.3. The Twofold Kingdom of Christ in Calvin's Thought: *The Institutes*

As indicated in previous chapters, language that intimates a twofold aspect of Christ's kingship and governance is not unique to Calvin. Nevertheless, it is not the case that Calvin simply parroted any one of the figures already considered. Like Luther, Calvin believed a careful distinction between the two aspects of Christ's kingdom—the one spiritual and eternal, in contrast with the other as political and temporal—is necessary for a clear presentation of the gospel. And yet, as will be demonstrated in the following sections, Calvin, more than Luther, tied his twofold-kingdom distinction to a

---

[33] Bucer, *RC*, 17; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 188–189. Bucer further writes, "The people of Christ, 'a royal priesthood, a holy nation, the special people of God,' ought to rely only on Christ its King and they should not be disturbed if the *petty governments of the world* are permitted to be in the hands even of savage tyrants." Bucer, *RC*, 20; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 191.

[34] This distinction is also evident throughout Chapters 3–5 of *De Regno Christi*. To cite one example from these chapters, Bucer, commenting on Psalm 2, writes, "[David] teaches that this Kingdom [of Christ] is a kingdom of proclamation, that our Lord Jesus is the only Christ and Son of God, whom the Father brought forth for this Kingdom when he raised him from the dead. …Therefore we should note here that where this proclamation of our Lord is *absent*, neither he nor his Kingdom is present." Bucer, *RC*, 45; Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer*, 216–217.

suffering, persecuted, and thus resident-alien or pilgrim church. Arguably, this connection was much more solidified by the time Calvin wrote the final edition of his *Institutes*.[35]

Interpreters of Calvin have often commented on the consistency and breadth of study evident in the successive editions of the *Institutes*. One biographer, comparing Calvin's *magnum opus* to a "gigantic edifice," writes:

> The *Institutes* is built over time, a cathedral in which every pillar, every pilaster is endowed with a history. A primitive cord goes back to 1536; it has the charm, the sturdiness of the Romanesque churches…. The edition of 1539–41 adds to this structure a patristic, or more precisely Augustinian, porch…. The third great version was completed in 1559, after several intermediate stages. The text is now four and a half times longer than the original.[36]

Throughout his entire career, Calvin tweaked, amplified, and reflected upon the structure and content of his *Institutio*, not fully satisfied until its fifth and final edition of 1559.[37] While Calvin added to and modified his twofold-kingdom distinction, most of his comments regarding this distinction are affirmed from the first and carried forward until the final edition.[38]

---

[35] For the purposes of this section, a comparison of Calvin's 1536 and 1559 editions will suffice as a consideration of the intermediate editions does not add anything significant to the particular argument made here.

[36] Bernard Cottret, *Calvin: A Biography*, trans. M. Wallace McDonald (1995; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 310.

[37] The subtitle of the final edition reads "*Basic instruction in the Christian religion, freshly set out in four books, and divided into four chapters according to the fittest method, and so greatly enlarged that it can almost be regarded as a new work*." Calvin also writes in his preface to the reader, "In the first edition of this work of ours I did not in the least expect that success which, out of his infinite goodness, the Lord has given. Thus, for the most part I treated the subject summarily, as is usually done in small works. But when I realized that it was received by almost all godly men with a favor for which I never would have ventured to wish, much less to hope, I deeply felt that I was much more favored than I deserved. Consequently I thought that I should be showing extreme ingratitude not to try at least, to the best of my slender ability, to respond to this warm appreciation for me, an appreciation that demanded my further diligence. Not only did I attempt this in the second edition, but each time the work has been reprinted since then, it has been enriched with some additions. Although I did not regret the labor spent, I was never satisfied until the work had been arranged in the order now set forth" (*Inst.*, "John Calvin to the Reader" [1:3]; *OS* III:5).

[38] As shown below, however, while the comments remain substantially the same, they are reorganized, thus reflecting a certain degree of development in Calvin's thought.

I.4.3.1. Calvin on the Twofold Kingdom: The Institutes (1536)

Calvin introduced the subject of a twofold kingdom and government in his sixth and concluding chapter of the 1536 *Institutes*. This final chapter is composed of three related sections or essays: on Christian Freedom, Ecclesiastical Power, and Political Power.[39] Having treated the Ten Commandments (ch. 1), the Apostles' Creed (ch. 2), the Lord's Prayer (ch. 3) and the sacraments (chs. 4–5), Calvin argues at the beginning of the sixth and final chapter of his *Institutes* that his summary of gospel teaching would be incomplete without an explanation of Christian liberty as it relates to ecclesiastical and political power.[40] Combating the varied responses of his day to the doctrine of Christian freedom—the "wild tumults" or "unbridled license" of the Anabaptists and the disdain or suppression of Christian freedom (presumably of the Sorbonne theologians)—Calvin argues in this sixth chapter, "Unless this freedom be grasped, neither Christ nor gospel truth is rightly known."[41] Calvin's articulation of a twofold kingdom in 1536 must be understood then as primarily polemical; according to Calvin, both the Sorbonne theologians (addressed especially in his second essay, "On Ecclesiastical Power") and the Anabaptists (addressed especially in his third essay, "On Political Power") failed to recognize the divine institution of *two* distinct—albeit related—aspects of Christ's kingdom. Calvin argued that the Sorbonne theologians merged and confused these aspects by usurping unwarranted power and authority to themselves, and so illegitimately instated numerous laws and ordinances that they deemed to be necessary for salvation. On the other hand, Calvin warned against the Anabaptist response, which, he believed, denied the legitimacy of the civil

---

[39] Cf. Ford Lewis Battles, *Interpreting John Calvin*, ed. Robert Benedetto, intro. I. John Hesselink and Donald K. McKim (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), 110–116.

[40] At the head of this chapter Calvin writes, "We must now discuss Christian freedom. No summary of gospel teaching ought to omit an explanation of this topic" (See Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 6.1 [176]; *OS* I:223). As Calvin closely connected this topic with his preceding chapters, arguably Battles unjustly divorces this chapter from the preceding five in his classification of Chapters 1–5 as Calvin's "catechetical" work and Chapter 6 as Calvin's "apologetic." See Battles, *Interpreting John Calvin*, 104; 110–111.

[41] Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.1 (176); cf. *OS* I:224. For the reference to the Sorbonne theologians see *Institutes* (1536), 6.14 (185).

kingdom.[42] As Calvin increasingly made clear, the two extreme positions of Catholicism and Anabaptism thus committed a twofold error: the denial of Christ's twofold kingdom was a theological error (contrary to the gospel and Christian freedom), while at the same time it was civil disobedience (a rejection of the divinely appointed office of the king).[43]

Admittedly, in 1536 Calvin's primary charge against both the Catholics and Anabaptists was that they misunderstood Christian liberty—that is, they erred theologically. According to Calvin, Christian freedom defined by and given in the gospel consists of three things: freedom from the just demands of the law, freedom of conscience to obey the law eagerly and willingly, and freedom to use or to leave things indifferent. The redeemed Christian does not stand under the curse of the law, to be condemned by its stringent requirements. As Calvin analogized, Christians

---

[42] Calvin's position against the Anabaptists did develop somewhat as he became better acquainted with their teachings. In 1536 Calvin was convinced that the Anabaptists generally "not just reject the magistrates, but cast off God that he may not reign over them" (*Institutes* [1536], 6.41 [210]; cf. *OS* I:262). In 1544, after receiving a translation of the *Brüderliche Vereinigung* (the *Schleitheim Confession* of 1527), Calvin recognized their wide diversity. Responding to the Anabaptist confession, Calvin classified the Anabaptists into "two principal sects (*deux sectes principalles*)": the first who recognize Scripture and, apart from their "many perverse and pernicious errors (*beaucoup d'erreurs mauvais et pernitieux*)," Calvin can agree with them on certain points, but the second group is a "labyrinth" of "absurd views" and are labeled by Calvin "the Libertines." See Calvin's *Brieve Instruction pour armer tous bons fideles contre les erreurs de la secte commune des anabaptistes*, ed. by Mirjam van Veen (Ioannis Calvini Opera Omnia denuo recognita [hereafter *COR*], series IV, volumen II), (Librairie Droz: Genève, 2007), 38; cf. *CO* 7:45–142 (quotations from 53); cf. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines*, trans. and ed. Benjamin W. Farley (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), 44–158. In this work of 1544, Calvin recognized that some Anabaptists affirmed the divinely appointed office of the magistrate; nevertheless, Calvin argued this is simply a pretext: "I care nothing for their fine pretexts by which [the Anabaptists] hide their blasphemy in saying that [the office of the magistrate] is 'an ordinance of God.' For the sum of it is this: whether it is a holy office and can be performed by believers, or, indeed, if a man in coming to it is corrupted by it?" (See *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, 80). Calvin's judgment of 1536 concerning the Anabaptist view of civil authority is substantially unaltered in 1544, and yet he is cognizant of the distinctions amongst the "Libertines." Calvin wrote an additional work directed against the Libertines entitled *Contre la secte phantastique et furieuse des Libertins qui se nomment sprituelz*, ed. by Mirjam van Veen, *COR*, series IV, volumen I; Cf. *CO* 7:143–248. For the English of the *Brüderliche Vereinigung* (Brotherly Union or Schleitheim Confession) see the translation provided by John H. Yoder in *The Legacy of Michael Sattler* (Scottsdale: Herald, 1973), 34–43.

[43] As argued more fully in Section I.4.5., this realization alleviates some of the perceived inconsistencies in Calvin's application of his twofold kingdom theology.

are not like fearful servants bound to masters who require the "exact measure of their tasks," but, rather, Christians are "sons, who are more generously and candidly treated by their fathers, [and] do not hesitate to offer them incomplete and half-done and even defective works, trusting that their obedience and readiness of mind will be accepted by their fathers."[44] As the Christian's freedom is purchased by Christ, Calvin concluded it is a great injustice to pile up a multitude of unnecessary observances (contrary to the Sorbonne theologians' position). Carefully distinguishing between the necessary submission to a weaker brother (Romans 14) and the unnecessary submission to the "rigor of the Pharisees," Calvin writes:

> Now, since believers' consciences, having received the privilege of their freedom…have, by Christ's gift, attained to this, that they should not be entangled with any snares of observances in those matters in which the Lord has willed them to be free, *we conclude that they are released from the power of all men*. For Christ does not deserve to forfeit our gratitude for his great generosity—nor consciences, their profit. And we should not put a light value upon something that we see cost Christ so dear. For he valued it not with gold or silver but with his own blood (I Peter 1:18–19), so that Paul does not hesitate to say that Christ's death is nullified if we put our *souls* under men's subjection (cf. Gal. 2:21).[45]

The imposition of the law, practiced by some "savage butchers (*carnifices*)" of the church (here Calvin has the Catholics in mind), unjustly binds the Christian, troubling his or her conscience.[46] Nevertheless, contrary to the Anabaptists, Calvin taught that the Christian is free from the power of all men *only* with respect to those things pertaining to the soul. It is at this point, in order to combat the two extremes of legalism (freedom of the conscience through obedience to the law) and civil antinomianism (freedom of the conscience through negligence of the law), that Calvin introduced his twofold-kingdom distinction.

---

[44] Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.3 (178); cf. *OS* I:225–226.
[45] Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.12 (183–184) [italics added]; cf. *OS* I:232.
[46] Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.14 (184); cf. *OS* I:233.

The 1536 placement of Calvin's concise definition of a twofold kingdom is structured such that it unites his section on Christian freedom and the following two sections or essays. Thus, transitioning from his thoughts on Christian freedom to a discussion of ecclesiastical and political power, he writes:

> Therefore, in order that none of us may stumble on that stone [of legalism or antinomianism], let us consider that 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 civil life that must be maintained among men. These are usually called the "spiritual" and the "temporal" 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 honorably, and temperately. For the former resides in the mind [*animus*] within, while the latter regulates only outward behavior. The one we may call the spiritual kingdom, the other, the political kingdom. Now these two, as we have divided them, must be examined separately; and while one is being treated, we must call away and turn aside the mind from thinking about the other. There are in man, so to speak, two worlds, over which different kings and different laws have authority.[47]

---

[47] Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.13 (184); cf. *OS* I:232–233; *CO* 1:204 [418–419]: "Ad eum ergo lapidem ne quis impingat, animadvertamus, duplex esse in homine regimen: alterum spirituale, quo conscientia ad pietatem et cultum Dei instituitur, alterum politicum, quo ad humanitatis et civilitatis officia, quae inter homines servanda sunt, homo eruditur. Vulgo appellari solent, iurisdictio spiritualis et temporalis; non impropriis nominibus, quibus significatur priorem illam regiminis speciem ad animae vitam pertinere, hanc autem, in his, quae praesentis vitae sunt versari; non quidem in pascendo aut vestiendo, sed in praescribendis legibus, quibus homo inter homines vitam honeste modesteque exigat. Nam illa in animo interiori sedem habet, haec autem externos mores duntaxat componit. Alterum vocare nobis liceat regnum spirituale, alterum regnum politicum. Haec autem duo, ut partiti sumus, seorsum singula dispicienda, et dum alterum tractatur, avocandi avertendique ab alterius cogitatione animi. Sunt enim in homine veluti mundi duo, quibus et varii reges et variae leges praeesse possunt." Cf. Calvin, *Inst*. 3.19.15 (1:847); cf. *OS* IV:294.

Several things are to be noted from this extended quotation. First, it is clear that Calvin distinguished the aspects of this twofold kingdom or governance according to their respective ends, and thus their present or eschatological concerns. For Calvin, spiritual government concerns itself with instruction in piety and reverencing God, and thus the freedom of the soul in *eternal* matters, whereas political government concerns itself with the duties of civil life "among men," and thus the submission of the body in *temporal* matters. Secondly, like Luther, it is clear that Calvin believed these aspects are distinct and accordingly able to be treated separately. Thirdly, it is unclear that Calvin at this point distinguished between kingdom (*regnum*) and government (*regimen*).[48]

Despite this seeming conflation of kingdom and government, in his second section—on "Ecclesiastical Power"—Calvin more clearly aligned the spiritual kingdom with Christ's church, and spiritual government with Christ's reign over his church. His specific aim in this section is to demonstrate that the church is a *particular* kingdom set apart by the gospel, that its members, free from all constraint of conscience, are bound by the rule of the gospel, and that this kingdom's representative leaders ought to govern according to the gospel (serving as Christ the King of this kingdom gave example).[49] In short, everything related to this kingdom and its government is marked by the redemptive message of the gospel.

---

[48] Willem Van 't Spijker disagrees that a great deal of connection is evident between Luther's two-kingdoms doctrine and the twofold government of Calvin; Van 't Spijker writes: "Luther's idea of the two kingdoms has a different scope than that of Calvin, which is not very congenial for a comparison." See his essay "The Kingdom of Christ According to Bucer and Calvin" in Peter De Klerk, ed., *Calvin and the State: Papers and Responses Presented at the Seventh and Eighth Colloquia on Calvin & Calvin Studies* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1993), 121. John Witte, Jr. would disagree with Van 't Spijker's assessment here; Witte notes that Calvin read the writings of Protestants such as Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer, and that his writings on religious liberty "reflect a particular affinity for Lutheran lore." Witte further notes that Calvin appreciated and used the "Lutheran theory of the two kingdoms," and when employed, he did so with a "breeziness that reflects comfortable acceptance of the doctrine." See Witte, *The Reformation of Rights*, 43–44. My own understanding of Calvin's use of Luther on this point is somewhere in between; Calvin was both familiar and comfortable using the distinction and terms, but able to modify and develop it as he saw necessary.

[49] Calvin writes, "To sum up, since the church is Christ's Kingdom, and he reigns by his Word alone, will it not be clear to any man that those are lying words [cf. Jer. 7:4] by

Nevertheless, as Calvin continues in his essay on "Political Power," as long as this particular church lives "among men," it lives among a *common* or general kingdom that is also given a corresponding (representative) government. Against the Anabaptists, Calvin argued that the spiritual kingdom does not obliterate the political kingdom, nor does spiritual government eliminate civil government.[50] Rather, the aspects of this twofold kingdom and government exist simultaneously and harmoniously.[51] For Calvin, this acknowledgment necessarily marks

---

which the Kingdom of Christ is imagined to exist apart from his scepter (that is, his most holy Word)?" See *Institutes* (1536), 6.20 (191); cf. *OS* I:240–241.

[50] Although, as indicated above, Calvin was not fully aware of the Anabaptist position(s) in 1536, and did not receive a copy of the *Schleitheim Confession* until 1544, his argument is contrary to the radically dualistic position as expressed by the Anabaptists in their 1527 confession: "Lastly, one can see in the following points that it does not befit a Christian to be a magistrate: the rule of the government is according to the flesh, that of the Christians according to the Spirit. Their houses and dwelling remain in this world, that of the Christians is in heaven. Their citizenship is in this world, that of the Christians is in heaven. The weapons of their battle and warfare are carnal and only against the flesh, but the weapons of Christians are spiritual, against the fornication of the devil. The worldly are armed with steel and iron, but Christians are armed with the armor of God, with truth, righteousness, peace, faith, salvation, and with the Word of God" (*The Schleitheim Confession*, VI [40–41]). Cf. Calvin's comments on Romans 13:1 where he writes, "There are always some restless spirits who believe that the kingdom of Christ is properly exalted only when all earthly powers are abolished, and that they can enjoy the liberty which He has given them only if they have shaken off every yoke of human slavery." Paralleling his *Institutes*, Calvin equates the Anabaptist position with that of the Jews who thought it "a disgrace that the offspring of Abraham, whose kingdom had flourished greatly before the coming of the Redeemer, should continue in bondage after His appearing." See Calvin, *The Epistles of Paul The Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, trans. by Ross Mackenzie, Calvin's Commentaries, eds., David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 280; *Inst.* 4.20.1 (2:1486) where Calvin claims "it is a Jewish vanity to seek and enclose Christ's Kingdom within the elements of this world." Cf. *OS* V:472.

[51] Calvin carefully notes that the aspects of this twofold kingdom and government do indeed exist in harmony, but that dissonance results when the representative leaders (either of church or state) do not rule according to their proper ends. Thus, for example, Calvin contrasts the governance of "tyranny" exercised by the Roman Catholic spiritual leaders—devising laws and ordinances apart from God's Word—with the proper use of spiritual weapons as evidenced in God's "faithful soldiers." The defined authority of the pastors of the church, Calvin writes, is not of power and might, but of consistent and determined service: "they may boldly dare do all things by God's Word, whose ministers and stewards they have been appointed; may compel all worldly power, glory, loftiness to yield to and obey his majesty; may for him command all from the highest even to the last; may build up Christ's household and cast down Satan's kingdom; may feed the sheep and kill the wolves; may exhort and instruct the teachable; may accuse, rebuke, and subdue the rebellious

Christ's church as an expectant, pilgrim church—one whose members live and perform their duties in society according to societal norms *while* hoping for the certain blessed life to come. Calvin summarizes:

> But as we have just now pointed out that this [political] kind of government is distinct from that spiritual and inward Kingdom of Christ, so we must know that they are not at variance. For spiritual government, indeed, is already initiating in us upon earth certain beginnings of the Heavenly Kingdom, and in this mortal and fleeting life affords a certain forecast of an immortal and incorruptible blessedness. Yet civil government has as its appointed end, so long as we live among men, to adjust our life to the society of men, to form our social behavior to civil righteousness, to reconcile us with one another, and to promote and foster general peace and tranquility. All of this I admit to be superfluous, if God's Kingdom, such as it is now among us, wipes out the present life. But if it is the Lord's will that we go as pilgrims upon the earth while we aspire to the true fatherland, and if the pilgrimage requires such helps, those who take these from man deprive him of his very humanity.[52]

Thus, according to Calvin, the Christian is a dual citizen while living in this present age; while expectantly anticipating the full realization of the heavenly kingdom, the Christian in the present is a member of a twofold kingdom and must therefore be cognizant and respectful of a twofold government. United to Christ by the grace of the gospel, the Christian

---

and stubborn; may bind and loose; and finally may launch lightnings and thunderbolts; *but do all things in God's Word*. See Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.17 (188) [italics added]; cf. *OS* I:237.

[52] Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.36 (208); cf. *OS* I:259; *CO* 1:229 [472–473]: "Verum, ut distinctum istud regiminis genus, a spirituali illo et interno Christi regno, nuper monuimus, ita nec quidquam pugnare, sciendum est. Nam illud quidem, initia coelestis regni quaedam iam nunc super terram in nobis inchoat, et in hac mortali evanidaque vita immortalem et incorruptibilem beatitudinem quodammodo auspicatur. At huic destinatem est, quamdiu inter homines agemus, vitam nostram ad hominum societatem componere, ad civilem iustitiam mores nostros formare, nos inter nos conciliare, communem pacem ac tranquillitatem alere ac tueri. Quae omnia supervacua esse fateor, si praesentem vitam extinguit regnum Dei, quale nunc intra nos est. Sin ita est voluntas Domini, nos, dum ad veram patriam adspiramus, peregrinari super terrain, eius vero peregrinationis usus talibus subsidies indiget, qui ipsa ab homine tollunt, suam illi eripiunt humanitatem."

participates in Christ's spiritual kingdom, both experiencing and waiting for its consummation, and yet the Christian is part of God's political kingdom, submitting himself to the "common laws of nations" (founded upon natural law) as upheld by the magistrate—providing these laws are not contrary to God's revealed will.[53]

I.4.3.2. Calvin on the Twofold Kingdom: The Institutes (1559)

While Calvin's twofold-kingdom distinction remained substantially consistent throughout his career, he continued to expand and enhance it until its final form as found in the 1559 edition of the *Institutes*. What was one sustained treatment in 1536—the three parts of Chapter Six as already explained—is in the final edition of the *Institutes* widely separated: Calvin's first essay on Christian freedom is found in Book 3.19, and the two essays on ecclesiastical and political power are found respectively in Book 4.2–12 and 4.20. Despite this separation, however, a significant repetition appears within the 1559 *Institutes*; the paragraphs that form 3.19.15 (from mid-section to the end) and 3.19.16 are repeated nearly verbatim in 4.10.3 and

---

[53] Calvin, *Institutes* (1536), 6.47–6.48 (215); cf. *OS* I:267–268. Calvin's reference is to Cicero here. Under the section entitled "Political Power" Calvin clarified that political government stems from God. Drawing upon Romans 13, Calvin claimed that God in his wise providence ordains "kings over kingdoms [and] senates or municipal officers over free cities." Furthermore, Calvin identified the law appropriate for political leaders with the equitable application of natural law: "What I have said will become plain if in all laws we examine (as we should) these two things: the constitution of the law, and the equity on which its constitution itself rests. Equity, because it is natural, cannot but be the same for all, and therefore, this same purpose ought to apply to all laws, whatever their object. Constitutions have attendant circumstances upon which they in part depend. It therefore does not matter that they are different, provided all equally press toward the same goal of equity. It should be clear that the law of God which we call the moral law is nothing else than a testimony of natural law and of that conscience which God has engraved upon man's hearts. Consequently, the entire scheme of this equity of which we are now speaking has been recorded in it. Hence, this equity alone must be the goal and rule and limit of all laws." See *Institutes* (1536), 6.42; 6.49 (211; 216); cf. *OS* I:263; I:269. On Calvin and natural law see Susan E. Schreiner, *The Theater of His Glory: Nature and the Natural Order in the Thought of John Calvin*, Studies in Historical Theology 3, gen. ed. David Steinmetz (Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1991), especially Ch. 4; Stephen J. Grabill, *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 86–97. On Calvin and equity see Guenther H. Haas, *The Concept of Equity in Calvin's Ethics* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997).

4.10.4. Arguably, this repetition signals that Calvin continued to associate the topic of Christian freedom with ecclesiastical and political power.

Although this reorganization and separation of what was once a unified treatment does not indicate a major shift in Calvin's thought on Christ's twofold kingdom, it is at least significant for two reasons. First, Calvin's comments regarding the Christian's freedom experienced as a member of the spiritual kingdom are more closely connected to his discussion of the benefits received by grace in Christ (the emphasis of Book 3). Second, this restructuring indicates that Calvin increasingly identified Christ's spiritual kingdom and government with the visible institution of the church and the role of church officers (the emphasis of Book 4.1–19), and Christ's civil kingdom and government with the visible institution of civil government and the role of the magistrate (the emphasis of Book 4.20).[54]

But Calvin did not restrict his twofold-kingdom theology to Books 3 and 4—that is, it is not simply limited to the human participants or members of the twofold kingdom. In 1559 Calvin also expanded and developed this discussion in Book 2. In this book, Calvin addresses the fall of humanity in Adam and the promise of redemption in Jesus Christ as mediator. Of particular interest here is Calvin's discussion of the threefold office of Jesus Christ as mediator. Contrary to both Osiander and Servetus (who taught Christ would have become incarnate even if Adam had not

---

[54] On the invisible/visible distinction of the church see *Inst.* 4.1.7 (2:1021–1022); cf. *OS* V:12. See the brief but helpful discussion of this distinction in Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin*, trans. Harold Knight (1938; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), 191–192. It should be noted here that Calvin *equated* membership of the invisible church with the spiritual kingdom (only the elect belong to the redeemed spiritual kingdom of Christ), but *identified* the visible church with the spiritual kingdom as it is not for us to determine who is elect and who is reprobate. Furthermore, it is over the visible church—that is, the true church where the pure and faithful preaching of the word and the proper administration of the sacraments exist—that Christ rules as mediator, outside of which there is no salvation. On the visible church, Calvin further writes, "…let us learn even from the simple title 'mother' how useful, indeed how necessary, it is that we should know her. For there is no other way to enter into life unless this mother conceive us in her womb, give us birth, nourish us at her breast, and lastly, unless she keep us under her care and guidance until, putting off mortal flesh, we become like the angels (Matt. 22:30)" (*Inst.* 4.1.4 [2:1016]); cf. *OS* V:7. A fuller description of the historical development of this doctrine can be found in Charles Aden Wiley, III, "Responding to God: The Church as Visible and Invisible in Calvin, Schleiermacher, and Barth," (PhD. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 2002). Especially pertinent is Chapter Three of this dissertation.

fallen), Calvin argued that the sole purpose of Christ's incarnation and mediation (as prophet, king, and priest) was to reconcile God and humanity.[55] More particularly, Christ's kingship, which is "spiritual in nature," guarantees the perpetuity of his church despite the turmoil and storms it faces; Calvin thus writes, "No matter how many strong enemies plot to overthrow the church, they do not have sufficient strength to prevail over God's immutable decree by which he appointed his Son eternal King."[56] As God-man, Jesus Christ therefore reigns over his spiritual kingdom, securing his redeemed church's perseverance and ultimate inheritance. Christ's kingdom, Calvin made clear, is consequently not of this world, although it certainly finds expression in this world. His characterization of the church as a suffering pilgrim church unmistakably follows:

> Now with regard to the special application of this to each one of us—the same "eternity" ought to inspire us to hope for blessed immortality. For we see that whatever is earthly is of the world and of time, and is indeed fleeting. Therefore Christ, to lift our hope to heaven, declares that his "kingship is not of this world" [John 18:36]. In short, when any one of us hears that Christ's kingship is spiritual, aroused by this word let him attain to the hope of a better

[55] *Inst.* 2.12.4–7 (1:467–474); cf. *OS* III:440–447. On Osiander, Calvin writes, "Osiander infers that if Adam had never fallen from his original and upright condition, Christ would still have become man. All men endowed with sound judgment understand of themselves how trivial and distorted this is" (*Inst.* 2.12.6 [1:470]; see editor's note; cf. *OS* III:444). Cf. Calvin's comments regarding this "certain extremist of considerable renown" in his sermon on Genesis 1:26–28 (preached on September 9, 1559); see Jean Calvin, *Sermons on Genesis*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2009), I:100–101. Cf. Jean Calvin, *Sermons sur la Genèse, Chapitres 1,1–11,4*, Supplementa Calviniana, XI/1, edited by Max Engammare (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000, 54–67 (reference on page 63).

[56] *Inst.* 2.15.3 (1:498); cf. *OS* III:475. Just prior to this quotation, Calvin further writes, "Therefore, whenever we hear of Christ as armed with eternal power, let us remember that the perpetuity of the church is secure in this protection. Hence, amid the violent agitation with which it is continually troubled, amid the grievous and frightful storms that threaten it with unnumbered calamities, it still remains safe." Cf. Calvin's 1542/45 Catechism where he also connects Christ's spiritual kingdom with the threefold office of Christ's mediatorial work. To the question asking what kind of kingdom Christ rules as mediator, the catechumen responds, "A spiritual kingdom, contained in the Word and Spirit of God, which carry with them righteousness and life." See "The Catechism of the Church of Geneva" in *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, ed. J.K.S. Reid, Library of Christian Classics XXII (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954) 95; cf. *OS* II:79.

life; and since it is now protected by Christ's hand, let him await the full fruit of this grace in the age to come.[57]

For Calvin, Christ's spiritual and eternal kingship places the present church's suffering in perspective. Presently the church is "under the cross," her condition being "harsh and wretched." Her happiness, however, is not in "outward advantages" since it "belongs to the heavenly life!"[58] Calvin concludes:

> For since [Christ's kingdom] is not earthly or carnal and hence subject to corruption, but spiritual, it lifts us up to eternal life. Thus it is that we may patiently pass through this life with its misery, hunger, cold, contempt, reproaches, and other troubles—content with this one thing: that our King will never leave us destitute, but will provide for our needs until, our warfare ended, we are called to triumph.[59]

From the above analysis it is apparent that throughout the editions of his *Institutes* Calvin maintained the distinction of a twofold kingdom and government. Already in 1536 Calvin aligned the spiritual kingdom with Christ's particular church—redeemed by grace and governed by gospel—

---

[57] *Inst*. 2.15.3 (1:498); cf. *OS* III:475. Unless indicated, quotations from Calvin's *Institutes* in this subsection first appeared in the 1559 edition.

[58] *Inst*. 2.15.4 (1:498); cf. *OS* III:475. It should be noted here that for Calvin this description of the church was not an abstract doctrine void of any practical application. In a letter written to Farel after the death of his wife, Calvin admits of his grievous trials, but also of his (and his wife's) future hope of everlasting life. Cf. *John Calvin: Selections from His Writings*, trans. Elsie A. McKee, ed. Emilie Griffin (New York: HarperCollins, 2006), 20–21. Calvin's description of the redeemed church as suffering, persecuted, and afflicted cannot therefore be divorced from his life. Himself an orphan, exiled from his native country, resident-alien in Geneva, refugee, victim, widower, and patient, Calvin described his life as "always on the road," a narrow and hard road. Herman J. Selderhuis describes Calvin's earthly journey well: "Calvin runs the race of this life, falling all the while, picking himself up again and again, and looking forward to the finish, which he calls 'the reflection of the life to come.' The race wears him out, often seeming to pointlessly bring him back to the place he started, and yet there remains something to look forward to. Calvin stays on the course in faith that the God who makes the race so difficult also secures the runner's finish." See *John Calvin: A Pilgrim's Life*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Downers Grove and Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 7. Most of the descriptions used here of Calvin's life come from the chapter titles in Selderhuis's biography.

[59] *Inst*. 2.15.4 (1:499); cf. *OS* III:476. The first line of this quotation was included in the 1539 *Institutes*, but the remainder of the quotation first appeared in the final 1559 *Institutes*.

and the political kingdom with God's general reign over mankind—upheld by divine providence and governed by natural law. While much of Calvin's initial formulation was influenced by polemics (opposing both the Catholics and Anabaptists), Calvin developed his views more positively, defining the visible church as a concrete manifestation of Christ's spiritual kingdom, a kingdom that while suffering in the present age, yet anticipates the consummative reign of King Jesus. As done in the previous chapter with Luther, it remains to be seen if for Calvin this twofold description of Christ's kingship could only be true of a postlapsarian church. To determine this we turn now to Calvin's analysis of sinless Adam's state.

I.4.4. Calvin on the State of Sinless Adam

As already noted, for Calvin it is the redemptive, mediatorial work of Jesus Christ that establishes and guarantees the ultimate and lasting inheritance of Christ's spiritual kingdom. I have further established that, for Calvin (*pace* Osiander and Servetus), Christ's mediation was necessary only as a result of sin. And yet, as Calvin also affirmed, sinless Adam belonged to God's spiritual kingdom; it is only after Adam's fall that he is "so banished from the Kingdom of God that all the qualities belonging to the blessed life of the soul have been extinguished in him, until he recovers them through the grace of regeneration."[60] Due to sin and this banishment, Calvin maintained that "we always have to distinguish between the state of the world as it was before Adam's fall, and the change which took place."[61] According to Calvin, sin thus introduced a "violent change" (*mutatio violenta*) to the kingdom of God.

But suppose Adam had not sinned; suppose he had not introduced this radical or violent change and had not been "banished" from God's kingdom. Hypothesizing what it would have been like without the Fall, and

---

[60] *Inst*. 2.2.12 (1:270); cf. *OS* III:254–255. Calvin's language of "banishment" from the kingdom of God as a result of sin is echoed in his Genesis sermon on the significance of the two trees in Eden (preached September 22, 1559). See Calvin, *Sermons on Genesis*, I:166. Cf. Calvin, *Sermons sur la Genèse,* Supplementa Calviniana, XI/1:114.

[61] Calvin, *Sermons on Genesis*, I:119; Calvin, *Sermons sur la Genèse,* Supplementa Calviniana, XI/1:78.

commenting on Genesis 3:19, Calvin wrote, "Truly the first man would have passed to a better life, had he remained upright; but there would have been no separation of the soul from the body, no corruption, no kind of destruction, and, in short, no violent change."[62] Similarly, in a sermon on Genesis 2:15–17 (a sermon on the significance of the two trees in Eden[63] preached in September of 1559), Calvin stated that Adam was created with a twofold purpose: one that concerned his life in the Garden of Eden, and the other that was "prepared for him after he had finished his course." Like in his Genesis 3:19 comment, Calvin questioned what would have happened to Adam had he not sinned; his answer suggests sinless Adam's life was an expectant pilgrimage that is kingdom-oriented and one that anticipates the inheritance of everlasting life. Calvin described Adam's hypothetical sinless existence as follows:

> [Adam] would have been exempted from all distress and sorrow, and living thus in the world, he would be *aspiring after the kingdom of heaven*, for it was necessary that he enjoy God's goodness here below before enjoying the inheritance which had been assigned to him. …So in that state…he could walk on a pleasant path, so to

---

[62] *CO* 23:77 (*Commentary on Genesis*, 3:19): "Transiturus quidem fuit primus homo in meliorem vitam, si integer stetisset: verum nulla tunc fuisset animae a corpore migratio, nulla corruptio, nulla interitus species, nulla denique mutatio violenta." The French reads as follows: "Le premier homme devoit bien passer en une meilleure vie, s'il fust demouré en son entier. Mais il n'y eust point eu de despartement de l'ame d'avec le corps, point de corruption, point de trespassement: brief, il n'y eust point eu de mutation violente." See *Commentaire de M. Iean Calvin sur le Premier Livre de Moyse, Dit Genese* (Geneva: Jean Gerard, 1554), 62. For the English see John Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis* (1554), trans. John King, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847), 1:180.

[63] Calvin makes an interesting argument regarding the sacramental nature of the tree of life; he argues that Adam would have been able to partake of the fruit from this tree as a tangible sign that he receives his life as a gift of God. More particularly, Calvin argues this tree is a sign signifying that Adam's life is a gift through the agency of the Lord Jesus Christ, not in his role as Redeemer and Savior (for this was not necessary for sinless Adam), but in Christ's role as "Creator and Sustainer." Calvin noted that this same gift of life is now promised to us "not simply in his role as the eternal Word of God, but because he made himself our brother (cf. Matt. 12:50), made himself the second Adam (cf. I Cor. 15:45)." See Calvin, *Sermons on Genesis*, I:164–168; Calvin, *Sermons sur la Genèse,* Supplementa Calviniana, XI/1:112–116.

speak, without any hardship or care and attain the everlasting life presented to him.[64]

Thus, Adam's garden existence was not static, but it had an eschatological element. Evidently, like the postlapsarian church, sinless Adam was a pilgrim figure, expecting a future and blessed state (the consummate realization of the spiritual or "heavenly kingdom"), but unlike the postlapsarian church, sinless Adam had no guarantee of his final entrance into this kingdom since his hope was not grounded on the redemptive work of Jesus Christ.[65]

But on what basis did Calvin assume Adam would have passed into a better life (*une meilleure vie*) or attained this inheritance of eternal life? Peter Lillback has argued that "covenant" is of utmost importance in the thought of Calvin; noting the connection Calvin made between Christ's redemptive work and God's gracious covenant, Lillback writes:

> Christ's redemptive work is fully integrated with the covenant. Accordingly, Christ is the Mediator, the Sponsor, the Redeemer, and testator of the covenant. The blood of the covenant in Christ's atonement or redemptive death for sin is what ratifies the covenant. Thus the covenant is ratified with Christ and His members. Christ's resurrection, intercession, priesthood, and kingdom, are associated with the covenant. Indeed, Christ is the one who confirms, seals and sanctions the covenant.[66]

For sinless Adam, however, this covenantal relation of grace (as based on the atoning sacrifice of Christ) was not available; indeed, according to

---

[64] Calvin, *Sermons on Genesis*, I:169 (italics added); Calvin, *Sermons sur la Genèse,* Supplementa Calviniana, XI/1:117.

[65] Commenting on Genesis 2:7 ("Man became a living soul"), Calvin writes, "Paul makes an antithesis between this living soul and the quickening spirit which Christ confers upon the faithful, (1 Cor. xv.45,) for no other purpose than to teach us that the state of man was not perfected in the person of Adam; but it is a peculiar benefit conferred by Christ, that we may be renewed to a life which is *celestial*, whereas before the fall of Adam, man's life was only *earthly*, seeing it had no firm and settled constancy" (*Commentaries on Genesis*, trans. by John King, 1:112–113; *CO* 23:36 [*Commentary on Genesis*, 2:7]).

[66] Peter A. Lillback, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 177. Note the extensive references Lillback cites where each of the appellations of Christ, as well as his work, are specifically connected to God's gracious covenant.

Calvin, it was unnecessary. Rather, a different relational arrangement existed between unfallen Adam and his Creator. Thus, while Calvin described Adam's arrangement in Paradise as gracious—that is, God graciously chose to enter into relation with Adam—Calvin maintained it was distinct from the one covenant of grace first promised to fallen Adam in Genesis 3:15 and successively to the Old and New Testament church.[67] Underscoring the unity of the covenant of grace from its first postlapsarian declaration until the present, Calvin writes, "The covenant made with all the patriarchs is so much like ours in substance and reality that the two are actually one and the same. Yet they differ in the mode of dispensation."[68] Adam's sinless relation with God is therefore distinguishable from the fallen and redeemed church's relationship with God; the redeemed church, whether in the Old or New Testament, expected (and even now expects) the "same inheritance" and "common salvation" offered in the one mediator of "the covenant of his grace."[69] Thus, while there was a substantial unity in the promise given to sinless Adam and his fallen descendants (namely, a place in the eschatological kingdom of God), there was a substantial difference as to the means whereby this promise was (and now is) realized. Calvin described sinless Adam's relationship with his Creator as one dependent on *his own* obedience to God's laws, a very different basis than the redeemed church's relationship that is dependent on the obedience of another (Jesus Christ as mediator).

---

[67] For example, Calvin writes, "And there is no obstacle in the fact that no one can maintain in this life the perfect obedience to the law which God requires of us. For inasmuch as this stipulation is included in the covenant of grace under which are contained both forgiveness of sins and the spirit of sanctification, the promise which we make there is joined with a plea for pardon and a petition for help" (*Inst*. 4.13.6 [2:1260]; cf. *OS* V:243). It should be noted that for Calvin the covenant of grace includes the promise of forgiveness of sins (justification) as well as the promise of a renewed life of holiness (sanctification), the "two members" of the covenant of grace. Cf. *Inst*. 3.20.45 (2:910); *OS* IV:359 ("Sequitur, Remitte nobis debita nostra: qua petitione et proxima breviter amplexus est Christus quicquid ad caelestem vitam facit; quemadmodum his tantum *duobus membris constat spirituale foedus quod Deus in salutem Ecclesiae suae pepigit*, Leges meas inscribam cordibus ipsorum, et propitius ero eorum iniquitati [Ierem.31.f.33, et 33.a.8]" (italics added)); Lillback, *The Binding of God*, 180.

[68] *Inst*. 2.10.2 (1:429); cf. *OS* III:404. See also Derek W.H. Thomas, "The Mediator of the Covenant" in *A Theological Guide to Calvin's Institutes: Essays and Analysis*, Calvin 500 Series (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2008), 205–225.

[69] *Inst*. 2.10.1 (1:429); 2.11.11 (2:460). See *OS* III:403; *OS* III:433.

Noting the legal basis that Calvin assumed of sinless Adam's relationship with God, Lillback writes, "Calvin develops the prelapsarian experience of Adam in language consonant with the covenant of works: probation, prohibition, law, obedience, divine liberality and innocence, aiming at ultimate perfection and life."[70] God's probationary command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was designed to "test" Adam's obedience; Calvin thus affirms, "A law is imposed upon him in token of his subjection; for it would have made no difference to God, if he had eaten indiscriminately of any fruit he pleased. Therefore, the prohibition of one tree was a test of obedience."[71] Nevertheless, Calvin did not assume Adam's relationship rested simply upon the keeping of this one prohibition; Adam's obedience was to be in accordance with the entire moral or natural law (identical with the content of the Decalogue).[72] To be sure, Calvin described Adam as created in a state of perfect righteousness that harmonized with God's law. As the *imago Dei*, Adam "truly referred his excellence to the exceptional gifts bestowed on him by his Maker."[73] Adam's soul, mind, will, and body all existed in perfect agreement with God's will. In short, as created in God's image, Adam's delight was to follow God's law. Should sin and disobedience disrupt this harmony, however, the realization of suffering and death is certain. Contrasting Adam's joyous state of obedience with the certain dreadful state of alienation, suffering, and death were he to disobey, Calvin writes:

> He was, in every respect, happy; his life, therefore, had alike respect to his body and his soul, since in his soul a right judgment and a proper government of the affections prevailed, there also life reigned; in his body there was no defect, wherefore he was wholly

---

[70] Lillback, *The Binding of God*, 289.

[71] *Commentaries on Genesis*, 1:125–126; *CO* 23:44 (*Commentary on Genesis*, 2:16).

[72] Cf. *Inst.* 2.8.1 (1:348–350); *OS* III:326–327; Lillback, *The Binding of God*, 289–290; Schreiner, *The Theater of His Glory*, 64–65; Scott R. Clark, "Calvin on the *Lex Naturalis*" *Stulos Theological Journal* 6/1–2 (May–November 1998): 1–22. Clark writes, "Far from being a conduit of the Classical or Thomistic view of the *lex naturalis* Calvin made a very sophisticated revision of the concept of natural law by removing it from the Stoic and Thomistic corpus of 'self-evident' truths and identifying it with the content of the Law revealed in the Garden and at Sinai and in the Sermon on the Mount" (18).

[73] *Inst.*1.15.3 (1:188); cf. *OS* III:178.

> free from death. His earthly life [*la vie terrienne*] truly would have been temporal; yet he would have passed into heaven without death, and without injury. Death, therefore, is now a terror to us; first, because there is a kind of annihilation, as it respects the body; then, because the soul feels the curse of God. …Thence it follows, that under the name of death is comprehended all those miseries in which Adam involved himself by his defection; for as soon as he revolted from God, the fountain of life, he was cast down from his former state, in order that he might perceive the life of man without God to be wretched and lost, and therefore differing nothing from death. Hence the condition of man after his sin is not improperly called both the privation of life, and death.[74]

Adam's former state was therefore void of any affliction of either body or soul. In fact, contrary to what we have seen of Calvin's postlapsarian description of the present expression of the kingdom of Christ, the presence of suffering was for Calvin a sure mark of Adam's banishment from the kingdom of God. The prelapsarian community was not a resident-alien church marked by patient suffering, for its "earthly" or "temporal" life was in continuity with its promised eschatological life. As Calvin described it, had Adam maintained obedience, he would have merely passed from the earthly to the heavenly life without fear of death. Unlike the postlapsarian church, Adam's life in the temporal directly influenced his (promised) life in the eternal—that is, blessing would have followed upon obedience.

According to Calvin, Adam's enjoyment of the kingdom of God— even his possession of everlasting life—depended on his choice to follow God's law. While Calvin does not explicitly relate Adam's hypothetical obedience as a means of maintaining his status in God's kingdom to the very different postlapsarian arrangement, the following connection may be deduced: what are now in the postlapsarian period distinct purposes of the spiritual and political aspects of Christ's kingdom were one in the prelapsarian period. In other words, before the Fall the postlapsarian distinction between law and gospel, between exclusively temporal and

---

[74] Calvin, *Commentaries on Genesis*, 1:127; *CO* 23:45 (*Commentary on Genesis*, 2:17). Cf. *Commentaire de M. Iean Calvin sur le Premier Livre de Moyse, Dit Genese*, 36.

eternal ends, or between exclusively penultimate and ultimate matters did not exist.[75] As Calvin clearly states, Adam's "earthly" life of obedience *directly* served an eternal purpose:

> Man in his first condition excelled in these pre-eminent endowments, so that his reason, understanding, prudence, and judgment *not only sufficed for the direction of his earthly life, but by them men mounted up even to God and eternal bliss*. Then was choice added, to direct the appetites and control all the organic motions, and thus make the will completely amenable to the guidance of the reason. In this integrity man by free will had the power, if he so willed, to attain eternal life…. Therefore Adam could have stood if he wished, seeing that he fell solely by his own will. But it was because his will was capable of being bent to one side or the other, and was not given the constancy to persevere, that he fell so easily. Yet his choice of good and evil was free, and not that alone, but the highest rectitude was in his mind and will, and all the organic parts were rightly composed to obedience, until in destroying himself he corrupted his own blessings.[76]

Unlike the postlapsarian church, Adam's perfect reason, understanding, prudence, and judgment (all graciously endowed by God) thus served the unified purpose of directing his earthly existence so that by them he might attain eschatological life.

Calvin's presentation of sinless Adam's state when compared to his portrayal of the state of fallen humanity is markedly different. Understandably, this has significant ramifications for his theology concerning Christ's kingship and governance. And yet, as seen in this section, Calvin held that both the prelapsarian and postlapsarian church were, and are, pilgrim communities. In Adam's case, his earthly existence and obedience was the means whereby he might realize the fully

---

[75] It is important to maintain the qualifying word "exclusive" here; certainly Calvin *did* hold that Adam in his sinless state had to perform certain functions (such as eating or reasoning), which had a more "penultimate" end—i.e, his existence in Eden. Nevertheless, as Calvin relates, even these functions of Adam had direct influence on his ultimate end—i.e, his eschatological life.

[76] *Inst*.1.15.8 (1:195 [italics added]); cf. *OS* III:185–186.

consummated spiritual kingdom of God; after the Fall, however, this means of realization became Christ (his person) and his obedience (his work). Because this means of realization in a post-fall context was found in someone external to the subject being governed, a distinction ensued between "civil" and "spiritual" matters. Indeed, this distinction—not to be confused with a separation—may have been hard to maintain in every practical instance. In the following section I offer several concrete examples from the Genevan context wherein Calvin's twofold kingdom distinction is applied; the question this section asks is whether the application is consistent with Calvin's theology.

I.4.5. Calvin's Twofold Kingdom: Consistent or Confused Application?

Perhaps the most prevalent critique alleging an inconsistency in Calvin's thought and practice as it relates to the twofold kingdom of Christ concerns the authority of the Genevan magistrate. Thus, while cautious in his estimation of the degree of disparity, David VanDrunen writes, "A number of features of the ecclesiastical bodies suggest a high degree of civil entanglement."[77] Philip Benedict is of the opinion that "tension…characterized [Calvin's] discussion of the respective spheres of secular and ecclesiastical authority." While acknowledging that for Calvin

---

[77] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 84. VanDrunen points to several factors that demonstrate this "entanglement," such as, the nomination and approval of elders by civil leaders, the Consistory's role as a "preliminary hearings court," and the Consistory's jurisdiction over all inhabitants of Geneva. VanDrunen does explain why he believes this seeming confusion existed in Geneva (e.g., in the case of drunkenness or prostitution, civil *and* spiritual matters are at play, and so the church and magistrate must "combine their efforts" to help each other [85]), and yet he concludes: "Nevertheless, in my judgement, Calvin is not so easily acquitted of the charge of inconsistency on other related matters" (87).

While VanDrunen is not incorrect in stating that the twelve elders serving on the Consistory were nominated by the civil leaders (the Little Council), it should be noted that the nominations were made in consultation with the ministers. Thus, the 1541 *Ecclesiastical Ordinances* state, "The Little Council shall consult with a view to nominating the most suitable and competent men that can be found; and, in order to effect this, it shall summon the ministers for the purpose of conferring with them." See Philip E. Hughes, ed., *The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004), 42.

the church's authority was over spiritual matters (e.g., combating sin, aiding believers, and guarding the church), and that the temporal government "watched over outward forms of behavior," Benedict detects this tension in the Genevan reformer:

> Yet Calvin also assigned to the secular magistrates the responsibility of seeing to it that both tablets of the Ten Commandments were upheld. They were thus obliged to punish idolatry, sacrilege, and blasphemy. They also had the duty of seeing that ecclesiastical discipline was upheld and the minsters of the word were not mocked. Although separate in jurisdiction, secular and ecclesiastical government were "conjoined."[78]

Even more forcefully, W. Fred Graham criticizes the Genevan consistory's call upon the magistrate to uphold both tables of the Decalogue—and so promote true religion—as unbiblical; he writes, "In this, Calvin was certainly a man of his age, reflecting over one thousand years of *res publica christiana* and not one iota of the New Testament."[79]

But was Calvin's desire, mirroring what he believed to be the duty of the "holy kings" in Scripture who "restored the worship of God when it was corrupted or destroyed, [and] took care of religion that under them it might flourish pure and unblemished," a contradiction of his twofold kingdom thought?[80] Certainly this question is a challenging one, especially

---

[78] Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 89.

[79] W. Fred Graham, *The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin & His Socio-Economic Impact* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1978), 62–63.

[80] *Inst*. 4.20.9 (2:1495); cf. *OS* V:480. Many examples can be given that reflect Calvin's sentiment as found here in the *Institutes*. Here I highlight but three letters written to kings that illustrates Calvin's conviction. In a series of letters addressed to the French King, urging him to protect French Protestants, Calvin writes in June of 1558, "But, though according to the world it should seem neither useful nor expedient to confess the truth of God, yet you have to consider, Sire, what He demands of you, who is entitled to be obeyed without contradiction. Knowing then that for this present time he has put you to trial, *both to maintain the doctrine of his gospel*, and to relieve the afflicted members of his body with whom he has strictly joined you…." See "Letter CCCCXCIX – To the King of Navarre" in John Calvin, *Tracts and Letters*, ed. Jules Bonnet, trans. Marcus Gilchrist (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1858), 3:422 (italics added). Six months later Calvin again wrote to the French King, stating, "So arm yourself beforehand, I entreat you, Sire, exercising yourself in the word of God, and suffering yourself to be taught thereby so that wealth, honours, high rank, royal dignity, shall not prevent your from *bearing the yoke of*

given the pre-modern context in which citizenship in Geneva was so closely linked with life in the church. While a full treatment of the complexities raised by this question cannot be sustained here, it is at least interesting, as Matthew Tuininga has recently noted, that Calvin's desire for the magisterial defense of Christ's kingdom was "precisely *because* of the distinction between the two kingdoms."[81] Tuininga points to Calvin's comments on John 18:36 as evidence of this claim; here Calvin writes:

> Although godly kings defend Christ's kingdom by the sword, it is done differently [*alio modo*] from the way in which worldly kingdoms are defended. For Christ's kingdom, which is spiritual, must be founded on the teaching and power of the Spirit. In the same way is its building effected; for neither the laws and edicts of men nor their punishments reach into consciences, yet this does not prevent princes from incidentally (*per accidens*) defending Christ's kingdom, partly by establishing external discipline and partly by lending their protection to the Church against the ungodly.[82]

As Tuininga summarizes, Calvin distinguished between the *direct* way in which Christ defends and nurtures his church (by his word and the officers of the church) and the *accidental* (more limited) manner through the sword as wielded by the magistrate.[83]

It is also apparent that Calvin believed that the magistrate's *accidental* protection of the church served civil purposes. According to Calvin, this was certainly true of heretics (which provides some justification

---

Jesus Christ, and so aspiring to the kingdom of heaven." See Letter DXXI—To the King of Navarre" in Calvin, *Tracts and Letters*, 3:487. To King Sigismund Augustus of Poland—to whom Calvin dedicated his commentary on Hebrews, and who read Calvin's *Institutes*—Calvin questioned, "For when Christ wishes even his humblest disciples to be like lamps suspended in a lofty place…what does he require of a king, whom he has placed at the summit of human dignity, that he might shine before all others?" See Letter CCCLXXIV—To the King of Poland" in Calvin, *Tracts and Letters*, 3:99.

[81] Matthew J. Tuininga, "'The Kingdom of Christ is Spiritual': John Calvin's Concept of the Restoration of the World" in Peter Escalante and W. Bradford Littlejohn, eds., *For the Healing of the Nations: Essays on Creation, Redemption, and Neo-Calvinism* (Lexington, KY: Davenant Trust, 2014), 98.

[82] *CO* 47:404. See Calvin, *The Gospel According to St. John 11–21 and the First Epistle of John*, trans. by T. H. L. Parker, Calvin's Commentaries, eds., David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance (1959; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 167.

[83] Tuininga, "The Kingdom of Christ is Spiritual," 99.

for his approval of Michael Servetus's execution),[84] but it was also true of other schismatics and erroneous groups of people who, in Calvin's estimation, plagued the church. Evidence that Calvin increasingly found false teaching to be contrary to civil authority is found in a 1548 letter he wrote to Edward Seymour, Regent of England under the minority of Edward VI.[85] Calvin counseled the regent as follows:

> From what I am given to understand, Monseigneur, there are two kinds of rebels who have risen up against the King and the Estates of the Kingdom. The one, a fantastical sort of persons, who, under colour of the Gospel, would put all into confusion. The others are persons who persist in the superstition of the Roman Antichrist. *Both alike deserve to be repressed by the sword which is committed to you,* since they not only attack the King, but strive with God, who has placed him upon a royal throne, and has committed to you the protection as well of his person as of his majesty.[86]

While Calvin in this letter acknowledged that these "fantastical" and "superstitious" groups mar the gospel, it is significant that he believed they deserve the sword because of their civil disobedience—that is, these erroneous groups denied the validity of the kingly office as ordained by God, and so must be punished accordingly. For Calvin, such persons not

---

[84] After the execution of Servetus, Calvin composed his *Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra Trinitate, contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serveti Hispani* (Geneva: Robert I Estienne, 1554). Nine years after Servetus's execution, Calvin still believed he was justified in exhorting the civil authorities to execute Servetus; Calvin writes, "Servetus suffered the penalty due to his heresies, but was it by my will? Certainly his arrogance destroyed him not less than his impiety. And what crime was it of mine if our Council, at my exhortation, indeed, but in conformity with the opinion of several Churches, took vengeance on his execrable blasphemies? Let Baudouin abuse me as long as he will, provided that, by the judgment of Melanchthon, posterity owes me a debt of gratitude for having purged the Church of so pernicious a monster." As quoted in Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996), 8:690–91. For more on Calvin's debate with Servetus and Sebastian Castellio see W. de Greef, *The Writings of John Calvin: An Introductory Guide*, trans. Lyle Bierma (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 160–165.

[85] Calvin began his correspondence with Servetus in 1546, so it is to be noted that this letter appeared two years after this debate began, but before the date of Servetus's execution.

[86] See "Letter CCXXIX – To the Protector Somerset" in John Calvin, *Tracts and Letters*, ed. Jules Bonnet, trans. David Constable, vol. 5 (1858; Edinburgh and Carlisle: Banner of Truth Trust, 2009), 187 (italics added). See *CO* 13:68–69.

only err theologically and confuse the gospel, but they are also political rebels.

It should further be noted that Calvin continually argued for the reformation of Genevan ecclesiastical-political relations along the lines of his twofold-kingdom distinction. A comparison of the 1541 and 1561 *Ecclesiastical Ordinances* illustrates this point. In the 1541 *Ordinances* a clear distinction was *not* evident between secular and ecclesiastical leadership; indeed, of the twelve elders to be elected to the Consistory, the 1541 *Ordinances* state it is preferable that the elders (*commis*) represent each of the three branches of civil leadership in Geneva: "In the present condition of the Church, it would be good to elect two of the Little Council, four of the Council of Sixty, and six of the Council of Two Hundred, men of good and honest life."[87] Apparently Calvin later acknowledged this practice was confusing at best, for in the council deliberations of January 30, 1560, Calvin and Viret requested that the ecclesiastical structure (*police ecclesiastique*) of the Consistory be more carefully distinguished from the temporal jurisdiction (*iuridiction temporeile*).[88] Upon their request it was decided that citizenship was not required of ecclesiastical officers. It was furthermore decided that the presiding syndic of the Genevan consistory lay aside his baton (a symbol of political authority) when taking office in order that he rule only in the official capacity as elder. As the 1561 *Ordinances* state, this common custom was discontinued in order that the Genevan

---

[87] "Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances: September & October 1541" in *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, ed. J.K.S. Reid, Library of Christian Classics XXII (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 63. See *CO* 10(1):22. Cf. Hughes, ed., *The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva*, 41–42. Two things are to be noted here. First, as made already clear in 1541, this arrangement was not permanent, but suitable for "the present condition" of the Genevan church. Second, it should not be inferred that no demarcation was made between civil and ecclesiastical leadership. Rather, as the seating arrangement of the Consistory evidences, a certain degree of distinction was made; John Witte Jr. and Robert Kingdon note, "The Consistory was made up of about two dozen men. Its presiding officer was one of the four syndics of the year. Its members sat on two benches. On one sat all the ordained pastors of the city and occasionally those from the villages attached to it, headed by Calvin as their moderator. On the other bench sat twelve lay commissioners, called 'elders' by Calvin, who were elected for this duty in the February elections every year." See their *Sex, Marriage, and Family in John Calvin's Geneva*, Religion, Marriage, and Family (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 66.

[88] See *CO* 10(1):120n1.

consistory model more closely follow a twofold-kingdom distinction. The 1561 *Ordinances* explain:

> For however much the sovereignty and superiority that God has given us, and the spiritual order that he has ordained in his church, be things conjoined and inseparable, nonetheless, in order that they be not at all confused, and because he who commands every empire and to whom we desire to subject ourselves as we ought has distinguished the one from the other, we declare our intention to be such that we shall follow what has been well ordered without adding to it what has come about since that time due to corruption.[89]

Calvin's clarification of the magistrate's *accidental* defense of the church, his opinion that heretical and theologically erroneous people acted contrary to *both* ecclesiastical and civil authorities (and should therefore be punished by civil authorities), and his continuing desire to refine the Genevan consistory's role may all help to alleviate some of the perceived inconsistencies thought to exist between Calvin's twofold-kingdom thought and its application. Aside from the fact that Calvin was not able to implement in Geneva everything he desired, it is at least evident that Calvin operated with a twofold-kingdom distinction in mind. In this Genevan Reformer's estimation, this had significant implications for the role and day-to-day functions of both church and magistrate during their earthly existence in which they anticipated Christ's final and consummative kingdom. Nevertheless, I do not here presume that Calvin *always* employed or approved of practices coincident with his twofold-kingdom distinction.

---

[89] See *CO* 10(1):122. I thank Elsie A. McKee for bringing this interesting revision of common practice to my attention. The French is as follows: "*Car combien que ce soyent choses coniointes et inseparables, que la seigneurie et superiorité que Dieu nous a donnee, et le regime spirituel qu'il a ordonné en son Eglise: toutesfois pource qu'elles ne sont point confuses, et que celui qui a tout empire de commander, et auquel nous voulons rendre suiection comme nous devons, a discerné l'un d'avec l'autre, nous declarons nostre intention estre telle, qu'on suive ce qui avoit esté bien ordonné, sans y adiouster ce qui est survenu depuis par corruption.*" I am grateful to Daniel C. Timmer for assistance with this translation.

I.4.6. Conclusion

As argued in this chapter, the distinction of a twofold kingdom is central for Calvin's understanding of what he thought to be the nature and task of the militant church in a postlapsarian context; for Calvin, the spiritual kingdom, institutionally represented in the visible church, is founded upon grace and thus concerns itself with redemptive or eternal (ultimate) matters, whereas the civil kingdom, institutionally represented in the magistrate or civil authorities, is founded upon a principle of obedience (law), and thus concerns itself with non-redemptive or temporal (penultimate) matters.[90] While much of Calvin's twofold-kingdom theology finds its roots in earlier representatives, and has affinities with Bucer's delineation of the "Kingdom of Christ" and "kingdoms of this world," Calvin tied his distinction more definitively to a suffering and pilgrim (or eschatologically orientated) church, that is, a church marked by sin and sorrow awaiting a future and glorious kingdom. Based upon this premise, it follows that Calvin—as seen with Luther in the previous chapter—could not logically apply his twofold-kingdom theology to the prelapsarian state of Adam. For Calvin, Adam's state in Paradise, contrary to the condition of the church under the covenant of grace, was one marked by *non*-redemptive, albeit expectant hope. In other words, Calvin's theological formulation of Christ's postlapsarian kingship presumes that a *singular* kingdom and government existed before the Fall (a kingdom expecting eternal consummation upon the fulfillment of Adam's obedience to law), whereas after the Fall, a *twofold* kingdom and government was inaugurated. In this postlapsarian context, Christ's spiritual kingdom is characterized by the gospel (whose members are *consequently* obedient to God's law), whereas Christ's civil kingdom is marked strictly by law.[91]

---

[90] Cf. VanDrunen, "The Importance of the Penultimate," 219–49.

[91] Calvin's comments in his fourth sermon on Deuteronomy 17 (regarding the laws of the Israelite king) reiterate this distinction. After asking the question, "What is [the] kingdom of Christ?" Calvin remarks, "I have told you already [that] it consisteth not in any visible things, or in any things belonging to this present life: but it is the gathering of us together by his holy spirite, into the hope of the heavenly life: and the preaching of the Gospell unto us, that it may bee as a rule to holde us under the obedience of God." Earlier in this same sermon Calvin linked expectant hope in the midst of suffering with the kingdom of

Admittedly, the above presentation of Calvin's twofold-kingdom theology is not *explicitly* found in his writings; Calvin did not speak of sinless Adam's *single* kingdom church, of a *twofold* kingdom distinction immediately following Adam's fall and the granting of the first gospel promise, nor did he clearly and systematically identify law with a prelapsarian kingdom and gospel with a postlapsarian spiritual kingdom. What is more, at times Calvin implemented and advocated practices in Geneva that may at first seem to contradict his presentation of the twofold kingdom, passively witnessing or even ascribing to the Genevan civil authorities matters that are often thought to be the purview of the church, and vice versa.[92] Nevertheless, the outline of a postlapsarian, pilgrim-church, twofold-kingdom theology is arguably *implicit* throughout Calvin's writings.

From the above analysis of Calvin's twofold kingdom theology, and understanding how this doctrine connected to the Reformer's nascent covenant theology (especially in connection with Adam's prelapsarian state), it is clear that Calvin's distinction should not be equated with a (modern) separation of church and state. As seen for both Bucer and Calvin, while this Reformational distinction certainly involved the distinct purposes of church and civil government in a fallen or sinful context, the existence of

---

Christ: he writes, "…although we be tormented according to the flesh…and that we have not so much as bread to eate: Yet notwithstanding the blessednesse which God which God sendeth us in that our Lord Jesus Christ reigneth over us, ought to be preferred before all things." He further counseled his congregation that the "scepter of our Lord Jesus Christ" is not a material one (like earthly rulers and magistrates), but that it is "the Gospell"—"*mais c'est l'Evangile, qui est la vraye marque de la presence de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ.*" Because of this sure, gospel-oriented reign of Christ, Calvin concludes that confident comfort follows: "…we have a sure warrant, in [that Christ] will have us to be gathered together into the unitie of faith by the doctrine of his gospel, and by that meane be made the heritage of God." See *Sermons Deuteronome* in *CO* 27:457–469 (quotations from pages 466 and 463 respectively). Cf. Jean Calvin, *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (1583; Edinburgh; Carlisle: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987), 647–48.

[92] For more on this subject see VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 82–93; Jeong Koo Jeon, "Calvin and The Two Kingdoms: Calvin's Political Philosophy in Light of Contemporary Discussion" *Westminster Theological Journal* 72/2 (2010): 299–320; David W. Hall, *Calvin in the Public Square: Liberal Democracies, Rights, and Civil Liberties*, The Calvin 500 Series (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2009), especially Ch. 3. As addressed in this chapter, however, some of the perceived "inconsistencies" in Calvin's thought (e.g., Calvin supporting the exercise of the civil sword against heresy) were, in fact, expressly informed by Calvin's twofold kingdom distinction (see Section I.4.5).

Christ's rule over two distinct aspects of his kingdom gets more fundamentally at what they saw as the heart of Scripture's message: God's promised redemption of his suffering church by means of the mediatorial work of Jesus Christ.[93] According to Calvin, this redemption is guaranteed and secured by Jesus Christ's mediatorial kingship. As VanDrunen summarizes, "Calvin believed that God had established two kingdoms with distinct purposes, yet that both are legitimate and divinely ordained. The one, the earthly or civil kingdom, concerns temporal matters and is governed by the civil magistrate. The other, the spiritual kingdom or the church, is concerned with heavenly and eternal matters, things pertaining to salvation."[94] As argued in this chapter, for Calvin these distinct "ends, functions, and modes of operation" can only be true in a postlapsarian context.

Similar to the previous chapter's argument concerning Luther, certainly Calvin's postlapsarian distinction of Christ's twofold kingship denies any conception of a synergistic religion; indeed, the Reformers adamantly taught that fallen humanity cannot enhance their standing before God through any merit of their own. It is on the basis of grace alone, made possible through the merits of Jesus Christ, that spiritual life is available to the sinner. As demonstrated, however, Calvin did not teach this was the case for sinless Adam. Rather, the very opposite was the case: it was upon the completion and maintained obedience to law that Adam was originally promised (graciously) eschatological life.

Admittedly, the fundamental difference that Calvin saw between the pre- and postlapsarian periods was not presented in the systematic fashion of later generations—neither should we attempt to mold it in such a manner.

---

[93] In his comments on Jeremiah 30:10—a text that promises "rest" and "quiet" to the house of Jacob—Calvin notes that the world has continually undergone "agitation" and "storms" (and presumably, this will be the case until Christ's return). This promised rest Calvin thus linked with Christ's kingdom; he writes, "As, then, Christ's kingdom is spiritual, it follows that a tranquil and quiet state is promised here, not because no enemies shall disturb us or offer us molestation, but because we shall especially enjoy peace with God, and our life shall be safe, being protected by the hand and guardianship of God." See *CO* 38:622; John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations*, trans. John Owen (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1854), 4:21.

[94] VanDrunen, "The Context of Natural Law: John Calvin's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," 514.

Fear of anachronism, however, should not keep us from recognizing the substantial continuity that existed between Calvin and later Reformed orthodox theologians on this issue. The same may be said concerning the respective views of Christ's kingship and rule. While later chapters give further evidence verifying this claim, it is my contention that significant continuity exists between the more mature presentation of Christ's *duplex regnum* as given by seventeenth-century Reformed theologians and the postlapsarian twofold-kingdom doctrine as expressed by Calvin. This does not negate, however, that a degree of discontinuity or development in this area is evident as demonstrated in the chapters of Part Two.

Part II: Development of the *Duplex Regnum Christi* in Reformed Orthodoxy

Chapter Five: Introducing Terms and Concepts

II.5.1. Introduction

In the previous chapters I argued that the early Reformers primarily
discussed Christ's kingdom and rule when distinguishing the church's role
from that of the king, prince, or magistrate; for example, as illustrated in
Bucer's case, a primary reason for his penning of *De Regno Christi* was to
demonstrate "what the Kingdom of Christ has in common with the
kingdoms of the world, and what is proper to the Kingdom of Christ, and
how they are conjoined and how they should serve each other in mutual
subordination."[1] As already discussed, this desire of the early Reformers is
often immediately apparent in the terminology used to distinguish Christ's
twofold kingdom—Calvin, we noted in Chapter Four, differentiated
between a *regnum spirituale* and *regnum politicum.* Furthermore, to the
degree that they produced systematically arranged works, the favored place
or *locus* for sixteenth-century Reformers to develop their two-kingdoms or
twofold-kingdom distinction was under the civil government sections of
their theological works.[2]

   Before transitioning in the following chapters to a more narrowly
focused consideration of three representative intellectual centers of
Reformed orthodoxy as they relate to the *duplex regnum Christ*, it is

---

[1] Bucer, *De Regno Christi Iesu servatoris nostri*, 16. English is from Pauck, ed.,
Melanchthon and Bucer, 191.
[2] Commenting on the development of systematic theologies in the sixteenth and
seventeenth centuries, Richard Muller writes, "Even Calvin's *Institutes* was no more than a
basic introduction in the doctrines of Scripture and not a full system of theology written with
the precision and detail of the systems of Calvin's own Roman Catholic opponents. The
Protestant theologians of the second half of the sixteenth century—writers like Ursinus,
Zanchi, and Polanus—took up the task of writing a complete and detailed system of theology
both for the sake of positive teaching and for the sake of polemical defense." Muller, *PRRD*,
1:1.1(B.1) [33–34].

necessary at the outset to note that this doctrine underwent significant, overarching shifts—both in terminology and placement—in the period immediately following the Reformation. Thus, in the introductory chapter to Part Two of this study, I introduce general terminological considerations and key concepts of the distinction. Initial remarks will also be made regarding the increasingly accepted placement of this doctrine within seventeenth-century theological systems, as well as noting an in-house disagreement regarding Christ's twofold kingdom.

II.5.2. Terminological Considerations and Key Concepts

While a temporal/spiritual distinction concerning Christ's kingship survived into the seventeenth century,[3] eventually the language and terms describing Christ's rule and reign came to center on the person of Christ as opposed to the nature or qualities of his kingdom and rule. In other words, owing to their desire for a more precise theology, seventeenth-century Reformed theologians thought it more appropriate to label Christ's twofold kingship

---

[3] For example, Frans Burman, writes, "This Kingship [of Christ] is moreover spiritual and eternal, not like the kingdoms and principates we see among men, resting upon outward force and power, and setting forth much of human splendour, but clearly of a different kind. For its seat is in the minds of men and in the hearts of those who love God." As quoted in Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, trans. G. T. Thomson, ed., Ernst Bizer (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1950), 482. Cf. Francis Burman, *Synopsis theologiae & speciatim oeconomiae foederum Dei* (Amsterdam: Johannes Wolters, 1699), V.XV.V. Several paragraphs earlier, however, Burman affirms the essential/theandric distinction formalized during the seventeenth-century: "Ac principio distinguendum venit regnum ejus mediatorium a regno naturali, quod juxta cum Patre ac Spir. S. obtinet. Est enim hic quaedam diversitas χέσεων, pari caeteroquin regni utriusque majestate ac honore. Cum illud Christo qua θεανθρώπω, hoc qua Deo competat; illud speciatim Ecclesiam, hoc autem cunctas creaturas complectatur." See Burman, *Synopsis theologiae*, V.XV.II. William Perkins also uses the language of spiritual and political; in his *Cloud of Witnesses*, as he defends a legitimate need for war, he writes, "We must know, that as there be two kindes of Kingdomes, a spirituall kingdome, and a politicke; so, there be two kindes of peace, spirituall, and politicke. Spirituall peace, is inward, in the Church: and politicke peace, is outward, in the common wealth. Spirituall peace, is begunne, and preserved by spirituall meanes of grace in the ministery of the Church; but warre is an ordinarie means for the establishing and preserving of politicke peace." See William Perkins, *The Workes of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ in the Universitie of Cambridge, M.W. Perkins* (Cantrell Legge, Printer to the University of Cambridge: Cambridge, 1609), III: 175–176.

first and foremost according to *who* he is, rather than by *what* he accomplishes with his regal authority. As the following paragraphs in this section illustrate, the primary distinction of the seventeenth-century Reformed scholastics was no longer Luther's "God's left hand vs. right hand," or even Calvin's "spiritual-as-distinct-from-political kingdom," but instead a kingdom and rule as it pertains to the *Logos* as second person of the Trinity, to be distinguished from a kingdom and rule as it pertains to the *theanthropos*, the God-man Jesus Christ.

II.5.2.1. Regnum essentiale and regnum mediatorium

Swiss-born theologian and principal author of the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* (1675), Johann Heinrich Heidegger (1633–1698) produced a massive two-volume *Corpus theologiae christianae*. Under his discussion of the threefold office of Jesus Christ in this work, Heidegger outlines a kingdom that is common to all three persons of the Trinity—what he labels as *regnum essentiale*—and a kingdom that is particular to Jesus Christ as theandric mediator—what he labels as *regnum mediatorium, personale, & oeconomicum*. Reiterating this by-then-standard distinction of a *duplex regnum*,[4] Heidegger affirms that the Son, as second person of the Trinity and equal in power with the Father and Holy Spirit, possesses and exercises kingship over all creatures, preserving and ruling all of creation. Because the Son is God, equal with the Father and Holy Spirit, kingship is essential to Him—it is necessary of Him owing to His divinity. As mediator, however, Jesus Christ possesses a distinguishable economical kingship; as mediator and Savior, Jesus Christ voluntarily exercises kingship over and for the sake of His church. Heidegger's careful description is as follows:

> This [mediatorial] kingdom corresponds to Christ as mediator and savior of his own body. For the one kingdom is also of Christ, and he shares it with the Father and the Holy Spirit as essential; the other belongs to him as mediator, and is unique, personal, mediatorial, and economical. The former kingdom Christ

---

[4] Chapter Six will make the case that Franciscus Junius was one of the earliest figures to formalize this distinction. While he employed the distinction as early as 1588, it seems it was more solidified by the turn of the century.

administers as God, together with the Father and Holy Spirit over all his creatures which, just as he made them by his word alone, so by that same word he sustains, preserves, and governs them; thus, "Jehovah God is great, and the great King above all Gods" (Psalm 95:3); "He is the eternal King, at whose anger the earth is set to trembling, and whose wrath the nations fear" (Jer. 10:10); "He is God of heaven and earth" (Matt. 11:25). The latter kingdom he administers as *theanthrōpos*, both God and man, the mediator and savior of the faithful, with respect to his church, that is, the elect only, in whose hearts he works by the power of his own Word and by the Spirit.[5]

Certainly the distinction Heidegger made here was not unique to himself; as demonstrated by Frans Burman (1628–1679) in the quotation noted above, differentiating between a natural/essential kingship and a mediatorial/economical kingship of Christ came to be a principal distinction of seventeenth-century Reformed theologians, one that—in their estimations—had to be established at the beginning of a proper discussion of Christ's power and kingship.[6] The widespread use of this distinction will become more apparent in the following chapters.

II.5.2.2. *Other terms relating to the regnum essentiale and regnum mediatorium*

As already hinted at, the Reformed orthodox were not limited to only two terms (*regnum essentiale* and *regnum mediatorium*) when outlining the

---

[5] Johann Heinrich Heidegger, *Corpus theologiae christianae...* (Tiguri: Ex Officina Heideggeriana, 1732), II.19.100 (pg. 130–131). "Regnum hoc Christo ut *Mediatori*, & Salvatori sui corporis convenit. Aliud enim Christi etiam Regnum, commune ei cum Patre & Spiritu S. *essentiale*, aliud ei, ut Mediatori, eximium, Personale, *Mediatorium* & *Oeconomicum* est. Illud Christus, ut Deus, una cum Patre & Spiritu S. exercet in creaturas omnes, quas, sicut verbo solo fecit, ita eodem verbo fert, conservat & gubernat, *Deus* scilicet *magnus Jehova*, & *Rex magnus super omnes Deos*, Psal. XCV.3. *Rex aeternus*, *a cujus ira contremificit terra*, *& cujus indignationem metuunt gentes*, Jer. X.10. *Deus Coeli & terrae*, Matth. XI.25. Hoc ut θεάνθρωπος Deus & homo, Mediator & Salvator fidelium, exercet erga Ecclesiam, ceu electos solos, in quorum cordibus verbi sui efficacia & Spiritu operatur." I am thankful to David C. Noe for providing assistance on this translation.

[6] Cf. Burman, *Synopsis theologiae*, V.XV.II.

kingly office of Christ. In fact, a number of near synonyms appear in their theological systems, each term highlighting a particular facet of Christ's twofold kingship. The renowned encyclopedist Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588–1638) offers several of these alternative designations in his definition of the *duplex regnum Christi*; he thus writes, "Christ's kingship is twofold, essential and personal; the essential, which is also called natural and universal, Christ holds with a glory and majesty equal to the Father and the H. Spirit; the personal, which is also called the donative, the economic and the dispensative, Christ administers as the *θεάνθρωπος* in a single mode."[7] According to Alsted, Christ's essential kingship—equal to that of the Father and Holy Spirit—is universal, and therefore appropriately labeled a *regnum universale*; his mediatorial kingship, however, is given him of the Father for redemptive purposes and therefore aptly called a *regnum donativum*, *regnum oeconomicum*, or *regnum dispensativum*. Like Alsted, Johannes Wollebius (1589–1629), in his influential *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* (1626), differentiates between Christ's essential kingdom—that which he holds from eternity with the Father and Holy Spirit—and his "personal kingdom, given him, and universal [*personale*, *donativum*, *et oecumenicum*], which he receives from the Father as our head and mediator."[8]

As evident from these terms, the principal delineation of a twofold kingdom of Christ for the Reformed orthodox rested upon whether a kingdom and rule could be said to be *given* to Christ, or whether it was intrinsic to him—that is, part of his identity as God. The attribution of a

---

[7] As quoted by Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 481. Cf. Johannes Heinrich Alsted, *Theologia scholastica didactica, exhibens locos commvnes theologicos methodo scholastica, quatuor in partes tributa* (Frankfurt: Conrad Eifrid, 1618), 587.

[8] Wollebius, *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*, 127. English is from John W. Beardslee III., ed., *Reformed Dogmatics: J. Wollebius, G. Voetius, F. Turretin*, Library of Protestant Thought (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 114. Cf. Wollebius, *The Abridgment of Christian Divinity*, 164. Commenting on the significance of Wollebius's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*, Beardslee writes, "It cannot be denied that its extensive use during the seventeenth century, its brevity, clarity, and faithful, positive expression of what Reformed theologians were saying in the decade of the Synod of Dordt and would keep on saying, entitle it to consideration as an avenue to an overall picture of the accepted 'orthodox' understanding of the Reformed faith—the 'teaching commonly accepted in our churches' on which Voetius, Turretin, and others set such store." See Beardslee, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 11.

bestowed kingship on Christ as distinct from his eternal or natural kingship was used by Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf (1561–1610) as early as 1596 in a series of theses entitled *De Regimine Ecclesiae*.[9] Here Polanus argues that the spiritual kingship Christ exercises over his church (the *summum regimen Ecclesiae*) is distinct from his natural or eternal power that he holds in common with the Father and Holy Spirit; in this *regnum dispensativum*, Jesus Christ voluntarily accepts a special governance given to him by the Father earned through a path of humiliation and abjection.

The above brief sketch demonstrates at least that seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox theologians used a variety of designations when unfolding the *duplex regnum Christi*. And yet, whether one used *regnum essentiale*, *universale*, *providentiae*, *divinum*, or *naturale* as distinct from *regnum personale*, *mediatorium*, *oeconomicum*, *donativum*, or *dispensativum*, the primary line of demarcation drawn by Reformed authors was between a kingdom sovereignly administered by the second person of the Trinity considered *extra carnem*, and a kingdom administered by the God-man Jesus Christ.[10] Lutheran scholastics, while recognizing distinctions in the exercise of Christ's rule as evident in the following paragraphs, did not make this same distinction due to their varying views of the *communicatio idiomatum* of Jesus Christ.[11]

II.5.2.3. A threefold kingdom of power, grace, and glory

A further related distinction the Reformed orthodox employed at times was between a threefold kingdom of power, grace, and glory. Bénédict Pictet (1655–1724), under his consideration of the kingly office of Christ in his

---

[9] Amandus Polanus, *Sylloge Thesium Theologicarum, Ad Methodi Leges Conscriptarum* (Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1597), 426.

[10] Johannes Marckius (1656–1731) contrasted and distinguished the *regnum providentiae* and *regnum gratiae* of Christ. See his *Christianae Theologiae Medulla Didactico-Elenctica* (Philadelphia: J. Anderson, 1824), caput 19, xxxi (204). Marckius's student, Bernhardinus DeMoor (1709–1780), expounded on his teacher's terms in his massive seven-volume work, equating the former with the *Regnum Naturale, Essentiale & Divinum*, and the latter with the *Regnum Gratiae, Mediatorium & Oeconomicum* of Christ. See DeMoor, *Commentarius perpetuus in Johannis Marckii Compendium theologiae christianae didactico-elencticum* (Leiden: Johannes Hasebroek, 1765), 3:1113–1114 (cap. 20, sec. xxxi).

[11] See Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, 260–261.

Christian Theology (1696), not only distinguished the two kinds of dominion exercised by Christ (essential and mediatorial as explained above), but he further argues "the mediatorial kingdom may be regarded under three characters—as the kingdom of *power* over all things, angels as well as men, but with a particular reference to the church; —as the kingdom of *grace*, set up in the church militant; —as the kingdom of *glory*, which is established over the church triumphant."[12] According to Pictet's arrangement, the *regnum potestatis* (or *regnum potentiae*) that Christ exercises, which is a subset of his mediatorial kingdom, is over all things. Christ's mediatorial kingdom, exercised through his kingdom of power, is thus universal in scope, although limited to the preservation and well-being of the church. Unfortunately some of Pictet's emphasis on the universality of the *regnum potestatis*—and consequently the *regnum mediatorium*—is lost in the nineteenth-century English translation; in the original, Pictet not only states that the *regnum potestatis* is over all things, but that it includes even the angels, both good and bad ("*ut Regnum Potestatis in omnia, ne Angelis exclusis, bonis & malis*").[13] For Pictet, Christ's mediatorial kingdom is comprehensive in scope—inclusive of the fallen angels—although its particular focus is the establishment, preservation, and eschatological consummation of Christ's church.

Pictet's arrangement, however, is not representative of every seventeenth-century formulation that distinguished a threefold character of power, grace, and glory to Christ's reign. In his early *Institutiones theologicae* (1602), Gulielmus Bucanus (d. 1603) posed the question, "In how many ways is this office [*regium munus Christi*] administered?" In reply, Bucanus claimed there is both a universal as well as special administration of Christ's regal office in this life; the universal administration he related to a rule of power (*potentiae*), whereas Christ's

---

[12] Benedict Pictet, *Christian Theology*, trans. Frederick Reyroux (London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1834), 322–323. Cf. Benedict Pictet, *Theologia christiana ex puris sanctarum* (Geneva: Cramer & Perachon, 1696), II.8.23.6 (pg. 629). The Latin reads as follows: "Regnum istud Mediatorium potest trisariam consideri, ut observarunt docti. I. ut *Regnum Potestatis* in omnia, ne Angelis exclusis, bonis & malis, sed cum certo respectu ad Ecclesiam. II. ut *Regnum Gratiae*, quod exercetur in Ecclesia militante. III. ut *Regnum gloriae* quod exercetur circa Ecclesiam triumphantem."

[13] Pictet, *Theologia christiana*, II.8.23.6 (pg. 629).

special administration he related to a rule of grace (*gratiae*).[14] Unlike the latter structure given by Pictet—which included Christ's *regnum potestatis* as a subset of his *regnum oeconomicum*—Bucanus tied Christ's reign of power to his universal kingship, exercised over all creatures (*omnes Creaturas*), not to be confused with his particular reign over his church (*peculiariter & praecipue Ecclesiam suam regit*).[15]

A threefold arrangement of power, grace, and glory was especially used by Lutheran scholastics; Theodoricus Hackspan (1607–1659), responsible for producing a seventeenth-century philosophical dictionary, outlined a threefold *regnum potentiae*, *regnum gratiae*, and *regnum gloriae* under his dictionary entry *regnum Christi* (q.v.).[16] Unlike Pictet, and more reminiscent of Bucanus's outline, Hackspan first distinguished the *regnum Christi* according to a consideration of this life and the life to come (as opposed to Pictet's primary dictionction of essential and mediatorial). As Hackspan explains, the *regnum potentiae* (referring to Christ's general dominion over heaven and earth) and the *regnum gratiae* (referring to Christ's special work of grace in the church) pertain to this life, whereas the *regnum gloriae* applies to the life hereafter.[17] Johann Gerhard (1582–1637), from whom Hackspan likely drew his definition, summarized this Lutheran distinction in his *Loci Theologici* (1625) as follows:

> That kingdom of Christ is considered either in this life or in the future life. *In this life* it is called the kingdom of power or of grace. *The kingdom of power* is the general dominion over all things, namely, the governance of heaven and earth (Ps. 8:[6]; Dan. 7:14;

---

[14] Guilelmus Bucanus, *Institutiones theologicae: seu locorum communium christianae religionis...* (Geneva: Samuelis Chouët, 1648), 25.

[15] Bucanus's answer to "Quotuplex est huius Officii administratio?" is as follows: "Duplex hoc quidem in seculo. *Universalis*, seu Potentiae, qua omnes Creaturas suo imperio regit. *Specialis*, seu Gratiae, qua peculiariter & praecipue Ecclesiam suam regit, tuetur, & gubernat, ditat in terries & glorificat in coelis, cuius etia[m] respectu proprie Rex nominatur." Cf. Bucanus, *Institutiones theologicae*, 25.

[16] Theodoricus Hackspan, *Termini distinctiones et divisiones philosophico theologicae* (Altdorff: Georg Hagen, 1664), 491–492.

[17] Interestingly, Hackspan points to scriptural passages such as Daniel 7:14, Matthew 28:18, Ephesians 1:21 and 1 Corinthians 15:25 to support his understanding of the *regnum potentiae* or "general dominion" of Christ over all things. These verses are not only the same passages used by Gerhard in the following quotation, but they are also used by the Reformed scholastics in support of their essential/mediatorial distinction.

Matt. 28:18; Eph. 1:21); the subjection of all creatures (1 Cor. 15:27; Eph. 1:[22]; Heb. 2:8); dominion in the midst of His enemies, whom He represses, coerces, and punishes (Ps. 2:9; 110:2; 1 Cor. 15:25); etc. *The kingdom of grace* is the specific operation of grace in the Church, namely the sending, illumination, and preservation of the apostles, evangelists, teachers and pastors in the Church (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8; Eph. 4:11); the gathering of the Church through the preaching of the Gospel and the dispensing of the Sacraments (ibid.); regeneration, renewal, illumination, and sanctification of believers through Word and Sacraments (John 3:5; 17:17; Eph. 5:26; Titus 3:5; etc.); the application of His merit; the protection and preservation of the devout (Matt. 28:20); the outpouring of various gifts (Eph. 4:8; etc.).[18]

Like Gerhard, Johann Quenstedt (1617–1688) also recognized Christ holds a threefold kingdom of power, grace, and glory, although as Robert Preus notes, Quenstedt links "redemption with creation and insist[s] that the latter is made to serve the former by the exalted Christ."[19] As Quenstedt pointedly argues, "*Regnum potentiae ad regnum gratiae est ordinatum*."[20] He thus continues: "The Messiah rules the entire earth, but he especially rules those who are covenanted, those purged by his blood and

---

[18] Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici: cum pro adstruenda veritate…* (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1863), 1:603. The Latin is as follows: "Regnum illud Christi consideratur vel *in hac vel in futura vita*. In hac vita dicitur regnum *potentiae vel gratiae*. *Regnum potentiae* est generale dominium super omnia, videlicet gubernatio coeli et terrae. Subjectio omnium creaturarum; dominium in media inimicorum, quos reprimit, coërcet et punit. *Gratiae regnum* est specialis operatio gratiae in ecclesia, videlicet missio, illuminatio et conservatio apostolorum, evangelistarum, doctorum et pastorum in ecclesia. Collectio ecclesiae per praedicationem evangelii et dispensationem sacramentorum, ibid.; regeneratio, renevatio, illuminatio, sanctificatio credentium per Verbum et sacramenta, applicatio sui meriti, protectio et conservatio piorum, effusio variorum donorum." English is from Johann Gerhard, *Theological Commonplaces* (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 2006).

[19] Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism* (Saint Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1970).

[20] Johannes Andrea Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologicum in Duas Sectiones* (Leipzig: Thomam Fritsch, 1715), P.III., Chapt. 3, Memb. 2, S.1., Thesis 77.

freed from the kingdom of Satan."[21] Quenstedt is therefore careful to point out that Christ administers even the *regnum potentiae* according to *both* natures; the primary delineation for the Lutherans was thus not whether the Son administers his rule as *Logos ensarkos* or *asarkos* (as it was for the Reformed), but on what side of glory Christ is said to rule.

Richard Muller's dictionary entry *regnum Christi* (q.v.) is especially helpful in noting many of the various terms employed by the Lutheran and Reformed orthodox, although he posits too tidy a division between the Lutherans and Reformed, especially as it relates to their use of the labels *regnum potentiae*, *regnum gratiae*, and *regnum gloriae*.[22] Muller states it was the Lutherans who held to this threefold division, whereas the Reformed held to a twofold kingdom (the *regnum essentiale* and *regnum oeconomicum*). According to Muller, the essential kingdom as expressed by the Reformed is equivalent to the Lutheran kingdom of power, whereas the Reformed economical kingdom assumes the two parts of the Lutheran kingdom of grace and kingdom of glory. While this assessment is true for much of orthodoxy, a neat divide between the two theological traditions was not always the case. As already seen with Bucanus and Pictet, the Reformed were not averse to using the threefold division of power, grace, and glory. It is also telling that this was not only true of early Reformed orthodoxy— Pictet, it should be noted, was Professor of Theology at Geneva from 1688– 1724. Further evidence of this late appropriation is apparent in the theology of Dutch Reformed minister Wilhelmus à Brakel (1635–1711); writing near the end of high orthodoxy, à Brakel argued Christ is king in the following threefold manner: "1) as God (being coessential with the Father and the Holy Spirit), He rules over the *kingdom of power* [*Koninkrijk der Macht*], to which all creatures belong; 2) as Mediator He rules over the *kingdom of grace* [*Koninkrijk der Genade*] upon earth; and 3) as Ruler over the *kingdom of glory* [*Koninkrijk der Heerlijkheid*] in heaven, of which both angels and all the elect are subjects."[23]

---

[21] The Latin reads as follows: "Dominatur Messias universo terrarium orbi, sed dominatur etiam suis foederatis, sanguine suo purpuratis, & e regno Satanae liberates." Cf. Quenstedt, *Systema*, P.III., Chapt. 3, Memb. 2, S.1., Thesis 77.

[22] Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek*, 259–261.

[23] See Wilhelmus à Brakel, *Logike Latreia, Dat Is, Redelijke Godsdienst…*

II.5.2.4. Further Variations

While acknowledging that the standard distinction of the *regnum Christi* was according to its essential and economical characters, Edward Leigh notes that some of the Reformed orthodox gave a slightly different presentation. This alternative arrangement, also threefold in character, emphasized varying aspects of Christ's rule as evident by the terms. First, Leigh notes that some advocated a twofold *regnum essentiale* and *regnum vicarium*; the former "belongs to all the Persons in the Trinity, and was before the fall," but the latter is "an oeconomical Mediatory Kingdom committed to Christ as Mediator."[24] As Leigh explains, this latter kingdom is owing to the fall of mankind and the subsequent making of a new covenant—"the Covenant was changed and made with Christ." Although Leigh's presentation at this point does not deviate from the standard definition (other than the introduction of the term *regnum vicarium*), a variation is evident in the threefold character that some attribute to the *regnum vicarium* (equivalent to the economical kingdom): it can be distinguished as to (1) a *regnum universale* or *regnum potentiae*, wherein as mediator Christ reigns over all people; (2) a spiritual kingdom, whereby God reigns over men and angels; and (3) a *regnum Davidicum*, wherein God reigns specifically over the Jews.[25] Interestingly, although Leigh offers this as the opinion of some, he himself opts for a "three-fold Kingdom of Christ," namely, the standard kingdom of power or excellency, kingdom of grace, and kingdom of glory.

While this threefold *regnum universale* or *potentiae*, *regnum spirituale*, *regnum Davidicum*—that, according to Leigh, is the opinion of some (he fails to mention who)—is not commonplace among the Reformed

---

(Rotterdam: Bolle, 1800), 1:466. The English is from *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, trans. Bartel Elshout, ed. Joel R. Beeke, vol. 1 (1700; Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 1999), 561. Although writing in Dutch, it is clear à Brakel's threefold distinction is referencing the three (technical) Latin distinctions of *regnum potentiae*, *regnum gratiae*, and *regnum gloriae*.

[24] Edward Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity: Consisting of Ten Books* (London: A.M. for William Lee, 1654), Book V: 420.

[25] Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity*, Book V: 420.

orthodox, it is significant that each of these designations is said of Christ's mediatorial kingdom as opposed to his essential kingdom. As Leigh continues to expound in the following paragraphs, this means Christ's mediatorial kingdom is universal in scope, as is his essential kingdom.[26] Others, such as Polanus, have certainly argued that Christ's mediatorial kingdom—what he denominates as the *regnum donativum*—is universal in nature. Polanus argues for a twofold distinction of the *regnum donativum*, namely the *regnum gratiae* and *regnum gloriae*; as the terms indicate, what distinguishes these two characters is the present as opposed to the future, eschatological reign of Christ, and yet over both Christ reigns according to his two natures. While Polanus acknowledges that the peculiar purview of the *regnum gratiae* is the church, it does have a universal scope; according to Polanus, Christ exercises mediatorial power even over the enemies of the church, and therefore as God-man, the mediator Jesus Christ defends and preserves his elect while they live in this age.[27]

II.5.3. Placement of the *Duplex Regnum Christi* in Theological Systems

As this dissertation argues, many affinities exist between the early Reformers and Reformed orthodox on the subject of Christ's royal reign. Perhaps most fundamentally, both distinguished the twofold character of Christ's kingdom as to its redemptive and non-redemptive ends.[28] And yet, it is noteworthy that later Reformed orthodox figures, rather than relying exclusively—or even primarily—upon early Reformers such as Calvin, Beza, or Bucer, drew more substantively on the likes of Junius, Polanus, Alting, Wollebius, and Alsted. Already we have seen evidence of this with respect to the various terms employed, but it is further evident in the

---

[26] Leigh argues Christ's kingdom is universal in four respects: (1) "In respect of all ages and times," (2) "In respect of all places, *Rev. 5.9.* to the end," (3) In respect of all creatures, *Rev. 5*," (4) "In respect of all things and actions." Cf. Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity*, Book V:421.

[27] Amandus Polanus, *Syntagmatis Theologiae Christianae* (Hanau: Claudium Marnium, 1609), Tomus Secundus, Book VI, cap. XXIX (2:2857–2871).

[28] Cf. VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 177.

commonly accepted placement of the *duplex regnum Christi* in later seventeenth-century systematic theologies. As seen in earlier chapters, early sixteenth-century Reformers largely developed their two kingdoms or twofold kingdom distinction under the civil government sections of their theological works, whereas this discussion shifted to the locus of Christology in the vast majority of seventeenth-century systematic theologies.

Although Chapter Six will focus on the importance of Francis Junius's contribution to the *duplex regnum Christi*, it should be noted here that his early description of the *duplex regnum Christi*—perhaps the first to relate the essential/mediatorial distinction to Christ's twofold kingdom—is housed within his outline of theology proper. Successive Reformed orthodox theologians, as evident in the systems of Trelcatius and Polanus, introduced the *duplex regnum Christi* under the locus of Christology. More specifically, discussion of Christ's twofold kingdom was increasingly relegated to two specific places in the systematic works of the Reformed orthodox: (1) immediately following their discussions of Christ's person, and within their accounts of the *munus triplex*, Christ's mediatorial work as prophet, priest, and king, and (2) within their discussions of Christ's session at the right hand of the Father.[29] This movement is rooted in the formal seventeenth-century debates regarding the person of Christ, particularly the debate between the Reformed and Lutheran orthodox over the so-called *extra calvinisticum*.[30] While discussion of Christ's twofold kingdom still surfaced at times in the context of distinguishing the church's role from that

---

[29] See Lucas Trelcatius, *A Briefe Institution of the Common Places of Sacred Divinitie*, trans. John Gawen (1604; London: T.P. for Francis Burton, 1610), Book 2:195–198. Considering the office of Christ, Trelcatius writes, "But whereas, the kingdome of Christ is two-fold, the one Essentiall, according to nature, which he hath common with the Father, and the holy Ghost: the other Personall, according to the dispensation of will, which hee executeth, as being Mediator…." Polanus writes, "Deinde quum Sessio illa ad dextrum Patris sit Christi, non est solius divin[a]e, neq[ue] solius humanae naturae Christi, sed totius personae *theanthropos secundum utramq[ue] naturam: Secundum divinam quidem naturam* no *kata theotav* & inse consideratam, sed *kata oikovomiav* consideratam: nam ut desce[n]dens de caelo se exinanire dignatus est servi forma assumta, ita post adscensionem in c[a]elum exaltatus est ad regnum illud Mediatorium & Oeconomicum, quod nomine Patris, qui caput ejus est, exercet." Amandus Polanus, *Syntagmatis Theologiae Christianae*, Tomus Secundus, Book VI, cap. XXVI (2:2749–2750).

[30] Cf. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, 111.

of the state—as seen in the (politically volatile) Scottish context examined in Chapter Eight—this movement is further evidence of an ongoing development of the *duplex regnum* doctrine in the seventeenth century.

II.5.4. An "In-House" Debate

A puzzling question associated with Christ's twofold kingship, and at times producing varying answers among the Reformed orthodox, asked whether or not Christ's kingdom was endless.[31] In a work that targeted specific theological problems of his day, University of Groningen Professor Johann Heinrich Alting (1583–1644) formulated this question as follows: "Can the kingdom of Christ, which Scripture says is eternal, be rightly said to be economical and temporal?"[32] While Alting agreed with Calvin who affirmed the eternality of Christ's kingdom (based on passages such as Dan. 7:14; Luke 1:33; and Rev. 21–22), Alting indicated there are scriptural passages that state Christ's kingdom is temporal (Ps. 2: 9–10; Ps. 110:1–2; Matt. 28:19; Eph. 1:20–21).[33] Beginning with the presupposition that Scripture cannot contradict itself, Alting concluded that both must be true; it is here that Alting finds the twofold kingdom distinction helpful in overcoming this seeming contradiction.

Basing his argumentation on 1 Corinthians 15:24–26 ("*tunc erit finis: cum tradet regnum*"), Alting contended that the *regnum Christi oeconomicum*—not to be confused with his essential kingdom—is temporal.[34] Alting defined this economical kingdom as one that the Son, as mediator, administers on behalf of the Father; according to Alting, the

---

[31] Cf. Herman Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek* (Kampen: Kok, 1928), 3:480–481. See also Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, trans. John Vriend, ed. John Bolt (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003). Bavinck highlights this debate, although incorrectly places Calvin on the side of those who argue for the temporary nature of Christ's kingship.

[32] Johann Heinrich Alting, *Theologia problematica nova: sive Systema Problematum Theologicorum in inclyta Academia Groningae & Omlandiae* (Amsterdam: Johannes Janssonius, 1660), Locus 12, problem 36 (611–612).

[33] Alting, or perhaps the editor, commits a research/scribal error when citing Calvin's *Institutes*; Book II, Chapter 16, Section 3 is referenced, whereas it should be Chapter 15.

[34] For the significance of this verse and the *duplex regnum Christi*, see also section I.2.2.

Father commissioned the Son to be his ambassador and vice-regent.[35] But as this relates only to this life, when the end of this age has come, and the Son has subjected everything to himself, this aspect of the Son's kingdom will cease ("*Ergo regnum desinet cum hoc seculo*"). David Pareus (1548–1622) echoed Alting's position on this point; commenting on 1 Corinthians 15:28, Pareus argued that the Son's future handing over a kingdom to the Father does not mean the Son will abdicate his nature, nor that he will give up his divine power, but rather that he will be deposed of his office as mediator.[36] Scottish theologian George Gillespie was apparently of the same opinion, as is evident from his *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*; in Book 2, Chapter 5 of this work, Gillespie distinguished between the Son's eternal kingdom that "shall be continued and exercised forever" as distinct from his mediatorial kingdom that "shall not be continued and exercised forever."[37]

Alting's and Gillespie's position, however, proved to be the minority one, especially in the latter half of the seventeenth century. Francis Turretin (1623–1687) asked nearly the same question as Alting in his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*—"Is the mediatorial kingdom of Christ to continue forever?" While Turretin recognized that there were varying opinions among the orthodox on this question, unlike Alting he responded simply in the affirmative.[38] In the formal distinctions he makes in the *status*

---

[35] "*Regnum Christi Oeconomicum*, quia administratio illius ipsi commissa est a Patre, ut Mediatori, ut legato & vicario Patris: nec aliter quam nomine Patris gubernator." Alting is careful to note that the administration of this economical kingdom, as well as its handing over at the end of the age, does not diminish the power and glory of Christ in any way. To the possible charge, "Ergo potestati & gloriae Christi aliquid decedet," Alting gives three negative responses. He affirms that Christ will reign coessential and coeternal with the Father and Spirit despite the ceasing of the economical kingdom. Cf. Alting, *Theologia problematica nova*, Locus 12, problem 36 (612).

[36] Pareus writes, "Sic igitur etiam subjicietur patri, non abdicatione naturae, aut potentiae divinae: sed depositione officii mediatoris, & legationis commissae." See David Pareus, *In Divinam Ad Corinthios Priorem S. Pauli Apostoli Epistolam Commentarius* (Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1614), 843.

[37] George Gillespie, *Aaron's Rod Blossoming, Or, The Divine Ordinance of Church Government Vindicated...*. (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, and Oliver & Boyd, 1844), 91.

[38] Interestingly, the primary opponent Turretin has in mind are the Socinians of his day who, "[i]n order to impair the dignity and divinity of our Mediator…maintain that this kingdom will come to an end on the last day and its ultimate act will be the judgment of the whole world; then his kingdom and regal authority will be given up to the Father." Turretin clearly distinguished this opinion of the Socinians from the "in-house" debate amongst the orthodox: "With them agree (although with a different feeling and intention) those of the

quaestionis section, Turretin admits that the "mode of administration can be changed and abrogated, [but] the substance of the kingdom ever remaining." He continues that while "all confess" the mode of administration will change at the end of the age, the affirmative answer he argues for in this question only concerns the substance of Christ's twofold kingdom.[39] Thus, according to Turretin, the kingdom referenced in 1 Corinthians 15 does not confirm the abrogation of Christ's mediatorial kingdom at the final day, but either refers to the church materially—i.e., the Son delivers his church up to the Father—or it references a change in mode of administration of this kingdom.

II.5.5. Conclusion

The *duplex regnum Christi* as advocated by the Reformed orthodox is not simply—and certainly not principally—a church/state distinction. It is not that the Reformed orthodox merely distinguished the twofold kingdom as to God's essential power over the state and Christ's mediatorial power over his church. Rather, this seventeenth-century distinction is couched in christological terms, and, more specifically, its basis of distinction is the manner of Christ's work—that is, whether he is considered to rule essentially as God, or personally and mediately as God-man. For this reason, many of the Reformed orthodox could claim a universality to *both* the mediatorial and essential kingdom of Christ. As seen in the representative contexts covered in the following chapters, in this way the Reformed orthodox could consistently argue that the magistrate has a task given to him by Christ (who is mediator and defender of his church); in their mind, however, the magistrate's responsibility is limited to the defense, protection, maintenance, and promotion of Christ's church.

      It is also apparent that the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom did not lie dormant following the first generation of Reformers, but that even into the seventeenth century there was continued and ongoing development.

---

orthodox who think that Christ's mediatorial kingdom will end with the world in order that a place may be given to his essential kingdom alone, by which God will be all in all." See *IET* 2:490; *FTO* 2:430 (XIV.17.I).

      [39] Turretin, *IET* 2:491; *FTO* 2:431 (XIV.17.III).

An equation of the *regnum essentiale/regnum mediatorium* distinction with the early Protestant political/spiritual kingdom distinction is simply not plausible; certainly this is evident were one to only apply the question regarding duration to it. As the following chapters argue, the *duplex regnum Christi*, as related to the varying political contexts within which it was expressed, experienced ongoing maturation and refinement in both its terms and significance.

Chapter Six: The Duplex Regnum Christi in Reformed Orthodoxy: Leiden as Representative Center

II.6.1. Introduction

The Spanish siege of Leiden during 1573–1574, an immensely formative and legendary period within Dutch history, has often been heralded as a time when tyranny was suppressed and freedom victoriously upheld. Geeraerdt Brandt, a historian writing nearly one century after these events, records a curious and telling anecdote from this time: during the siege, the Leiden government was forced to print paper money due to the scarcity of silver, but they included on each of the larger bills the defiant inscription "*Haec libertatis ergo.*" The Sunday following the release of the paper money, at least one Reformed preacher fulminated from his pulpit, proclaiming that the Leiden magistrates were "*Libertines* and *Free-thinkers*" and that the inscription should have read "*Haec religionis ergo.*"[1] The obvious and stark point of contention highlighted in this one scenario centered on how to interpret the suffering that the Leideners endured during the 1570's. Did the Leideners join the Dutch Revolt and consequently face the threat of Spanish retaliation—assuredly not an easy decision as it would involve suffering and bloodshed—because of civic pride and fidelity to the Dutch Republic, or so they might be free of Spanish-imposed Roman

---

[1] Geeraerdt Brandt, *G. Brandts Histoire der reformatie, en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen in en ontrent de Nederlanden* (Amsterdam: Jan Rieuwertsz., Hendrik en Dirk Boom, Boekverkoopers, 1671), I:554. For an English translation see Geeraert Brandt, *The history of the Reformation and other ecclesiastical transactions in and about the Low-Countries, from the beginning of the eighth century, down to the famous synod of Dort, inclusive....* 4 Vols. (London: T. Wood, for Timothy Childe, at the White Hart at the West End of St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1720) I: 310–311.This anecdote is also told by Christine Kooi in her *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572-1620*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, v. 82 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 29.

Catholicism? What fueled their fight for survival, and what compelling reason did they have to resist the temptation to open the city walls to their besiegers? Was it patriotism or religion? Or was it perhaps a combination of both? As the above scenario indicates, the answer in the sixteenth-century Leideners' minds depended largely on whether one was associated more with the political or the religious leadership of the city.

This clash of opinions surfaced not only during the immediate crises of Leiden's siege, but it colored much of the city's ensuing history. Scholars who have studied the advent of the Reformation in the Netherlands—and especially those who have connected this with the more particular consideration of how the Reformation was introduced into varying cities within the Netherlands—have noted the "unusually fractious" relationship of the Leiden magistracy and the city's religious leaders.[2] Christine Kooi has noted that the five decades following the Spanish siege of Leiden amounted to a period of "negotiation" wherein the city's rulers and church's leaders had to decide what "it meant for Leiden's ecclesiastical polity to be 'Reformed.'"[3]

It is within this "fractious" environment that the Leiden theological professors developed the doctrine of the *duplex regnum Christi*. In order to situate their formulation of this doctrine more concretely within its historical context, this chapter is divided into three parts: first, I will provide a brief sketch of Leiden's sixteenth-century history as it relates to the topic on hand (noting in particular the significance of the establishment of Leiden University); second, I will more narrowly focus on Franciscus Junius's seminal contribution to the *duplex regnum* doctrine—Junius being a representative Leiden theologian. Following this, I will introduce the nature and use of scholastic disputations held at Leiden University, and then

---

[2] Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 17. Kooi notes that past scholarship on the Dutch Reformation "painted its portrait in broad strokes, as a national or at least provincial phenomenon." She argues, however, that political power was decentralized, and therefore reform could vary from city to city in the Netherlands. Kooi writes, "The fact remains that Reformed preachers, returning from exile after 1572, had to introduce reform into Holland and Zeeland one village, one town, one city at a time. Local circumstances were in fact of paramount importance to the success or failure of the establishment of a Calvinist Reformation in the Dutch provinces freed from Spanish rule" (3).

[3] Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 197.

consider especially the relevant disputations of Antonius Walaeus, a second representative figure who taught at Leiden University. This chapter will conclude by connecting the research and findings related to these two Leiden professors to the overarching thesis of this dissertation.

II.6.2. Contextual Considerations

II.6.2.1. Leiden: Brief Sixteenth-Century Civic History

The intent of this section is not to reproduce the history of Leiden, or to locate its place within the history of the Netherlands; indeed, this subject spans many volumes.[4] Rather, my purpose for highlighting brief aspects of Leiden's history, focusing especially on its political context during the early years of the so-called Eighty Year's War (1568–1648), is to situate contextually the writings of the representatives dealt with later in this chapter.

As already suggested, the siege of 1573–1574 marked a defining turning point for Leiden during the sixteenth century. Nearly fifty years prior to this event, Leiden was a city under Habsburg control approximating 11,000 inhabitants; this number was reduced to approximately 6,000 by the end of the siege.[5] As this drastic decrease in numbers indicates—the city was reduced to nearly half its size—Leiden experienced a period of significant instability, turmoil, and testing. Nevertheless, despite the starvation and external military threats, Leiden proved victorious, and even prospered as a city at the turn of the century. Certainly the ordeal of the siege, and its subsequent triumph, steeled the city's resolve for survival and independence. And yet, as Kooi aptly summarizes, the purpose for Leiden's relief following its years of trial and suffering was differently interpreted by

---

[4] See, for example, the seventeen-volume work by John Lothrop Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic: A History*, 17 vols., (New York ; London: Harper & Bros, 1900). See also Jonathan I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806*, Oxford History of Early Modern Europe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). For much of the history in this section I rely on Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, chapters 1–2.

[5] Jeremy Dupertuis Bangs, *Strangers and Pilgrims, Travellers and Sojourners: Leiden and the Foundations of Plymouth Plantation* (Plymouth, MA: General Society of Mayflower Descendants, 2009), 102.

the magistrate and church leadership; the contrast she draws is worthy of fuller quotation:

> For the Calvinists (as contemporaries pejoratively labelled the most radical Protestants), who were a vocal party within the Reformed congregation, the relief of Leiden was a mandate to re-shape completely the city's religious life, to redefine all aspects of the church: doctrine, liturgy, membership and governance. They were, after all, fighting for religion, as their preachers reminded them. But they faced a ruling elite whose own confidence and authority had been boosted by its resistance to the Habsburgs, magistrates who felt that they, too, had proven their fidelity, as partisans of the Prince of Orange. The siege hardened their political attitudes for the next half-century where civic (and that included religious) affairs were concerned: their duty was to all of Leiden, not just to one privileged group within it. To them 1574 was a victory of liberty over tyranny for the entire city.[6]

In order to understand these differing interpretations, some account of both the political makeup of Leiden and the introduction of the Reformation in Leiden is necessary.

The governmental structure of sixteenth-century Leiden was oligarchic in nature. Although officially under Habsburg rule, the city was considered to be self-governing, and its town council was made up of forty members (called the *Vroedschap*) who were usually wealthy or prominent citizens.[7] From this *Vroedschap* were elected four burgomasters (*burgemeesteren*), eight magistrates (*schepenen*), and a sheriff (*schout*)—a collective ruling body known as the *Gerecht* which effectively governed the daily affairs of the city. Kooi notes that despite Leiden's decision to join the anti-Habsburg cause in 1572—a revolutionary act—the *Gerecht* remained relatively stable: "Despite the upheavals of the Revolt and the Reformation, the polity of Leiden remained a remarkably stable system, whose powers and responsibilities were enhanced and expanded thanks to the weakness of

---

[6] Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 39.
[7] For more on the governmental structure see Bangs, *Strangers and Pilgrims*, 110; Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 23–24.

central authority in the early years of the Republic."[8] Given this enduring stability, and considering the oligarchic nature of Leiden's government, it is understandable that the magistrates would be wary of any other forms of leadership, even if it were within the church.[9]

Before the arrival of the Beggar troops in June of 1572, who declared the city for the Prince of Orange, the introduction of Protestant ideals into Leiden was rather a piecemeal affair. As early as 1520, Luther's writings were being printed in Leiden, but the city also encompassed a significant Anabaptist faction.[10] In 1566, when Habsburg power momentarily collapsed under Margaret of Parma, Leiden experienced somewhat of a backlash against the established Roman Catholic religion; iconoclasm and plundering swept through many of the parish churches and monasteries.[11] The magistrates negotiated with the Reformed, permitting them to worship publicly if they agreed not to disrupt other religions; consequently, the first legalized Reformed worship service occurred in Leiden on January 5, 1567. Only three months later, this practice was outlawed again when troops under the Duke of Alva restored pro-Habsburg control to the magistracy. Only after Leiden's *overgang* (defection) to the rebel side in June of 1572, and Leiden's willing acceptance of the anti-Catholic Beggar troops, did the Reformed church establish a more permanent place in Leiden. For a brief period both Catholicism and Protestantism were accepted in Leiden, but rumors soon linked Catholics (even Catholic city officials) with pro-royal leanings. It was even rumored that some Catholics were plotting to turn the city over to Habsburg hands.

---

[8] Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 24.

[9] Jeremy Bangs records an interesting description of the tapestries and famous paintings that hung from the walls of the town hall's main chambers, the meeting place for Leiden's magistracy. Among the wall-hangings there was added a tapestry in 1588 that depicted the flooding of the Leiden countryside which enabled soldiers to bring food and relief to the besieged Leideners in 1574. As Bangs remarks, "Leiden's citizens were frequently presented with the reminders of the siege." See Bangs, *Strangers and Pilgrims*, 111. The inclusion of this tapestry in the town hall illustrates the fact that the magistracy interpreted the relief of the siege in a particular way; that is, it quickly became a historic rallying point intended to promote civic pride and solidarity.

[10] Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 26.

[11] Cf. Jeremy Dupertuis Bangs, *Church Art and Architecture in the Low Countries Before 1566* (Kirksville, Mo: Truman State Univ Press, 1997), ch. 2.

This suspicion was only hardened after it was discovered that some Catholic royalists—who had fled the city in 1572—worked with the Spanish commander that led the siege of Leiden. Kooi thus summarizes, "When both exiled Leideners who conspired with the Spanish forces and those still inside the walls who urged surrender to save the town from destruction were lumped together indiscriminately under the label 'papists,' any public acceptance of Roman Catholicism became virtually impossible."[12] Thus, shortly after the siege in Leiden, to be Catholic meant one was held in suspicion and could not be considered loyal to the city, whereas to be Protestant meant one was faithful to the city's cause. The city's leadership then depended largely on the Reformed to provide rallying support for the anti-Habsburg cause, and yet, given the makeup of the city's government as described, it is understandable that this relationship was tenuous at best.

As Leiden theologians and pastors sought to build a Reformed church following the momentous turning point of 1573–1574, the "competing visions" as Kooi describes them—the magistrates' desire for unity against "conflict and discord" on the one hand, and the "Calvinists'" desire for unity against "impurity and heterodoxy" on the other[13]—proved to be the dynamic context within which Leiden theologians formulated their doctrine of the *duplex regnum*. And yet, while this doctrinal distinction may have had practical implications for these "competing visions," the varied emphases of magistrate and pastors was not itself the motivating factor behind the formulation as presented by Leiden's theologians. Before investigating the way in which Leiden's Reformed theologians at the time addressed and developed the topic of the twofold kingdom of Christ, however, we will first highlight the importance of Leiden University as a representative center of international Reformed orthodoxy.

II.6.2.2. Leiden University as an Intellectual Center of Reformed Orthodoxy

---

[12] Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 37.
[13] Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 16.

Founded in 1575, it is often said that Leiden University was given by Prince William of Orange as a gift to the city in part because of its resistance during the Spanish siege.[14] The university's stated purpose was to instruct its students "both in the right knowledge of God and of all kinds of good, honest, and free arts and sciences aiming to the lawful government of the land."[15] Thus, both church and state had an interest in the establishment of Leiden University. With its three faculties of medicine, theology, and law, Leiden University very early on was recognized as a significant intellectual center in Europe.[16] The university's significance for Reformed orthodoxy, especially after the establishment of the Staten (or Theological) College in 1592,[17] is further evident in the number of influential professors coming from various European countries and teaching within the theology faculty in its early years: Lambert Daneau, Lucas Trelcatius, Sr., Franciscus Junius, Franciscus Gomarus, Lucas Trelcatius, Jr., Jacob Arminius, Johannes Polyander, Simon Episcopius, and Antonius Walaeus.[18] Given its reputation, international faculty, and the attraction it held for students throughout Europe (approximately 950 English and Scottish students came

---

[14] Kooi argues that this view is false; rather, she says, "Orange and the States chose the city for its strategic location after the siege away from the theater of the war." See Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 34. For the early history of Leiden University see, among others, Gilles Dionysius Jacobus Schotel, *De Academie te Leiden in de 16e, 17e, en 18e eeuw* (Haarlem: Kruseman & Tjeenk Willink, 1875); Willem Otterspeer, *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid: De Leidse universiteit, 1575–1672 (Groepsportret met Dame 1)* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2000); Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 19–58.

[15] As quoted in Van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 115.

[16] See especially the study by Daniela Prögler, *English Students at Leiden University, 1575-1650* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2013). Prögler remarks, "Only a small number of universities were internationally renowned, such as the Italian universities (in particular Padua), Heidelberg, and Leiden; most institutions had merely a regional attraction" (8). Prögler has calculated that there were 21,045 matriculations at Leiden University from 1575–1650, and that of this number 919 came from England. Within this same timeframe, for example, the Genevan Academy matriculated 3,403 students (see table on 32).

[17] The Staten College was established in 1592 for the training of Reformed ministers. Stanglin and McCall note that it consisted of "a regent, a sub-regent, and three members of the theology faculty." See Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 30.

[18] Cf. Prögler, *English Students at Leiden University*, 98–102. Prögler notes that Junius was paid 1200 guilders annually for his position, whereas less well-known law professors, for example, might receive 500 guilders per annum. The well-known professor Joseph Justus Scaliger was paid 2000 guilders for his position.

to study at Leiden from 1575–1675), it is clear that we may indeed consider this university as a representative center of Reformed orthodox thought.[19] The following is a consideration of two representative Leiden professors as it relates to the twofold kingdom of Christ.

II.6.3. Franciscus Junius on the Twofold Kingdom of Christ

This section will consider Franciscus Junius's (1545–1602) specific contribution to the development of the *duplex regnum Christi*. Junius, a renowned exegete and Leiden theology professor, is often credited for formalizing the archetypal/ectypal distinction concerning theology, a distinction he clearly expounds in his *De theologia vera*.[20] He has not, however, been adequately credited for his role in the development of the *duplex regnum Christi* doctrine. While this has been overlooked in secondary scholarship, the primary argument of this section is that Junius was a transitional figure in the development of this doctrine. From my research in this area, it seems that Junius was one of the first Reformed orthodox theologians to formalize the distinction between a common kingdom that is essential to the entire Trinity and a distinct personal kingdom given to Jesus Christ as God-man. This is not to say, however, that the content expressed by the *duplex regnum* distinction was non-existent

---

[19] Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, v. 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 124. Cf. Prögler, *English Students at Leiden University*, 32.

[20] See especially Willem J. Van Asselt, "The Fundamental Meaning of Theology: Archetypal and Ectypal Theology in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought," *WTJ* 64 (2003): 319–335. See also Van Asselt's introductory essay in Franciscus Junius, *A Treatise on True Theology: With the Life of Franciscus Junius*, trans. David C. Noe (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014), esp. xxxi–xl. Junius's *On True Theology* was originally published as *De theologia vera, ortu, natura, formis, partibus, et modo illiu: libellus recens, quo omnes Christiani de sua dignitate, et Theologi de gravitate sui ministerii secundum Deum admonentur* (Lugduni Batavorum [Leiden]: ex officina Plantiniana, 1594). See also *Opera Theologica Francisci Junii Biturgis sacrarum literarum professoris eximii. Quorum nonnula nunc primimum publicantur. Praefixa est vita autoris. Omnia cum indicibus VII acuratissimus*, ([Heidelbergae], in officina Sanctandreana, 1608), I: 1370–1424 [two volumes, henceforth cited as *OT*, I and *OT*, II]); Abraham Kuyper, ed., *D. Francisci Junii opuscula theologica selecta*, Bibliotheca Reformata 1 (Amsterdam: F. Muller and J.H. Kruyt, 1882), 45–101 [henceforth cited as Kuyper, ed.].

before Junius; rather, just as Junius's archetypal/ectypal distinction mirrored, for example, Scotus's *theologia in se* and *theologia nostra*,[21] so too the more technical definition of the *duplex regnum* that Junius contributed to had medieval and reformational precursors.[22] This section therefore seeks to highlight Junius's formative contribution to the doctrine of the *duplex regnum Christi* by examining several of his published works and theological theses.

II.6.3.1. Exegetical Grounding: Junius's Sacred Parallels

The earliest reference that I encountered in Junius's writings indicating the existence of a more formalized distinction of a twofold kingdom of Christ occurs in his *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, a work stemming from his Heidelberg career and published in 1588.[23] Admittedly, labeling this instance as the "earliest" reference to the twofold kingdom distinction in Junius's writings is not a conclusive statement; it is possible that an earlier reference exists. Nevertheless, after scanning Junius's works published prior to 1588 (and conducting electronic word searches for terms such as "*duplex*" and "*regnum*"), I was unable to find an earlier indication of this distinction. It is likely therefore that Junius began to utilize and refine a twofold kingdom distinction shortly after beginning his Heidelberg teaching career in 1585.

In his *Sacred Parallels* of 1588, Junius attempts to harmonize various passages of the Old and New Testament; his customary format is to quote the two complementary verses, and then give a short exposition—usually not more than one or two paragraphs—as to their agreement.[24] Each

---

[21] Van Asselt, "The Fundamental Meaning of Theology," 322.

[22] See Part One of this dissertation.

[23] François Du Jon, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres: Id Est Comparatio locorum Scripturae sacrae, qui ex Testamento vetere in Novo adducuntur: summam utriusque in verbis convenientiam, in rebus consensum, in mutationibus fidem veritatemque breviter & perspicue ex fontibus Scripturae S. genuinaque linguarum Hebraeae & Graecae conformatione monstrans ... Francisci Iunii Biturigis* (Heidelberg: Commelinus, 1588). Cf. *OT*, I:979–1266.

[24] The third book is an exception to this format as explained in a note below. On Junius's *Sacred Parallels*, see especially the three-volume work by Douglas Judisch, "A Translation and Edition of the *Sacrorum Parallelorum Liber Primus* of Francis Junius: A Study in Sixteenth-Century Hermeneutics," 3 vols. (PhD. diss., University of St. Andrews,

section is given a number. Of particular interest here is Parallel 39 of Book II, a brief account of the corresponding nature of Psalm 110:1 and 1 Corinthians 15:25.

In several instances I have already noted the importance of these particular Scripture passages for the development of the *duplex regnum*, but it is interesting to note Junius's reliance on and use of them early in the development of this doctrine. The specific question Junius wrestles with in the comparison of these two verses concerns the timing of Christ's kingdom; what does it mean that Christ reigns *until* the Father subjects all things to the Son? Careful not to undermine his belief in the aseity of the Son, Junius argues that these texts must be referring to the particular administration in which the Son rules, namely, the administration of the kingdom that he exercises as mediator.[25] In this capacity, Christ's governance is in reference to him as God and man such that his two natures are personally united, and the specific purpose of his rule and governance is the economy or accomplishment of our salvation (*oeconomiam salutis nostrae*).[26] While Junius in this short description specifically denominates this mediatorial rule of Christ an "economical kingdom," it should be noted that Junius here does not technically distinguish between a *twofold* kingship, that is, between an eternal or essential kingdom and a mediatorial one.

A second reference to the *duplex regnum* distinction in Junius's *Sacred Parallels* occurs in his third book, a bi-testamental analysis of

---

1979). Judisch states, "*The Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres* has, indeed, a primarily polemical origin, since it is designed to vindicate the bi-testamental passages against those who raise objections to them and who, consequently…imperil the salvation of those who give heed" (1:62–63). Volume 1 of Judisch's work provides a biography of Junius and an analysis of the *Sacred Parallels*, whereas volumes 2 and 3 give an English translation of the first book of Junius's *Sacred Parallels* (his parallels on the Gospels and the book of Acts).

[25] In the preface to his third book of the *Sacred Parallels*, Junius writes of Christ: "Summa, Jesum Christu[m] aeternu[m] Dei filium et ὁμο[ού]σιον vel coessentialem Deo patri & Spiritu sancto, veru[m] Deum, & veru[m] homine[m] in unitate person[a]e, esse illum ispsum aeternum & unicu[m] Prophetam, Sacredote[m], & Regem a Patre Ecclesi[a]e datu[m] in plenitudine temporu[m]…." See Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, 346.

[26] Junius writes, "'Nam oportet illum regnare,' id est, perfungi illa sua regni administratione in persona sua, qua Mediator est Dei & hominum secundum utramque naturam adunatam personaliter…." See Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, 301.

Hebrews.[27] In his opening comments on Hebrews 1:1–4, Junius proposes that these four verses of the first chapter of Hebrews give evidence of the threefold office as held by Christ (his prophetic office is indicated in verse 1, kingly office in verse 2, and priestly office in verse 3).[28] In his introductory comment on the kingly office of Christ, Junius immediately connects Christ's kingship to his mediatorial work conducted personally as God-man; Junius opines that it is because Christ is considered in this capacity that the Father is said to constitute the Son as heir of all things, and that the Son delivers all things to the Father.[29] Junius does not connect a precise term to his comments here, and yet the basic content of the later-developed *duplex regnum* distinction is present.[30]

A third reference appears shortly thereafter; in his comments on Hebrews 2:8–13 (to which he compares Psalm 22:23; Psalm 18:3; and Isaiah 8:19), Junius questions whether the author to Hebrews implies an absence of power in Christ when he states, "*At nunc nondum videmus omnia ei subjecta esse*."[31] Junius argues against this interpretation, stating that our view of Christ does not necessarily reflect his actual state. Drawing from Hebrews 2:9, and tying in 1 Corinthians 15, Junius suggests that the seemingly implied subjection of Christ only makes sense when contrasted with his future glory; in other words, in this age his reign seems inglorious, but this is proven not to be the case when compared with the future age. It is within this description of Christ's present-age reign—contrasted with his future reign—that Junius again references Christ's *regnum mediatorium*. As seen with the earlier references to this distinction in the *Sacred Parallels*,

---

[27] Junius's third book has a slightly different general format than the former two in that the expositions tend to be longer and the base text that Junius sequentially works through (to which others are compared) is Hebrews. The parallels are therefore not numbered, but arranged according to chapter number of Hebrews.

[28] Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, 347. The 1588 edition of Junius's *Sacred Parallels* mistakenly associates verse 11 with proof of Christ's prophetic office (rather than verse 1—an extra number "1" was undoubtedly inserted). This is corrected in his collected *Opera*. Cf. *OT*, I:1146.

[29] Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, 348.

[30] The connection to what is later called the *regnum personale* or *regnum donativum* is most apparent. A similar passing reference that hints at a kingdom exercised by Christ as mediator (that is, God and man united personally) is found in his section on the first five verses of Hebrews 2. See Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, 358.

[31] Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, 367.

the distinction is not fully developed here, and yet Junius does parenthetically note that the phrase "mediatorial kingdom" should be familiar at least to some as he includes the intriguing parenthetical qualification of the term "*ut ita loquamur*."[32]

II.6.3.2. Junius's Polemical Use of the Duplex Regnum

In addition to these exegetical comments found in his *Sacred Parallels*, Junius employed the distinction of a twofold kingdom in at least two polemical contexts in which he believed fundamental beliefs of the Reformed orthodox were questioned. Writing near the turn of the century, Junius responded both to the Socinian challenge—a position that he likened to the third-century heresy of Paul of Samosata—and the significant and highly technical attack of Reformed orthodoxy launched by the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine.[33] Against the Socinians, Junius wrote a three-volume *Defense of the Catholic Doctrine* (published in 1591 and comprising approximately 200 pages in his *Opera*) wherein he meticulously refuted their position on exegetical and theological grounds.[34] Similarly, Junius's more extensive seven-volume *Animadversiones in Roberti Bellarmini*

---

[32] Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres*, 368. This inclusion of the phrase "as it is called," referring to the term *regnum mediatorium*, suggests that Junius is relying on others for this terminology.

[33] Junius knew of both Christophoros Ostorodt and Andreas Voidovius, two Polish Socinians who came to Leiden in 1598 and wished to study there. See VanAsselt, "Introduction" in *A Treatise on True Theology*, xvi. The immense scholarship of Bellarmine produced a flurry of Protestant response. Nearly every Protestant elenctic theology of the seventeenth century criticized Bellarmine specifically, making him "one of the most-cited authors in that era." See Eef Dekker, "An Ecumenical Debate between Reformation and Counter-Reformation? Bellarmine and Ames on *liberum arbitrium*" in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem Van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 143. Bellarmine's writings effected approximately two hundred reactions (142).

[34] The first volume is *Defensio Catholicae doctrinae de S. Trinitate personarum in unitate essentiae Dei, adversus Samosatenicos errores specie inanis philosophiae in Polonia exundantes* as found in *OT*, II:2–56. The second volume is *Defensio Catholicae doctrinae de S. Trinitate personarum in unitate essentiae Dei, adversus Samosatenicos et alios errores...* as found in *OT*, II:57–124. The third volume is *Defensio Catholicae doctrinae de S. Trinitate personarum in unitate essentiae Dei, adversus Samosatenicas Interpretationes et Corruptiones locorum in Scripturis sacris...* as found in *OT*, II:125–228.

(published in 1600 and totaling just over 1300 pages) is a detailed rebuttal of Bellarmine's critique published nearly fourteen years earlier.[35]

In the earlier anti-Socinian three-volume work, a reference to the *duplex regnum*—or at least, to its substantial content—occurs in the final volume. The basis of this third volume is a Socinian commentary on John 1;[36] Junius quotes from this commentary, and then offers his own reply. Quite early, in his comments on the Socinian preface, Junius writes:

> For Christ as king, and the kingdom of Christ, is spoken of in two ways: first, with respect to a universal kingdom, which is a divine and eternal kingdom, common to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in one essence. Second, with respect to a particular kingdom (*respectu singularis regni*), in which as Mediator-King he obtains royal power over his church in his person. The first he has naturally, the later by divine dispensation.[37]

Junius here employed the twofold kingdom distinction to respond to Socinian anti-Trinitarians who challenged the essential divinity of Christ based on the premise that his kingship is derived from the Father. It is significant that this distinction arises within Junius's attempt to refute this novel interpretation of John 1; it is likely that this impetus caused him to nuance more carefully his position—this occurrence of the *duplex regnum* is more refined than the earlier 1588 references in the *Sacred Parallels*. While Junius does not use the more technical terms of *regnum essentiale* or *regnum naturale* as distinct from *regnum oeconomicum* or *regnum*

---

[35] *Animadversiones VII. in Roberti Bellarmini controversiam primam christianae fidei...quam Rob. Bellarminus Politianus societas Jesu (ut vocant) disputationum suarum libris exaravit adversus huius temporis haereticos*, in *OT*, II:406–1747.

[36] Junius here is refuting the *Brevis Explicatio, in Primum Ioannis Caput*, attributed to Laelius Socinius, the uncle of Faustus Socinius. Cf. Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 299. Lim comments that Socinius believed "Jesus was the Son of God, Lord, Christ, king, priest, head (of the Church), prophet, Messiah, servant, and Savior," but to designate Jesus as second person of the Trinity "was equivalent to ditheism."

[37] "Nam Christus rex, & Christi regnum bisariam dicitur: primum respectu universalis regni, quod regnum divinum atque aeternum est, commune Patris, Filii, & Spiritus sancti in unitate essentiae: secundo respectu singularis regni, quo ut Rex Mediator, regnum obtinet Ecclesia suae in persona sua: quorum prius a natura habet, posterius a dispensatione divina." See *OT*, II:132–133.

mediatorium here, evidence of a *twofold* kingship is more apparent in this 1591 reference than the 1588 references.

Junius also employed the *duplex regnum* distinction in his polemical work against Bellarmine. Junius's use of the distinction in this work—a work that appeared nearly nine years after his anti-Socinian treatises—is even more stylized and technical than the 1591 reference already quoted. In the second of the seven-volume work, housed within his comments on Bellarmine's arguments against historic heresies, Junius writes:

> For the kingdom of Christ is twofold: (1) one is essential from nature, which is had in common by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and (2) the other is personal from a dispensation of the will, which is properly of the person of Christ. The former is eternal, but the latter will have an end.[38]

After making this statement, Junius proceeds to argue for its validity from, not surprisingly, 1 Corinthians 15:24–27 and Psalm 110. While Junius considers the distinction to be a point of consideration belonging under the purview of theology proper—a characteristic not true of many later representatives—the essential characteristics as presented by the majority of seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox theologians are here present.[39]

The context within which Junius made this assertion is important to consider. As noted, he is here responding to Bellarmine's *Controversies of the Christian Faith*. More specifically, the context is Junius's comments on Bellarmine's second controversy ("On Christ the Head of the Whole Church"), Book I, Chapter 16. Within this controversy, Bellarmine argued

---

[38] "Nam regnum Christi duplex est; essentiale ex natura, quod co[m]mune est Patri, Filio, & Spiritui sancto; & personale ex dispensatione voluntatis, quod proprium personae Christi: illud aeternum, hoc finem habiturum." See *OT*, II:557.

[39] This reference occurs within the second volume, which is entitled *De Christo Capite Totius Ecclesiae*. It should be noted, however, that Junius's headings are reflective of the titles and subtitles used by Bellarmine. Junius uses the *duplex regnum* distinction in response to Bellarmine's Tome II (*De Christo Capite Totius Ecclesiae*), Book I (*Explicatur sentenia novorum Samosatenorum*), Chapter XVI (*Soluitur argumentum Tertium*). See Roberto Bellarmino, *Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini...De controuersiis christianae fidei aduersus huius temporis haereticos: quatuor tomis comprehensae : [tomus primus]* (Paris: Tri-Adelphorum Bibliopolarum, 1613), 1:303–305. Although this is technically under the *De Christo* section as delineated by Bellarmine, Junius characterizes it more properly under the consideration of God, i.e., *De Deo*.

for the full divinity of each person of the Trinity, and refuted various arguments that opposed this doctrine. In this particular chapter, Bellarmine wrestled with Paul's statement from 1 Corinthians 15:28: "Then the Son himself will also be subjected." After examining several interpretations of this statement, and arguing contrary to his opponents that it does not imply the Son is inferior to the Father, Bellarmine concluded that Paul simply emphasizes here that the humanity of the Son will *even in glory* be subject to the Father.[40] Junius does not disagree with Bellarmine on this point— indeed, he suggests of Bellarmine's view, "*Haec quidem vera est sententia*"—and yet he utilized this opportunity to give a fuller interpretation of 1 Corinthians 15:24–28.[41] According to Junius, not only did Paul teach that Christ according to his humanity would be subject to the Father in glory, but he also taught that Christ's personal kingship (distinct from his essential kingship) would be consummated in glory as it agrees and is subject to the Father's will.

II.6.3.3. The Duplex Regnum in Junius's Theological Theses

As evident from the 1588 *Sacred Parallels* references, Junius was already using the basic building blocks of the *duplex regnum* distinction in his years at Heidelberg. Over the next decade, Junius not only continued to refine his terms to express the concept of Christ's kingship, but also introduced the *duplex regnum* distinction to his theological students at Leiden. As evident from his theological theses delivered at Leiden from 1592–1602, Junius incorporated the distinction of a twofold kingdom into the divinity curriculum. Perhaps his fullest and most precise description of the *duplex regnum* occurs within his theses arguing for the existence of God as one essence and three persons. Junius writes:[42]

> But the power and kingdom of Christ (and this we grant before we treat [his] attributes) is twofold: there are two reasons he is called King and Lord. There is a common kingdom that belongs to the

---

[40] See St. Roberto Francesco Romolo Bellarmino, *Controversies of the Christian Faith*, trans. Kenneth Baker, S.J. (Saddle River: Keep the Faith, Inc, 2016), 369–370.

[41] *OT*, II:556.

[42] Roberto Bellarmino, *Controversies of the Christian Faith*, 2016.

whole divine essence, because the three persons (equal in power and glory) reign in one essence and common work in all persons and over all things, infinitely and unchangeably from eternity to eternity. There is also an individual and temporal kingdom of the person of the God-man, in which the person of Christ sending himself for our salvation (the common kingdom of the deity remaining intact), according to both natures in the unity of their personal works, and by a free dispensation, rules in all persons and over all things in the church, which is his progressing and mutable reign. The beginning and end of its administration is in time, but its work or fully completed action [*apotelesma*] is most perfect in eternal glory and in the salvation of the church. In the first respect, the Son is King according to nature, in the second respect, according to a free dispensation, [but] in both respects as true God, for he could not rule the latter and lowly kingdom if he were not God.[43]

There are at least three significant things to be noted here. First, reminiscent of the reference found in his *Animadversiones in Roberti Bellarmini*, this particular description of the *duplex regnum Christi* is housed within Junius's outline of theology proper. The placement here is significant as later Reformed orthodox theologians generally introduced the *duplex regnum Christi* under the *locus* of Christology.[44] While Junius does hint at the

---

[43] Franciscus Junius, *Theses theologicae quae in inclyta academia Lugdunobatava ad excercitia publicarum disputationum* [*Theses Leydenses*, 1592–1602] in Kuyper, ed., 147 [thesis 13.25]. "Dominium autem & regnum Christi (ut hoc adijciamus, antequam transeamus ad attributa) duplex est: adeo ut duplici etiam ratione Rex & Dominus dicatur. Est regnum commune totius divinae essentiae, quo tres personae, aequali potentia & gloria, in unitate essentiae, & operationum communium, in omnibus & super omnia, infinite, & immutabiliter, ab aeterno in aeternum regnant. Est regnum singulare personae *theanthropou* temporarium, quo persona Christi demittens se propter salutem nostrum (integro servato communi deitatis regno) secundum utramque naturam in unitate personalium operationum, voluntaria dispensatione regnat in omnibus, & super omnia, in Ecclesia, regno proficiente & mutabili, cuius administrandi principium & finis in tempore, opus vero seu *apotelesma* in gloria aeterna & salute Ecclesiae perfectissimum. Ratione prioris modi, Filius Rex est secundum naturam: ratione posterioris, secundum voluntariam dispositionem: ratione utriusque verus Deus: neque enim posteriori & abiectiori regni modo regnare posset, si Deus non esset."

[44] As discussed in the previous chapter, discussion of the *duplex regnum* was most often relegated to two specific places in the systematic works of the Reformed orthodox: (1)

duplex regnum in his later theses on Christ,[45] his more detailed explanation of the twofold kingdom of Christ within his theses on the trinity (rather than under the later commonly held placement of Christology) gives some indication of the newness of this particular distinction.

A second thing to note from Junius's description is that some ambiguity exists concerning the universality of the *duplex regnum*. For instance, does Junius limit the kingdom administered by the God-man simply to the church, and the commonly held kingdom of the Trinity to the state (or a realm extraneous to the church)? This question hinges on his two uses of the phrase "in all persons and over all things." Although he makes clear that the personal kingdom of the God-man concerns itself with the salvation of his people, and that it is thus centered on the church, Junius expressly links the phrase "*in omnibus et super omnia*" to *both* aspects of the Son's rule. Nevertheless, it is not clear in the second use of the phrase (i.e., in the context of his temporal, personal kingdom) whether Junius meant that Christ rules "all-people-and-all-things who are in the church," or whether he meant that Christ rules over "all people and all things," including the church. This ambiguity—itself a likely indicator of the newness of the distinction—is clarified by many of his successors. Polanus,

---

within their accounts of Christ's mediatorial work as prophet, priest, and king, and (2) within their discussions of Christ's session at the right-hand of the Father.

[45] In his theses on Christ, Junius states: "The kingly office is that kingdom which Christ possesses and executes on behalf of the Father, as it is written, 'I will give to you the heathen for your inheritance, etc.' (Ps. 2). For the Father himself has given him as the head of the church, as demonstrated in the prophetic and priestly sections, and is for himself and for us, our wisdom, justice, power made perfect before God." Junius continues to affirm that the Father gathers a kingdom (his church) to himself, defends it against the Devil and all enemies, until in the end Christ will bring to an end his economical kingdom (*huius regni oeconomicum*) by handing this over to the Father. The Latin is as follows: "Officium Regis est, quo Christus fungitur à patre in regni possessionem missus dicente, dabo tibi gentes haereditatem tuam, &c. *Psal. 2.* Pater enim ipsum, dedit caput Ecclesiae, ut res Prophetia demonstratas, & sacerdotio partas, apud ipsum & apud nos sua sapientia, iustitia, potentia perficiat coram Deo, Patre pro nobis, & in nobis regnum suum colligat, id est, Ecclesiae Catholicae membra singula per Spiritum illum omnia in omnibus operantem & adversus diabolum, peccatum, mortem, mundum, omnia denique impedimenta tueatur, donec omnes inimicos posuerit sub pedibus eius: quo demum tempore Dominus noster & servator Christus defunctus voluntaria huius regni oeconomia, sive dispensatione, omnique imperio & omni potentia ac virtute abolita, regnum suum hoc oeconomicum Deo ac Patri traditurus est, ut Deus sit omnia in omnibus." See Junius, *Theses Leydenses*, in Kuyper, ed., 197 [thesis 28.12].

for example, argued that Christ's mediatorial kingdom—what he denominates as the *regnum donativum* or "given kingdom"—is indeed universal in nature. While acknowledging that the particular purview of Christ's mediatorial kingdom is the church, Polanus affirmed that Christ exercises mediatorial power even over the enemies of the church, and therefore as God-man, the mediator Jesus Christ defends and preserves his elect while they live in this age.[46] Thus, according to Polanus, Christ does not possess two *separate* kingdoms identified by varying scopes (viz., one kingdom is over the church, and another kingdom is over everything else), but instead his *singular* kingdom has two distinct aspects identified by a twofold purpose.

A third and final thing to be noted from this description—and one that is evident in the earlier references as well—is that Junius assumed Christ's mediatorial kingdom is temporary or limited to this age; indeed, as he stated in the *Animadversiones in Roberti Bellarmini*, "the [essential kingdom] is eternal, but the [personal kingdom] will have an end."[47] While some Reformed orthodox continued to advocate an end or limit to the personal kingdom of Christ, most argued that as Christ retains both natures into eternity, he must also retain his twofold kingdom, although his *regnum personale* is differently administered in glory.[48]

As argued in the above sections, Junius played a formative role in the development of the *duplex regnum Christi*. Most likely formulating and developing this doctrine while still at Heidelberg, Junius continued to employ this distinction while employed as a professor at Leiden University. Notably, Junius was an instructor of Walaeus during his period of study at Leiden, and was likely the source for much of Walaeus's twofold kingdom theology. Before considering Walaeus in particular, however, it will be useful to consider first the nature of scholastic disputations at Leiden University given that a later focus will be on a particular disputation authored by this university professor.

---

[46] Amandus Polanus, *Syntagmatis Theologiae Christianae*, Tomus Secundus, Book VI, cap. XXIX (2:2857–2871 [especially 2:2861]).

[47] See quotation referenced earlier.

[48] See section II.5.4.

II.6.4. Scholastic Disputations at Leiden University and the *Duplex Regnum Christi*

II.6.4.1. The Nature and Use of Scholastic Disputations at Leiden University

An especially helpful insight into the mind and thought of an academic institution of the seventeenth century—or more narrowly, a particular department during a specified timeframe—can be gained through an investigation of the disputations that occurred at the institution in question. The counterpart to the university lecture (*lectio*), the *disputatio* was designed to supplement what was gleaned in the lecture by asking and contemplating the debatable or disputed questions (*quaestiones disputatae*), with the intention of arriving at a resolution. This practice of asking and debating a particular question is deeply rooted in classical and medieval pedagogical systems, and goes back as far as the *Sic et Non* of Peter Abelard.[49] Public disputations, often presided over by a master or faculty member, involved a respondent who either affirmed or denied a particular question; the respondent did so by expounding a set of theses and answering the objections of appointed opponents. Often, to conclude the disputation, the regent master or presiding faculty member would summarize and give a ruling or determination. Usually the text of the disputation was made available for anyone in attendance.[50]

In Leiden, the law faculty was the first to implement disputations in its curriculum; its practice was praised by Professor Everhardus Bronchorst in 1587 as "great and incomparable."[51] Early in 1596, the Leiden law

---

[49] The quintessential medieval formulation is found in the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas. For more on this practice in the medieval context, see Alan Cobban, *English University Life In The Middle Ages* (London: UCL Press, 1999), 174–177.

[50] For a concise summary of the *disputatio* method, see Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation*, 37–44.

[51] As quoted in Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation*, 38. Stanglin's reference is to P.C. Molhuysen, *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidsche Universiteit*, 7 vols. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1913–24), 1:151. For more on the practice of disputations at Leiden see Prögler, *English Students at Leiden University*, 103–105.

faculty received permission from the university curators to implement a series of disputations that would study the corpus of Roman law every two years.[52] Following the example of the law faculty, Leiden's theological faculty implemented its own series or cycle of disputations in May of 1596; this original cycle comprised 36 disputations, and ended in November of 1597. As Donald Sinnema and Henk van den Belt note, the common Leiden practice was for theology professors to take turns presiding over disputations centered on a particular dogmatic *locus*, and they would proceed through all of the systematic *loci* in a successive manner; progression through the various theological *loci* would often take two to three years. Professors were assigned a *locus* based on seniority; the senior faculty member presided over the first *locus*, and the others followed in turn until all the topics were treated. Professors newly appointed during the disputation cycle, were simply plugged in to the order.[53] Once the series finished, the entire set of disputations were often collected and published as a separate systematic or dogmatic system.[54] After the completion of the series, a new cycle would resume (*repetitio*), often treating the same *loci* and questions, and, where appropriate, introducing new material.

As Sinnema and van den Belt further note, the completed cycle—and especially a cycle that was later published—was often used as a resource for later disputation cycles.[55] Thus, for example, the second repetition of the original cycle (lasting from December 1597 to March 1601) was printed as *Compendium theologiae thesibus*, and the fourth repetition (December 1604 to January 1607) was printed as *Syntagma disputationum*

---

[52] Donald Sinnema and Henk van den Belt, "The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," *Church History & Religious Culture* 92, no. 4 (December 2012): 509.

[53] Sinnema and van den Belt, "The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," 507; 517. See also Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation*, 42–43. Stanglin notes it is not exactly known how the topics for each cycle were determined, but conjectures that the topics were agreed upon in advance of a given cycle.

[54] Sinnema and van den Belt, "The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," 507. Professors could also preside over separate disputations that were not designed as part of a series (modeled after the medieval *disputatio de quolibet* or *quodlibet* practice [a disputation on anything]).

[55] Sinnema and van den Belt, "The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," 507.

theologicarum.[56] While questions remain concerning the authorship of the individual disputations (i.e, whether the author was the presider, the respondent, or the respondent with oversight of the presider),[57] especially these printed cycles were seen as position statements not just of one faculty member or another, but of the faculty as a whole. Certainly in Leiden's case, the cycle of disputations that resulted in the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (published in 1625) was the clearest example of this fact.[58]

Given that scholastic disputations are an effective tool whereby one can trace the treatment of a particular doctrine, and considering the prominent place the *Synopsis Purioris* had within Dutch Reformed orthodoxy, it is helpful to analyze the doctrine of the twofold kingdom of Christ as developed within this pedagogical framework. In order to do so, in the following sections I will focus on the work of—and especially one

---

[56] Franciscus Junius, Lucas Trelcatius, and Franciscus Gomarus, *Compendium theologiae thesibus in Academia Lugduno-Bat. ordine a D.D. et professoribus Fr. Junio, Luca Trelcatio, et Francisco Gomaro publice propositis, ab anno 1598 usque ad annum 1605 concinnatim* (Hanover: Guilielmum Antonium, 1611); *Syntagma disputationum theologicarum, in Academia Lugduno-Batava quarto repetitarum, clariss. viris doctor. & professoribus Francisco Gomaro, Iacobo Arminio & Luca Trelcatio Iuniore, praesidibus* (Rotterdam: Joannes Leonardus, 1615). Cf. Sinnema and van den Belt, "The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," 511–512, who note that the dates included in the title of the second repetition are incorrect.

[57] B.J.D. van Vreeswijk distinguishes between "formal" and "material" authorship. Van Vreeswijk makes the case that at the very least the presiding professor held "material" authorship over the printed theses. In his estimation then, the "theology implied in the disputations was indeed the opinion of the presiding professor." See "An Image of Its Maker: Theses on Freedom of Franciscus Junius (1545–1602)" in W. J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde, eds., *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 97.

[58] For an English translation of the initial two volumes to the *Synopsis Purioris* see Dolf te Velde and Willem J. van Asselt, eds., *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (Synopsis of a Purer Theology)*, trans. Riemer A. Faber, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, 3 vols. (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014; 2016). As noted in the introduction, "During the remainder of the seventeenth century, the *Synopsis* had a prominent place as a theological handbook for use in training Reformed ministers in the Netherlands" (1:1). For the full Latin text see Johannes Polyander, Andreas Rivet, Antonius Walaeus, and Antoine Thysius, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae: disputationibus quinquaginta duabus comprehensa ac conscripta per Johannem Polyandrum, Andream Rivetum, Antonium Walaeum, Antonium Thysium, S. S. theologiae doctores et professores in Academi a Leidensi*, ed. Herman Bavinck (1625; Leiden: D. Donner, 1881). Further references to this edition of the *Synopsis* will use the Latin title, whereas references to the English translation will use the title *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*.

pertinent disputation presided over by—Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639).[59] Before considering Walaeus's contribution to the *Synopsis Purioris*, however, we will briefly consider several other occurrences or allusions to the *duplex regnum* doctrine with this important Leiden University document.

II.6.4.2. The Duplex Regnum as Expressed Elsewhere in the Synopsis

While Walaeus's twenty-eighth disputation on Christ's exaltation (as discussed next) contains the clearest use of the *duplex regnum* distinction with the *Synopsis*, it is not the only place; the other Leiden theologians responsible for the *Synopsis Purioris* also included references or aspects of the twofold kingdom of Christ doctrine. Thus, Johannes Polyander (1568–1646; professor at Leiden from 1611–1646), within the twenty-sixth disputation *On the Office of Christ*, notes that Christ will put aside his mediated rule or government. Thesis 52 of this disputation reads as follows:

> But as Christ's Church has a twofold state, the one of grace in this age and the other of glory in the future, we should distinguish the current government of the Church from the one that is to come. For in this life Christ rules his Church through the intervening [*mediate*] agencies of ecclesiastical administration by faithful pastors, and he protects it by the administration of devout political magistrates. In the life that is to come he will rule it directly, without the external supports of that kind and by the divinity he shares with the Father and the Holy Spirit, so that together with them he may be all things to every member of the household of faith…(1 Corinthians 15:28; Revelation 21, 22 and 23).[60]

---

[59] For a brief biography of Walaeus see Samuel Clarke, *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical History: Contained in the Lives of One Hundred Forty Eight Fathers, Schoolmen, First Reformers and Modern Divines Which Have Flourished in the Church since Christ's Time to This Present Age* (London: Printed for T.V., 1654), 935–985.

[60] *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:127. The Latin is as follows: "Ceterum ut Ecclesiae Christi duplex est status, unus gratiae in hoc seculo, alter gloriae in futuro, ita praesens Ecclesiae gubernatio a futura est distinguenda. In hac enim vita Christus Ecclesiam suam mediate regit per Ecclesiasticam fidelium pastorum, ac protegit per politicam piorum

At first sight, Polyander here seems to emphasize a slightly different distinction, namely, the distinction between a *regnum gratiae* and *regnum gloriae* as already considered by e.g. Bucanus and others in section II.5.2.3. That Polyander indeed had in mind the same distinction that concerns us here, however, is evident from the way in which he continues his argument; in Theses 53 and 54 he continues by stating that Christ will, having secured his elect people from the fear of the enemy, "hand over to [the Father] his mediatorial (or dispensational [*oeconomicum*]) scepter."[61] This handing over of Christ's economical reign, Polyander further explains, will occur after the final act of judgment when, with "personal power," Christ will graciously give life to his friends (*amicis suis*), but death justly to his enemies.

A further allusion to the twofold kingdom of Christ in the *Synopsis Purioris* is found in Disputation 41, presided over by Antonius Thysius (1565–1640; professor at Leiden from 1619–1640). In this disputation, defended in 1623, Thysius argues that Christ (the God-man and mediator) is the sole Head of the church, whereas the Antichrist is the "head of the church that does evil."[62] After explaining several scriptural analogies whereby Christ's relationship to his church is defined, Thysius is careful to distinguish the appointed-by-the-Father power and authority of the God-man from the Son's already-held divine sovereignty. Referencing (among other verses) Matthew 28:18 and 1 Corinthians 15:24–28, Thysisus states:

> By the order that exists among the divine persons, and by the specific economy and arrangement suited for redemption, Christ, being God and man, has received this privilege from the Father and holds on to it in subservience to the Father, and excercises it as a deputy, even though he has been endowed with a knowledge and power that is divine.[63]

Magistratuum administrationem; in altera vita eam immediate absque ejusmodi externis adminiculis reget secundum Deitatem sibi cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto communem, ut cum utroque sit omnia in omnibus fidei domesticis…1 Cor. 15, 28. Apoc. 21, 22. 23." See *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, ed. Herman Bavinck, 261.

[61] *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:129.

[62] *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:589.

[63] *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:595. Cf. Thesis 10 where Thysius also refers to Christ as "God's deputy [*vicarius Dei*]" since Christ received his "position from the father

Although Thysius did not at this point use formal categories or terms to distinguish this twofold authority of Christ (i.e., *regnum mediatorium* as distinct from *regnum essentiale* or *naturale*), arguably much of the theology behind these terms is present. The use of this formal distinction is seen even more clearly as we now consider Walaeus's contribution to the *Synopsis Purioris*.

II.6.4.3. Walaeus's Disputation on the Session of Christ and the Duplex Regnum

As part of the reform of Leiden University following the conclusion of the Synod of Dort, Antonius Walaeus was installed as Professor of Theology, responsible for teaching dogmatics; he delivered his inaugural address in October of 1619, and served in this position until his death in 1639. Of the fifty-two disputations included in the *Synopsis Purioris* (this cycle of disputations began only four months after Walaeus's appointment), Walaeus was responsible for fourteen.[64] In the eighth disputation that he presided

---

and subject to the father, takes his place and rules on his behalf (1 Corinthians 15:27)." See *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:593–595.

[64] Eleven of the fourteen *Synopsis* disputations presided over by Walaeus are included in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Ex officina Francisci Hackii, 1643), 2:319–365. The list of his disputations is as follows:

1. *Disputationum Prima: De S. Scriptura Necessitate, & Authoritate* (comprising 36 theses);
2. *Disputatio De S. Scripturae Perspicuitate, & Interpretatione* (comprising 39 theses);
3. *Disputatio De Persona Patris et Filii* (comprising 34 theses);
4. *Disputatio De Angelis Bonis Ac Malis* (comprising 52 theses);
5. *Disputatio De Peccato Actuali* (comprising 54 theses);
6. *Disputatio De Juramento* [Not included in disputation section of *Opera Omnia*]
7. *Disputatio De Divina Praedestinatione* [Not included in disputation section of *Opera Omnia*]
8. *Disputatio De Statu Exaltationis Iesu Christi* (comprising 36 theses);
9. *Disputatio De Resipiscentia* (comprising 53 theses);
10. *Disputatio De Cultu Invocationis* [Not included in disputation section of *Opera Omnia*]
11. *Disputatio De Ecclesia* (comprising 51 theses);
12. *Disputatio De Sacramento Baptismi* (comprising 56 theses);
13. *Disputatio De Disciplina Ecclesiastica* (comprising 59 theses);
14. *Disputatio De Vita Ac Morte Aeterna, Et Consummatione Seculi* (comprising 60 theses)

over, a disputation that took place in 1622 and was entitled *On the State of Exaltation of Jesus Christ* (*Disputatio De Statu Exaltationis Iesu Christi*), Walaeus made clear reference to Christ's twofold kingdom. The twenty-fourth thesis of this disputation reads as follows:

> And so this sitting down of Christ at the right hand of his Father does not strictly mean that glory and natural kingdom [*regnum naturale*] which the Son of God shares with the Father from eternity, for if that were the case then also the Holy Spirit should also have his seat at the right hand of God. But it means the economic and voluntary kingdom [*regnum oeconomicum et voluntarium*] in which Christ was established as the God-and-man and our Mediator, for the gathering and defense of his Church. Therefore the apostle Paul asserts that "the Father has put all things under his feet, except him who has made all things subject to him (1 Corinthians 15:27).[65]

The significance of this thesis becomes evident when seen within the immediate context of this particular disputation and its relation to other areas in Walaeus's theology. After noting briefly the subsequent two repetitions of this disputation, we will focus on developing the above-stated

---

Notably, Disputations 6, 7, and 10 are left out of the *disputationes* section in Walaeus's *Opera*; it is likely that they are not here included because these three disputations are replicated nearly exactly in Walaeus's smaller dogmatic work, his *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae*. It seems that Walaeus relied on this presumably earlier work, a product from his teaching career at the Latin school of Middleburg, to produce these three disputations. Similarities are evident when comparing other disputations to this earlier work, but not nearly as extensive as in these three disputations. Walaeus's son (Johannes Walaeus), who was responsible for compiling his father's *Opera*, writes in the *lectori*: "The *miscellanea* correspond to orations already printed, and to disputations one or two of which have been inserted in *loci* by indication of the author, lest someone suspect them to have been omitted" (Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:A* 4ʳ). It is not immediately clear what Johannes Walaeus meant by *loci*: did he hereby refer to Walaeus's *Loci Communes*, the *Enchiridion*, or more generically "other places"?

[65] Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 2:339. "Significat ergo haec sessio Christi ad dextram Patris, non proprie gloriam illam & regnum naturale, quod filio Dei cum Patre ab aeterno fuit commune, hoc enim pacto etiam Spiritus Sanctus ad dextram Dei sederet: sed regnum oeconomicum & voluntarium, in quo tanquam θεάνθρωπος, & Mediator noster, ad Ecclesiae su[a]e collectionem ac defensionem a Patre est constitutus, unde Apostolus Paulus *ei omnia a Patre esse subjecta* asserit, *excepto tamen eo qui ei omnia subjecit*, I Cor. 15. v. 27." See also *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, 278 (*Disputatio XXVIII, thesis XXIV*). English is taken from *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:173.

thesis within Walaeus's 1622 disputation more narrowly, whereas in the next subsection we will discuss the twofold kingdom distinction within Walaeus's theology more broadly.

Walaeus's brief treatment of the *duplex regnum Christi* (Christ's *regnum naturale* as distinct from his *regnum oeconomicum*) in a disputation on Christ's session at the right hand of the Father should not be surprising; as already referenced in Chapter Five, Christ's session was one of the favored places where this doctrine was discussed by the seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox. More surprising (and worthy of further investigation) is the absence of the *duplex regnum Christi* distinction when comparing the next two successive repetitions of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*. In the first repetition, which took place from July of 1625 to July of 1628, Walaeus again presided over a disputation on the state of Christ's exaltation. In the second repetition, occurring from 1628 to 1632, this particular locus was covered by Johannes Polyander. When comparing these two repetitions to the original *Synopsis*, interestingly it is Polyander's 1631 disputation that more closely matches the structure and content of the original 1622 *Synopsis* disputation authored by Walaeus (even though admittedly the *duplex regnum* distinction was not technically employed by Polyander in his 1631 version either, the substantial content is present).[66] In other words, Walaeus significantly changed his 1627 disputation on Christ's session; absent in this disputation cycle on Christ's session is the use of the *duplex regnum* distinction.[67] Nevertheless, despite this absence in his 1627 disputation, Walaeus's inclusion and use of the *duplex regnum* in the original 1622

---

[66] Compare Antonius Walaeus, *Disputationum Theologicarum Repetitarum Vicesima-Octava, de Statu exaltationis Iesu Christi* (Leiden: Ex Officina Bonaventurae & Abrahami Elzevir, 1627) with Johannes Polyander, *Disputationum Theologicarum, quae ex ordine repeti consueverunt, vigesima octava, de Statu exaltationis Christi* (Leiden: Ex Officina Bonaventurae & Abrahami Elzevir, 1631). On the repetitions of the *Synopsis* see Sinnema and van den Belt, "The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," 524–526.

[67] It should be noted that Walaeus's 1627 disputation was much shorter than his 1622 disputation, which may be one reason why the *duplex regnum* distinction was left out; whereas the 1622 disputation contained 36 theses, the 1627 disputation had only 20 theses. Furthermore, the 20 theses of the 1627 disputation are on average much shorter than the 1622 theses. Furthermore, the absence of this distinction and the shorter theses may in part be due to the influence of the respondent; the 1622 disputation was defended by Daniel de Swaef, and the 1627 disputation was defended by Isaac Basirius.

disputation indicates at the very least that by the early seventeenth century this distinction was utilized in the education of theology students at Leiden University.

When considering Walaeus's original 1622 disputation, and especially the use of the *duplex regnum* within his treatment of Christ's exaltation, it is instructive to consider the use of this distinction within the logical flow of the particular theses. In Theses 1 and 2, Walaeus contrasts Christ's three steps of humiliation (his death on the cross, burial, and descent into hell—the subject of the previous disputation) with the three steps of Christ's exaltation: his resurrection from the dead, ascension into heaven, and session at the Father's right hand. Walaeus discusses the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ in Theses 3–9, the local ascension of Jesus Christ in Theses 10–20, and the royal enthronement of Jesus Christ in Theses 21–36. In each of these three subsections Walaeus argues from the demonstration of the particular step's nature and/or causes to its results or fruit (*fructus*).[68] Thus, for example, Walaeus's treatment of the resurrection moves from a refutation of the "Marcionites, Libertines, and men of similar ilk" in Thesis 3,[69] to a support of Christ's bodily resurrection as proved from

---

[68] As noted in the introduction of the English *Synopsis*, "the authors…commonly follow this Aristotelian pattern of topical questions: What does the term mean? Does the object exist? What is it? What are its parts? What specific aspects can be discerned? What are the causes of the object? What effects or consequences follow from it? To what other entities is it related? What things are the opposite or contradictory to it?" See *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 1:5. Sinnema also notes that the inclusion of theses on the use (*usus*) or fruit (*fructus*) of a particular doctrine was a common "feature of Protestant exegetical and dogmatic analysis." As Sinnema notes, Andreas Hyperius recommended in his *De Recte Formando Theologiae Studio* (Basel, 1556) that the exegete should point out "what in a passage may be useful for the present time" and that the dogmatician should "note how much spiritual fruit can be gained from a doctrine, both publicly for the church and privately for conscience." Sinnema further argues that this early commitment at Leiden University not to divorce the theoretical from the practical in dogmatics and biblical studies was partially the reason why a separate chair for practical theology was not established in the university's early existence; in turn, the absence of a practical theology department "had the effect of pressuring the Leiden professors to highlight more deliberately the practical implications of their own teaching." See Donald Sinnema, "The Attempt to Establish a Chair in Practical Theology at Leiden University (1618–1626)" in Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma, and Jason Zuidema, eds., *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*, Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, Volume 170 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), 432; 440.

[69] *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:159.

both Scripture and the church fathers (Theses 4–6), next to a discussion of the efficient cause of Christ's resurrection (Thesis 7), and concludes with the many effects or results of the resurrection (Theses 8–9). Similarly, Walaeus treats the place to which Christ ascended in Theses 10–13, the mode and form in which he ascended in Theses 14–19 (a defense largely from various places in Scripture), and the fruits of his ascension in Thesis 20.

Walaeus reiterates this pattern in Theses 21–36, his argument for the final step of Christ's exaltation, namely, Christ's royal and eternal session. Walaeus first argues that because God is a Spirit—one who "lacks flesh and bones" (*ac proinde carnem et ossa non habeat*)[70]— the phrase "the right hand of God" must be taken metaphorically to denote a position of honor and regal authority. It is in this context that Walaeus introduces the distinction of Christ's twofold kingdom as already quoted. He argues that Christ is not given a position of authority with respect to him being the Son of God, but as God-man and mediator of his people, particularly his church. Walaeus points to numerous scriptural passages as evidence that Jesus Christ is *given* a name or position of authority and honor that is distinct from what he eternally possesses as Son of God; thus, in Thesis 25, he cites Ephesians, 1:20–22; Philippians 2:9–11; and Hebrews 2:7–8.

In a separate thesis (Thesis 26), Walaeus further argues that the designations of Scripture attributed to Jesus Christ are not simply glorious titles, but that the God-man, because he is seated on the throne, possesses real power and authority over *all creatures*. It is noteworthy that Walaeus does not limit Christ's economical kingdom to the church; rather, as he states, this kingdom or rule particular to the God-man—like his natural kingdom—is over all creatures (*in omnes creaturas*). Walaeus thus contends that as King, Jesus Christ governs everything, builds and gathers from the world his church by means of his word and Spirit, and by his power conserves and protects the church from the world and Satan. This Mediator-King will therefore exercise full victory over all of his enemies.[71] According

---

[70] *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:171.
[71] Thesis 26 states, "Sed haec Christi capitis gloria, non est titularis, sed cum potestate et imperio in omnes creaturas etiam conjuncta; qua tamquam Rex et gubernator

to Walaeus, this future and final triumph of Christ's economical or mediatorial kingdom over all people is certain as proven from Scripture (Thesis 27); for evidence, Walaeus points to Psalm 110:1 and the complementary passages of 1 Corinthians 15:25 and Matthew 26:64 (as well as Mark 14:62 and Matthew 28:18).

In Theses 28–30, Walaeus further contends that Christ is seated at the Father's right hand according to *both* his divine and human nature. Contrary to the Lutherans—whom Walaeus calls the "Ubiquitarians"—who claim that Christ's session at the Father's right hand proves the ubiquity of Christ's body (Thesis 30), Walaeus argues that Christ is constituted as mediatorial king according to the hypostatic union of his human nature with his divine nature.[72] Here Walaeus emphasizes again that Christ's divine nature did not receive any new gift from the Father (for he possessed glory and power from eternity), but that—owing to the will of the Father and the accomplishment of salvation—according to his assumed human nature, the person of Jesus Christ received glory and power from the Father.[73] In other words, Walaeus argues that both natures of the theandric mediatorial king

---

omnium, verbo et Spiritu suo Ecclesiam efficaciter e mundo colligit, et potentia sua adversus mundum et Satanam conservat ac tuetur; idque donec de hostibus omnibus plene triumphabit." See *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, 278 (*Disputatio XXVIII*, *thesis XXVI*). The English is: "This glory of Christ as Head is not merely in name only, but it is also accompanied by power and rule over all creatures. With this, as the King and Ruler over all things, he effectively gathers the Church out of the world by his Word and Spirit, and by his power he keeps it safe and guards it against the world and against Satan, and he does so until he will triumph completely over all his enemies." *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:173.

[72] Cf. *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:175n20. The editorial note describes the internecine arguments amongst Lutherans between 1616 and 1625 concerning the ubiquity of Christ's body; one group, following Brenz, maintained this doctrine based on the hypostatic union, but another group, following Chemnitz, argued that Jesus divested his human omnipresence with his *kenosis*, only to take it up again after his exaltation.

[73] Inclusion of the Latin here is helpful. Thesis 28 states: "Nam quemadmodum Christus Mediator est constitutus secundum utramque naturam…ita quoque secundum utramque Rex noster est constitutus, cum hoc tamen discrimine, quod divina natura nulla hic nova dona accepit, sed ejus gloriae ac potentiae quam ab aeterno possedit, novum usum ac manifestationem, secundum Patris voluntatem et salutis nostrae oeconomiam…sed humana natura utrumque accepit a Patre, nempe gloriam ac potestatem atque usum eorum." See *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, 279 (*Disputatio XXVIII*, *thesis XXVIII*).

will neither be confounded nor separated.[74] As such, Jesus Christ will visibly appear as king at the end of the age.

In the final six theses of this disputation (mirroring the pattern explained earlier), Walaeus transitions to consider the fruit or use of Christ's royal session. Interestingly, he does not focus simply on its positive use (i.e., Christ's priestly intercession for his church), but also emphasizes that the session of Christ should be a daily threat to the enemies of the church, including Satan himself. Indeed, as Walaeus notes, an effect of Christ's royal session is that he will gather and defend his church against the tyranny of the whole world, even the gates of hell itself (*adversus totius mundi tyrannidem atque inferorum portas conservat*).[75] Walaeus concludes that the ultimate or final act of Christ's reign as priest (*regni sacerdotalis*) will be the final judgment when, citing 1 Cor. 15:24, 28, he will lay aside the economical form of his government (*oeconomica regnandi forma*), and, as victor, hand over himself and then his kingdom to the Father.[76]

II.6.4.4. The Duplex Regnum as Expressed Elsewhere in Walaeus's Theology

In addition to Walaeus's academic disputations that contributed to the creation of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, he also produced two dogmatic works: the first a more introductory work entitled *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae*, and the second a more advanced work entitled *Locos Communes Sacrae Theologiae*.[77] While it is not certain at what point

---

[74] Walaeus is reflecting the commonly held Reformed orthodox position of the *communicatio idiomatum*. For more on this distinction see Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek*, 72–74.

[75] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, 280 (*Disputatio XXVIII, thesis XXXI*). Cf. *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:177.

[76] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, 281 (*Disputatio XXVIII, thesis XXXVI*). Cf. *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:179. For further discussion on the cessation of the economical kingdom of Christ, see Section II.5.4.

[77] These two works, published posthumously, make up Volume 1 of Walaeus's *Opera*. The *Enchiridion* was intended as an introductory text to Reformed theology, and the *Loci Communes* further developed this. As explained by Johannes Walaeus (Antonius Walaeus's son) in the preface: "Ita sacro Ministerio initiandis *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae* dedit, quo iis applanaretur via, & Theologiae vestibulum aperiretur. Initiatos,

Walaeus composed these works in relation to the 1622 disputation already referenced, it seems that his 1622 disputation drew from these two works. Although it is possible that Walaeus redacted both the *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae* and the *Locos Communes Sacrae Theologiae* at a later date, inserting in them where appropriate material from his *Synopsis* disputations, it is more probable that his 1622 *Synopsis* disputation drew from the *Enchiridion* and *Loci Communes*. Several lines of reasoning point in this direction. First, Walaeus's son, Johannes Walaeus, indicates in the preface to the *Opera* that the content of the *Enchiridion* at least originated from his father's earlier teaching career at Middelburg (which he began in 1606).[78] Second, as noted earlier, at least three of Walaeus's disputations included in the *Synopsis* cycle appear nearly verbatim in the *Enchiridion*.[79] It is most likely that Walaeus used his *Enchiridion* as the basis for his *Synopsis* disputation because a repetition of material is not seen in other disputations that have a duplicated topic. For example, Walaeus presided over a disputation entitled *De Peccato Actuali* in 1621; this same heading is included in his *Enchiridion*, but the material in both is different. If the individual *Synopsis* disputations were in fact the basis for the *Enchiridion*, one would assume that the fuller consideration of original sin as given in the *Synopsis* disputation would have replaced whatever was included in the *Enchiridion*.

Finally, it is further evident that large portions of Walaeus's *Synopsis* disputation on the session of Christ are taken from his *Loci Communes*. The twenty-fourth thesis of Walaeus's *Disputatio De Statu Exaltationis Iesu Christi*, as already quoted, is repeated nearly verbatim in Walaeus's section on Christology in his *Loci Communes*:

> Therefore the session of Christ at the right hand of the Father
> signifies, not properly his glory and natural kingdom (*regnum*

Locis Communibus Sacrae Theologiae & Consiliis penitius admisit, & Omnia revelavit." Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:A* 3ʳ.

[78] See Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:A* 3ʳ. Walaeus's son states, "*Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae* in illustri Middelburgensium Schola dictari coeptum est, & qui eum ex illa Schola in Academiam Leydensem comitati sunt discipuli, ibidem ei non minimam ejus partem extorsere."

[79] See the previous section II.6.4.3.

naturale)—that which the Son of God holds in common with the Father from eternity (indeed, if this was the case, the Holy Spirit would also be seated at the right hand of God)—but the voluntary and economical kingdom (*regnum oeconomicum*), in which as God-man and our Mediator, he gathers and defends his church established by the Father. Psalm 110:1 states, "He will reign until his enemies will be put under foot." The Apostle Paul explains when he says that all things are subject to him by the Father, nevertheless, except him who subjects all things (1 Cor. 15:27). This concerns, therefore, the mediatorial and economical glory, not the natural divine glory.[80]

Several observations can be noted concerning this repetition. First, assuming that the *Loci Communes* version predates the version included in the *Synopsis* (as already explained), it is interesting to note Walaeus's use of Psalm 110 in support of his claim here; it is not apparent why this exegetical support is dropped in the 1622 disputational version of this passage. Second, the inclusion of the concluding phrase—"*Agitur ergo de gloria mediatoria & oeconomica, non naturali divina*"—is also noteworthy. Third, and perhaps most significantly, the two variations appear under differing aspects of Walaeus's Christology; the variant included in the 1622 *Synopsis* disputation was, as seen, related to the session of Christ, whereas the *Loci Communes* variant was included in a section in which Walaeus argued for the hypostatic union of Jesus Christ. Walaeus's inclusion of the *duplex regnum* distinction in these two areas of his Christology is significant as it underscores a tenet of this work's thesis: that is, increasingly the Reformed orthodox thought of the *duplex regnum* as primarily a christological distinction—even more so than a political or ecclesiological one.

---

[80] Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 2:391. Cf. section II.7.3.2. "Significat ergo haec sessio Christi ad dextram Patris, non proprie gloriam illam & regnum naturale, quod filio Dei cum Patre ab aeterno fuit commune, hoc enim pacto etiam Spiritus Sanctus ad dextram Dei sederet: sed regnum oeconomicum & voluntarium, in quo tanquam θεάνθρωπος, & Mediator noster, ad Ecclesiae suae collectionem ac defensionem a Patre est constitutes. Psal.110.vers.1. *Oportet illum regnare donec posuerit inimicos suos sub pedibus suis*. Quod explicans Apostolus Paulus *ei omnia a Patre esse subjecta* asserit, *excepto tamen eo qui ei omnia subjecit*, I Cor. 15. v. 27. Agitur ergo de gloria mediatoria & oeconomica, non naturali divina."

For Walaeus, Christ's twofold kingdom is very much related to his hypostatic union, that is, that the person of Christ assumed to himself a human nature.[81] As previously indicated, Walaeus therefore distinguished between a natural glory intrinsic to the divinity of Christ, and a mediatorial glory pertaining to the theandric person of Jesus Christ. When Scripture indicates anything *given* to Jesus Christ or *received* by him—whether a kingdom, glory, power, or name above any other name—this assumes a degree of subjection to the giver; for Walaeus then, because there cannot exist any subordination of the Son to the Father, this subjected mediatorial glory is inferior to the Son's natural glory.[82] In Walaeus's estimation, this distinction is useful for properly interpreting scriptural passages such as John 17:5: "And now, Father, glorify me with the glory I had with you in your presence before the world was."[83]

Walaeus employed the distinction of a twofold kingdom in at least one other place in his *Loci Communes*. The remark is found in the tenth locus, entitled *De Sacrosancta Trinitatis Mysterio*. More particularly, Walaeus included a passing reference to the mediatorial kingdom of Christ in his consideration of the person of the Son of God (*De Persona Filii Dei*) within this locus on the Trinity. In the midst of answering numerous objections to the divinity of the Son, Walaeus addressed the possible objection from 1 Corinthians 15:24—that is, because the Son hands over a kingdom to the Father, the Son is therefore subject to the Father. Without fully explaining the *regnum mediatorium*, Walaeus simply replied that this

---

[81] For more on the personal union of the two natures in Christ, see Antoine Thysius's *Disputatio XXV* of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* entitled "*Filii Dei Incarnatione et Unione personali duarum naturam in Christo*." Especially relevant is Thesis 24 of this disputation. Thysius uses this distinction later (in Thesis 38) to interpret how it is that the Son of God has power from all eternity, while at the same time as Son of Man he is given all power in heaven and on earth (*data omnis potestas in coelo et in terra*) (Matt. 28). Cf. *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 2:89–91.

[82] Under a section pertaining to the session of Christ included in his *Enchiridion*, Walaeus writes, "Gloria tamen haec & majestas humanae naturae Christi, inferior est gloria mere divina. Nam Pater quidem subjecit humanae naturae Christi omnia, sed tamen *Excepto illo qui illi omnia subjecit*, ut Paulus testatur I. Cor.15.vers.27." Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:42.

[83] The Latin is as follows: "Et nunc glorifica me, tu Pater, apud temet ipsum ea gloria, quam habui apud te, priusquam mundus eset." Cf. Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:42. Cf. also to Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:389.

objection does not stand as this verse is speaking of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, which is why Scripture also testifies "*regni ejus non erit finis*."[84]

As demonstrated, the distinction of a twofold kingdom possessed by Christ is utilized in various places throughout Walaeus's work, although in every instance it is associated with a description of the person or work of Jesus Christ.[85] While it is interesting to note the number and context of these references, it is also significant that (like the *Synopsis Purioris* more generally) Walaeus did not—as far as I can determine—use this distinction in the context of delineating the magistrate's role from the pastor's.[86] This absence is further remarkable given that Walaeus wrote a seventy-page tract devoted to this subject: *De Munere Ministrorum Ecclesia, & Inspectione Magistratus circa illud*.[87] While Walaeus carefully amasses exegetical and

---

[84] Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:249. Walaeus does not here give a scriptural reference, but simply states "as it is said elsewhere in Scripture (*ut alibi Scriptura loquitur*)." He does, however, quote this same phrase elsewhere in his *Opera*, and cites Luke 1:33. Cf. Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:394.

[85] Somewhat surprisingly, Walaeus did not distinguish between Christ's natural and mediatorial kingdom in his section on the threefold office of Christ as found in the *Enchiridion*. While Walaeus does argue here for the kingly reign of Christ over the entire world, especially for the defense of the church (a theme found elsewhere when he employs the *duplex regnum* distinction), and while he references Scripture verses here that are used to support the *duplex regnum* elsewhere (such as Psalm 2:6, Ephesians 1:20, and 1 Corinthians 15:25), Walaeus does not specifically address this distinction here. See Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 1:38.

[86] Johannes Polyander was responsible for Disputation 50 of the *Synopsis Purioris* entitled *De Magistratu Politico*. Within the 65 theses of this disputation, Polyander provides a thorough defense of the ministerial office of the magistrate. While clearly distinguishing the role and duties of the magistrate from that of the pastor (see Theses 46 and 47 especially), and while affirming that the Christian magistrate is "custodian and vindicator of both tables of the law [utriusque legis tabulae custody ac vindici]," nevertheless Polyander did not utilize or rely on the *duplex regnum Christi* distinction within this entire disputation. For the reference, see *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, ed. Herman Bavinck, 622. As an aside, Polyander admits that prescribing the proper way for magistrates to treat heretics is a hard question. In the end, he advocates for a gentler approach, advising that the magistrate as a rule try to find another approach (other than capital punishment) to convice the heretic of his or her errors; only as an exception—in very serious or flagrant cases—should the magistrate employ the death penalty. See Theses 55–57; *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, ed. Herman Bavinck, 623–624.

[87] Cf. Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, 2:3–73. This tract, largely directed as a refutation of the more Erastian leanings of Johannes Uytenbogaert, was considered by some as a significant contribution to the question concerning the church and magistrate's relationship. Thus, for example, this tract is mentioned before any other work in the *Lectori* of Walaeus's *Opera*.

dogmatic support to defend his claim for the distinct power and authority of the magistrate and church officer, he does not (as did Turretin, for example) make explicit that this distinction rests on the twofold kingdom and authority of Christ. While too much significance can be attached to this absence in Walaeus's theology, it is at least noteworthy that he did not in this instance think to use the twofold kingdom distinction. This absence here, placed alongside its use in Walaeus's Christology sections, underscores the varied use and development of the (more technical) *duplex regnum* distinction within the seventeenth century.

II.6.5. Conclusion

Like Geneva and Edinburgh examined in the following chapters, Leiden may be viewed as a representative center of Reformed orthodox theology. As will be seen with their contemporaries in Geneva and Edinburgh, the Leiden theologians examined in this chapter increasingly related the *duplex regnum* to the person and mediatorial work of Christ. Indeed, as demonstrated from our analysis of Franciscus Junius, Leiden played a prominent and foundational role in the development of this doctrine. Furthermore, it is also evident from this investigation of Leiden and its representative theologians that, despite the "fractious" relationship that existed between magistrate and pastorate during the early seventeenth century, the basic premise behind the Leiden theologians' formulation of the *duplex regnum Christi* was theological/christological rather than political/ecclesiological. Thus, rather than Leiden's changing social or political factors contributing to this doctrine's development, a stronger motivation for the refinement of the twofold kingdom had to do with a desire for more precise terms and categories when describing the dual nature of Christ's regal work; this desire was prompted in part due to the rise of Socinian objections against the divinity of Christ (with specific reference to his supposed limited authority). This more apparent christological concern is demonstrated to be the case both from material and formal considerations of the twofold kingdom distinction; in other words, both the content of the distinction and its placement within the theological systems of Leiden theologians validate it as chiefly a christological concern. Indeed, as seen

with Walaeus, the distinction did not even appear in his tract devoted to distinguishing the separate roles of church and magistrate. Certainly this does not mean that a deep ditch existed between the early Reformers and later Reformed orthodox on this subject; rather, Leiden's example as it concerns the *duplex regnum* is further evidence of an underlining unity that experienced development. In the following chapter, I will test this overarching thesis using Geneva as a representative intellectual center.

Chapter Seven: The Duplex Regnum Christi in Reformed Orthodoxy: Geneva as Representative Center

II.7.1. Introduction

On May 21, 1536, La Clémence, the bell hanging from the north tower of St. Pierre, signaled the adoption of the Protestant religion by Geneva's citizens; unanimously they voted "to live in this holy Law of the Gospel and the Word of God [and to reject] all masses and other ceremonies and papal abuses, images, and idols."[1] Significantly, at the same time that the Protestant religion became the law of the land for Geneva, she proclaimed her independence as a republic.[2] Defiantly rejecting Savoy's long-standing rule, and simultaneously thwarting the feigned designs of their Bernese protectors, the Genevans declared, "we have endured war against both the duke of Savoy and the bishop for seventeen or twenty years…not because we intended to make this city subject to any power, but because we wished that a poor city which had warred and suffered so much should have her liberty."[3]

---

[1] Cf. Scott M. Manetsch, *Calvin's Company of Pastors: Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church, 1536–1609*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 18.

[2] Although *cuius regio eius religio* ("whose region, his religion"), a sixteenth-century practice often associated with the Peace of Augsburg (1555) that closely linked a ruler's religion with his realm, was only officially applied in the Holy Roman Empire, this action in Geneva closely reflected this principle.

[3] See *Registres du Conseil de Genève*, Tome XIII du 3 juillet 1534 au 23 mai 1536 (vol. 27 à 29) (Geneva: Albert Kundig, 1940), 444. As quoted by A.N.S. Lane, "The City of God: Church and State in Geneva," in Richard C. Gamble, ed., *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: A Fourteen-Volume Anthology of Scholarly Articles* (New York: Garland Pub, 1992), 10:143. Cf. E. William Monter, *Calvin's Geneva* (New York: Wiley, 1967), 55.

Geneva's struggles did not end with her declaration of independence in 1536, however. Sixteenth-century Geneva was marked by strife and anxiety in search for political stability; commenting on the history of Geneva following Calvin's death, William Monter writes, "The principal theme of the history of the republic from 1564 to 1603 was her search for political security."[4] While I do not presume to give a detailed account of Geneva's socio-political history in this chapter, at least some sketch of its instable founding as a new republic and subsequent fight to maintain independence throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is helpful for a fuller understanding of the *duplex regnum Christi*—especially when we face the question "To what degree did Geneva's particular historical context influence this city's theologians and their understanding of Christ's twofold kingdom?" Thus, this chapter—much like the following two—is divided into two major parts: first, varying contextual considerations are noted which either directly or indirectly affect the Genevan theologians' presentation of the twofold reign of Christ, and secondly, I narrow in on representative figures in Geneva (most notably Francis Turretin) and their formulations of the *duplex regnum*. Related to the central thesis of this study, a primary question this chapter will seek to answer is determing what was most basic to the seventeenth-century Genevan professors' understanding of the *duplex regnum Christ*; was it primarily political or christological/theological concerns?

II.7.2. Contextual Considerations

II.7.2.1. Geneva: Prior to 1536

Reflecting on the previous century of Geneva's history, the Genevan pastor and theologian Louis Tronchin (1629–1705) recognized the crucible through which the city's forefathers passed in order to claim freedom. Near the end of his life, Tronchin made this comment on Geneva's fight for freedom:

---

[4] Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, 196.

> The past century [sixteenth century] was full of troubles, seditions, wars, fears, desolations and alarms. This city and its territory were afflicted by woes of all sorts. One cannot think about the injustices that certain Princes perpetrated on the faithful citizens without trembling. One cannot bring to mind without horror the inhumane tortures and cruel executions that the most generous defenders of liberty suffered. And when one thinks about the great perils to the State, and about the terrible hardships they bore, it is impossible to look back on them without being astonished at the resolution of our Predecessors and without adoring the favors of God.[5]

Struggle for political autonomy marked much of Geneva's history.[6] As evident from Tronchin's quotation, this quest for independence—as well as her fight to maintain this liberty once achieved—left an indelible mark on the inhabitants of this city, including the city's pastors and theologians.

Known primarily for its annual fairs during the medieval period, pre-Reformation Geneva was governed by prince-bishops who, by the mid-fifteenth century, were firmly entrenched under the auspices of the dukes of Savoy.[7] As Thomas Lambert explains, however, political authority in pre-Reformation Geneva was exercised (to varying degrees) by four parties: the bishop of Geneva, the duke of Savoy,[8] the cathedral Chapter, and the

---

[5] As quoted in Thomas A. Lambert, "Preaching, Praying and Policing the Reform in Sixteenth-Century Geneva," (PhD. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998), 48. Cf. BPU, Archives Tronchin v. 59, f, 121–122. Tronchin's reflections come from his pre-election address delivered to the Council on January 7, 1700. For the original French of this quotation see Lambert, "Preaching, Praying and Policing the Reform in Sixteenth-Century Geneva," 69n43.

[6] Numerous sources can be referenced here regarding Geneva's politico-social history; among the most pertinent are: Lambert, "Preaching, Praying and Policing the Reform in Sixteenth-Century Geneva," especially chapter 2 and 3; Paul Guichonnet, ed. *Histoire de Genève* (Toulouse: Privat, 1974); Henri Naef, *Les Origines de la Réforme à Genève*, 2 vols. (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1968); Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, passim; and George Keate, *A Short Account of the Ancient History, Present Government, and Laws of the Republic of Geneva* (London: for R. and J. Dodsley, 1761).

[7] As Scott Manetsch notes, the dukes of Savoy were given papal permission to nominate episcopal candidates; Geneva's prince-bishops were thus "members of the House of Savoy or noble patrons of the dukes." See Manetsch, *Calvin's Company of Pastors*, 13. Monter notes that from 1444 until 1522, six various members of the House of Savoy occupied the Genevan bishopric. See Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, 32.

[8] The duke of Savoy also appointed a *vidomne* (from the Latin *vice dominus*) who exercised authority on the former's behalf; the *vidomne* was not able, however, to exercise

commune.[9] While Savoyard designs of expansion into Geneva were relatively muted in the latter half of the fifteenth century, the new Duke of Savoy, Charles III (succeeded to the throne in 1504), took decisive steps towards gaining fuller control of Geneva.

Savoyard political machinations came to a head in 1519 after Genevan Eidguenots (an anti-Savoy faction) signed a defense treaty with the Swiss canton of Fribourg.[10] In response, Charles III marched into Geneva, "armed from head to foot, [and] surrounded by dozens of gentlemen and hundreds of soldiers."[11] After offering amnesty to the Genevan citizens, the Fribourg alliance was soon disannulled and the leader of the Eidguenots executed. Presuming to have gained full control of Geneva, Charles III triumphantly entered Geneva in 1523.

Although most of the Eidguenots fled from Geneva during the rise of Savoyard influence, they remained active in their struggle for an independent Geneva from afar. After securing a second *combourgeoisie* (defense pact) with Fribourg and Bern, the anti-Savoyard group returned to Geneva in 1526. With this adoption of the Fribourg-Bern treaty, Geneva publicly declared herself to be free of Charles III's protectorship.[12] In the following decade, Genevan citizens had to both construct a functioning government of their own and repel the repeated attacks of Savoy to regain dominance. As early as 1526, the political framework of the soon-to-be republic was in place: the Small Council, the Council of 60, the Council of 200, and the General Assembly were all instituted.[13] Geneva's weak political foundation was challenged, however, not only by the ongoing

---

capital punishment, something reserved only for the duke (although it was the commune who alone could sentence somebody to death).

[9] Lambert, "Preaching, Praying and Policing the Reform in Sixteenth-Century Geneva," 49. See pages 49–51 for a description of the respective roles of the cathedral Chapter and commune.

[10] The two opposing factions were the Eidguenots (from the German *Eidgenosse*, or "confederate"—the basis for *eyguenots* or Huguenots) and the Mammelukes. The former advocated for a defensive alliance with Fribourg, whereas the latter were pro-Savoyard.

[11] Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, 36.

[12] Just several months earlier, on December 10, 1525, Charles III appeared before the Genevan General Assembly, forcing the Genevans to recognize the duke as their sovereign protector.

[13] For a brief but concise description and list of duties of the various councils see Keate, *A Short Account*, 62–102.

guerilla warfare practiced by the pro-Savoy Mammelukes,[14] but it was also put to the test in 1530 and 1536 when Charles III amassed forces intent on recapturing Geneva. In both cases Geneva was compelled to invoke the treaty with Bern, and in both instances Savoy was unable to withstand the sizeable Bernese military presence. With the threat of Savoy removed, Geneva declared herself to be an independent republic in 1536.

II.7.2.2. Geneva: 1536–1603

As Manetsch notes, Bern's military assistance proved to be a "Trojan horse."[15] Forced to rely on the aid of Bern, Genevan authorities struggled as to how they should react to the Protestant influences slowly making inroads into the Catholic city.[16] In addition, the Bernese liberators expressed their own expansionist aims, offering to take over the government of Geneva. Fearing their fight to be in vain, it is in this context that the Genevan magistrates responded with the above-referenced quotation wherein they resolved to not subject themselves to any foreign power, whether this be of Savoy or Bern.[17] Thus fear of foreign pressure and influences that threatened to undermine her identity and independence characterized much of Geneva's political-social history in the half-century following her declaration as a republic.[18]

---

[14] See Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, 46. Monter notes that the Mammelukes formed a "Fraternity of the Spoon" who often pillaged Genevan properties and ambushed Genevan citizens.

[15] Manetsch, *Calvin's Company of Pastors*, 14.

[16] Most notable of the Protestant influence of Bern was the sending of William Farel to Geneva in 1532. As Robert Kingdon writes, "Bern helped introduce into Geneva Protestant preachers who attacked local Catholicism and urged Genevans to embrace Protestantism. The most prominent of them was a charismatic French orator named William Farel." See Kingdon, "Geneva" in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans Joachim Hillerbrand (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 161.

[17] For quotation, see section II.6.1.

[18] Comparing the Savoy crisis, the crisis of 1538 (resulting in the expulsion of Calvin and Farel), and the 1555 crises (see below), William Naphy notes there are a number of common factors. He writes, "First, many Genevans were almost fanatically devoted to preserving the city's independence and the privileges which accompanied it…. Second, there seems to have been a general acceptance of the idea of magisterial control over ecclesiastical affairs. The magistrates' deposition of the Bishop and the moves against the Church before the advent of the Protestant preaching is clear evidence of this. Next, the magistracy was quite willing to control morality in Geneva but showed a clear reluctance to use

Following the city's invitation to Calvin to resume his post in 1541,[19] and the subsequent creation of a Reformed presence in Geneva (outlined most notably in the 1541 *Ecclesiastical Ordinances*, a document approved with slight amendments by the Genevan government), a growing number of immigrants flocked to Geneva, fleeing persecution from other Catholic territories. Indeed, by the late 1550s, Geneva's population had nearly doubled from what it was twenty years earlier.[20] As most of these immigrants were supportive of Calvin and his reform—himself considered a foreigner of Geneva for most of his life[21]—native Genevans increasingly resented this influx of people. Rallying around the moniker "Enfantes de Gèneve"—a name that served to underscore their native affiliation with Geneva—citizens such as the Favre clan and the followers of Ami Perrin challenged the authority of Calvin and the city's ministers."[22] Especially threating for the Perrinistes was the ministers' alleged right to interrogate and excommunicate, a tension that came to a head in 1555. The Perrinistes, however, quickly lost favor with the Genevan populace after Ami Perrin seized the syndical baton from Henri Aubert during a drunken demonstration, an act that was interpreted as sedition. After several

---

excommunication as a means of coercion…. Moreover, there was a *deep-seated fear of foreign domination* which was connected with *the desire to protect Geneva's liberties*." See William G. Naphy, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation: With a New Preface* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 43 (italics added).

[19] Calvin and Farel were expelled from Geneva in 1538 as they refused to follow orders from the city's magistrates. For more on Farel see especially Jason Zuidema, *Early French Reform: The Theology and Spirituality of Guillaume Farel*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Farnham ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011).

[20] Lambert, "Preaching, Praying and Policing the Reform in Sixteenth-Century Geneva," 65.

[21] Calvin was not invited to become a citizen (*bourgeois*) until near the end of his life (December 25, 1559). Cf. Willem Van 't Spijker, *Calvin: A Brief Guide to His Life and Thought*, trans. Lyle Bierma (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 123.

[22] Genevans were uniquely divided into three categories: *citoyens*, *bourgeois*, and *habitants*. A *citoyen* was a Genevan who was born and baptized in Geneva of *citoyen* parents, whereas the status of *bourgeois* could be purchased by long-standing residents. *Habitants* were simply registered alien residents, and had far less rights then a *citoyen* or *bourgeois*. This threefold category gives further evidence of the deep-rooted patriotism in Geneva. Cf. Harro Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin*, Cambridge Studies in the History and Theory of Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 133–134.

executions and death sentences, the Perrinistes were largely driven from Geneva and lost any position they might have held.[23]

After the Perrinistes' defeat in 1555, the greatest threat to political stability in Geneva came from without. With the reinstatement of Emmanuel-Philibert of Savoy in 1559 to his father's lost duchy, Savoy again threatened to take control of Geneva. Although some of the lands—originally part of Savoy, but conquered by Bern and given to Geneva—were returned to Savoy in 1564, the House of Savoy was not satisfied. By the late 1580s, Geneva was again forced to fight for her independence; this ongoing war with Savoy culminated in the battle known as the Escalade, an attack on December 12, 1602 wherein the Genevans—although severely outnumbered—successfully and definitively repulsed the Savoyard threat.[24]

II.7.2.3. Geneva: 1603–1685

With the establishment of the Genevan Academy in 1559, and its subsequent leadership throughout the following century provided by men such as Théodore de Bèze, Lambert Daneau, Antoine de la Faye, Giovanni Diodati, Théodore Tronchin, and Benedict Turretin, seventeenth-century Geneva increasingly grew as an internationally recognized center of Reformed theology. Geneva's international presence was evident, for example, at the Synod of Dort (1618–1619). At the request of the States General of the Netherlands, Geneva commissioned Diodati and Tronchin to attend; Diodati's address to the synod regarding the doctrine of perseverance greatly impressed the synod's moderator, Johannes Bogerman.[25]

Geneva's repute is also demonstrated in various letters sent to and received from ecclesiastical synods or leaders, and especially those of the French Reformed churches. Thus, in a letter addressed to the 1626 National Synod of Castres (France), the Genevan pastors and professors Diodati and

---

[23] Lambert, "Preaching, Praying and Policing the Reform in Sixteenth-Century Geneva," 67.

[24] This battle is still celebrated with an annual festival in Geneva.

[25] James I. Good, *History of the Swiss Reformed Church since the Reformation* (Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1913), 34.

Benedict Turretin expressed their appreciation for the commitment to the Reformed faith evident in the French churches. Despite the trials and afflictions they were experiencing (due to persecution), the letter exhorts the French Reformed churches to not place their confidence in an "Arm of Flesh," but to acknowledge that "the true Shields and Bucklers of Salvation do belong to GOD, who only hath the privilege and deserveth the Glory of his Churches protection and deliverance." [26] Diodati and Benedict Turretin further encouraged the French church to render their "Loyalty and Fidelity…unto God and unto those to whose Authority he hath subjected our Persons and Estates in this World."[27] As Mercier notes, the influence and exhortation of these seventeenth-century Genevan pastors/professors greatly encouraged the struggling French Reformed church.[28]

A further indication of Geneva's seventeenth-century international reputation is found in a letter written by a certain Mr. Claude to Francis Turretin. The author of the letter requested the renown Genevan theologian to reconsider the obligatory signing of the 1675 Helvetic Consensus by all ministerial candidates—a requirement mandated by the Genevan Council. Although Claude's praise of the city is couched within a request, and is therefore to be treated with a degree of caution, nevertheless the positive (French Reformed) estimation of Geneva is apparent. Claude writes:

> But as to your Church & Academy it is not to be conceived, *Sir*, that
> your magnificent & most honoured Lords, which are her protectors,
> her first Directors & nursing Fathers, your Pastors, your Professors,
> your Ruling Elders, your principal heads of Familys, do not

---

[26] A full account of this letter is given by Andrew Le Mercier in his *The Church History of Geneva, in Five Books. As Also a Political and Geographical Account of That Republick. By the Reverend, Mr. Andrew Le Mercier Pastor of the French Church in Boston* (Boston, New-England, 1732), 142–152 (quotations are from 145–146).

[27] It is significant that Diodati and Turretin's letter was written in the midst of the French-Huguenot rebellions of the 1620s, a period in which the Huguenots took up arms in an (unsuccessful) attempt to defend and assert their rights provided them in the Edict of Nantes (1598). For more on this history see Mack P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[28] Le Mercier, *The Church History of Geneva, in Five Books*, 153. As evidence, Le Mercier quotes an extract from the French church's reply.

remember that *Geneva* hath been always ever since the blessed
Reformation a pattern of Union and Concord to other Churches….[29]
Claude continues his letter, beseeching Turretin to have leniency with
respect to what he considers adiaphorous articles of religion stipulated in the
Consensus (i.e., the question concerning the divine inspiration of the
Hebrew vowel points, the nature of the imputation of Adam's sin, and the
ordering of the divine decrees), arguing that if Geneva claims these to be
fundamentals of religion, in essence they would ostracize themselves from
the broader Reformed community and thus jeopardize their international
influence.

A final indicator of Geneva's seventeenth-century repute is seen in
the number of immigrants it attracted. After the 1685 revocation of the Edict
of Nantes, Geneva experienced a second influx of especially French
Protestant immigrants. It is estimated that approximately 4,000 French
refugees took up residence in Geneva in the two decades following King
Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes.[30] Fearing the French king's
threats for aiding these refugees, and requiring the necessary funds to
support them, Geneva successfully collaborated with other Protestant
cantons, thus further establishing its international repute.

From the above cursory sketch of Geneva's history, it is evident that
the city's situation at the close of the seventeenth century—an established
and self-governing republic with a recognized international reputation—was
very different than that of a hundred and seventy years earlier—a period
when she was a fledgling city asserting her independence from foreign
powers and influence. As we transition to consider Francis Turretin on the
twofold kingdom of Christ, it is noteworthy that he wrote his theological
works within this later seventeenth-century context (unlike, for example,
Calvin or Beza).

---

[29] As quoted in Le Mercier, *The Church History of Geneva, in Five Books*, 186.
[30] Good, *History of the Swiss Reformed Church*, 116.

II.7.3. Francis Turretin on the Twofold Kingdom of Christ

II.7.3.1. Francis Turretin (1623–1687): Biography

The son of a theology professor and pastor of the Italian church in Geneva, Francis Turretin (Francisco Turrettino) was born on October 17, 1623.[31] After his father's death in 1631 and the completion of his philosophical and theological training at the Academy of Geneva, in 1644 Turretin began his travels to Leiden, Utrecht, Paris, and Saumur for further study, thus acquainting himself with many leading Reformed figures of his day.[32] Turretin was exposed to figures such as Johann Polyander and Gisbertus Voetius, and also met the leading representatives of what came to be known as Amyraldianism: Moise Amyraut, Louis Cappel, and Josué de la Place.[33]

Turretin returned to Geneva in 1647 and, following the lead of his father, became the pastor of the Italian church.[34] After a brief eleven month

---

[31] Several biographical descriptions of Francis Turretin are available. See especially Eugène de Budé, *Vie de François Turrettini: Théologien Genevois 1623–1687* (Lausanne: Georges Bridel, 1871); John W. Beardslee, III, "Theological Development at Geneva Under Francis and Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1648–1737)" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1956), esp. 1–6; James T. Dennison, Jr., "The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," in *IET* 3:639–658; "Funeral Oration of Benedict Pictet Concerning the Life and Death of Francis Turretin," trans. David Lillegard, in *IET* 3:659–676. Unless otherwise noted, the following sketch relies on Dennison's biography.

[32] In Paris, Turretin frequented the home of Jean Daille (1594–1670); it was Daille who, in a glowing recommendation, attested to Turretin's honesty, diligence, zeal, and progress in studying theology. Daille further commented on Turretin's frequent attendance at the holy assemblies and his participation of the Lord's Supper ("…*fréquentant les saintes assemblées de notre église et participant à la cène du Seigneur…*"). See de Budé, *Vie de François Turrettini*, 32.

[33] Turretin repudiated La Place's teachings in his defense of the covenant of works. As Dennison writes, La Place proposed, "…[mankind is] not guilty by the immediate reckoning of Adam's first sin to their account" ("The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," 643). Furthermore, as Wallace points out, Turretin's covenant theology will directly contradict the *foedus hypotheticum* and *foedus absolutum* distinction Amyraut introduced in support of his hypothetical universalism (Wallace, "The Doctrine of the Covenant," 158–159).

[34] Turretin's family history traces itself back to Lucca, Italy, most well-known in Reformation history as the city where Peter Martyr Vermigli effected a significant reform (Vermigli also educated Jerome Zanchi here briefly). Three generations prior to Francis Turretin, Regolo Turretin—Turretin's great grandfather—was a contemporary of Vermigli, experiencing his reform measures in Lucca. Cf. the impressive genealogy given by de Budé, *Vie de François Turrettini*, 23–25. For more on Lucca and Vermigli see especially Philip McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), a

pastorate in Lyons (as pastor on loan), Turretin once again returned to Geneva, this time to take up the chair of Theology at the Academy of Geneva in 1653. Turretin would hold this position until his death in 1687.

Throughout this period Turretin wrote his massive *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, a three-volume work composed of twenty separate *loci* (covering prolegomena to eschatology). In his "Preface to the Reader," Turretin does not confess reliance on Luther, Calvin, or Beza for this multi-volume work as might be expected, but he singles out the Groningen University professor Samuel Maresius (1599–1673). In fact, Turretin modeled his entire *Institutes* after Maresius's twenty *Decades*, a small (approximately twenty-page) appendix to the Groningen professor's larger *Systema Theologicum*. Writing of his students, Turretin comments:

> Among other things I proposed for their investigation the *Decades* of the most celebrated Maresius. And [in order] that this might be to them a more useful exercise, I thought that the state and foundation of the controversies treated there should be explained in a few words (some distinctions and observations also being added) by which the *prōton pseudos* ('principal falsehoods') of opponents might be revealed and the principal objections solved. Nor content with the living word, I wished these to be committed also to writing that they might be fixed more deeply in the memory.[35]

As already evident in the title, Turretin's magnum opus is to be read as a polemic against his opponents (primarily the Roman Catholics, Arminians, Socinians, and Salmurian school) and as a defense of the Reformed faith.[36]

---

volume which deals extensively with "Part I" of Martyr's life, namely, his life in Italy until 1542; Philip McNair, "Biographical Introduction" in *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture, Church*, ed. Joseph McLelland, PML I (Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994), 3–26. McNair claims, "Lucca came perilously near to civic reformation on the pattern of Calvin's Geneva." See his "Biographical Introduction," 7.

The Italian church in Geneva was largely a result of Pope Paul III's reconstitution of the Inquisition in 1542. Bernard Ochino first preached to a group of Italian refugees in Geneva in 1542; due to their Italian roots, four Turretins (including Francis) took up the pastorate in this church. See James T. Dennison, Jr., "The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," in *IET* 3:640 for a list of the pastors serving in this church.

[35] See "Turretin's Preface to the Reader," in *IET* 1:xxxix; *FTO* 1:xxiii.

[36] On Turretin and his opponents (especially the Salmurian school) see James T. Dennison, Jr., "The Twilight of Scholasticism: Francis Turretin at the Dawn of the

As he confesses in the preface, his intent in writing was "…to explain the importance of the principal controversies which lie between us and our adversaries." All of this Turretin believed could be done without introducing any "novelty" or teaching "not confirmed by the vote of our most proven theologians of highest reputation."[37] Turretin's life and scholastic disputations were thus aimed at quieting his antagonists and guarding the Reformed tradition; answering the sophisticated arguments of his opponents, Turretin used the technical "school-theology" to meet this challenge head-on.[38] Although he ultimately failed in his aims— Enlightenment rationalism gained ascendency in Geneva shortly after his death[39]—the remainder of this chapter will focus on his scholastic presentation of the Reformed faith especially as it relates to the distinction of Christ's twofold kingdom.

II.7.3.2. Turretin and the Duplex Regnum Christi

Before examining what Turretin means with his distinction of a twofold kingdom, it is first necessary that we pay careful attention to the language Turretin employs. Just as he notes that God's (single) covenant with mankind is twofold in nature—comprised of a covenant of nature and a

---

Enlightenment," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, Carl R. Trueman and R.S. Clark, eds. (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999), 244–255.

[37] See "Turretin's Preface to the Reader," in *IET* 1:xl; xlii; *FTO* 1:xxiv; xxvi.

[38] Cf. Richard A. Muller, "Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology," *Church History* 55/2 (June 1986): 193–194. Muller writes, "Protestant scholasticism can now be represented as an attempt to produce not a restrictive system centered upon a single doctrinal locus but rather a technically sophisticated school-theology."

[39] See especially Martin I. Klauber, *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671–1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva* (Cranbury; London, Canada: Associated University Press, 1994). Klauber notes that, in opposition to his father Francis Turretin, Jean-Alphonse "gave rational arguments an equal footing with biblical revelation…[and thus] the importance of biblical revelation was significantly diminished" (10). Cf. Martin I. Klauber, "The Eclipse of Reformed Scholasticism in Eighteen-Century Geneva: Natural Theology from Jean-Alphonse Turretin to Jacob Vernet," 129–142 in Martin Klauber and John B. Roney, eds. *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564–1864* (Westport: Praeger, 1998). In this essay, Klauber argues that Jean Alphonse and Jacob Vernet were the two "most important members of the department who led the movement against Reformed scholasticism and toward an expanded use of general revelation" (129).

covenant of grace[40]—Turretin does not distinguish between two separate kingdoms, but he argues Christ possesses a *twofold kingdom* (kingdom here in the singular). In other words, according to Turretin, Christ does not possess a plurality of kingdoms. As seen already with Calvin, Turretin here echoes his theological forebear who also spoke, not of two kingdoms, but of a twofold kingdom (*duplex regnum*) and twofold government (*duplex regimen*). Both Calvin's and Turretin's language of a "twofold kingdom" immediately signals that the two aspects of Christ's reign are related, and yet distinguishable.[41]

II.7.3.2.1. Placement of the Duplex Regnum Christi— Christology

Certainly by the time of Turretin's composition of his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, the preferred locus under which to discuss the *duplex regnum* was Christology, and more particularly within one's outline of the mediatorial office of Christ, the *munus triplex*.[42] Thus, following this established

---

[40] The parallels between the Reformed scholastic presentation of covenant theology and the *duplex regnum Christi* extend beyond terminology. As both doctrines hinge on the person and work of Christ, it is not surprising that more fundamental connections between the two doctrines are evident within their systematic formulations.

[41] As demonstrated in Chapter Five, while a plurality of terms existed in defining the *duplex regnum*, it was generally understood amongst the Reformed orthodox that Christ's kingdom was singular in nature, albeit with varying aspects.

[42] As noted in Chapter Five, discussion of Christ's twofold kingdom was most commonly found within two places of the Reformed orthodox systematic theologies: (1) within their accounts of the *munus triplex*, and (2) within their discussions of Christ's session at the right hand of the Father. This too characterized Turretin's work. While what follows deals with the former placement, Turretin also utilized the *duplex regnum* distinction in his assessment of Christ's session. After arguing that the subject in view of the session must be a person—as opposed to either the divine or human nature of Christ—Turretin argues Christ's session can be considered essentially or economically: "When Christ is considered theologically, as Logos (*Logos*) simply, it is rightly said to be the right hand of God inasmuch as he partakes of the same omnipotent essence of God with the Father. But when considered economically as Mediator, he is rightly said to sit at the right hand of God. In the former sense, the right hand of God is spoken of the divine omnipotence, but in the latter metaphorically of the empire and dominion which properly belongs to the person." See *IET* 2:370; *FTO* 2:325. Shortly after this statement, when discussing the timing of Christ's "sitting," Turretin further draws on the *duplex regnum* distinction. He writes, "Christ indeed as Logos (*Logos*) was from eternity with the Father, but he cannot on that account be said to have sat down at the right hand of God (in the sense in which that sitting is ascribed to him after the resurrection according to his glorious states as Mediator). He reigned as Son over

pattern, Turretin's most succinct description of the twofold kingdom of
Christ occurs within his fourteenth locus, his discussion of Christ's
mediatorial office.[43] Christ, Turretin argues, possesses a twofold kingdom:
"one natural or essential; the other mediatorial and economical." Over the
natural kingdom Christ reigns as eternal *Logos*, but over the economical
kingdom he reigns as God-man (*theanthrōpos*). The former kingdom,
Turretin writes, is common such that it includes all creatures—even the
elect—over whom Father, Son, and Holy Spirit equally (naturally and
essentially) reign, whereas the latter kingdom is particular, a peculiar
economy of grace "terminated specially on the church," over which Jesus
Christ reigns economically.[44] The natural kingdom, proper to each person of
the Trinity, is ordered and directed by divine providence, whereas the
mediatorial kingdom, proper to the person of Jesus Christ (inclusive of both
natures), is ordered and directed by the decree of election. For Turretin then,
it follows that citizens of the mediatorial kingdom are incorporated by way
of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In short, the kingdom of
the incarnate Christ (that is, the mediatorial kingdom) is constituted and
governed by gospel promise: it depends upon God's determinative decree
from all eternity; it requires the prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices of
Jesus Christ; and it ensures its citizens' protection from all spiritual
enemies.

By way of contrast, the promise of eternal life merited by the
righteousness of another has no place in the natural kingdom. In other

---

the kingdom of nature, but not as God-man (*theanthrōpos*) over the economic kingdom." Cf.
IET 2:371; *FTO* 2:325.

[43] As already indicated, Turretin patterned his *Institutes* after the work of Samuel
Maresius. He was thus undoubtedly aware of Maresius's *Systema Theologicum*. In this larger
work, Maresius, much like Turretin following him, focuses on the twofold character of
Christ's kingdom in his twelfth locus *De Officio Mediatoris*. Maresius's succinct delineation
is as follows: "Regia in Christo dignitas duplex est, altera simpliciter Naturalis, quae ipsi
competit praecise qua Deo, *a* altera Oeconomica, quae est illius qua θεάνθρωπος; nihilque
revera ad praecedentem addit praeter novam χέσιν duplicem, unam ex parte *subjecti*, quod sit
Immanuelis nostri, sive Dei manifestati in carne, alteram ex parte *objecti*, quod ita se in
omnia extendat, ut speciatim ordinetur *b* ad bonum & salute Ecclesiae; ne Sociniani hic *c*
nonnisi subalternum & dependens Dominium Christo vindicent, ad ipsius summam & veram
divinitatem evertendam." See Samuel Maresius, *Systema Theologicum cum Annotationibus*
(Groningen: Aemilius Spinneker, 1673), 570.

[44] *IET* 2:486. Cf. *FTO* 2:427.

words, for Turretin the natural realm is ordered not by gospel, but by law. As such, this realm concerns itself with things that are penultimate; the *modus administrationis* of this kingdom centers upon human might, diligence, and energy as deemed acceptable by law.[45] Turretin summarizes, arguing the spiritual kingdom is not:

> [O]f the world as to mode because the kingdoms of the world consist of and are defended by a multitude of subjects, number of provinces, crowds of cities, abundance of riches, bristling forts, armed garrisons and other external means, without which they would necessarily fall. But the kingdom of Christ (as we have already said) is conducted in a spiritual manner, recognizes no other honors and resources than righteousness, holiness, peace of conscience, salvation and eternal life; no other arms than the word and Spirit; no other fortifications than the protection of God.[46]

As the mediatorial kingdom finds its *principium* in the incarnation of Jesus Christ, it is therefore exclusively redemptive; its members are redeemed by grace, are members of Christ's church, and rely on Scripture's account of Jesus Christ's positive righteousness and its application to them by the Holy Spirit. The natural kingdom, according to Turretin, is not so; it is not orientated around redemptive purposes, and yet it owes its allegiance to Christ as eternal *Logos*. Perfect obedience is the requirement of this realm, but since its citizens (all of humanity in Adam) have failed in this regard, its members are subject to divine scrutiny and judgment. Those who are not citizens of the heavenly, mediatorial kingdom—in other words, those not found in union with Jesus Christ, the *theanthrōpos*—are subject to eternal condemnation. Heavenly and eternal blessings flow to citizens of Christ's economical kingdom, whereas dreadful and eternal curses flow to citizens found *only* in Christ's natural kingdom.[47] Thus, in a postlapsarian context,

---

[45] *IET* 2:488. By way of contrast, the *modus administrationis* of the heavenly kingdom "is entirely spiritual, not by might nor by power, but by his Spirit (Zech. 4:6; Hos. 2:18; 2 Cor. 10:4)." Cf. *FTO* 2:428.

[46] *IET* 2:489; *FTO* 2:429.

[47] Citing Psalm 2:6, Turretin confirms the Messiah will break the earthly kings with a rod of iron such that "these nations shall be broken by the word of the gospel, which is the scepter or rod of his strength." *IET* 2:490; *FTO* 2:430.

over the natural kingdom the triune God stands as fearful legislator and judge, but over the economical kingdom God rules as merciful Father on account of Jesus Christ.[48]

Departing somewhat from the language of Calvin, Turretin further states that Christ reigns over even the temporal kingdoms of this world in a *spiritual*—as opposed to earthly—way.[49] Reaffirming the unity and discontinuity of Christ's kingship, Turretin writes, "Indeed [Christ] reigns differently in the pious and the wicked: in the former by the sweet and healthful influence of the Spirit, as head; in the latter, by his own powerful virtue as Lord; *but over both he exercises a spiritual, not an earthly sway* (*imperium*)."[50]As he further explains, Christ's unified government over *all* people and *all* things is practiced in a spiritual manner, but over the pious Christ's spiritual rule is pleasant and salvific (*suavi et salutari*) as distinct from the spiritual dominating power he exercises as Lord over the impious (*in* [*impios*] *potenti virtute sua qua Dominus*).[51] Commenting on the above quotation, David VanDrunen writes:

> Turretin's exposition here might be suspected of harboring some confusion, insofar as the distinction between the two kingdoms that he previously set forth is not a strict distinction between the "pious" and the "wicked." The pious live in the civil as well as the spiritual kingdom (and some wicked people hold external membership in the church). Despite what thus *may be a brief confusion of categories*,

---

[48] Cf. *IET* 2:399; *FTO* 2:351. In the context here Turretin is explicating Christ's prophetic office. He questions whether Christ can be called a legislator, to which he responds, "We answer in a few words that Christ can be viewed in two ways: either absolutely and theologically (inasmuch as he is the Word [*Logos*] and the same God with the Father and the Holy Spirit); or relatively and economically (inasmuch as he is the God-man [*theanthrōpos*] and the Mediator between God and men). In the former respect, he is the one legislator who can save and destroy (Jam. 4:12). In the latter, he is neither properly a legislator, as Moses was (because he is opposed to Moses and his law as the author of grace and of truth, Jn. 1:17); nor principally because his principal office was to reveal to us the mystery of the gospel."

[49] Turretin writes, "Although temporal kingdoms are subjected to Christ, his kingdom ought not on that account to be temporal. They are not subjected to and administered by him temporally and in an earthly manner, but spiritually and divinely; even as the earth is under heaven and is ruled by him, it is not therefore done in an earthly but heavenly way." See *IET* 2:489; *FTO* 2:430.

[50] *IET* 2:490 (italics added); *FTO* 2:430.

[51] *FTO* 2:430. Cf. *IET* 2:489–490.

Turretin's sentiments here seem a logical extension of his earlier comments: as creator and sustainer, Christ rules the temporal kingdom as the sovereign lord of all; as incarnate redeemer, Christ rules the spiritual kingdom as a tender savior.[52]

While much of VanDrunen's analysis of Turretin is commendable, what he sees as a "confusion of categories" may be solved if one were not to apply Calvin's categories to Turretin's formulation; in other words, Turretin here is not distinguishing between a distinct spiritual and civil kingdom as does Calvin. Rather, as Turretin's primary objective in this sixteenth question is to demonstrate the spirituality of Christ's *economical* kingdom, here he argues that Christ's economical or mediatorial kingdom is universally over all (that is, it is equal in scope with his natural kingdom), but that it has distinct aims for both the pious and the wicked—for the former, redemption and security, but for the latter, judgment.[53]

Having argued that Christ's mediatorial kingship is spiritual, Turretin asks in the following question whether or not it is eternal. As seen in Chapter Five, Turretin argued for the eternality of Christ's mediatorial kingdom—contrary to the Socinians as well as certain Reformed orthodox—by distinguishing between the *substantia ipsa* of the *regnum mediatorium* as distinct from its *forma et modus administrationis*.[54] As Turretin clarifies, while the form or mode of this aspect of Christ's kingdom may change (dependent on whether his subjects are in a state of grace or state of glory), the substance will remain. Indeed, owing to the perpetual office of Christ held as God-man, Turretin concludes the mediatorial kingdom must endure even in glory, although he acknowledges its administration will not still demand the redemptive work of Jesus Christ.[55] Thus, Turretin reasons, "Nothing hinders the kingdom of Christ [read: mediatorial kingdom] from being called at the same time both temporal and eternal; the former with respect to the mode of government which obtains in

---

[52] VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 180–181 (italics added).

[53] While Turretin affirms that the Christ's economic kingdom is universal in scope, he does not conclude (as seen in the above) that *all* are citizens of this same kingdom; rather, only the elect are citizens of this kingdom.

[54] Cf. Section II.5.4. Cf. *FTO* 2:431.

[55] Cf. *IET* 2:494; *FTO* 2:434.

this life among enemies; the latter properly and by itself because it will never have an end, either as to the King himself or as to his subjects or as to his glorious administration (Dan. 7:14; Lk. 1:33; Rev. 21, 22)."[56] Turretin's conclusion further illustrates that a facile equation cannot be made between the categories of the early Reformers and those used by the Reformed orthodox concerning Christ's kingship.

II.7.3.2.2. Placement of the Duplex Regnum Christi—Other Loci

Discussion of Christ's *duplex regnum* is not only relegated to the locus of Christology in Turretin's *Institutes*, however; in at least two other areas he employs this distinction: (1) under his eighteenth topic concerning the church and (2) within his twentieth and last topic dealing with the last things. Within his section on ecclesiology, Turretin devotes two separate questions wherein he carefully distinguishes the distinct powers and governments of the ecclesiastical and civil leaders.[57] Attempting to steer a middle ground between those who "sin in excess [*in excessu peccant*]" and those who "sin in defect"—an often-used apologetic of the Reformed orthodox—Turretin argues that while the officers of the church properly exercise a ministerial power within Christ's kingdom, the care of religion (*cura religionis*) also concerns the magistrate.[58] While at first glance this

---

[56] *IET* 2:494; *FTO* 2:434.

[57] The two questions are as follows: Q.29: "Does any spiritual power distinct from the political belong to the church? We affirm." Q.34: "What is the right of the Christian magistrate about sacred things, and does the care and recognition of religion belong in any way to him? We affirm." Cf. *IET* 3:274–281 (*FTO* 3:232–239) and *IET* 3:316–336 (*FTO* 3:268–284) respectively.

[58] The attempt to steer a middle ground was an argument often used by the Reformed orthodox, and can be seen throughout Turretin's *Institutes*. Thus, when distinguishing ecclesiastical and political government, Turretin writes, "They sin in excess who claim all ecclesiastical power for the magistrate; who oppressed by the liberty of the ministry, deliver the thurible into the hand of Uzziah and think that no power belongs to the pastors except what is derived from the magistrate. They sin in defect who remove him from all care of ecclesiastical things so that he does not care what each one worships and allows free power to anyone of doing and saying whatever he wishes in the cause of religion." See *IET* 3:316. Cf. *FTO* 3:268. In Turretin's estimation, it is primarily the Erastians—he cites Louis Dumoulin's *Ad Paraenesim suam ad adificatores imperii* (1657) and his *Jugulam causa* (1671)—who err on the side of excess (i.e., granting all authority to reside in the

may seem to be a confusion of categories, Turretin's primary argument here—mirroring the above distinction between the essential and mediatorial kingship of Christ—is that the representative offices and functions of pastor and magistrate are neither to be confounded nor divorced from one another.[59]

After proving that ecclesiastical power indeed exists, Turretin gives seven ways in which it is distinct from political power: it is distinct as to origin, subject, form, end, object, effects, and mode. As held by the Reformed generally, both ecclesiastical and political government find their origin in God as supreme governor, and yet it is here that Turretin appeals to the *duplex regnum Christi*; ecclesiastical and political government differ even in their origin since, as he writes:

> Political power was instituted by God, the Creator, and supreme ruler of the world; but ecclesiastical power was instituted by Jesus Christ, the supreme head of the church and its Lord and governor. The political magistrate as such does not serve properly and formally in promoting the kingdom of Christ, nor does he discharge his office in his name, as appears in the heathen magistrate; but ministers are sent by Christ for the establishing of his kingdom and act in his name.[60]

Thus, the minister of God's word derives his authority from Jesus Christ as God incarnate, whereas the magistrate (also a minister of God) derives his or her authority from God as creator.[61]

Given the fundamental distinction between these two offices, we must ask whether Turretin's claim that the magistrate is also the "nursing father" of the church (Is. 49:23)—and as such is custodian of *both* tables of

---

magistrate), and the "Romanists" who err on the side of defect (i.e., the magistrate must respect and perform pontifical decrees). Cf. *IET* 3:274; *FTO* 3:233.

[59] Turretin's concern to distinguish these two offices leads him to argue that it is unlawful, given the abrogation of the old covenant, "to join together these two administrations [that of king and priest] in the same man." See *IET* 3:321; *FTO* 3:272.

[60] *IET* 3:278; *FTO* 3:236.

[61] According to Turretin, the distinction of ecclesiastical and political authority is also reflected in who is able to hold such offices; ecclesiastical authority can only be exercised by men, but political authority can be held by both men and women, even if they are "heathen and strangers to the covenant." See *IET* 3:278; *FTO* 3:236.

the law (*custodes sint utrisque tabulae*)—is logically coherent.[62] Citing Uzzah and Uzziah as negative Old Testament examples of those who "rashly invaded" each other's calling, Turretin claims the princes who properly take care of religion are discharging a duty entrusted to them.[63] Turretin is careful to clarify the magistrate's care of religion as distinct from the pastor's, however. The magistrate's care of religion extends only to *circa extrinseca* pertaining to worship, whereas pastors are responsible for the administration of *circa interna* belonging to the worship of God. As he further clarifies, the magistrate's care of religion and sacred things is circumscribed, "differing greatly from the right of pastors."[64] Negatively (*kat' arsin*), the magistrate cannot compose new articles of faith, administer word and sacrament, exercise ecclesiastical discipline, prescribe a particular form for the worship service, or unilaterally enact any ecclesiastical matter. Positively (*kata thesis*), however, the magistrate is to establish and conserve pure worship; protect and defend the church against heretics and disturbers of its peace; provide for, defend, and encourage the ministry of the word; confirm faithful pastors in their work and punish the delinquent; ensure and uphold the scriptural formulas and constitutions of the church; and establish the ordinary (and extraordinary should the need arise) assemblies of the church.[65] According to Turretin, the magistrate's care of religion—much like that of a father's in a well-ordered family, who regulates (*dispono*) and arranges (*ordino*), but leaves the execution and performance to the household members (*domesticos*)—is thus indirect and restricted to the external so that things done in the house of God may be decent and

---

[62] Cf. *FTO* 3:268–269; *IET* 3:316–317; 3:328. Certainly this claim is not unique to Turretin; he here relies on a long tradition of those who claim the magistrate to be guardian of both tables of the law as the "nursing fathers" of the church. In fact, Turretin references a speech given by James Ussher who utilized similar language, and then refers his readers to "the celebrated Voetsius" who discusses this in depth (cf. *IET* 3:322–323; *FTO* 3:273–274). As already noted, secondary scholarship has wrestled with the perceived inconsistency that existed on this matter.

[63] *IET* 3:318; *FTO* 3:270. Turretin is referencing two Old Testament kings who were punished by God for interfering with priestly activities. 2 Samuel 6 records that God struck down dead Uzzah when he touched the ark of God. 2 Chronicles 26 records that Uzziah was struck by leprosy (from which he died) after wanting to offer incense in the temple.

[64] *IET* 3:319; *FTO* 3:271.

[65] *IET* 3:319–320; *FTO* 3:271–272.

orderly.[66] While attributing to the magistrate the care of religion, Turretin yet carefully distinguished between the offices and functions of the magistrate and pastor; arguably, this is the case for Turretin as these distinct yet related offices and functions are informed in large part by the more basic distinction of the *duplex regnum Christi*.

As already indicated, a further area in which Turretin utilizes the distinction of the twofold reign of Christ occurs in his section on eschatology, and particularly in his treatment of the final judgment. In the sixth question of the final topic of his *Institutes*, Turretin asks, "Is a final judgment to be expected and what will it be like?" After arguing for its reality—appealing to proofs from Scripture, the providence and justice of God, the consciences of men, and the confession of the Gentiles—Turretin states that the one who will act as Judge must be Christ according to both natures; as he makes clear, "Christ will be the Judge in that very visible nature in which he was condemned for us."[67] It is here that Turretin draws on the *duplex regnum* distinction: because the incarnate Son has been *given* a kingdom, the exercise of power pertaining to this kingdom (that is, judgment) is also given him by the Father. Furthermore, just as Christ's twofold kingdom serves a dual purpose—i.e., redemption of the elect and condemnation of the wicked—so too the final judgment exercised by Christ as king fulfills these purposes. Turretin's language of a common, essential judiciary authority held by all persons of the Trinity as distinct from a particular, mediatorial, and donative judgment exercised by Christ as God-man mirrors the distinctions already examined regarding Christ's essential and mediatorial kingdom. His explanation is worthy of fuller quotation:

> For although judiciary power is common to the whole Trinity, still it will be specially exercised by the incarnate Son. Judgment is said to have been given him by the Father (Mt. 28:18; Jn. 5:22; Acts 10:42; 17:31) as being the King of his church, the avenger of his elect, the most strict punisher of the wicked and rebellious, the Lord of all.

---

[66] *IET* 3:321; *FTO* 3:272.
[67] *IET* 3:599; *FTO* 3:513.

> The former belong to grace, the latter to power and both pertain to the office of Mediator.[68]

Especially interesting in this statement is Turretin's claim that the incarnate Son's judgment— distinct from the judiciary power of the Trinity—is over all. Just as he held that Christ's mediatorial kingship is universal in scope, so too the mediatorial judgment related to his donative kingdom is inclusive of *both* the elect and wicked. As Turretin clarifies, however, while the judgment of the mediator King is universal, yet particular and distinct aims are evident. The Genevan theologian thus explains, "This [Christ] will do [i.e., final judgment of all] especially both for the greater consolation of the pious (who will look upon him as their defender and Advocate instead of their Judge) and for the greater terror and confusion of the wicked."[69]

II.7.3.3. Turretin's Twofold Kingdom and Federal Theology

While many have looked to the Genevan pastor-professor as representative of the mature, fully developed twofold covenant or federal framework,[70] and increasingly others have looked to Turretin as representative of the so-called Reformed "two-kingdoms doctrine,"[71] to my knowledge these two areas of study have not been related in the secondary scholarship on Turretin. The

---

[68] *IET* 3:599; *FTO* 3:513.

[69] *IET* 3:599; *FTO* 3:513.

[70] On Turretin and federal theology see especially J. Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace*, Reformed Historical Theology, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007); James J. Cassidy, "Francis Turretin and Barthianism: The Covenant of Works in Historical Perspective," *The Confessional Presbyterian* 5 (2009): 199–213; Christopher A. Ostella, "The Merit of Christ in the Covenant of Works: Francis Turretin and Herman Bavinck Compared" (Th.M. thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, 2007); Benjamin T. Inman, "God Covenanted in Christ: The Unifying Role of Theology Proper in the Systematic Theology of Francis Turretin" (Ph.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2004), esp. ch. 8; Peter J. Wallace, "The Doctrine of the Covenant in the Elenctic Theology of Francis Turretin," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* (2002): 143–179; Stephen Spencer, "Francis Turretin's Concept of the Covenant of Nature," in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994), 71–91.

[71] See especially VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 176–206; VanDrunen, "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine and the Relationship of Church and State," 749–759 for his reliance on Turretin. I use the terminology of "two kingdoms" here due to its common use in scholarship.

purpose of this section is therefore to explain how these two doctrines are related in Turretin's thought. The intent here is not to produce a systematic analysis of their proper relationship, but to see how both doctrines coincided within Turretin's theology.

Relying on the distinctions Turretin makes, arguably his presentations of federal theology and the *duplex regnum Christi* are necessary correlatives as both doctrines articulate the two possible relationships (that of Judge to unrepentant subject or Father to redeemed child) that exist between a greater, sovereign Lord and a lesser, fallen subject. It follows, then, that the reality of a twofold covenant (*foedus naturae* and *foedus gratiae*) and the reality of the twofold kingdom of Christ is strictly a postlapsarian possibility. In other words, before the fall Christ's kingdom was without distinction as his subjects (sinless Adam and Eve) were undivided. Based on Turretin's distinctions, this further means that in sinless Adam's case, only Christ's natural kingdom (*regnum naturale*) was operative;[72] the correlative covenant in this instance was the covenant of nature (*foedus naturae*). With Adam's fall and the gracious promise of Christ's economic mediation, two covenantal relations are possible for Adam's descendants: to know their Creator as Lord and Judge under a broken covenant of works, or to know their Creator as Father and Redeemer under a divinely worked covenant of grace. While Christ's natural kingdom remains intact after Adam's fall, Christ's mediatorial kingdom is inaugurated by his promised fulfillment of the original covenant in the covenant of grace. To establish this argument we will consider in some detail the two *loci* Turretin dedicates to covenant theology, and then relate his distinction of Christ's twofold kingship to his federal theology.

II.7.3.3.1. Francis Turretin on the Covenant of Nature

---

[72] It is, admittedly, somewhat confusing to speak of the natural kingdom of *Christ* in a prelapsarian context since the name Christ refers to the anointing of the Son with respect to his redemptive work. While I retain the language here of the twofold kingdom of *Christ*, it is more proper to speak of the natural kingdom of the *Son* or *Logos* when referring to his prelapsarian rule.

Francis Turretin introduces the subject of covenant in his eighth locus, *De Statu Hominis Ante Lapsum, et Foedere Naturae*. Turretin first contrasts the common definition of covenant as made between men—"a mutual agreement between two or more persons concerning the mutual bestowal of certain goods and offices for the sake of common utility"—with the covenant God as Creator made with Adam as creature. Unlike covenants made between humans, Turretin argues that any covenant God makes with his creatures is one of condescension (*sugkatabasis*); while God was not in any way obligated to enter into covenantal relation with humanity—that is, he could have stipulated obedience of humans simply on the grounds that they were part of his creation—out of his own voluntary goodness "[God] added a covenant consisting in the promise of reward and the stipulation of obedience."[73] As created persons are not God's equal, are entirely dependent on God, and do not bind God in any way, God's choice to enter into covenant is therefore strictly speaking (*stricte loquendo*) not a covenant; rather it is God's obligation of himself (that is, promising humanity a reward upon fulfilled obedience) in order that humans might be "invite[d] to a nearer communion with him."[74] Mark Beach summarizes Turretin here: "In exercising his sovereign rights over his human creatures, God simultaneously displays his unsurpassed kindness and goodness by inviting man into a more intimate and meaningful communion with himself through a covenant relationship, a covenant involving the 'bond of love' and

---

[73] *IET* 1:574; *FTO* 1:517. Stephen Spencer argues that this constitutes "two conflicting strains" in Turretin's presentation: in the most dominant strain Turretin thought of the *foedus naturae* as additional to the Creator-creature relationship, whereas he at times presented this covenant as implied by or essential to the Creator's relationship to the creature (Spencer, "Covenant of Nature," 71). While Spencer sees these "two strains" as contradictory, the relation Turretin draws is, in fact, a simple one. For Turretin, God's covenant with man is not dependent on God choosing to create man, but choosing to *interact* or *relate* with man. When God *communes* with created beings, it is necessarily by way of accommodation or covenantal condescension. Perhaps this relation can further be illustrated according to the categories of *theologia in se* and *theologia nostra* (although not used by Turretin here): as to *theologia in se* the Creator is not obligated to enter into covenant with the creature, but as to *theologia nostra*, the Creator, choosing to reveal himself, binds himself and so enters into covenant. Cf. Martin I. Klauber, "Francis Turretin on Biblical Accommodation: Loyal Calvinist or Reformed Scholastic?" *WTJ* 55 (1993): 78. We return later in this chapter to distinguish between natural obligation (based on the Creator-creature relationship) and covenantal obligation (extra to Adam's existence as creature).
[74] *FTO* 1:517–518; *IET* 1:574. Cf. *IET* 2:174; Spencer, "Covenant of Nature," 75.

'mutual obligation.'"[75] The twofold covenant Turretin outlines is thus dipleuric (two-sided or conditional); the covenantal arrangement he discuses is comprised of both stipulations and sanctions.

Turretin next outlines the "double covenant" (*foedus geminum*) that he finds in Scripture. Interestingly, Turretin does not distinguish between *two* or multiple covenants, but he distinguishes the various characters of a singular covenant.[76] Benjamin Inman likens Turretin's language of *foedus geminum* to that of "twin covenant"; by this designation, Turretin already indicates that the later "gracious" covenant is a renewal of the earlier "legal" covenant.[77] In other words, the various characters (gracious and legal) of the covenant are distinguishable, and yet very much related. Turretin's careful description of this twofold covenant follows:

> This double covenant is proposed to us in Scripture: of nature and of grace; of works and of faith; legal and evangelical. The foundation of this distinction rests both on the different relation (*schesei*) of God contracting (who can be considered now as Creator and Lord, then as Redeemer and Father) and on the diverse condition of man (who may be viewed either as a perfect or as a fallen creature); also on the diverse mode of obtaining life and happiness (either by proper obedience or by another's imputed); finally on the diverse duties prescribed to man (to wit, works or faith). For in the former, God as Creator demands perfect obedience from innocent man with the promise of life and eternal happiness; but in the latter, God as Father promises salvation in Christ to the fallen man under the condition of faith. The former rests upon the work of a man; the latter upon the grace of God alone. The former upon a just Creator; the latter upon a merciful Redeemer. The former was made with innocent man without a mediator; the latter was made with fallen man by the intervention of a mediator.[78]

---

[75] Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 83.
[76] Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 90; Spencer, "Covenant of Nature," 75. Turretin does, however, speak at times of "two covenants." Cf. *IET* 2:637; *FTO* 2:560, "For as there are two covenants (*duo sunt Foedera*) which God willed to make with man…."
[77] Inman, "God Covenanted in Christ," 264–265.
[78] *IET* 1:575; *FTO* 1:518.

As Beach notes, there are four factors upon which Turretin founds his distinction of the twofold covenant: (1) on the possible two relations man can have with God (either to know God as "Creator and Lord" or as "Redeemer and Father"; (2) on the possible two states of man (either perfect or fallen); (3) on the possible two ways of attaining eschatological life (either proper or alien imputed righteousness); (4) and on the two conditions prescribed of man (either works or faith).[79]

The covenant of nature thus assumes the qualities described in the first part of each parallel; in the *foedus naturae* sinless (perfect) Adam knew God as Creator and Lord, could attain blessed life by way of proper righteousness, and was obligated to live a life of perfect and personal obedience. As Turretin later elaborates, two clauses summarize this covenantal arrangement: "do this and live" and "cursed is he who continueth not."[80] Although Turretin admits the positive sanction of eternal life is not explicitly stated in Scripture, he argues it is implied by the threat of the negative as well as the sacramental nature of the tree of life (*arbor vitae*).[81]

---

[79] Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 90.

[80] *IET* 2:174; *FTO* 2:155.

[81] *IET* 1:575–576; *FTO* 1:519. Cf. *IET* 1:476 (*FTO* 1:424); 1:580–582 (*FTO* 1:523–525). Ascribing sacramental qualities to the two trees in the garden dates back to Augustine who writes, "[Adam and Eve] were, then, nourished by other fruit, which they took that their animal bodies might not suffer the discomfort of hunger or thirst; but they tasted the tree of life, that death might not steal upon them from any quarter, and that they might not, spent with age, decay. Other fruits were, so to speak, their nourishment, but this their sacrament. So that the tree of life would seem to have been in the terrestrial Paradise what the wisdom of God is in the spiritual, of which it is written, 'She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her'" (Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods, vol. 2, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Augustin: City of God, Christian Doctrine, ed. Philip Schaff [1887; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995], book 13: ch.20 [256]). Turretin also echoes his Italian predecessor, Jerome Zanchi, who writes of the probationary tree: "Ergo ideo arbor scientiae boni & mali: quia visibilis regula fuit, qua cognosceretur bonum & maluminon per se, sed propter mandatum Dei adiunctum: sicut & reliqua omnia faciunt sacramenta, verba visibilia. Ratio, cur haec interpretatio placeat prae aliis, est, quia haec fuit prima lex Dei, unde omnes reliquae pendent. Oportuit igitur hanc esse vim totius legis; qua docetur, quid bonum, quidve malum. Simplex autem & absoluta boni & mali denitio est, quae sic habet illud esse bonum, quod Deo placet; malum, quod displicet: coq, non esse definiendem bonum vel malum, ex natura rerum; sed ex voluntate Dei. Atque hoc aperte docuit illa arbor, tanquam sacramentum voluntatis divinae." See Zanchi, *De operibus Dei intra spatium sex dierum creatis* in *Operum theologicorum d. Hieronymi Zachii* ([Geneva]: Stephen Gamonet, 1613), 3:501–502. Cf. Zanchi, *Operum theologicorum* 3:500, where Zanchi writes, "Duae hae arbores in medio

Turretin further argues that the *foedus naturae* was a federal arrangement; just as Christ merited eternal life for all those united to him as representative head, so Adam, as a public person (*persona publica*), could render obedience to God and attain the promised reward for him and his descendants.[82] Despite this obvious two-Adam structure, Turretin is quick to note that had Adam obeyed God's law, the promised reward would yet have been given him because of God's "debt of fidelity." In other words, the covenant of nature excludes any condign merit since the "intrinsic value" of Adam's obedience in no way matches the "infinite reward of life."[83] As indicated above, Turretin teaches that God is not bound by man, and yet God binds himself to his covenant (a pact which promises life upon obedience). In short, sinless Adam could have merited life for himself and his posterity; nevertheless this possibility is rightly considered merit *ex pacto*.[84]

In summary, for Turretin the covenant of nature was God's voluntary condescension wherein he communicated to Adam his creature (and those represented in him) the promise of eschatological life upon condition of obedience.[85] Were Adam to remain faithful to God's law (the one law comprised of natural/general and symbolic/special prescriptions), Adam and his posterity would have eternally basked in the knowledge of their rewarding God as Creator and Lord.[86] As Stephen Spencer observes,

---

Paradisi, praeter veritatem historiae, magna etiam continent mysteria, & multarum sunt rerum sacramenta."

[82] *IET* 1:576; *FTO* 1:519. See also *IET* 1:584 (*FTO* 1:526) where Turretin argues on the basis of a two-Adam Christology.

[83] *IET* 1:578; *FTO* 1:521.

[84] *IET* 1:578; *FTO* 1:521.

[85] Turretin's concise definition of the *foedus naturae* is as follows: "The covenant of nature is that which God the Creator made with innocent man as his creature, concerning the giving of eternal happiness and life under the condition of perfect and personal obedience" *IET* 1:575; *FTO* 1:518.

[86] While most accounts of the prelapsarian covenant focus on the probationary command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Turretin also highlights the importance of Adam's obedience of God's natural law. He writes, "For although [Adam] was bound to obey each special precept or that symbolic law given to him [namely, the revealed command not to eat of the tree], still most especially was obedience to the natural law required of him (for exploring of which this symbolic precept only served, as will be shown hereafter)." See *IET* 1:577; *FTO* 1:520. Just as we have seen with his twofold

the heart or essence of Turretin's *foedus naturae* is that God relates himself to man as "creator-governor-legislator-rewarder."[87]

II.7.3.3.2. Francis Turretin on the Covenant of Grace

Turretin revisits the subject of covenant in his twelfth locus, this time to discuss the postlapsarian covenant of grace (*De Foedere Gratiae et Duplici ejus Oeconomia*). After a lengthy philological exercise wherein he examines the several Greek, Hebrew, and Latin words used for covenant (*bryth*, *diathēkē*, *epangelia*, *euangeliou*), he concludes that the covenant of grace is so named because it is both causally and materially gracious. In other words, both source and content of this covenant are entirely gracious.[88]

  Mirroring his earlier treatment of the *foedus naturae*, Turretin notes the covenant of grace is also one of condescension, its *principium* being the free (unrestrained) good will of the Triune God. The principal distinction between the former natural covenant and the later covenant of grace is therefore not to be seen in its source (the good pleasure [*eudokia*] of God), but in the relation of the several parties. In the covenant of nature, Creator and creature were in agreement, but in the later covenant an offended God is angered on account of offending man.[89] There is then, in the covenant of grace, a necessary third party: Jesus Christ, a mediator who reconciles God and man who are at odds due to man's disobedience. Contrasting the covenant of grace with the covenant of nature Turretin writes:

> God acts here not as in the covenant of nature (inasmuch as he is Creator and Lord) because sin abolished that natural communion which joined the creature with the Creator; …nor as legislator and the rigid exactor of moral perfection from him because this could not be expected from a corrupt creature; nor can the sinner approach

---

distinction of a singular covenant, so also Turretin makes a twofold distinction of one law (natural and special).

  [87] Spencer, "Covenant of Nature," 77.

  [88] *IET* 2:172; *FTO* 2:153. Turretin's reliance on Aristotelian categories should not be missed here.

  [89] The first covenant Turretin thus labels a "covenant of friendship" (*foedus amicitiae*) and the later covenant one of reconciliation ("*foedus reconciliationis*"). See *IET* 2:190; *FTO* 2:169.

> in any way a most just and holy God except as he is a merciful Father and Redeemer—as offended, indeed, but as to be appeased, who through his love of benevolence wished to reconcile offending man to himself (Rom. 5:8; Eph. 2:4).[90]

In the former covenant God reveals himself as Creator and Lord, one who is entirely just, holy, and exact. In his sinless state Adam was able to please and commune with this "legislator" and "rigid exactor" because he was created in perfect holiness. For Turretin the relational and judicial were not at odds in Adam's state. In fact, he assumes the one cannot be thought of as existing without or independent of the other. Precisely when Adam proved to be disobedient, he broke communion with God. Since the God of the ensuing twofold covenant does not change—he remains the Triune God, just, holy, and exact—communion must be restored through a mediator. It is only in a once-broken and restored covenant that God then reveals himself as Father and Redeemer.

Already we have hinted at some of the similarities and differences Turretin perceives between the various characters of the twofold covenant. In the fourth question of his twelfth locus, Turretin lists five points of continuity and ten points of discontinuity between the covenant of grace and covenant of nature. They agree (*conveniunt*), he notes, in their divine author; in the contracting parties of God and man; in the glory of God as their general end; in their external conditional form (since stipulations are attached to each); and in the promise of eternal, heavenly life and happiness. As Peter Wallace remarks, there is a "fundamental unity in the covenant, both before and after the fall."[91] Nevertheless, as Turretin continues to

---

[90] *IET* 2:176; *FTO* 2:157.

[91] Wallace, "The Doctrine of the Covenant in Turretin," 163. An interesting historical question—one that cannot be answered here as it is too far afield—asks if a switch or transition is evident between a two-covenant position or between a single (but twofold) covenant position. If this is evident, when did this develop? Andrew Woolsey's dissertation (wherein he traces the historical development of covenant theology) hints at an answer to this as he briefly deals with the status of the covenant of works *after* the fall. Woolsey notes that although this covenant arrangement once broken does not offer any promise of life, nevertheless its condemnatory role demanding the punishment of man is still in effect. Woolsey does not that John Ball was "reluctant to refer to it as a covenant at all since by it no reconciliation between God and man could be effected. Ussher did continue to call it a covenant of law, but qualified this by saying that it only merited the name of covenant now

unfold, the covenant of nature and grace "differ in many more particulars (*in multo pluribus differunt*)."[92] Although related, there is to be no confusion between these two arrangements. Distinctions are to be made as to the author, contracting parties, foundation, promise, condition, end, manifestation, order, extent, and effects.[93] Only through the mediation and righteousness of Jesus Christ—the third party and foundation of the covenant of grace—can an offended and "angry judge" become a "merciful Father."[94] In Christ, God thus gives himself as a "husband who betrothed us unto himself in eternal mercies (Hos. 2:19; Cant. 2:16); as a father who adopts us into his family (2 Cor. 6:18); [and] as a ruler and king who selects us for his chosen (*periousion*) people."[95]

Not only is the covenant of grace founded upon the mediatorial work of a third contracting party (absent in the former covenant), in the

---

with respect to that part that it played in driving men to the covenant of grace, which was now the only way to life for fallen creatures." See Andrew Woolsey, *Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study in the Reformed Tradtion to the Westminster Assembly* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 76.

[92] *IET* 2:190; *FTO* 2:169.

[93] Wallace charts Turretin's ten distinctions as follows (see his "The Doctrine of the Covenant in Turretin," 164):

	foedus naturae	*foedus gratiae*
Author	God as Creator and Lord	God as Father and Redeemer
Parties	God and man	God and man, with the Mediator
Foundation	Man's obedience	Christ's obedience
Promise	Eternal life	Eternal life and salvation from sin and death
Condition	Works	Faith
End	Declaration of justice	Manifestation of mercy
Manifestation	Conscience in the state of nature	The mystery "entirely hidden from reason, and available only by revelation"
Order	First (violator has hope in new covenant)	Last (violator has no further recourse)
Extent	Universal in Adam	Particular with the elect in Christ
Effects	Glory to obedient man Terror to fallen man Bondage to sinners Drives man away from God	Glory to God alone Gracious to fallen man Freedom to sinners Calls men back to God

[94] *IET* 2:180; *FTO* 2:161.

[95] *IET* 2:180; *FTO* 2:161.

sixth question of locus twelve Turretin further expands his argument concerning the particularity of the covenant of grace (the ninth distinction outlined above). Here Turretin argues that the covenant of grace is neither universal in presentation nor in acceptance. In contrast to the covenant of nature, the covenant of grace is particular, extending only to the elect.[96] Drawing upon the "common and received opinion" of the Reformed, Turretin links his discussion here with the invisible/visible church distinction.[97] As to the acceptance of the covenant of grace, this covenant is *particularly* made with the elect, the invisible church. But as to its (external) presentation, the covenant of grace extends (still particularly) to the visible church. God's gracious, redemptive covenant thus has a *particular* end (the salvation of a chosen people), its mediator mediates for *particular* people, it grants *particular* (or gracious) promises, and the Word (gospel), the "sole herald of the covenant of grace," was given to *particular* people. The covenant of nature, on the other hand, was *common*, made with all people in Adam as federal head. In this arrangement *all* people were promised eternal life upon obedience, and *all* people received the revelation of nature. Only after the fall then is there a twofold knowledge of God (*duplex cognitio Dei*);[98] the elect know God as Creator-Father, whereas those not incorporated into the covenant of grace, those yet bound under the law as expressed in the covenant of nature, know God as Creator-Judge.[99] As

---

[96] Cf. *IET* 2:174 (*FTO* 2:155) where Turretin writes, "The former was made with Adam before the fall and in him with *all men*…. The latter was entered into *with the elect in Christ* after the fall" (italics added).

[97] *IET* 2:207; *FTO* 2:183. Cf. *IET* 3:32–41 (*FTO* 3:29–36) where Turretin gives a lengthy description and defense of the invisible/visible church distinction.

[98] *IET* 2:209–210; *FTO* 2:186. Distinguishing a twofold revelation and subsequent twofold knowledge of God, Turretin writes, "For whatsoever the revelation of nature may be, it differs not only in degree but in species from the revelation of the word, since it leads to the Creator, but not to the Redeemer. It testifies of the existence, power, wisdom, providence and beneficence of God towards living creatures (*ta biōtika*); but not of saving grace and the good will of God in Christ (which is a mystery hidden from all the past ages)."

[99] *IET* 2:210. Turretin writes, "It is also gratuitously supposed that before the gospel was heard, [the Gentiles] had contracted the guilt of having violated another covenant than that of nature because as many as are not under grace are under the law and thus under the covenant of works." As an aside, the translation of this sentence is somewhat confusing, seeming to indicate that the violation of "another covenant" by the Gentiles is other than that of the covenant of nature. The Latin is clearer: "*Gratis etiam supponitur ante auditum*

argued below, this twofold knowledge of God, so important for Turretin's covenant theology, was also fundamental to his distinction of a twofold kingdom.

II.7.3.4. Relating Turretin's Twofold Kingdom and Federal Theology

It is perhaps already apparent that for Turretin both kingdom and covenant are relational categories. In fact, in so far as these terms refer to the existing relationship between God and man, Turretin believes *both* "covenant" and "kingdom" indicate a specific type of relationship—that is, a relationship between a greater Lord and a lesser subject. Not surprisingly then, numerous similarities are evident in his doctrines of the twofold kingdom and twofold covenant.

Perhaps most fundamental, for Turretin a distinction of a twofold covenant and twofold kingdom presupposes the presence of sin. While this may be obvious in Turretin's covenant theology—God initiated the covenant of grace in response to Adam's breaking of the covenant of nature—it may not be immediately apparent in his theology concerning Christ's kingship. Realizing this is only true given a fallen context is further hampered if Calvin's terminology, for example, is used to describe Turretin's position. In other words, distinguishing the twofold kingdom as natural and mediatorial (Turretin's descriptors), as opposed to civil and spiritual (Calvin's descriptors), already presumes the offense of man and the need for reconciliation or mediation made by another.[100] Although Turretin affirms Adam had the power to believe in Christ before his fall, he argues Adam did not actually believe in the Redeemer-Mediator who was then an

---

Evangelium, alterius foederis violati, quam naturalis reatum contraxisse, quia quotquot non sunt sub gratia, sunt sub Lege, adeoque sub foedere operum." See *FTO* 2:186.

[100] Turretin's description of Christ taking upon the office of Mediator clearly involves sin: "Therefore Christ is properly called Mediator by act and exercise because he exercises the office of Mediator to establish a union between God and men, separated from each other on account of sin." See *IET* 2:375; *FTO* 2:331. Throughout his entire fourteenth locus, "The Mediatorial Office of Christ," Turretin assumes Christ's mediation reconciles an offended God and offending man. Cf. *IET* 2:376; 391 (*FTO* 2:332; 344).

"unrevealed object."[101] Since sinless Adam had no need of a mediator, had no need of redemption, it follows that for Turretin Christ's mediatorial kingdom was unnecessary in a prelapsarian context. Rather, the Son exercised his reign over Adam naturally and essentially. And yet, from Turretin's description of the covenant of nature we learn this prelapsarian natural kingdom had an eschatological end. With the entrance of sin, the promise of eschatological life was not to be found in obedience to law (as was the case with the *foedus naturae* under a natural kingdom), but in Christ, promised in the covenant of grace under the mediatorial kingdom.

While correlative, there is not a simple or univocal relation between kingdom and covenant in Turretin's theology. Certainly he did not equate the *foedus naturae* with Christ's natural kingdom, even in its prelapsarian context. As already seen, for Turretin Christ's natural kingdom is essential to him, and although it does not depend on anything external to him, it is expressed in his reign as Creator over creation. The covenant of nature, however, was not principally expressed in a basic Creator/creature relationship, but was something additional to creation. As Beach illustrates, Turretin did not "confuse covenant with creation":

> For man is related to God as creature; but he is also (or additionally) related to God as *covenant* creature. The natural obligation of obedience that humans owe God is not itself a covenant relationship, for that Creator-creature relationship *per se* does not include any sort of promised blessing; there is no promised outcome or *telos* to this relationship. However, with the imposition of specific laws, with sanctions, God establishes a relationship with Adam (and his descendants) that is covenantal in nature, and so man is also under the obligation of *covenant* obedience to God.[102]

While distinguishable, Turretin does not conceive of the covenantal relationship apart from the Creator/creature relationship. Beach further notes, "[T]he Creator/creature relationship is incorporated into the covenant

---

[101] *IET* 1:571–573. Cf. *FTO* 1:515. Against the Arminians Turretin answers affirmatively his question, "Did Adam have the power to believe in Christ?"
[102] Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 109–110.

relationship and even presupposes it."[103] Indeed, as indicated above, Adam's natural obligation as creature (his accordance with natural law) harmonized with his covenantal obligation (his accordance with the symbolic law of prohibition). Despite Adam's covenantal disobedience, natural obligation continues after the fall simply because the Creator/creature relationship does not change. Thus, every human being, whether pious or impious, repentant or unrepentant, is a citizen of Christ's natural kingdom on account of their created status. The same cannot be said of his mediatorial kingdom, however. With his satisfaction of the Father's justice, Jesus Christ took upon himself the negative curses of Adam's *covenantal* disobedience and furthermore fulfilled the original positive *covenantal* obligations. Those united to this mediator in this restored covenant thus become citizens of Christ's economic kingdom; the covenant of grace and Christ's mediatorial kingdom are in this sense correlative.

II.7.3.5. Concluding Remarks on Turretin's Use of the Duplex Regnum

Turretin's understanding of Christ's twofold kingdom is distinctly presented in postlapsarian terms in much the same way as his distinction of a twofold covenant is understood in light of Adam's fall. For Turretin, Christ's kingly reign and covenantal participation are integrally related. In the covenant of nature Christ participates as *Logos*, equal to his Father, thus presupposing Christ's natural or essential reign over all of creation. In the covenant of grace, however, Christ participates as the God-man, one who was economically subservient to his Father. As the mediator of this covenant, Christ reconciles an offended Judge and offending man, thus inaugurating his mediatorial kingdom. Prior to his fall, Adam, under the natural kingship of Christ, was able to know his Creator as a faithful and just Rewarder-Judge. Adam's fallen posterity, however, know God in two ways: either as an unappeased, fearful Lord-Judge (those not incorporated as citizens of

---

[103] Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 110. Beach further writes, "This covenant relationship [that is, the covenant of nature], however, also and at the same time takes up into itself the Creator/creature relationship, including man being fashioned in the divine image and created as a moral agent with the natural law inscribed upon his conscience" (111).

Christ's economic kingdom), or as an appeased, loving Lord-Father (those
for whom Christ reigns as mediator-king).

II.7.4. Bénédict Pictet (1655–1724) and the Twofold Kingdom of Christ

A second Genevan representative we will much more briefly consider is
Bénédict Pictet, professor of theology in the Academy of Geneva from
1686–1724. Pictet largely followed his uncle, predecessor, and colleague
Francis Turretin in his presentation of theology, and therefore it is no
surprise that his presentation of the twofold kingdom of Christ mirrors much
of his uncle's.[104] Indeed, in the preface to his *Christian Theology*, Pictet
confesses his reliance on and appreciation for Turretin's work when he
gives the rationale for composing his own work:

> I had no other design in view than to satisfy the wishes of our
> studious youth, who, having eagerly gone through the excellent
> system of controversial theology, drawn up by my revered uncle,
> and most beloved father in Christ, the illustrious Turretine, earnestly
> requested that they might have given to them a system of didactic
> theology, in which controversies were left out, and the truth simply
> and plainly taught.[105]

Although claiming to eschew the "barbarous expressions of the school-
divines," and opting to leave out "innumerable questions" of "little
importance" often found in larger *Loci communes*,[106] Pictet continued to
utilize the by-then standard distinction of a twofold kingdom as held by

---

[104] Pictet's professorship at the Academy of Geneva overlapped with Turretin's for
one year. For more on Pictet see Martin I. Klauber, "Family Loyalty and Theological
Transition in Post-Reformation Geneva: The Case of Benedict Pictet (1655–1724)" *Fides et
Historia* 24:1 (Winter/Spring 1992), 54–67; Eugne de Budé, *Vie de Bénédict Pictet,
theologien genevois (1655–1724)* (Lausanne: Georges Bridel, 1874).

[105] Pictet, *Christian Theology*, viii. The Latin is as follows: "Non alium in finem
hanc Theologiam in lucem edere suscepi, quam ut studiosis nostris facerem satis, qui
praelegentes avide Eximiam *Theologia Elencticae Institutionem*, a Celeb. Turretino,
Immortalis memoriae viro, Venerand Avunculo, ac desideratissimo in Christo Parente,
adornatam, flagitabant, ut Institutio Theologiae Didacticae ipsis traderetur, in qua omissis
controversiis, Veritas tantum nude doceretur." Cf. Pictet, *Theologia christiana*, ¶¶ 3r.

[106] Pictet, *Christian Theology*, ix. Cf. Pictet, *Theologia christiana*, ¶¶ 4r.

Christ. Following closely Turretin's formulation as already discussed, Pictet introduces the regal aspect of Christ's mediatorial office as follows: "In the third place, [it] is kingly. His dominion is of two kinds, the one essential, which he possesses with equal glory and majesty with the Father and Holy Ghost; the other mediatorial, which he possesses as Mediator, and of which we are now to speak."[107]

It is not the case, however, that Pictet merely parroted his theological forebears. In his *Medulla theologiae christianae didacticae et elencticae*, Pictet uses the distinction of a *duplex regnum* to determine the beginning of Christ's kingdom; he asks:

> Question: Was Christ king from the beginning of the world, or from all eternity?
> Response: The essential kingdom (that which is common with the Father) must be distinguished from the economical kingdom (that which consists in the calling and gathering of the church, its conservation, rule, protection, and perfect and complete glorification). The first is eternal, whereas the economical kingdom is either of grace or glory.[108]

Intriguing in this quotation is not that Pictet uses the commonly accepted distinction of a twofold kingdom to determine the *beginning* of Christ's kingship, but that he designates Christ's economical kingdom as operative either in a state of grace or glory. In other words, whereas Pictet indicates here that Christ's essential kingship has no beginning, Pictet also notes that Christ's economical or mediatorial kingship has its beginning in time (and presumably after the fall and the subsequent announcement of grace). Furthermore, Pictet notes the essential kingship endures into the state of

---

[107] Pictet, *Christian Theology*, 321. Latin: "Tertia pars officii Mediatorii est Regnum; sed duplex Christi regnum est; aliud essentiale, quod aequali cum Patre & Spiritu sancto, gloria ac majestate obtinet, aliud oeconomicum, quod qua Mediator administrat, de hoc dicendum." Cf. Pictet, *Theologia christiana*, II.8.23.1 (pg. 626).

[108] Benedict Pictet, *Medulla theologiae christianae didacticae et elencticae* (Geneva: Societatis, 1711), 121. The Latin is as follows: "Q. Annon Christus erat jam Rex ab initio mundi, imò ab aeterno? R. Distinguendum Regnum *essentiale*, quod illi cum Patre commune, à *Regno Oeconomico*, quod consistit in Ecclesiae vocatione & collection, ejusdem conservation & gubernatione, ejus protectione, & perfectâ ac plenâ glorificatione. Primum est aeternum. Regnum *Oeconomicum vel gratia est vel gloria*.

glory. Thus, Pictet makes explicit what was more implicit in Turretin's account: that is, while Christ is essentially king from all eternity, his mediatorial kingship—and consequently a twofold kingdom—is properly considered a post-fall reality that then lasts into glory.[109] This connection is further apparent as immediately following his discussion of the regal office of Christ, Pictet transitions to several questions wherein he outlines key characteristics of the covenant of grace.[110] While too much emphasis may be placed on where one treats a particular subject, it seems clear from the context that Pictet acknowledged a close relationship between the *duplex regnum Christi* and covenant theology.

II.7.5. Conclusion

As a representative center of Reformed theology, the theologians of seventeenth-century Geneva increasingly related the *duplex regnum* to the person and mediatorial work of Christ. Not only is this evident from the places wherein they treated this doctrine in their systems of doctrine (predominately under their *loci* dealing with the person and work of Jesus Christ), but it is also apparent as they more closely aligned Christ's twofold kingdom with a more robust covenant theology. Especially from the analysis given here of Francis Turretin, it is evident that christological concerns are more basic to this doctrine than political versus ecclesiological issues. Future discussions of the "two-kingdoms doctrine" must take seriously Turretin's presentation of the twofold reign of Christ; in Turretin's words, interpreters of the twofold covenant and Christ's twofold kingdom

---

[109] Pictet's follow-up question to the above is equally interesting; he asks, "An fuit Rex Ecclesiae ab initio?" To this he responds, "Non habuit alium Regem Ecclesia; sed Regnum diu latuit, Matt. II.2. XXI.5. Joh. XVIII.36. I. Cor. II.8. & fuit humile; at post resurrectionem manifestatum fuit. Heb. II. v.7.8. Ephes. I. v. 20.21.22." See Pictet, *Medulla theologiae christianae didacticae et elencticae*, 121. It is interesting here that Pictet does not say the kingdom [read: mediatorial kingdom] was non-existent prior to the visible manifestation of the King in the incarnation and resurrection, but that it long lay hidden (*sed Regnum diu latuit*).

[110] The chapter within which this discussion falls is entitled "Ch. IX. De Christo mediatore, lege, foedere Gratiae."

must proceed with "peculiar accuracy."[111] The tendency to immediately politicize Turretin's statements without considering their Christological signifance ought to be avoided. Although Turretin did use the *duplex regnum Christi* to highlight the distinct offices and duties of pastor and civil leader, for the seventeenth-century Genevan professor, distinguishing between Christ's natural and mediatorial reign was not equal to the (modern) ideal of separating church and state. Rather, both Turretin and Pictet taught that this distinction, as it relates to one's covenantal relation with God, strikes at the heart of the gospel message. In the final analysis, this chapter provides further evidence that supports the overarching thesis of this work: the seventeenth-century descriptions of Christ's royal office and work (i.e., *regnum essentiale* as distinct from *regnum mediatorium*), while containing much in common with the early Reformers' articulations, nevertheless give evidence of ongoing development and refinement. In the following chapter, this thesis will be tested using Edinburgh University as a final representative intellectual center.

---

[111] Cf. *IET* 2:169; *FTO* 2:151. Turretin's comment regarding the need for "peculiar accuracy [*akribeian*] comes at the beginning of his twelfth topic on the covenant of grace.

Chapter Eight: The Duplex Regnum Christi in Reformed Orthodoxy: Edinburgh as Representative Center

II.8.1. Introduction

On July 23, 1637, as Archbishop William Laud's new Book of Common Prayer was about to be introduced at St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh's historic church, resistance against it was forcibly illustrated by a flying stool thrown from the hands of a woman, accompanied by her shrill words, "Villain, dost thou say mass at my lug?"[1] While the stool missed its mark—intended for the head of Dean Hannay, who was attempting to read from the prayer book—the ensuing riot is symbolic of the deep-seated turmoil characteristic of seventeenth-century Scotland.[2]

Certainly there is no easy label—theological, religious, political, social, ideological, or otherwise—to apply to this unrest; indeed, as the background to the flung cutty stool indicates, seventeenth-century Scotland experienced a complex mix of political maneuverings and ecclesiological

---

[1] The Prayer Book Riot in St. Giles is often told. See, for example, Andrew Thomson, *Samuel Rutherford* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1884), 65–66.

[2] As David Stevenson describes, the July 23 riot was much more than a single woman throwing her stool; he records, "As soon as the dean began to read from the new prayer book those who objected to its use, especially the women, began to shout insults at the bishop and dean 'calling them traitors, belly-gods, and deceivers.' Many got to their feet, throwing stools and protesting, and left the kirk. They continued to riot outside while inside the service continued. When the bishop left the kirk after the service he was pursued and stoned by the mob (the women again taking a leading part). The dean…wisely remained in the kirk, shutting himself up in the steeple." Similar riotous activity occurred in Tolbooth and Greyfriars kirks. See David Stevenson, *The Scottish Revolution, 1637–1644; the Triumph of the Covenanters* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1973), 59–63.

tensions that erupted into two revolutions (1638 and 1688–90).[3] Despite the temptation to delve into this dramatic history, it is not the intent of this chapter to give a summary of Scotland's deep-seated religious and political tensions of the seventeenth century; indeed, other studies can be consulted for this.[4] Similarly, it is also not the intent of this study to provide a comprehensive study of Edinburgh University, the Scottish intellectual center that is the narrower focus of this chapter.[5] Rather, the purpose of this chapter is to provide a sufficient context for understanding the doctrine of the twofold kingdom of Christ as established by a representative number of seventeenth-century Edinburgh professors.

In establishing this goal, this chapter is divided into four unequal parts. First, a cursory section highlighting aspects of Scotland's rich seventeenth-century history will provide the broader contextual foundation for the chapter. Next, the chapter's focus will narrow to consider the significance of Edinburgh's "Town College"—later named Edinburgh University—as a representative intellectual center of Scotland. The third and fourth sections, which constitute the bulk of the chapter, are devoted to a consideration of two theologians whose combined professorships at Edinburgh University nearly extended from 1630–1662; the men considered here are Johannes Scharpius (1572–1648) and David Dickson (1583–1662).[6] While others have recognized the significance of Dickson to some

---

[3] See especially the opening chapter "Scotland and its Seventeenth-Century Revolutions" in Sharon Adams and Julian Goodare, eds., *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2014).

[4] A readable and chronological study, first published in 1940, is given by Johannes G. Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters: Their Origins, History and Distinctive Doctrines* (Edinburgh: Blue Banner Productions, 1998). See also Adams and Goodare, eds., *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions*. This collection of essays includes a helpful chronology of seventeenth-century Scotland, as well as a bibliography of further reading related to the topic of each essay.

[5] See Péter Attila Komlósi, "Dual Aspects of Ministerial Training in Late Sixteenth Century: Edinburgh's 'Tounis College' and the formation of ministers' early career with special regard to the 'Exercise'" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2012). See also Thomas Craufurd, *History of the University of Edinburgh, from 1580 to 1646; to Which Is Prefixed, the Charter Granted to the College by James VI. of Scotland, in 1582* (Edinburgh: A. Neill, 1808).

[6] A two-year gap separated their professorships.

degree, the life, work, and contributions of Scharpius is rarely acknowledged in secondary scholarship.

The primary research question this chapter asks is, "What did Scottish professors of theology in the seventeenth century teach their students concerning the royal reign of Jesus Christ?" More specifically, what particular terms or distinctions did they employ, how were these designations used in their writings, and what was the surrounding literary context? Especially when considering the so-called Melvillian "two-kingdoms" construct in the Scottish context,[7] most commentators will focus on the thought of Melville himself, Samuel Rutherford, or George Gillespie, and only consider this doctrine as it relates to the ecclesiological/political question.[8] Without denying this connection, however, the argument of this chapter is that the example of seventeenth-century Edinburgh University, focusing on the two above-mentioned representative theologians, further corroborates the overarching thesis of this work: that is, the Reformed orthodox description of the *duplex regnum Christi* is continuous with the theology of the magisterial Reformers, and yet in its terminology,

---

[7] Andrew Melville is often remembered for his so-called "Two-Kingdom" speech delivered on September 2, 1596. Directing his words against King James VI, and apparently calling him "God's sillie vassal," Melville said, "Therefore, sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James, the head of this commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member." Melville continued to address James forcefully, "Sir, when you were in your swaddling clothes Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land, in spite of all his enemies." As quoted in Thomas M'Crie, *The Story of the Scottish Church: From the Reformation to the Disruption* (London: Blackie & Son, 1875), 84–85. As VanDrunen notes, "Melville and others adopted the terminology of 'two kingdoms' particularly in confronting the royal crown with the limits of its power and the rights and authority of the church." VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 174.

[8] See Steven J. Reid, "Andrew Melville and the Law of Kingship," in *Andrew Melville (1545-1622): Writings, Reception, and Reputation*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History, ed. Roger A. Mason and Steven J. Reid (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), 46–74; VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 174–207; W. D. J. McKay, *An Ecclesiastical Republic: Church Government in the Writings of George Gillespie*, Rutherford Studies in Historical Theology (Carlisle, Cumbria, U.K.: Published for Rutherford House by Paternoster Press, 1997), especially Chapters 2 and 3; John Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford*, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History (Cambridge, U.K.: New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997), especially Chapters 6 and 7.

explanation, and even placement of consideration, the twofold kingdom of Christ is more closely and expressly linked to the explanation and defense of the mediatorial/covenantal work of Jesus Christ.

II.8.2. Contextual Considerations

Before considering the two representative Edinburgh theologians, it is helpful to situate these professors and pastors within their historical context. As indicated, the teaching careers of Sharp and Dickson lasted from 1630 until 1662, a period of tremendous upheaval in Scotland. Civil war, victories, defeats, concessions, broken promises, a royal execution, and the invasion of the English Parliamentarian army all occurred during the teaching careers of these men in Edinburgh.

When endeavoring to periodize Scotland's "seventeenth-century" history, it is tempting to use 1603 and 1707 as the respective bookends of the century—the union of crowns and the union of parliaments. But as Adams and Goodare clarify, while these dates are important, they were not the most dominant; indeed, more significant for the seventeenth-century Scot were the dates of 1638 and 1688–90.[9] A possible solution to this periodization problem may consider the seventeenth century to be the (short) period between the "long sixteenth century" (1500–1640) and the "long eighteenth century" (1660–1800).[10] However, without denying the historic significance of a new monarch's accession, or the turn of a century, it is apparent that historical events cannot be neatly divided into the clean divisions we may want.

With this proviso in mind, and understanding that periods of history are artificial constructions always imposed "after the fact," I rely here on Johannes Vos's conceptual outline of Scotland's "seventeenth-century" as it

---

[9] Adams and Goodare, "Scotland and its Seventeenth-Century Revolutions," in *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions*, 1–3. Adams and Goodare are here relying on the work of David Stevenson in his essay "Twilight before Night or Darkness before Dawn? Interpreting Seventeenth-Century Scotland" in Rosalind Mitchison, ed., *Why Scottish History Matters* (2nd ed., Edinburgh: Saltire Society, 1997), 53–64.

[10] Adams and Goodare, "Scotland and its Seventeenth-Century Revolutions," in *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions*, 2.

is helpful in providing a basic framework for this chapter's later considerations.[11] Most relevant for this chapter are what Vos considers to be the second, third, and fourth periods; these three periods closely parallel the lifespan of the two Edinburgh theologians considered later in this chapter. What follows then is a brief synopsis of these periods that cover approximately 90 years of Scottish history.

II.8.2.1. 1567–1637: Struggles Between Presbytery and Prelacy

Following shortly on the heels of Mary of Guise's death in 1560, the Scots Confession of Faith—a Reformed confessional statement prepared by the "six Johns"—was ratified by the Scottish Parliament.[12] The Reformation spread rapidly throughout Scotland, and in 1567 Parliament recognized the legitimacy of the Presbyterian church, even devising a coronation oath which bound the sovereign "to maintain the true Kirk and root out heretics and enemies to the true worship of God."[13] Despite this reformational success, under the monarchy of James VI the ecclesiological practices of the Scottish kirk increasingly became more prelatic. This was especially apparent after the introduction of the "Black Acts" in 1584; in these acts, Parliament declared that James held authority over the church, it confirmed

---

[11] See Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters*, 8–10. Vos's outline is as follows:
1. 1560–1567: Background of the Covenanting Movement
2. 1567–1637: Struggles Between Presbytery and Prelacy
3. 1637–1651: Period of the Second Reformation
4. 1651–1660: The Church of Scotland under the Commonwealth
5. 1660–1688: The Period of Persecution
6. 1688–1690: The Revolution Settlement

These are the chapter headings by which Vos arranges his work. See also the introductory essay by John McCallum, who also wrestles with the problem of periodization. He writes, "The line between studies of the Reformation and studies of post-Reformation religion is a distinctly blurry one, but it is fair to say that those studies concerned with the Reformation in a broad sense which have looked past 1600 or 1603 into the seventeenth century have tended to take 1560 as their starting-point." See his John McCallum, *Scotland's Long Reformation: New Perspectives on Scottish Religion, c. 1500-c. 1660*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2016).

[12] For a brief description of the 1560 *Scots Confession* see John H. S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Hope Trust, 1988), 154–160.

[13] Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland*, 191.

the practice and authority of crown-appointed bishops, and it stipulated that ministers could not discuss political matters.[14] Despite these acts, Presbyterian assemblies continued to meet, and in 1592 the General Assembly sent a list of requests to the king. As a result, Parliament nullified the Black Acts of 1584, allowing for an annual General Assembly.[15]

These concessions did not last long, however; especially after the Union of Crowns in 1603, James VI (James I) seemingly doubled his efforts to create a uniform kingdom, which included the desire for a uniform church. For James, who was a strong believer in the "divine right of kings," this uniform church could not be Presbyterian in polity; in his estimation, "parity of ministers without bishops was 'the mother of confusion and enemy to unity.'"[16] Accordingly, "perpetual moderators" were introduced in 1607, and new doctrinal statements (a Confession and Catechism) as well as established rules of practices (a new Liturgy and Book of Canons) were adopted in 1616. The introduction of the Five Articles of Perth (1618) was the "final blow" for Scottish Presbyterianism under James's reign.[17]

II.8.2.2. 1637–1651: Period of the Second Reformation

After James's death in 1625, Charles I succeeded his father as king. Charles did not slacken James's policies, but, in the minds of most, he further extended his political reach. This was perhaps most apparent when he ordered that a new Service Book (composed under the direction of Archbishop Laud) regulate the Scottish kirk's worship. As already indicated, the introduction of this book caused great alarm. Many Scottish ministers (such as Alexander Henderson[18] and David Dickson) were

---

[14] McKay, *An Ecclesiastical Republic*, 2.

[15] Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters*, 33.

[16] As quoted in J. M. Reid, *Kirk & Nation: The Story of the Reformed Church of Scotland* (London: Skeffington, 1960), 57. James VI expressed his divine-right ideals in his work *Basilikon Doron*, as well as a smaller pamphlet entitled *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*.

[17] McKay, *An Ecclesiastical Republic*, 2.

[18] On Henderson, see L. Charles. Jackson, *Riots, Revolutions, and the Scottish Covenanters: The Work of Alexander Henderson* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2015).

strongly opposed to this infringement of the Crown; as a result, on February 28, 1637, the National Covenant of Scotland was signed.

At the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, the Scottish kirk proceeded to revoke many of the previous acts and decisions that undermined Presbyterianism. This Assembly abolished Episcopacy, denounced the Articles of Perth, declared Laud's Service Book to be unlawful, deposed or excommunicated the Scottish bishops, and established Presbyterianism as the ecclesiastical system of the Scottish church.[19] Charles I became increasingly alarmed at the Covenanters' success, and proceeded on two occasions to take up arms against them (the Bishops' Wars of 1639–40). Both attempts were unsuccessful. Given these failures, coupled with the pressures of the English Revolution (1640–42) closer to home, Charles I had to relax his grip on Scotland, finally recognizing the Presbyterian polity of the Scottish church.

When civil war broke out in England, the Scottish Covenanters—despite some internal opposition—promised military support to the English Parliament in exchange for their pledge to maintain "the Reformed religion in Scotland, and the reformation of religion in England and Ireland according to the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches."[20] The details of this agreement were ratified in the Solemn League and Covenant (1643). True to their promise, the Covenanters provided military assistance to the English Parliament in 1644–46; indeed, Charles I surrendered to the Covenanters in May of 1646, after which they turned him over to the English.[21] Nevertheless, as the Covenanter armies proved to be less effective than at first imagined, and with the growing power of the English Parliament (whose army under Cromwell was largely composed of Independents), the Scottish desire for a unified adherence to Presbyterianism quickly became a distant reality. The Covenanters were further divided when royalist nobles secretly met with Charles I in 1648;

---

[19] See David Stevenson's dictionary entry "Glasgow Assembly" in Nigel M. de S. Cameron, ed. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 364.

[20] Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters*, 56.

[21] See K. M. Brown's dictionary entry "Covenanters" in *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*, 218.

Charles promised to allow Presbyterianism for a trial period of three years if the "Engagers" would assist the King in regaining his throne.[22] Not surprisingly, the "stricter" Covenanters opposed this plan, believing that the King's concessions were disingenuous.

II.8.2.3. 1651–1660: The Church of Scotland under the Commonwealth

In 1649, Charles I was executed by the English Parliament; in place of the monarchy, the English declared the beginning of the Commonwealth of England. According to the Scottish Parliament, however, Charles II was the proper heir to the Scottish crown. After denouncing Popery and Prelacy, as well as swearing to uphold the Solemn League and Covenant, Charles II landed in Scotland in June of 1650. Angered that Scotland would yet insist on a Stuart king, Cromwell invaded Scotland and, in a great display of military might, captured Edinburgh in September of 1650. After a failed invasion into England, Scotland was forced to submit to the Commonwealth army by May of 1652.

Given Cromwell's success, Charles II and his royalist supporters sought a more unified base in Scotland. They therefore requested of the Scottish General Assembly that persons who had been disqualified from service in the state because of their involvement in the "engagement" be allowed to serve again. Deeming it to be an act of necessity, the General Assembly passed resolutions allowing for their reinstatement; this only further divided the Covenanter position, however. Persons in favor of the General Assembly position—such as David Dickson—were known as "Resolutioners," whereas those who opposed this decision—such as James Guthrie and Samuel Rutherford—were called "Protestors." The Protestors received the official support of Cromwell, and yet neither group was able to convene a General Assembly without the express permission of parliament. Any position of privilege experienced by the Scottish Covenanters quickly

---

[22] This treaty with the imprisoned Charles I is known as the "Engagement," and the supporters of the plan came to be known as the "Engagers." See Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters*, 61–63. Cromwell's army signally defeated the Engagers; their leader, Duke of Hamilton, was beheaded.

faded after Charles II's restoration in 1660. Rather than the long-sought-for Presbyterian form of government, the restored Scottish crown brought with it Episcopleanism as the favored form of the Scottish kirk. Having thus briefly considered the turbulent political and ecclesiastical context of Scotland's seventeenth century, this study next considers the academic context within which Johannes Scharpius and David Dickson operated.

II.8.3 Edinburgh University

At the close of the sixteenth century, Scotland had five intellectual centers; three were founded in the fifteenth century (St. Andrews [1412]; Glasgow [1450]; and Old Aberdeen, King's College [1495]), and two were founded after and according to the model of the 1560 *First Book of Discipline* (the Town College in Edinburgh [1583] and Marischal College in Aberdeen [1593]). The Tounis College of Edinburgh is unique in that it was the only one of the five that was not initiated by the church, but was instead created due to the efforts of the Town Council. Initiatives to begin a Town College date back to 1561, but a royal charter was not granted until April 14, 1582. By the following year construction of the college commenced, and the Town College opened with matriculating its first students in 1583.[23] Thus, the opening of the Town College coincided nearly exactly with the passing of the Black Acts as described in the previous section.

Under the direction of the first master and regent Robert Rollock, Edinburgh's Town College quickly gained in its theological presence and influence. Owing to the influence of both Rollock and Melville, the Town College's curriculum focused on a thorough grounding in the liberal arts, with an emphasis on the study of Greek and Latin.[24] As Komlósi has demonstrated, this training "was not an end in itself," but "with the ultimate aim in mind that the students would be able to develop skills that can be

---

[23] For this paragraph I rely especially on Komlósi, "Dual Aspects of Ministerial Training in Late Sixteenth Century," 14–32.

[24] Jack C. Whytock, *"An Educated Clergy": Scottish Theological Education and Training in the Kirk and Secession, 1560–1850*, Studies in Christian History and Thought (Eugene: Wipf and Stock; Paternoster, 2007), 39.

used in a variety of ways in the church."[25] According to Komlósi's calculations, the young Edinburgh college very quickly asserted its influence in the Scottish kirk through its graduates; during the final forty years of the sixteenth century, Edinburgh's Town College provided approximately twenty percent of Scotland's clergy who held a degree.[26]

After the first graduating class of 1587, Robert Rollock was appointed as the first Professor of Theology. Drawing on descriptions of Rollock's professorship from one of his students, Jack Whytock outlines four characteristics of the education received at the Edinburgh school: (1) the exposition of Scripture; (2) theological training that was "clearly Protestant and covenantal"; (3) practice of disputations; and (4) "an overall concern about the spiritual advancement of the students."[27] Such practices of the late sixteenth century established the patterns for theological education in seventeenth-century Edinburgh. In 1620, according to provisions made in the *First Book of Discipline*, a new Chair of Divinity was established at the Edinburgh College, held first by Andrew Ramsay from 1620–1626.[28] The two Edinburgh professors considered in the following sections held the appointment of this chair for a combined total of just over three decades.

II.8.4. Johannes Scharpius and the Twofold Kingdom of Christ

The first Edinburgh theologian this chapter considers is John Sharp (1572–1648).[29] His name often Latinized as Johannes Scharpius, Sharp was

---

[25] Komlósi, "Dual Aspects of Ministerial Training in Late Sixteenth Century," 181.

[26] Komlósi, "Dual Aspects of Ministerial Training in Late Sixteenth Century," 181–182. Komlósi notes that this percentage is remarkable given that Edinburgh University's first graduating class was in 1587.

[27] Whytock, *"An Educated Clergy,"* 41.

[28] Alexander Bower, *The History of the University of Edinburgh: Chiefly Compiled from Original Papers and Records, Never Before Published*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Alex Smellie, 1817), 141. Apparently the principalship was thus distinguished from the professor holding the chair of divinity; at Edinburgh, the principal increasingly taught less in the area of theology (although Robert Leighton countered this practice).

[29] For a brief biography of Sharp see David Stevenson's article under "Sharp, John" in *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*, 769. See also Vaughan T. Wells's article under "Sharp, John" in H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: In Association with the British Academy: From the*

appointed in 1630 as fourth Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh University, a position he held until his death. Sharp was a student of Andrew Melville[30] at St. Andrews University, and in 1592 successfully defended his theses concerning sin under Melville's supervision.[31] After pastoring in Fife for several years, Sharp was imprisoned and subsequently banished for life from Scotland because he acted as clerk of the 1605 General Assembly held in Aberdeen; this Assembly met in opposition to the demands of James VI who was attempting to limit the authority of the Scottish church.[32] Sharp then travelled to France where he became Professor of Theology in 1608 at the College of Die in Dauphiné. While employed there he compiled his massive, two-volume *Cursus Theologicus* (1620),[33] and interestingly dedicated it to the very authority that deported him from his homeland.[34] This monumental work, extending to just over one thousand pages in the original Latin, is an elenctic theology aimed specifically at rebutting the attacks of Robert Bellarmine, and is arranged according to a fairly standard

---

Earliest Times to the Year 2000 (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 50:23–24.

[30] Andrew Melville's influence on the Scottish universities can hardly be overestimated. Not only was Melville a leading figure in Scottish Presbyterianism by carefully defining the ecclesiastical polity of the church, he was also instrumental in the development of theological higher education. See especially the study by Steven J. Reid, *Humanism and Calvinism: Andrew Melville and the Universities of Scotland, 1560-1625*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Farnham, England; Burlington: Ashgate PubCo, 2011). The connection between Melville as theological instructor of Sharp is also important as Melville would have undoubtedly instructed his students concerning the proper and distinct functions of church and magistrate.

[31] *Theses Theologicae de Peccato Quas Spiritu Sancto Praeside, D. Andrea Melvino Sacrae Theologiae Doctore…Joannes Scharpius ad diem III. & IV. Julij in Scholis Theologicis Academia Andreanae* (Edinburgh: Robertus Walde-grave, 1600).

[32] For a fuller account of this incident in Sharp's life, see Bower, *The History of the University of Edinburgh*, 174–177.

[33] Johannes Scharpius, *Cursus Theologicus, in Quo Controversiae Omnes De Fidei Dogmatibus, Hoc Seculo exagitatae, nominatim inter nos & Pontificios, pertractantur; Etad Bellarmini argumenta respondetur. In Duos Tomos Divisus* (Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1620). Sharp's three other published works include: *Tractatus de Justificatione hominis coram Deo* (Geneva: Paulus Marcellus, 1609); *Tractatus de misero hominis statu sub peccato* (Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1610); *Symphonia prophetarum et apostolorum* (Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1625).

[34] The opening dedication reads as follows: "*Invictissimo Serenissimoque Iacobo Primo, Magnae Britanniae Aliorumque Regnorum Imperatori Potentissimo, trecentarum sexaginta & ampliùs insularum in Mari Britannico & magno Oceano, Domino, fidei Catholicae Apostolicae defensori acerrismo, S.*"

locus delineation.[35] Apparently Sharp's reputation as a Protestant theologian was becoming too great for the liking of Cardinal Richelieu as Sharp was once again forced to leave his home; in 1630 he was exiled from France, but was at this time permitted back in Scotland. For the next eighteen years or so, Sharp served as professor of divinity at the University of Edinburgh.[36] Vaughan Wells notes that during his tenure in Edinburgh, Sharp aligned himself with the Covenanters, and in 1637 signed the petition against the use of the prayer book.[37] It is estimated that Sharp died in 1648, and was succeeded in his position at Edinburgh by Alexander Colvill.

II.8.4.1 The Twofold Kingdom of Christ in Cursus Theologicus: De Christi Officio

Sharp discussed the twofold kingdom of Christ in at least two places in his *Cursus Theologicus*. The first appearance is within the twenty-first topic entitled *De Christi Officio*, a section which flows out of the previous topic's consideration *De Christo Mediatore*.[38] Following the standard threefold distinction of Christ's mediatorial office of prophet, priest, and king (*munus triplex*),[39] Sharp devotes approximately eight pages to a discussion of the kingly office of Christ in which he considers the definition and distinctions within the kingly office, Christ's resurrection, his forty days of post-resurrection life upon earth, ascension into heaven, session at the Father's right hand, and the final judgment. It is especially the first of these sections

---

[35] As noted in the previous chapter (Sect. II.8.4.2), Bellarmine's technical challenge to Reformed theology produced a flurry of nearly two hundred responses—Sharp's being one of these many rebuttals.

[36] David Stevenson, "Sharp, John" in Cameron, *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*.

[37] Vaughan T. Wells, "Sharp, John" in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 50:24.

[38] Both the 1620 and 1622 editions of the *Cursus Theologicus* do not have chapter numbers, but have headings on each page indicating what section or topic the author is dealing with. For the whole of the section *De Christo Officio*, it is mislabeled in both editions as *De Christo Mediatore.*

[39] Drawing upon the early church fathers, Calvin has been credited for standardizing the threefold office of Christ according to his prophetic, priestly, and kingly work. Calvin makes this clear in his *Institutes* II.XV. Cf. Louis Berkof, *Systematic Theology*, 4th ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 356.

that must be considered as it is here that Sharp delineates the twofold kingdom of Christ.

Given that Sharp's consideration of Christ's twofold kingdom is found within the broader arrangement of the *munus triplex*, which seems to have been the favored placement of this doctrine at least by the time of this work's publication (1620), one would expect Sharp's presentation to follow closely what was seen in the previous chapters. And yet, he has a remarkably different schema or arrangement. The most striking difference is that Sharp in this section does not at the outset distinguish between an essential kingdom held by the Son as God, distinct from an economical kingdom held by the God-man. This is not because Sharp is unfamiliar with this distinction (given that he employs it elsewhere as considered in our following section), but presumably because the natural or essential kingdom of the Son is not properly considered under the *munus triplex*. In other words, Sharp's only concern in this section is to describe the *mediatorial* or *official* kingdom of Jesus Christ.[40] It should be remembered that in his deliberation on this subject, Sharp is refuting Bellarmine who goes to great lengths to demonstrate that the Calvinists and Lutherans err when they say Christ exercised the office of mediator according to both natures. [41]

---

[40] Writing just over two centuries after Sharp, Geerhardus Vos, who undoubtedly drew upon the Reformed orthodox for his terminology, made this specific point. Within his *Reformed Dogmatics*, and specifically the section dealing with the offices of Christ, Vos has this question and answer: "94. Is Christ already king apart from His mediatorship? Yes. As sharing in the Diving Being, He also possesses from eternity the royal power over all creation that belongs to God. …In a strict sense, however, one cannot speak of this as a *munus regium*, a "kingly office." After all, an office always presupposes delegated authority exercised in the name of another. Divine kingly power is absolute. Hence one was accustomed to speak of a *regnum essentiale*, an "essential rule," and place next to it the *regnum personale*, the "personal rule." The latter, then, means the official kingship of the Mediator." See Geerhardus Vos, *Reformed Dogmatics*, trans. and ed. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2012), 175.

[41] Cf. Bellarmin, *Controversies of the Christian Faith*, 575–589. Sharp was therefore very aware that he precisely had to define how and according to what nature Christ exercises his mediatorial office. In replying to Bellarmine, Sharp gives eleven arguments why the *principium formale* of Christ's mediatorial activity is said to be *secundum utramque naturam*. Argument #8 states: "*Christus ut est Propheta, Rex & Sacerdos, est Mediator: at Propheta, Rex & Sacerdos in Scripturis dicitur secundum utramq[ue] naturam, ut est persona θεάνθρωπος, Hebr.3.4.5.6. Hebr. 7.3 & 1.2. Act.2.36. Psalm.2.6.*" *Cursus Theologicus*, I:782.

Following a deliberate bipartite (Ramist) structure,[42] Sharp's primary distinction here is to consider a twofold kingdom of Christ that is "general" and "special."[43] It is apparent that Sharp considers this general and special kingdom (singular in nature) to be proper to the mediatorial function of Jesus Christ given that he holds both aspects as *θεάνθρωπος*. In his general kingdom, Jesus as God-man exercises mediatorial power and authority over all things (*rebus omnibus*) he has created; in his special kingdom, Jesus as God-man concentrates his royal authority on collecting, administering, and conserving his church. Sharp notes that it is in this latter sense that Christ is properly called King (*et huius regni respectu, proprie Christus Rex dicitur*).

Continuing his bipartite divisions, Sharp states that the special kingdom—the aspect of Christ's kingdom that is centered on the church—can be considered in two ways: comparatively and absolutely (*in se*). Comparatively this special kingdom can be viewed according to what it has in common with other kingdoms and how it differs from these other kingdoms. Sharp lists five common characteristics shared between Christ's kingdom and earthly kingdoms: (1) there is one person who rules, (2) there are subjects who are ruled, (3) there are laws, (4) there is obedience, and (5) there is power to protect (*tueor*) the good and punish (*punio*) evil doers. The differences are somewhat more expanded by Sharp. First, there is a different quality, for Christ's kingdom is spiritual and not of this world. Next, there is

---

[42] For a balanced account of the use of Ramus at Edinburgh University, see Steven J. Reid, *Humanism and Calvinism: Andrew Melville and the Universities of Scotland*, 209–212. Reid comments, "The degree programme clearly utilised the works of Ramus, but only as a means by which to inculcate the basic elements of logical disputation in the young entrants before moving on to 'real' logic in the shape of Aristotle" (210). Peter Ramus, a Catholic-turned-Protestant murdered during the infamous massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, was also influential in France and England. Richad Muller provides a helpful analysis of Ramist thought in *PRRD*, I. 4.1 (B.1) where he writes, "The seventeenth-century understanding of Ramism was, thus, not as a model that set aside Aristotle and scholastic method, but as model [*sic*] that modified and adapted both. Ramism emerges, therefore, not as an opposition to Protestant scholasticism but as a significant element in its framework and fashioning."

[43] Sharp writes, "Regnum Christi duplex est. 1. Generale, quo ut *θεάνθρωπος* rebus omnibus creates praest, easque regit & gubernat. 2. Speciale, quo ut *θεάνθρωπος* Ecclesiam colligit, administrat & conservat, & huius regni respectu, proprie Christus Rex dicitur." See Scharpius, *Cursus Theologicus*, I:883.

a difference in the citizens; citizens of earthly kingdoms are all indiscriminate (*promiscue*), presumably because all (whether believer or unbeliever) are part of an earthly kingdom, whereas citizens of Christ's kingdom are for the most part believers, even though in this world there is a mixing in of hypocrites who will, however, be separated from this kingdom at the end of the world. Third, there are different modes of administration. Earthly kingdoms are largely governed by external might, resources, political laws, etc. Christ's kingdom is governed internally by the Holy Spirit, and externally through the ministry of word and sacrament. Fourth, a different obedience is required; earthly kingdoms require for the most part an external obedience that is moral and bodily; in Christ's kingdom, internal and spiritual obedience is required. Fifth, different benefits are provided in each; earthly kingdoms may provide good things for this life, but the benefits of Christ's kingdom are all spiritual. And finally, there is a difference in duration; earthly kingdoms will pass away (*pereunt*), one kingdom succeeding another, but Christ's kingdom is eternal.

According to Sharp, these five common and six differing characteristics are sufficient to evaluate four erroneous theological positions concerning the kingdom of Christ. Presumably against the Anabaptists (although this is the one position he does not name), Sharp says that they err who suppose that the kingdom of Christ and kingdoms of the world are necessarily contrary. The Jews, secondly, err in that they dream (*somnio*) of a worldly kingdom of Christ. Third, the Chiliasts err in believing that the 1,000-year kingdom of Christ occurs in this world before the consummation of all things, and before the duration of the Christians' triumph in the kingdom of heaven. Finally, the Papists and others err who pretend to minister in the kingdom of Christ, but instead invade (*invado*) and occupy as lords the kingdom of the world.[44]

---

[44] Although Sharp does not reference any authority, his perfunctory assessment of the Roman Catholic Church here is remarkably similar to Luther's as already considered from his *Temporal Authority*: "Constantly I must pound in and squeeze in and drive in and wedge in this difference between the two kingdoms, even though it is written and said so often that it becomes tedious. The devil never stops cooking and brewing these two kingdoms into each other. In the devil's name the secular leaders always want to be Christ's masters and teach Him how He should run His church and spiritual government. Similarly, the false

Having reflected on Christ's special kingdom comparatively, Sharp next considers it absolutely or *in se*. Considered *in se*, Christ's special kingdom is composed of four parts: the (present) victory of Christ over his enemies (the Devil, sin, flesh, world, and death); the glory after this victory; the occupation of the kingdom following this glory; and finally the administration of this kingdom. In the ensuing pages of this section, Sharp links these four aspects of Christ's special kingdom to his resurrection, forty post-resurrection days on earth (evidence of his victory), ascension into heaven (occupation of his kingdom), session at the Father's right hand, and the final judgment (administration of his kingdom).[45]

Within this final section on Christ's session, Sharp asks whether Christ as mediator will continue to reign after the final judgment. Initially it appears that Sharp teaches this royal and mediatorial function of Christ will cease after he hands over the kingdom to the Father (*tradet regnum Patri*) in the final judgement; indeed, Sharp notes that in the final judgment the royal office of Christ will be completed as he abolishes *all* external government, whether this be civil or ecclesiastical government.[46] Sharp clarifies his position, however, by answering the following question: "When we say that Christ will surrender the kingdom to the Father after the final judgment, will he then be Mediator King?"[47] Sharp answers that Christ will not reign in eternity as he did in this world (i.e., using external means in the presence of enemies), and yet, having vanquished his enemies, he will remain as mediator and head of his entire body throughout eternity.[48] Citing 1

---

clerics and schismatic spirits always want to be the masters, though not in God's name, and to teach people how to organize the secular government." Cf. *LW* 13:194–195; *WA* 51:239.

[45] Contrary to the Chiliasts or Millenarians (*Millenariis*), Sharp makes a clear distinction between the administration of Christ's kingdom before the final judgment and after. Cf. *Cursus Theologicus*, I:893; 898.

[46] Sharp writes that one of the ends (*fines*) of the final judgement is "Ut regii officii Christi sit complementum, quia debellatis hostibus tradet regnum Patri, abolita omni externa politia tam civili, quam Ecclesiastica." *Cursus Theologicus*, I:896.

[47] "Cum Christus dicatur traditurus regnum Patri post ultimum iudicum, an tum Mediator regnaturus sit?" *Cursus Theologicus*, I:897–898.

[48] "Non regnabit ut in hoc mundo regnat per media externa in media hostium, quia tum debellatis hostibus cum suis in unum collectis, ut Mediator et caput cum toto suo, corpore in aeternum manebit, suosque; iam Reges factos, Deo Patri regendos tradet, hostesque omnes a Patre in aeternum captiuos detinendos subiiciet, I. Cor.15.24." *Cursus Theologicus*, I:898. Sharp also dealt with the so-called problem of 1 Corinthian 15:24 within

Corinthians 15:24, Sharp acknowledges that the "this-world" administration of Christ's kingdom will cease, but that Christ, as God, will be crowned with eternal glory with the Father forever. Here Sharp hints at the more traditional understanding of the twofold kingdom of Christ, that is, a kingdom distinguished essentially and mediatorially. A variation of this particular designation is more fully developed by Sharp in his section dealing with the church.

II.8.4.2 The Twofold Kingdom of Christ in Cursus Theologicus: De Ecclesia Militante

Despite Sharp's quite unique delineation of the kingdom of Christ as produced under his locus dealing with Christ's kingly office, he was aware of, and used to some degree, the more standardized formulation of Christ's natural (essential) kingdom as distinct from his dispensatory (economical) kingdom. This particular use is expanded in Sharp's locus dealing with the militant church, and especially the subsection entitled *De Capite Ecclesiae*.[49]

According to Sharp, the head of the church can be considered communally (in this sense, the head is the triune God) or singularly (in this sense, it is the God-man, Jesus Christ). As theandric head, Christ exercises his spiritual rule over the militant church in a (not surprisingly) twofold way: (1) ultimately or principally, and (2) subordinately and ministerially.[50]

---

his section on the Trinity; here he countered the objection that Christ handing over a kingdom to the Father implies his ultimate subjection to the Father. This objection occurs within a list of 35 possible arguments for the subordination of the Son to the Father. Sharp gives a response to each argument. Objection #26 (which is mislabeled as #36), reads as follows: "Qui tradit regnum patri est inferior patre, ac proinde non Deus: At filius tradet regnum patri. I. Cor. 15.24. Ergo." Sharp answers, "Est captio a dicto secundum quid: nam non ita tradet regnum, ut desinat ipse regnare, quia regni eius non est finis. Dan. 7.14. Luc. 1.33. Mich. 4.7. Sed respectu modi regnandi quo nunc utitur in Ecclesia militante: et hoc tantum sensu post diem iudicii tradet regnum patri." *Cursus Theologicus*, I:236. Thus, confirming what he writes in his section on the offices of Christ, it is the mode of Christ's rule that changes following the final judgment.

[49] Following his penchant for bi-partite arrangements, Sharp considers the militant church with respect to its head and body (*respectu capitis* and *respectu corporis*). *Cursus Theologicus*, II:87.

[50] Latin: (1) *summum et principale*; (2) *subalternum et ministeriale*.

This ultimate or principal rule is proper only to Christ whereby he, by the scepter of his word and Spirit, rules over each and every one of his members. And yet, although this rule is centered on the members of the militant church, Sharp recognized that Christ's ultimate rule is made effective even through the works of his enemies (Eph. 1:23; Phil. 2:13). Following this recognition, Sharp introduces what seems to be the more common descriptors of Christ's twofold kingdom; "But this kingdom of Christ," he said, "is twofold. 1. Natural. 2. Dispensatory."[51]

Sharp's definition of the *regnum naturale* mirrors what we have already seen from other representative figures of Reformed orthodoxy; the natural kingdom, according to Sharp, is the eternal kingdom that the Son holds with the Father and Holy Spirit as all three are identical in power and glory. This rule is shared equally by the three persons of the one divine essence; it is a joint work (*operationum communium*) over and above all things; and it is infinite, immutable, and lasting from eternity to eternity.[52] Sharp does not consider this aspect of Christ's kingdom further,[53] but instead contrasts it with the dispensatory or economical kingdom of Christ. Sharp explains that this kingdom is one which Christ receives (unlike the *regnum naturale*), and that its particular concern is the gracious salvation of the body of Christ. Sharp further clarifies that this economical kingdom is inferior (*inferius*) to the natural kingdom because, he says, it has an end in that it will be handed over to the Father.[54] As Christ, for the present, maintains this economical rule over his church, Sharp concludes that in this sense the government of the church is properly considered monarchical (*huius regiminis respectu, Ecclesiae regimen Monarchicum est*).[55]

---

[51] "Est autem hoc Christi regnum duplex. 1. Naturale. 2. Dispensationis." *Cursus Theologicus*, II:88.

[52] "Naturale est aeternum illud regnum quo aequali potentia et gloria cum Patre et Spiritu sancto in unitate essentiae et operationum communium in omnibus et super omnia, infinite, immutabiliter, ab aeterno, in aeternum regnat." *Cursus Theologicus*, II:88.

[53] Sharp writes, "De quo regno hoc loco [De Ecclesia Militante] non est agendum." *Cursus Theologicus*, II:88.

[54] "Regimen κατ᾽ οἰκονομίαν, seu dispensationis est gratuitum illud regnum quod in se recipit ad salute corporis sui, hoc autem regimen naturali illo inferius est et finem habiturum, qui tradet hoc regnum Patri, I. Cor. 15.25 28." *Cursus Theologicus*, II:88–89.

[55] Following this analysis of the ultimate or principal rule of Christ over his church, Sharp considers next the ministerial rule of the church. This, he says, is also twofold:

II.8.4.3. Analysis of Sharp's Presentation of the Duplex Regnum

Two observations concerning Sharp's presentation of the *duplex regnum Christi* can be made at this point. First, although Sharp was certainly aware of the more familiar terms used to describe Christ's twofold kingdom, he was not opposed to using other distinctions. Thus, as seen in his locus dealing with the office of Christ, Sharp first distinguished Christ's royal office as "general" (over all things) and "special" (centered on the church), but both aspects held as *theanthrōpos*. And yet, it is not apparent how this "general kingdom" relates to the *regnum naturale* as described in the locus on the militant church. Initially it may appear that Sharp's descriptors of a "general" and "special" kingdom correspond to his later use of the more traditional language of a distinct "natural" and "economical" kingdom; this correlation is especially tempting if the perceived scope of each kingdom is used to delineate each (i.e., general and natural as over all things, compared to special and economical as centered on Christ's church). But this strict correlation cannot be upheld. Sharp's definition of Christ's general kingdom is not synonymous with his use of the technical term *regnum naturale* since the former is attributed to the God-man, whereas the latter is held by the Son considered apart from his humanity. Furthermore, the general kingdom as described by Sharp is properly considered mediatorial; the natural kingdom is not.

A second observation concerns the duration of Christ's kingship. As already noted from his locus on Christ's office, Sharp argued for the continuation of Christ's mediatorial royal office (using 1 Cor. 15 as exegetical support), but in his locus on the church he stated that Christ's economical kingdom was inferior to his natural kingdom since the former will have an end (again using 1 Cor. 15 as support). Sharp's position is quite unique here. This construction is unlike other representative theologians considered in previous chapters, not because he supposed there will come an

invisible and visible. Ministerial government that is invisible is held by the Holy Spirit and ministering angels, whereas ministerial government that is visible is exercised through the word and discipline of delegated men in church. See *Cursus Theologicus*, II:89.

end to Christ's economical kingdom—although this was indeed the minority position among the Reformed orthodox—but because Sharp seems to have disassociated Christ's economical kingdom from his mediatorial kingdom. Whereas the vast majority of the Reformed orthodox equated the *regnum oeconomicum* with the *regnum mediatorium*, Sharp, by allowing for the former's end and the latter's continuation into eternity, seems to have at least interpreted and used the term *regnum oeconomicum* differently than most. Whether Sharp intended this distinction or not, his excessive reliance on a bipartite structure for organizing his theology was likely a main reason why his interpretation of the dispensatory kingdom of Christ differs slightly from others. Nevertheless, despite his Ramist organization, his use of other terms (such as general and special, or ultimate and ministerial), and the question surrounding the duration of Christ's economical kingship, in the end Sharp's description and use of the *duplex regnum Christi* is largely consistent with what was already seen from other Reformed orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century. The following section considers this doctrine from the life and works of another prominent university professor in seventeenth-century Scotland.

II.8.5. David Dickson and the Twofold Kingdom of Christ

The second Scottish theologian and Edinburgh divinity professor to consider is David Dickson (1583–1662). Thought to have been born in 1583, Dickson assumed the role and duties of theology professor for over two decades (1640–1662), first at the University of Glasgow for approximately ten years, and then for the remainder at the University of Edinburgh.[56] Prior to his Glasgow professorship, Dickson served as pastor of the Irvine congregation for nearly twenty-three years. As professor and pastor,

---

[56] For a brief biography of Dickson see John Howie, *Biographia scoticana: or, a brief historical account of the lives, characters, and memorable transactions of the most eminent Scots worthies, noblemen, gentlemen, ministers, and others*, 2nd ed. (Glasgow: John Bryce, 1781), 280–287. See also Andrew Stewart, "David Dickson—Covenanter and Commentator," *The Reformed Theological Review* 68, no. 1 (April 2009): 46–61. This article provides an overview of Dickson's life and writings, focusing on the contributions Dickson gave in his various commentaries.

Dickson was certainly an influential figure such that John Macleod somewhat hagiographically opines, "…in his own time there was no man who was held in higher esteem or carried greater weight than Dickson did in the councils of the Church, nor was there anyone that did more useful work in spreading the Faith of his Church and giving it popular and permanent form."[57] Dickson's effective ministry in Scotland was evidenced both privately and publicly; instances of his usefulness can be seen in the individual care he gave those under his pastoral oversight,[58] as well as in his published writings and public leadership provided throughout the controversies plaguing the Scottish kirk and academy from the early 1620's to 1660's.[59]

Dickson's extant writings can be categorized into doctrinal and pastoral works, sermons, commentaries or exegetical pieces, and public speeches or letters. As will become apparent after examining selections from these different genres, Dickson, much like the other representatives of

---

[57] John Macleod, *Scottish Theology in Relation to Church History Since the Reformation* (Edinburgh; Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1974), 83.

[58] The editor to Volume 1 of Dickson's *Select Practical Writings* recounts Dickson's care and counsel given to John Stirling, a young lad on the verge of leaving the parish school because he felt as though he could not serve God while studying Latin. As his pastor, Dickson challenged him to reconsider. Stirling heeded his pastor's advice, finished college, and became a chaplain under the direction of Dickson. Cf. *Select Practical Writings of David Dickson*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: John Greig, 1845), xxx–xxxii. The editor also records the fascinating account of a robber who stole Dickson's purse; years later the same robber returned to Dickson, confessing that the words the pastor spoke at that time so convicted him that he repented of his wicked ways. The man refunded what he stole, with interest (see xxxii–xxxiii). Admittedly, this account is from a hagiographic type of genre that should not always be taken at face value. As an aside, it appears that a companion volume was to be included with the *Select Practical Writings*, but this apparently never materialized.

[59] Indicative of the massive influence Dickson had on the Presbyterian church within Scotland, John Howie writes, "Either at Glasgow or at Edinburgh, the most part of the presbyterian ministers, at least in the west, south and east parts of Scotland, from 1640, were under his inspection." See Howie, *Biographia scoticana*, 285. Crawford Gribben, quoting from H.M.B. Reid's work on the divinity professors of Glasgow, makes this same point, noting, "One estimate suggests that two-thirds or even three-quarters of Scottish preachers graduating in the mid-seventeenth century had trained under Dickson: 'The men who came out from Glasgow and Edinburgh Divinity Halls from 1640 onward to the Restoration were really Dickson's men.'" See his essay "Robert Leighton and the Presbyterian Consensus" in Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben, eds., *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550–1700*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), 166.

Reformed orthodoxy already examined, closely tied Christ's twofold kingship to a consideration of Christ's person and work. More specifically, Dickson aligned his discussion of the *duplex regnum* within a broader consideration of Christ's mediatorial and covenantal work.[60] The following analysis attempts to draw comprehensively from Dickson's works; while generally focusing on his later writings that correspond with his appointments as Professor of Divinity at Glasgow and Edinburgh University—*An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles*, *The Summe of Saving Knowledge*, and *Truth's Victory Over Error*—some analysis of his other sermons and exegetical works will be included in the footnotes.

II.8.5.1 An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles

Dickson's 1645 commentary on the apostolic letters was completed several years prior to his professorship at Edinburgh, and yet a consideration of this work is important for at least two reasons. First, it draws on his exegetical labors, and so allows for a consideration of a different genre of writing than what is reflected on in subsequent sections,[61] and second, Dickson's specific intent in producing this commentary (originally published in Latin and shortly afterward translated into English) was for the education of young students in theology, thus providing a unique window into what Dickson saw as necessary for the training of his students.[62] Dickson was principally

---

[60] For two dissertations assessing the importance of covenant theology for Dickson see Carol A. Williams, "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant: David Dickson and the Covenant of Redemption," (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2005) and Byunghoon Woo, "The *Pactum Salutis* in the Theologies of Witsius, Owen, Dickson, Goodwin, and Cocceius," (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2014). See also Richard A. Muller, "Toward the Pactum Salutis: Locating the Origins of a Concept," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 18 (2007): 16–22.

[61] Dickson also wrote an extensive commentary on the Psalms that was published over the course of two or three years (1652–1654). Following the example of "grave authors before [him]," he divided this commentary into three equal parts, dedicating each commentary of 50 psalms to a different person.

[62] For the English see David Dickson, *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles, Together With an Explanation of those other Epistles of the Apostles, St. James, Peter, John & Jude: Wherein the sense of every Chapter and Verse is Analytically unfolded, and the Text enlightened* (London: R.I. for Francis Fglesfield, 1659). For the Latin see David Dickson, *Expositio Analytica Omnium Apostolicarum Epistolarum: Seu, Brevis Introductio ad pleniores Commentarios, in Usum Studiosorum Theologiae* (Glasgow: Georgius Andersonus,

concerned that young "Clients to Divinity," with all of their other duties and studies, were not adequately trained in the proper reading and exegesis of the Scriptures.[63] He wished to correct this deficiency by producing this commentary (together with his Commentary on the Psalms and Matthew), and strongly encouraged his contemporaries to follow his example in producing clear and concise expositions of Scripture.[64]

Before considering the primary place in *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles* in which Dickson addressed the twofold kingdom of Christ,[65] some analysis of his method is appropriate. Drawing again upon the prefatory address to the reader of this work, Dickson's penchant for brevity is highlighted; his goal was only to give the "main scope of the Text, and of the obscurer words, and harder sentences, and of their coherence one with another, and also with the principal scope." All of this Dickson purposed to do with perspicuity so as to not "intangle the Reader."[66] Combining this desire for succinctness with his role as divinity instructor, Dickson characterizes himself as a porter offering a key of scriptural introduction to students of theology:

1647). Dickson's intent that this commentary was to be used in the instruction of divinity students is reflected in the original Latin title.

[63] Dickson, *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles*, "To the Reader." Here he writes, "Tis well known in the Schools, in how little time, how many and great volumes are to be read, how many facilitating and perasceuastical exercises young Clients to Divinity must run thorow; and in apportionating either of daies or hours, to the several sorts of studies, how little time is spent in reading the Holy Scriptures, to get a right understanding of which, ought to be the chief labour of all men."

[64] For a discussion of Dickson's role in encouraging others such as James Fergusson, George Henderson, and James Durham to produce what is called the "Scotch Commentary Series," see Stewart, "David Dickson—Covenanter and Commentator," 51–59.

[65] Other than the clear reference to Christ's twofold kingdom as examined in this section (from Dickson's exposition of 1 Corinthian 15), I was not able to find other such references in this commentary. This is likely due to the very brief nature of this work; many verses only receive one or two lines of explanation. A veiled reference to the essential kingdom of Christ can be found in his comments on Ephesians 5:5 (although the specific term is not used). Commenting on this verse, Dickson writes, "Because uncleanness and covetousness are excluded from the Kingdome of heaven, which is called the God the Fathers and Christs, because it is a Kingdome common to both." Dickson, *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles*, 120.

[66] Dickson, *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles*, "To the Reader." For more on Dickson's methodology, see Williams, "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant," 120–130.

> Where the sense of the verse is obvious, and the connexion plain,
> there will be no need of this help of mine, which is to take place
> chiefly in obscurer passages; but lest there should bee any gap, I
> have made the work all along similar and homogeneous. Hee that
> likes not this concise way of writing, I beg of him that hee would
> not deter others from the reading of it. If this Introduction shall but
> open a door to the Students of Divinity unto larger Commentaries, I
> have my desire. A Key, the less it is, the higher it is wont to bee
> valued.[67]

This method is intriguing not only because it admits—even necessitates—a
complementary relationship with other works of theology, but it also
clarifies for the interpreter of Dickson what he considered to be the "more
obscure" as opposed to the more "obvious" places of theology.

Evidently, Dickson believed that one of these more obscure
doctrines that needed further exposition was the mediatorial kingship of
Jesus Christ. It should not be surprising by now that Dickson used the
Apostle Paul's description of the Son's future handing over of the kingdom
back to the Father as found in 1 Corinthians 15:24–28 to provide a brief
commentary on Christ's twofold kingdom. Dickson infers from these verses
that two things will occur simultaneously at the conclusion of this world's
age: (1) the Son will deliver up his kingdom to the Father, and (2) all
contrary rule, authority, or power will be abolished. Dickson clarifies:

> Two things are conjoyned in time, with the end of the world, *viz.*
> The delivering up the Kingdome by the Son into the hands of the
> Father, and the putting down of all rule, authority, and contrary
> power; whereof this is the meaning: After Christ shall have subdued
> and abolished all adverse power, as the Devil, the World, and the
> rest, of what kind soever, hee will vanquish those powers so far
> forth, that they shall not any longer bee injurious to his members, all
> of them being thrust down to hell; at *last* Christ shall present his
> Church (which is called the Kingdome of Christ, given him of his

---

[67] Dickson, *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles*, "To the Reader."

> Father) every way perfect, and deliver it up, as it were, into the
> hands of his Father.[68]

At this point Dickson closely associated the "Kingdome of Christ" with the church, a kingdom that is *given* to the Son by the Father. And yet, even as Dickson identifies this *given* kingdom with the church, he recognized that the kingly power of the Son is over all enemies of King Jesus and his church.

It is not until the following paragraph, however, that Dickson formally distinguishes a twofold kingdom of the Son, i.e., the kingdom or rule given to him by the Father over which he is mediator, and the kingdom or rule he holds equally with the Father. Commenting further on 1 Corinthians 15:24, he writes:

> Having finished all things which were committed to him by his
> Father to finish, hee shall resign up the Kingdome also committed
> to him, over all things which are in the world, to the perfecting the
> work of our Redemption, hee shall (I say) deliver up the Kingdome
> to God, according to his *Humanity,* and to his Father, according to
> his *Divinity*; not that hee shall cease to reign immediately, but
> mediately, and as before: not that hee shall leave off to reign with
> the Father, but shall cease to reign as deputed by the Father, to
> conflict with his enemies, or to administer any longer in a laborious
> and painful work of gathering his Church, otherwise there is no end
> of his Kingdome, hee shall indeed reign much more gloriously than
> now hee doth, when his adversaries are conquered, without the
> Ministery of Angels or men, hee shall govern, together with the
> Father, and fill all his with light, love, life, with his virtues
> immediately.[69]

---

[68] Dickson, *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles*, 66–67. Dickson, *Expositio Analytica Omnium Apostolicarum Epistolarum*, 210. The English translation is fairly accurate except that it missed any indication of the signaling words "*cujus loci.*" Thus, rather than Dickson simply saying "this is the meaning…." he wrote, "this is the meaning of this topic…." The use of the particular designation *locus* most likely signals here is a particular doctrine or topic of theology that is worthy of note.

[69] Dickson, *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles*, 67.

Several observations can be made of this extended quotation. First, the technical force of the distinction Dickson here makes is somewhat muted in the English translation given that the specific term "*regnum mediatorium*," included in the Latin, is not translated. Thus, instead of the phrase "hee shall (I say) deliver up the Kingdome to God, according to his *Humanity*, and to his Father, according to his *Divinity*," a better translation would read, "he will hand over and resign the 'mediatorial kingdom' (so-called) to his God, according to [his] humanity, and to his Father, according to [his] divinity."[70] Indeed, the placement of this specific term at the beginning of the phrase, coupled with the use of *inquam* in the Latin, is more likely Dickson's way of highlighting the technical use of the term *regnum mediatorium* rather than giving force to his own words (as apparently the translator believed to be the case).

Secondly, Dickson here addresses the manner in which Jesus Christ will hand over the mediatorial kingdom. If the mediatorial kingdom is now held by Christ according to both natures (a commonly held assertion), then he will also presumably deliver or hand over the same kingdom according to both natures. Dickson thus distinguishes in what manner this will be done: With respect to his humanity, Jesus Christ will hand the kingdom over to *God* (considered as Father, Son, and Spirit), but with respect to his divinity, Jesus Christ will hand the kingdom over to the *Father*. That Dickson is deliberate in tying the personal and economic relations of the Trinity to this distinction of the *duplex regnum* should not be missed by the interpreter.

Thirdly, from this quotation it is evident that Dickson is careful to note the distinct *mediate* rule and kingdom of Jesus Christ (i.e., as mediator according to both natures) as distinct from the Son's *immediate* rule and

---

[70] The Latin reads: "Quartò, Peractis omnibus quae Ipsi peragenda commissa errant à Patre, commissum etiam sibi regnum, in omnia quae in mundo sunt, ad Redemptionis opus peragendum, Regnum (inquam) mediatorium tradet, & resignabit Deo suo, secundum humanitatem, & Patri suo, secundum Divinitatem, non ut desinat immediate regere, sed ut cesset, mediate, & sic regere ut prius: non ut desinat cum Patre regnare, sed ut cesset tanquam deputatus à Patre regnare, cum hostibus conflictari, aut laboriosam, seu tumultuosam provinciam in colligenda Ecclesia amplius administrare; alioqui enim regni ejus non est finis, imò verò gloriosior erit quam nunc est, regnandi ratio, cum devictis adversariis, sine Ministerio Angelorum vel Hominum, unà cum Patre & Spiritu, luce, dilectione, vita, & virtute suâ immediate implebit, & gubernabit omnes suos." Dickson, *Expositio Analytica Omnium Apostolicarum Epistolarum*, 210.

kingdom, a reign and kingdom that the Son will hold equally with the Father for all eternity. At this point Dickson does not provide any evidence of being familiar with the specific terms of *regnum essentiale*, *regnum naturale*, or *regnum universale* to denote this shared and equal kingship of the Son with the Father, and yet his description of this kingdom, distinct from Christ's *regnum mediatorium*, parallels what was already seen in the representative figures from Leiden and Geneva.[71]

       Lastly, it should be observed that Dickson did not limit the *regnum mediatorium* to the incarnate Son's rule over his church. While Dickson certainly believed the focus of this specific kingdom is the mediatorial and redemptive work of Jesus Christ within his church, he nevertheless stressed that the kingdom "committed" to the God-man (i.e., the *regnum mediatorium*) is "*in omnia quae in mundo sunt* (over everything in the world)."[72] This again buttresses one of the primary arguments of this study, namely, that the Reformed orthodox did not primarily differentiate the twofold kingdom of Christ as to its scope (i.e., determining what areas of life each kingdom pertained to), but as to the mode of Christ's rule (as Dickson argues, whether the Son rules *immediately* as one person of the Trinity, or *mediately* as God-man).[73] Evidence of this mediated kingdom, given to the Son by the Father, is also found in Dickson's co-authored work next considered.

II.8.5.2 The Summe of Saving Knowledge

---

[71] See Chapter Five for further discussion of these terms.

[72] Dickson, *Expositio Analytica Omnium Apostolicarum Epistolarum*, 210.

[73] This distinction of the mediate and immediate rule is further spelled out by Dickson in his comments on 1 Corinthians 15:28. It is the Son, as man ("*Christus qua Homo*"), who was subjected to the Father; thus, the entire "Mediatory Embassage" of the Son was according to the commission and under the authority of the Father. When the Son resigns this mediatorial role, the Trinity, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, will then immediately rule over all the saints. As an aside, the English translation skips over the translation of "Deus Triunus" in this context. See Dickson, *Expositio Analytica Omnium Apostolicarum Epistolarum*, 211. Dickson also referenced 1 Cor. 15 and the authority of the Son over "all things" except for God "essentially considered"—to whom he made himself subject—in his comments on Psalm 8:3–8. See Dickson, *A Brief Explication of the First Fifty Psalms*, 40–41.

Perhaps the work most often associated with David Dickson is *The Sum of Saving Knowledge*, a work he coauthored with James Durham, his younger colleague and former student. This *medulla*-type work was published as early as 1649, around the same time that Dickson took up his labors at Edinburgh.[74] Although *The Sum of Saving Knowledge* never received official status as a recognized ecclesiastical document, it was often published together with the Confession of Faith and Catechisms produced by the Westminster Assembly several years prior.[75] Biographer Robert Wodrow writes of this work, "It was the deed of these two great men, and, though never judicially approven by this church, deserves to be much more read and considered than I fear it is."[76]

  The Sum of Saving Knowledge is divided into four primary sections. In the first section, four heads of Christian doctrine are outlined: the human fallen condition, the remedy provided in Christ, the means provided in the covenant of grace, and the blessings of this covenant. Next, the uses of these doctrines are considered. This is followed by the warrants or motives to believe, and finally, the evidences of true faith. Carol Williams has argued that Dickson in this brief summary of the Christian faith seems to have corrected what he may have considered a deficiency in the Westminster Confession of Faith, namely, the exclusion of the *pactum salutis.*

---

[74] David Dickson and James Durham, *The Sum of Saving Knowledge: Or, A Brief Sum of Christian Doctrine...Together with the Practical Use Thereof* (Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter, & Co., 1871). Unless otherwise indicated by the editor, references to *The Sum* will be to this edition. For the dating of *The Sum's* publication, see Williams, "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant," 8.

[75] In his introduction to this work, John Macpherson notes that this book was instrumental in the conversion of Robert Murray Mc'Cheyne, who wrote in his diary on March 11, "Read in the *Sum of Saving Knowledge*, the work which I think first of all wrought a saving change in me." See David Dickson and James Durham, *The Sum of Saving Knowledge, with Introduction and Notes by Rev. John Macpherson*, Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students, eds. Marcus Dod and Alexander Whyte (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, [1886?]), 8.

[76] Robert Wodrow's *A Short Account of the Life of the Reverend Mr David Dickson* is included as the introduction to David Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error: Or, The True Principles of the Christian Religion, Stated and Vindicated Against the Following Heresies....* (Glasgow: John Bryce, 1764). This work is republished as David Dickson, *Truth's Victory Over Error: A Commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith*, ed. by John R. de Witt (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2007), which also includes the biography by Wodrow (ix–xxviii; the quotation being from xx). Unless otherwise indicated, future references to *Truth's Victory over Error* will be from this latter edition.

Referencing *The Sum*, Williams writes, "[Dickson] explained how the intratrinitarian covenant provides the divine basis of the temporal covenant of grace and provided a longer section on the practical use of the saving knowledge contained in Scripture in which section the covenant of redemption also figures prominently."[77] Without attempting to evaluate Williams's overarching claims here, she is certainly correct to note that covenant is the organizing principle for Dickson and Durham's brief work.

There are two particular instances in *The Sum* where the authors underscore Jesus Christ's mediatorial work as king as distinct from his divine power or authority. The first is a rather veiled reference to Christ's twofold kingship, whereas the latter is more explicit. The first reference is found in Head II, a discussion of the gracious and covenantal remedy provided by Jesus Christ. Here the authors write, "For the accomplishment of this Covenant of Redemption, and making the elect partakers of the benefits thereof in the Covenant of Grace, Christ Jesus was clad with the threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King." The authors continue that Christ was "made a King, to subdue [his people] to himself, to feed and rule them by his own appointed ordinances, and to defend them from their enemies."[78] Important for this discussion is the realization that the kingly office of Christ is here paired with a consideration of the intratrinitarian covenant of redemption, and consequently its historic outworking in the covenant of grace. Furthermore, Dickson and Durham are careful to note that Jesus Christ is *given* the kingly office—he was "clad" with the office, and he was "made" a king. It is unclear whether this reference is to the *donativum regnum* as discussed in Chapter Six.[79]

---

[77] Williams, "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant," 185.

[78] Dickson and Durham, *The Sum of Saving Knowledge*, 11.

[79] Interestingly, the nineteenth-century commentator of *The Sum*, Rev. John Macpherson, explicitly connects these statements of Dickson and Durham to the twofold kingdom of Christ. He does so by highlighting the *personal* right whereby Christ has dominion over all things as distinct from the kingly office and power he holds as given to him by the Father. Macpherson comments, "In virtue of His divine being, Christ is king. In the exercise of this *personal* right, He has dominion over all things that exist and over all intelligent beings. As mediator, He is king of saints, and has this office conferred upon Him by His Father. He is by the Father set king in Zion (Ps. ii. 6), the government is put upon His shoulder (Isa. ix. 6), and the Father hath put all things into His hand (John iii. 35)." See

A second and more explicit reference to the *duplex regnum* is found in the third major section of *The Sum*, an outline of four warrants or motives to believe in Christ. Within their explanations of these warrants, Dickson and Durham repeatedly reference the mediatorial work of Jesus Christ as King and leader/commander of his people. The authors assert that there is much assurance in believing because Christ stands in the place of his people, appointed as mediator by God the Father to fulfill all covenantal obligations. They thus conclude:

> That, for fulfilling of the covenant of redemption, the Father hath given to the Son (as he standeth in the capacity of the Mediator, or as he is God incarnate, the Word made flesh) all authority in heaven and earth, all furniture of the riches of grace, and of spirit and life, with all power and ability, which the union of the divine nature with the human, or which the fullness of the Godhead dwelling substantially in his human nature, or which the indivisible all-sufficiency and omnipotency of the inseparable, everywhere present Trinity doth import, or the work of redemption can require: "The Father (saith he) hath given all things into the Son's hand," to wit, for accomplishing his work.[80]

Here the distinction between the *given* authority that Jesus Christ possesses as God-man and the *natural* authority the Son has substantially as God is much more apparent. Whereas the authors had earlier indicated that Christ exercises his mediatorial office for the express purposes of his redeemed people, here they indicate that as God-man he is given "all authority in heaven and earth."[81] In other words, the authority associated with the God-man's mediatorial office is not localized or restricted to dominion over a

---

Dickson and Durham, *The Sum of Saving Knowledge*, ed. John Macpherson, 96 (italics added).

[80] Dickson and Durham, *Sum of Saving Knowledge*, 48–49.

[81] When discussing the first warrant to believe, they write, "God hath made a gift of Christ unto his people, as a commander: which office he faithfully exerciseth, by giving to his kirk and people laws and ordinances, pastors and governors, and all necessary officers; by keeping courts and assemblies among them, to see that his laws be obeyed; subduing, by his word, Spirit, and discipline, his people's corruptions; and, by his wisdom and power, guarding them against all their enemies whatsoever." This final phrase gives some indication that the power and rule of the God-man is not localized, but rather that it has a distinct aim. See Dickson and Durham, *Sum of Saving Knowledge*, 37.

particular people, but it is all-encompassing, as wide and as universal as the Son's essential authority.[82] Nevertheless, as the context of this discussion makes clear, this distinct *given* authority as held by Jesus Christ as mediator is specifically appointed to him for the specific work of redemption (i.e., the accomplishment of the covenant of redemption).[83] This language and distinction is very similar to what was already seen from Dickson's comments on 1 Corinthians 15, and, as seen further, this twofold authority or rule is evidenced in at least one more of Dickson's works.

II.8.5.3 Truth's Victory over Error

David Dickson's *Truth's Victory over Error* is an elenctic commentary on the then newly formed Westminster Confession of Faith. As university professor at both Glasgow and Edinburgh, from approximately 1647–1653 Dickson lectured in Latin on each chapter of the confession.[84] The collection of these class notes, *Praelectiones in Confessionem Fidei*, was

---

[82] Dickson makes the same point in his Matthew commentary, published in 1647. In at least two places he references a distinct authority given to the God-man (distinguished from the authority of the Son *per se*), and yet this authority of the incarnate Christ is universally over all things (with the exception of the Father). The first doctrine he draws from Matthew 11:27 is as follows: "Beside the right and power which Christ as God hath unto and over all things, he hath received of the Father as God-man, or God-incarnat [*sic*], right unto and over all things, in, and for the church, nothing being excepted, except him who hath delivered all things unto him." Dickson used nearly the same language and distinction in his comments on Matthew 28:18. See respectively David Dickson, *A Brief Exposition of the Euangel of Jesus Christ According to Matthew* (Glasgow: George Anderson, 1647), M; Hh.

[83] Foundational to Dickson's explanation of the eternal covenant of redemption is his distinction between the Triune God acting *essentially* together as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the God-man acting *personally* as mediator or Redeemer of his people. Thus, Dickson can say that the Son is both the "party offended" by sin because he is essentially one with the Father and Spirit, and he is the "party contracter" as well when considered personally as God-incarnate or "as God designed Mediatour." This fundamental distinction between the Son considered essentially and Jesus Christ considered personally is the very same foundation for the twofold rule or authority of Christ. See Dickson, *Therapeutica Sacra: Shewing briefly the method of healing the diseases of Conscience concerning Regeneration* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1664), Book I:24. Dickson hints at this later in this work when answering the question how the Son of man could be so humiliated while *at the same time* maintaining the majesty of the Son of God; he answers this paradox by stressing the *communicatio idiomatum*, writing, "We must distinguish in Christ these things, which are proper to either of the two natures, from these things which are ascribed to His person, in respect of either of the natures or both the natures" (I:53).

[84] Jack C. Whytock, *An Educated Clergy*. 64–66.

translated into English and published in 1684 as *Truth's Victory over Error*.[85] Jack Whytock gives some indication of the importance of this work for theological education in Scotland, claiming that it "served as a teaching system in this period at both Glasgow and Edinburgh Universities" and that the dictates (or lecture notes) constituted "one of the chief Scottish theological textbooks for divinity students in Period III [1638–1661]."[86] Throughout this work Dickson's concern to ground his students in the theological truths of Reformed orthodoxy is apparent.

As discussed in Chapter Five of this dissertation, a common place for the Reformed orthodox to introduce the twofold kingdom of Christ was within their treatments of the mediatorial work of Jesus Christ, especially as it relates to his *munus triplex*. Surprisingly, however, this distinction is absent in the eighth chapter of *Truth's Victory over Error*, "Of Christ the Mediator."[87] Rather, the only direct reference to the *duplex regnum* occurs in Dickson's commentary on Chapter XXV of the Westminster Confession, "Of the Church." In defense of the confession's statement that the visible church is catholic and universal, Dickson writes that the position of the

---

[85] Although the English translation first appeared in 1684, the name of David Dickson was not associated with this translation. Rather, the book was published by George Sinclair who never attributed authorship to Dickson, but rather, in the dedicatory to the 1684 edition, seems to have claimed authorship himself, writing, "I move in a distinct Sphere from Masters of Universities. They teach in *Philosophy, the Causes and Reasons of Things*. What I write is but *Practical* and *Mechanical*, for the promoting of natural Knowledge and Learning, as do the *Virtuosi*." After discovering that the 1684 edition of *Truth's Victory over Error* was simply a translation of Dickson's *Praelectiones in Confessionem Fidei*, Wodrow notes that the suppression of Dickson's name caused one reader to jot down in jest the following three-line poem:

> "*Truth's Victory over Error:*
> No Errors in this book I see,
> But G.S. where D.D. should be."

For reference to the poem as cited by Wodrow see Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, x. For the quotation by Sinclair see "The Epistle Dedicatory" in *Truths Victory over Error. Or, An Abridgement of the Chief Controversies in Religion, which since the Apostles days to this time, have been, and are in agitation, between those of the* Orthodox Faith, *and all Adversaries whatsoever; a list of whose names are set down after the* Epistle to the Reader… (Edinburgh: John Reed, 1684), A3r.

[86] Whytock, *"An Educated Clergy,"* 65.

[87] At this point Dickson simply defends the commonly held claim that Christ is mediator according to both natures; as such, Christ executes the office of prophet, priest, and king (citing Luke 1:32) "according to both his natures." Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 55–56.

Independents is refuted, "Because the donation, or the gift, of the kingdom (that is, of the church universal) made by the Father to the Son is universal and of all the world (Psa. 2:8; 72:8; Isa. 49:6; Dan. 7:14)."[88] At this point Dickson does not distinguish the "donation of the kingdom [*regnum donativum*]" from the Son's essential rule, but presumably assumes that his students are already familiar with this distinction. Furthermore, Dickson's use of this distinctive terminology ("donation," "gift") at this point gives credence to the assumption stated earlier that he and Durham were referring to the *regnum donativum* when, in *The Sum*, they described Christ as "clad" with the kingly office.

From this foundational presupposition of power/authority that is appointed or given to the Son by the Father, Dickson further elaborates that officers of both the church and commonwealth are appointed by God, each holding distinct and representative authority. Numerous questions and answers revolve around this subject. Dickson groups these together in three primary places: his commentary on WCF XX (Of Christian Liberty); WCF XXIII (Of the Civil Magistrate); and WCF XXX (Of Church Censures).

A repeated refrain in these three sections is that the officers and function of the church are distinct from that of the magistrate.[89] Thus, to the question, "Do not the (…) Erastians err who make no distinction between church power and secular power?" Dickson answers in the affirmative for the following reasons:

1. Because Christ hath committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven to the officers of his church, which are governors distinct from the civil magistrate (Matt. 16:18–19; John 20:21–23).

2. Because church power and civil power differ specifically. The church and commonwealth are polities *formally and essentially*

---

[88] Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 191.

[89] In addition to the example given here, see his answers to Question 11 under the section "Of the Civil Magistrate." Dickson writes against the belief that the Pope has power over the magistrates since, "God hath put a difference between the government of the church and the civil government, and given to each their own proper and distinct officers. Neither can invade the other without very great sin (2 Chron. 19:8–11)." See Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 181.

> *different*. They are not, as such, powers subordinate, at least in a right line, but co-ordinate (Acts 4:19–20; 2 Chron. 26:18). Next, God the creator and governor of the world is the efficient of the power of the civil magistrate (Rom. 13:1–2, 4). But God-Christ, our blessed Mediator and Lord of his church, is the efficient of the church particularly and of its government.[90]

Important to notice here is that Dickson forcibly argues for an *essential* difference between civil government and the church's authority. As seen in the quotation, this is true because the two have distinct efficient causes; civil government stems from God as creator, but the church's ministerial government from Jesus Christ as mediator. Drawing on Aristotle's fourfold causation, Dickson further elaborates that the material cause of both (the *materia ex qua*, *materia in qua*, and *materia circa quam*) are to be distinguished, and concludes by arguing that the *telos* or final cause of civil and ecclesiastical government are distinct; the goal of civil government, he writes, "is the corporal and external good of a society," but the end of church government "is the spiritual good of the church and its edification (Matt. 18:15; 1 Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 10:8)."[91]

Despite the essential difference that Dickson sees between the church and magistrate, he nevertheless argues, like many of the Reformed orthodox, that *cura religionis* is proper to the duty of the magistrate.[92] According to Dickson then,

> The Lutherans, Anabaptists, Arminians, Quakers, and all sorts of heretics and sectaries err, who maintain (under the pretext of Christian liberty) that the civil magistrate is not in duty to punish any man with the sword for errors in doctrine, but that they ought to

---

[90] Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 242 (italics added).

[91] Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 242.

[92] See especially Question 5 and 6 under the section "Of the Civil Magistrate." In the first question he differentiates between the keys of the kingdom of heaven as given to the officers of the church as opposed to the power of the magistrate, whereas in the second question he argues that civil magistrates have the authority to convene ecclesiastical synods. Apparently in Dickson's mind this is not a contradictory claim. See Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 173–174.

be tolerated and suffered, providing such persons as own them do not trouble or molest the commonwealth.[93]

In defense of this claim, Dickson points to the godly example of Old Testament kings (such as Hezekiah, Josiah, Asa, and Jehoshaphat), as well as key scriptural passages such as Isaiah 49:23 (where in his view it is foretold that under the New Testament kings "shall be nursing fathers to the church, and queens nursing mothers").[94] Because the magistrate is to suppress all blasphemy and heresy according to the example of these godly kings, the civil leader is custodian of both tables of the law (*custos utriusque tabulae*). Dickson's language is particularly forceful here; with the "assistance of the church and her censures," the magistrate's duty is to force (if necessary) all subjects to conform to "the true worship, sound doctrine, and discipline of the church." Dickson concludes:

> If then [the magistrate] may punish evil doers who offend against the second table and force and compel them to obedience by the sword of justice which God hath put into his hand, much more may he punish idolaters and blasphemers who offend against the first table and force and compel them to obedience, seeing there are many sins against the first table which are more heinous and odious than the sins against the second table.[95]

Dickson's conclusion is admittedly surprising for the modern reader: According to this seventeenth-century Edinburgh theologian, the Roman Catholic practice of forcefully compelling others to convert was *not* "sinful" in principle, but was wrong only because the Church of Rome taught a "superstitious and idolatrous" religion. For those who "have the true religion among them," however, this practice is legitimized, even if, as Dickson acknowledges, "our blessed Saviour and his apostles did not use such means for propagating the gospel."[96]

---

[93] Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 132.
[94] Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 134; cf. 169–170.
[95] Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 171.
[96] Dickson, *Truth's Victory over Error*, 171.

II.8.6. Conclusion

This chapter focused on two Edinburgh university theologians who are often overlooked in connection with the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom. Indeed, most studies of this subject in the Scottish context focus on representatives such as Melville, Rutherford, or Gillespie. While the contributions of these men certainly warrant independent and extensive investigation, this chapter, by limiting its selection of representatives to professors teaching at Edinburgh's Town College, contributes an overview and analysis of John Sharp's and David Dickson's presentation of Christ's royal governance to the contemporary "two-kingdom" discussion. While the political context as discussed in the early part of this chapter differs from the Genevan and Leiden contexts as described in the previous two chapters— arguably, Edinburgh's seventeenth-century context was much more politically unstable—a remarkable degree of continuity is evident when considering the respective theologians' presentations of the twofold reign of Jesus Christ.

Corroborating the primary argument of this dissertation, both Sharp and Dickson distinguished a twofold kingdom and governance of Christ according to his person and work. Thus, both Edinburgh theologians, like the representative theologians seen in the previous two chapters, distinguished broadly between a natural kingdom that the Son holds equally with the Father and Holy Spirit, and a mediatorial kingdom that Jesus Christ is given by the Father. Furthermore, especially Dickson held that this mediatorial kingdom was not limited in its scope—indeed, it is as comprehensive as Christ's natural kingdom, and thus the two aspects can be legitimately considered a singular kingdom—and yet the specific benefit or purpose of Christ's *regnum mediatorium* is the salvation, defense, and edification of Christ's church. As Dickson held that Christ's given mediatorial kingdom is over all, he could therefore consistently argue for the very different *purposes* of the work done by Christ's official representatives on earth, and yet at the same time instruct the magistrate to force (if necessary) all subjects to conform to "the true worship, sound doctrine, and discipline of the church."

And yet, it is not the case that Sharp and Dickson presented their material in exactly the same way. As illustrated in this chapter, a consideration of these two representatives demonstrates that the Reformed orthodox presentation of the *duplex regnum Christi* was not a monolithic exercise. Sharp's distinctions especially, while broadly continuous with other representatives considered, differed in significant ways. For one, Sharp introduced a "general" and "special" distinction to the mediatorial kingdom held by Christ as *θεάνθρωπος*. In this way, Sharp accounted for the meditorial power that Christ exercises over all things, but also his mediatorial power concentrated on his church. Furthermore, most likely owing to the polemical context in which Sharp was articulating his distinctions, as well as his adherence to an (overly) strict Ramist model, he seemingly disassociated Christ's *regnum mediatorium* from his *regnum oeconomicum*. In the final analysis then, a consideration of this doctrine in the Scottish context evidences that broad lines of continuity connect the seventeenth-century Edinburgh University professors' formulations with those teaching at the intellectual centers considered on the continent. Within this broader continuity, however, elements of discontinuity were present.

Chapter Nine: Conclusion

Given the historical nature of this study, this dissertation has up to this point purposefully not weighed in on the contemporary exchanges surrounding the so-called "Reformed Two-Kingdoms" (R2K) debate. To be clear, the intention of this study is not to adjudicate this internecine dispute. Nevertheless, as both the critics and proponents of the R2K distinction claim to be operating within the Reformed tradition, this dissertation yet seeks to inform the current systematic formulations by providing an overview of this doctrine's development from the early Reformers of the sixteenth century to the Reformed orthodoxy of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Admittedly, the descriptor "overview" is too ambitious of a word to describe this project; as argued in the introductory methodological section, this study had to remain selective in its approach. Despite this necessarily selective approach, a historical case was made by analyzing representative theologians, and as seen in Part Two, theologians from representative schools of influence in early-modern Europe.

II.9.1. Restatement of Argument

The overarching argument of this study has been that the early Protestant and Reformed orthodox descriptions of the kingly reign and rule of Jesus Christ had both continuous and discontinuous elements. To state this concretely, when the formulations of early Reformers such as Luther, Calvin, or Bucer concerning Jesus Christ's regal office and work are compared with Reformed orthodox figures such as Francis Turretin, Franciscus Junius, or Johannes Scharpius, marked similarities and dissimilarities are apparent. While it has further been acknowledged that varying emphases are evident when comparing one early Protestant figure with another (or equally, one Reformed orthodox theologian with another), arguably the Reformed orthodox as a whole more closely aligned their

discussion and distinctions concerning Christ's kingly rule with his person and work. Specifically, while the Reformed orthodox certainly held that the delineation of a twofold kingdom of Christ had practical implications regarding the church's role as distinct from the civil authorities', their discussion and distinctions surrounding the *duplex regnum Christi* were much more fundamentally connected with the person of Jesus Christ (whether considered *essentially* as God or *personally* as God-man) and his mediatorial (i.e., covenantal) work. This closer christological connection was seen to exist both in relatively political stable contexts (i.e., Geneva), moderately stable contexts (i.e., Leiden), and in politically unstable contexts of the seventeenth century (i.e., Scotland). In other words, the Reformed orthodox formulation of the *duplex regnum Christi*, while important for the immediate political context, was grounded doctrinally in a description and defense of the person and work of Jesus Christ.

II.9.2. Summary of Findings

On the one hand, the figures considered in the previous chapters have been too diverse and across too large of a timeframe to given an accurate and detailed account of any one individual. Indeed, it is admittedly the case that any study that spans from someone as early as John Chrysostom (fourth century) to as late as Bénédict Pictet (early eighteenth century) is necessarily deficient in this. And yet, as the above chapters have shown, a comprehensive scope (from the early church fathers to the Reformed orthodox) must be placed alongside a more narrowly defined study (the *duplex regnum Christ*) in order to give an adequate account of the intellectual development and significance of the narrower study.

Thus, Part One of this study, with its brief focus on select early-church figures, and its more concentrated focus on Luther, Bucer, and Calvin, argued that an organic relationship could be seen when comparing select patristic and medieval theologians' expressions regarding Christ's royal office with the early Reformers' presentations. Drawing on Chrysostom's designation of Christ's "kingdom of appropriation" as distinct from his "kingdom of creation," or Augustine's two cities, it is evident that the early Reformers developed a robust theology that sought to give full

expression to the dual aspect of Christ's royal office. Chapter Three argued that Luther's formulation (although far from a scholastic or systematic presentation) was instrumental as it connected the whole of his theology to his two kingdoms distinction. In particular, this chapter argued that Luther's two-kingdom distinction was not simply a visible/invisible division, nor did the Reformer believe it was a natural distinction inherent in creation. Rather, this chapter argued that Luther's two-kingdom thought, presented most often by him in the context of distinguishing the church's role from the magistrate's, is a redemptive reality realized in salvation history only *after* the devastating effects of sin (i.e., after the fall of Adam).

Chapter Four considered the thought of Martin Bucer and John Calvin. This chapter looked particularly at Bucer's *De Regno Christi* as well as relevant sections of Calvin's *Institutes*. It was shown that Bucer carefully delineated between the "Kingdom of Christ" and "kingdoms of this world," which in his estimation had significant ramifications for the role of the magistrate. This chapter also argued that Calvin tied his twofold-kingdom distinction to an eschatologically orientated church; similar to Luther, this meant that for Calvin a twofold-kingdom distinction only makes sense for a church marked by sin and waiting for a future, eternal kingdom. Furthermore, Part One argued that although Luther, Bucer, and Calvin each connected their conceptions of Christ's royal reign to broader soteriological matters, Christ's dual (or twofold) reign was considered most often within discussions that centered on the identity and work of the church or magistrate.

Part Two transitioned to a study of the *duplex regnum Christi* within Reformed orthodoxy. The introductory chapter to this section outlined and defined the most common terms and distinctions related to Christ's twofold kingdom. As argued in this chapter, not only were Reformed orthodox figures much more precise in their terminology concerning Christ's kingship, the favored place for discussing Christ's twofold kingdom moved from ecclesiology to christology. The next three chapters narrowed its focus to consider three influential academic centers of thought within Reformed orthodoxy: Geneva, Leiden, and Edinburgh. After situating each of these centers within their respective historical context, these chapters highlighted in particular the thought of six Reformed orthodox representatives (selecting

two from each academic institution). Although some variation existed as to how the *duplex regnum* was presented (seen, for example, when comparing Johannes Scharpius to Francis Turretin), the broad consensus amongst the Reformed orthodox was to distinguish Christ's essential kingdom from his mediatorial. As noted from many of these figures, this distinction did not mean that Christ's kingdom was spatially divided—i.e., that there is some area of existence that pertains to the *regnum essentiale* but not to the *regnum mediatorium*. Rather, Christ's singular kingdom is distinguished in a twofold way that is determined according to the covenantal mode in which he rules—considered either as second person of the Trinity or as Redeemer-mediator of his people.

       The broad uniformity evidenced in Part Two amongst the Reformed orthodox is especially remarkable given the varying political contexts as described in the three centers of Leiden, Geneva, and Edinburgh. Initially, my working hypothesis was that the socio-political context had a great deal to do with the twofold-kingdom doctrine. Without denying that the differing political contexts influenced this doctrine's formulation to a degree, as argued in the relevant chapters of Part Two, the interests and concerns that motivated the development of the *duplex regnum Christi* in the seventeenth century were largely exegetical, polemical, and doctrinal. Stated negatively, the motivatation behind the particular expressions and definitions of the *duplex regnum Christi* was not in the first place due to the varying political contexts. Thus, in numerous cases (i.e., Alting, Turretin, Polyander, Thysius, Walaeus, Scharpius, and Dickson) a description and defense of the *duplex regnum Christi* often occurred in the context of explaining scriptural passages such as Matthew 28:18–20 and 1 Corinthians 15: 24–28. The specific exegesis of these passages in this manner was often linked to the differing polemical concerns of the Reformed orthodox. As seen with Junius, for example, disputes with the Socinians (who, among other reasons, denied Christ's divinity on the basis that he *received* his kingship and power from the Father) forced the Reformed orthodox to refine their language and description of Christ's twofold reign. As the Socinians looked to passages such as 1 Corinthians 15:24 in support of their view, the Reformed orthodox were compelled to offer an alternative exegesis. Finally, as seen for example with Turretin in Chapter Seven, the refinement of other doctrines in the

seventeenth century, and especially that of covenant theology, was linked to the development of the *duplex regnum Christi*.

By highlighting these three factors (i.e., exegesis, polemics, and refinement of other doctrines) as motivating reasons why the Reformed orthodox developed the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom in the manner that they did, I do not hereby imply that they were the *only* motivating factors. Indeed, the use of Latin as a common language in academia, the movement of professors and students from one academic center to another, the exchange of letters and ideas throughout seventeenth-century Europe, and the transmission of ideas/doctrines from one professor to a succeeding professor (noted in the Introduction as "institutional continuity"), all may have helped contribute to this broader consensus. Future studies devoted to the doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom may wish to investigate more narrowly any one of the three primary factors noted here—i.e., by focusing on the exegesis of other related passages, elenctic questions, and doctrines—or focus on other contributing factors not able to be studied in this work.

When comparing and contrasting the representatives discussed in Part One to those discussed in Part Two, several lines of continuity and discontinuity become apparent. For both the magisterial Reformers and the Reformed orthodox, the twofold-kingdom distinction was not simply a church/civil authority distinction, despite, for example, Calvin's descriptors that might suggest otherwise. Rather, the distinction was more comprehensive; for the magisterial Reformers (to a lesser degree) and the Reformed orthodox (more explicitly), Christ's twofold reign was tied to his redemptive work wherein Jesus Christ acts as a covenant mediator reconciling God with his suffering and expectant people. Consequently, for the magisterial Reformers and the Reformed orthodox, the reality of a twofold kingdom of Christ was necessarily a postlapsarian distinction.

Areas of discontinuity are also detected. As argued in Part Two, the Reformed orthodox, unlike Luther, Bucer, or Calvin, more clearly delineated Christ's twofold kingdom not in terms of scope, but according to the mode whereby Christ rules (i.e., whether considered as *Logos* or as *theanthrōpos*). Thus, for the Reformed orthodox the *duplex regnum* was preeminently a christological distinction. This same emphasis is not seen in

Calvin, for example; although Calvin spoke in terms of a singular "twofold kingdom," the sense of his distinction is often in overlapping realms or areas of life (i.e., spiritual and civil). As Chapter Five further illustrated, the Reformed orthodox presentation was also much more systematic and technical than Luther's, Bucer's, or Calvin's; precise terms were chosen and employed by the Reformed orthodox to reflect the modal distinction within Christ's rule. Furthermore, both Bucer's and Calvin's description of Christ's kingdom is most often placed in connection with his discussion of the church's function as distinguishable from the magistrate's; among the Reformed orthodox, it most often appears when discussing the person and work of Christ. Finally, owing to this christological connection, the Reformed orthodox largely thought of Christ's twofold kingdom as a perpetual reality (given the enduring nature of Christ's mediatorship according to both natures), whereas for the early Reformed, as seen in Calvin for example, the twofold nature of Christ's kingdom ceases to exist at the end of this age (i.e., "so long as we live among men").[1]

While the technical and systematic formulations of the Reformed orthodox are not found in the magisterial Reformers' descriptions of Christ's kingly rule, arguably much of the content of their theologies is consistent. The Reformational distinction concerning Christ's kingdom, presented especially by Calvin as to its twofold rule by God (as Creator and Redeemer) and God's subsequent twofold covenantal relation with human beings (as creature and as redeemed), was necessarily given in postlapsarian terms. Not only does this realization clarify the magisterial Reformers' position on a complicated subject, it further suggests that a bipartite federal or covenantal framework finds its roots in the Protestant Reformation. In summary, while varying formal emphases are to be noted, substantial agreement existed between the early Reformed and the Reformed orthodox concerning Christ's kingdom and governance.

---

[1] *Inst*.4.20.2 (2:1487); cf. *OS* V:473.

II.9.3. Reassessment of Secondary Literature

Based upon the findings as summarized in the preceding section, it is appropriate, in the final analysis, to give some reassessment of the secondary literature. As this work has focused on the twofold kingdom of Christ mainly within the Reformed tradition, similarly the reasssment here will be limited to scholarship produced by and about Reformed authors. Furthermore, this evaluation will remain general by outlining four interrelated tendencies within the contemporary R2K dialogue—supported by specific examples when necessary—and suggest ways wherein the above historical reading may either inform or challenge the modern-day discussion. Several of these tendencies have been hinted at throughout this work, but they are here summarized.

The first tendency noted in the contemporary secondary literature concerns terminology. Nearly without fail, every published work addressing the subject of Christ's twofold reign has employed the term "two kingdoms" or some variation of this phrase that denotes a plurality of kingdoms. Thus, a search in WorldCat for the phrase "two-kingdoms doctrine" within a work's title produced 183 entries, and a search for the phrase "two-kingdoms theology" within a work's title produced 128 entries.[2] On the other hand, although it may not have the same familiar ring to it, a WorldCat search for the phrase "twofold-kingdom theology" or "twofold-kingdom doctrine" within a work's title produced two results.[3] Similarly, a GoogleBooks search for the exact phrase "two-kingdoms theology" produced 2,550 entries, and the phrase "two-kingdoms doctrine" 5,780 entries. Not a single entry was listed for the exact phrase "twofold-kingdom

---

[2] These searches in WorldCat occurred on June 30, 2018.
[3] I should note that in one of his essays assessing the "Two Kingdoms" paradigm, Cornel Venema does highlight the singular "twofold kingdom" and "twofold regiment" language of Calvin. He makes the point that "Calvin's 'Two Kingdoms' language does not so much refer to two separate realms or worlds as to a *twofold government* of God" (italics his). Nevertheless, Venema does not develop this further, and reverts back to the plural term of "two kingdoms" throughout the rest of the essay. See Cornel Venema, "The Restoration of All Things in Proper Order: An Assessment of the 'Two Kingdoms/Natural Law' Interpretation of Calvin's Public Theology" in *Kingdoms Apart*, 14.

theology" or "twofold-kingdom doctrine."[4] The point, while a simple one, has significant ramifications for the present discussion. The vast majority of those discussing this topic within the current (English-speaking) context have adopted Luther's early terminology that signals a *plurality* of kingdoms; nearly absent from the contemporary discussion is any acknowledgement of the *singularity* of Christ's kingdom as indicated by the prolonged use of the term "*duplex regnum*" (or "twofold kingdom") within the Reformed tradition. Ironically, both sides of the present R2K discussion (each claiming to operate within the "Reformed heritage") have for the most part failed—whether intentionally or not—to employ the more precise and long-standing terms and definitions of the Reformed orthodox.

Related to this first tendency, a second propensity of interlocutors (especially marked during the earlier stages of the contemporary R2K discussion) is to gravitate towards either Luther's or Calvin's terminology when discussing the "two kingdoms" doctrine. Thus, in much of the secondary literature the debate has centered on relating the "spiritual kingdom" to the "political," "civil," or "temporal" kingdom. And so, with a focus on these terms, to distinguish the "spiritual kingdom" from the "political" or "civil kingdom" (depending on one's systematic preferences) is either viewed as a hallmark doctrine within the Reformed tradition or as "not in the Bible at all."[5] This fixation on these terms within the Reformed camp is largely a reaction to VanDrunen's earlier essays on Calvin and the two kingdoms (written in 2004 and 2005), as well as his historical survey of natural law and two-kingdoms theology (2010).[6] Thus, for example,

---

[4] These keyword searches in GoogleBooks, using the advanced search function to search for the exact phrases, occurred on June 23, 2018.

[5] Cf. VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*, 13, who states: "The classic Reformed theological paradigm suggests that Christians are citizens of two distinct kingdoms, both of which are ordained of God and under his law, yet exist for different purposes, have different functions, and operate according to different rules. In their capacity as citizens of the *spiritual kingdom of Christ*, Christians insist upon non-violence and the ways of peace, refusing to bear arms on behalf of his kingdom; in their capacity as citizens of the *civil kingdom*, they participate as necessary in the coercive work of the state, bearing arms on its behalf when occasion warrants" (italics added). Compare this to Ouweneel, *The World is Christ's*, 50.

[6] Cf. respectively VanDrunen, "The Context of Natural Law: John Calvin's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," 503–525; VanDrunen, "The Two Kingdoms: A

VanDrunen highlights these terms as he writes in his 2004 essay, "Calvin believed that God had established two kingdoms with distinct purposes, yet that both are legitimate and divinely ordained. The one, the *earthly* or *civil kingdom*, concerns *temporal* matters and is governed by the civil magistrate. The other, the *spiritual kingdom* or the church, is concerned with *heavenly* and eternal matters, things pertaining to salvation."[7]

Disagreeing with VanDrunen's interpretation of Calvin, but adopting the same language and terms, Jason Lief is especially concerned to show that Calvin's two regiments (spiritual and temporal) are united in the one kingdom of Christ, and that ultimately Calvin's formulation is not opposed to the neo-Calvinist transformationalist concerns. Contrary to VanDrunen's claims, Lief argues that the "roots of the neo-Calvinist movement" can be found in Calvin's theology of the two regiments.[8] Steven Wedgeworth and Peter Escalante have also criticized VanDrunen's interpretation of Calvin's two-kingdoms theology, arguing in two extended internet articles that the so-called R2K is a "peculiar doctrine" with "unintended but ruinous consequences following from its unwitting but profound mistakes."[9] Wedgeworth and Escalante do not take issue with the terms "spiritual" and "temporal" to describe Christ's kingship, but rather with the strict association that R2K proponents make between Christ's spiritual kingdom and the church's ministry, and similarly, between Christ's temporal kingdom and the magistrate. In its broadest outline, Wedgeworth and Escalante argue *pace* VanDrunen and Tuininga that "the Kingship of Christ is of universal extent, and in two ways: the first spiritual, invisible, immediate and pertaining to the just, though as eschatologically and cosmologically universal; the second temporal, visible, mediate and

---

Reassessment of the Transformationist Calvin," 248–266; VanDrunen, *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms*.

[7] VanDrunen, "The Context of Natural Law: John Calvin's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," 514 (italics mine).

[8] Jason Lief, "Is Neo-Calvinism Calvinist? A Neo-Calvinist Engagement of Calvin's 'Two Kingdoms' Doctrine" *Pro Rege* 37, no. 3 (March 2009): 8.

[9] Steven Wedgeworth and Peter Escalante, "John Calvin and the Two Kingdoms – Part 1 and 2," The Calvinist International, www.calvinistinternational.com/2012/05/29/calvin-2k-1/ (accessed February 3, 2018); www.calvinistinternational.com/ 2012/05/29/calvin-2k-2/ (accessed February 3, 2018).

pertaining to all."[10] Without attempting to referee the different interpretations here, it is significant to note that the terminology of "spiritual" and "temporal" remains unchallenged. Indeed, both parties have assumed that this language is reflective of the Reformed tradition as a whole, or that at least a "two-kingdoms theology" delineated according to its spiritual and temporal characteristics is instructive for today.[11]

More recently, the terminology used by those involved in the R2K discussion has seemed to shift slightly; this again is largely due to the pioneering work of VanDrunen who has sought to establish a theological link between the Noahic common-grace covenant and the temporal kingdom, and similarly, between the gracious postlapsarian covenant as formalized with Abraham (and successively worked out in redemptive history) and the spiritual kingdom. Thus, while close to the previous labels of "civil (or temporal)" and "spiritual," VanDrunen has more recently opted for the terms "common kingdom" and "redemptive kingdom."[12] Cornelis Venema picks up on this language of "common" and "redemptive." After noting several valuable critiques of neo-Calvinism as offered by Reformed two-kingdoms advocates, ultimately he rejects the two-kingdoms paradigm since in his opinion it "starts from a basic duality between two realms [and it therefore] cannot offer an integrated view of the kingdom or rule of God in creation and redemption."[13] As indicated by the title of his article, Venema's primary concern with contemporary R2K proponents is that they have divided Christ's singular kingdom into two. Despite his harsh critique, nowhere in his article does Venema call into question the use of VanDrunen's terms.

In any disagreement (and especially a theological disagreement), defining one's terms is vitally important. As this dissertation has sought to

---

[10] Wedgeworth and Escalante, "John Calvin and the Two Kingdoms – Part 1."

[11] While Tuininga's analysis of Calvin's two kingdoms is largely historical, the final chapter provides suggestions for appropriating Calvin's "two-kingdom" theology (distinguished most often as Christ's spiritual and temporal kingdom) into a modern American context.

[12] See for example VanDrunen, *Living in God's Two Kingdoms*, 29.

[13] Cornelis P. Venema, "One Kingdom or Two? An Evaluation of the 'Two Kingdoms' Doctrine as an Alternative to Neo-Calvinism," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 23 (2012): 103.

establish, the labels associated with Christ's kingdom and rule were carefully chosen and applied by the Reformed orthodox. Indeed, the development and refinement of these terms (for example, *regnum essentiale* as distinct from *regnum donativum*) is clear evidence of the Reformed orthodox desire to articulate more carefully and precisely the nature of Jesus Christ's kingly office. While more work is warranted here, future advocates of a Reformed "two-kingdoms theology" may wish to reconsider the labels and language they use by drawing upon the precise terms and definitions of the Reformed orthodox; perhaps this may go a long way in alleviating the concerns of those who have so far opposed this distinction. For one, a common criticism of the R2K framework is that its proponents are operating from a dualistic paradigm, one that divorces or widely separates a Scripture-orientated realm of grace from a neutral or independent realm of nature.[14] While these charges are for the most part unfounded, they are understandable if a *plurality* of kingdoms is assumed. Adopting terminology that highlights the singularity and connectedness of Christ's royal reign will undercut any charge of radical separation.

A third tendency noted in contemporary authors is that most think in terms of scope when questioning the legitimacy of a "two-kingdoms" distinction. This is understandable again if a plurality of kingdoms is assumed, and especially given the continued use of the terms "political/temporal" and "spiritual." Thus, often the conversation focuses on the perplexing question that seeks to locate the activity of the Christian. To what kingdom does activity "X" belong? The question is therefore posed, "Does the 'house-building' of the Christian builder belong to the 'common' kingdom or the 'redemptive' kingdom?" Or perhaps more troubling, "How (if at all) does the Christian's education, art, or science relate to or fit within

---

[14] Timothy Scheurs describes this supposed dualism of R2K as follows: "The argument for 'religious secularism' unfolds in like manner: the Bible's moral norms and ethical commands apply only to those in the church. In this passing age of history (*saeculum*—'secular'), the sovereign rule of Jesus Christ is acknowledged and brought to bear on the Christian's activities only while he is in the ecclesiastical kingdom (the church). All other cultural pursuits in which the Christian is involved, whether they are academic, vocational, or political, are devoid of religion and the norms and values of Scripture." See Timothy Scheurs, "Dual Citizenshp, Dual Ethic? Evaluating the Two Kingdoms Perspective on the Christian in Culture" in *Kingdoms Apart*, 143.

the 'redemptive' kingdom?"[15] The concern of the neo-Calvinist is to highlight the integratedness of the Christian's cultural activity with his or her spiritual pilgrimage, all under the cosmic scope of Jesus Christ's rule;[16] on the other hand, the R2K advocate wishes to highlight the special, redemptive activity that occurs within the church as opposed to the common, non-redemptive, or penultimate activity that occurs within society.[17] Depending on the answers given, charges of illegitimate transformationalism or "radical dualism" are then raised.

But with each of these scenarios, the contemporary questioner is asking a fundamentally different question than that addressed by the Reformed orthodox representatives considered in Part Two. As demonstrated in these chapters, when the Reformed orthodox delineated the twofold reign of Christ, they were not seeking to label one cultural activity as common and another as redemptive (or even as a mix of both). For them, the distinction of Christ's essential kingdom from his mediatorial kingdom was a logical (or modal) distinction rather than a spatial one; as such, the Reformed orthodox could maintain that Christ's rule is singular and comprehensive, and at the same time that it has distinct purposes for his people. Furthermore, the contemporary question that has sparked much of this debate has a "bottom-up" approach (i.e., "How does this particular human activity fit within Christ's kingdom?"), whereas the Reformed orthodox distinction has a "top-down" focus as it addresses the mode of Christ's reign. If both sides (the neo-Calvinist and R2K camps) claim to be operating within the Reformed tradition, surely the questions as asked by the Reformed orthodox ought to inform this present dialogue. Thus, rather than beginning with the question of "In what sphere does the activity of the Christian plumber belong?"—which immediately assumes the presence of at least two spheres categorized according to human activity—those claiming the Reformed heritage should begin with the seventeenth-century question

---

[15] In his article, John Wind lists six common critiques given by those who reject a Reformed version of the two-kingdoms doctrine. Wind lists the rejection of "Christian education" as a common critique. Cf. Wind, "The Keys to the Two Kingdoms," 19.

[16] This is for example the concern of Nelson Kloosterman, "Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms in the Thought of Herman Bavinck" in *Kingdoms Apart*, 75–78.

[17] VanDrunen, *Living in God's Two Kingdoms*, 24–27.

that asked, "In what manner does Christ rule the plumber who confesses Christ as Redeemer?" Beginning with the proper question is key if any resolution is to be hoped for within the present divide on this subject. While this conclusion hints at the beneficial merits of this approach, further work is needed relating the terms and definitions given by the Reformed orthodox to this contemporary question.

Finally, those discussing the Reformed two-kingdoms distinction have either politicized or flattened the historical development of this doctrine within the Reformed tradition. This final tendency is understandable given the natural proclivity to lump complex historical factors and positions into more manageable categories. Likely owing to the political and ecclesiological contexts within which the Lutheran two kingdoms and early Reformed twofold-kingdom distinction surfaced, contemporary interpreters have largely understood this distinction only within this dimension. Thus, although differing in their interpretations, both Tuininga and Littlejohn have respectively produced studies on Calvin and Richard Hooker, arguing that the positions of the men as they have described provide a normative basis for the contemporary church's political theology. In the end, however, both interpreters fail to acknowledge the much wider christological implications as stressed by the Reformed orthodox. Related to this tendency to restrict the "two-kingdoms" distinction to the political, too often it is presented as a stagnate doctrine void of any maturation. While VanDrunen is to be commended for his substantial work that moves from Augustine to Cornelius Van Til (d. 1987), his approach in the end flattens the significant amount of development that existed on this doctrine. Admittedly, VanDrunen only deals with Reformed orthodoxy in one chapter of his work (focusing here on Johannes Althusius, Samuel Rutherford, Francis Turretin, and the Westminster Standards), and thus does not have the opportunity to develop fully the various Reformed orthodox nuances. Nevertheless, while VanDrunen rightly claims that there is much continuity between the Reformed and Reformed orthodox on Christ's twofold reign, Turretin's formulation (to select one Reformed orthodox figure) differs from Calvin's in significant ways that as yet have not been adequately addressed. While this dissertation has attempted to detail some of this development (especially in the context of the early-modern European

university), further work must examine the contributions of many more Reformed orthodox figures, and thus assess the argument of this dissertation in light of a broader spectrum of evidence.

II.9.4. Conclusion

The doctrine of Christ's twofold kingdom has a rich and variegated history that can be traced from the early church, through the medieval and Reformation periods, into Reformed orthodoxy, and beyond. While the historical scope of this study was restricted to these periods, and especially that of Reformed orthodoxy, the contemporary church and academy may certainly consider themselves as beneficial recipients of this history. In the introduction to this study, I noted the brief summary of Christ's person and work articulated in one of the first ancient Christian creeds; in this creed, the Christian confesses that Christ's "kingdom shall have no end." Over one and a half millennia after the composition of this phrase, the Christian church yet confesses the royal and enduring reign of Jesus Christ.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Alsted, Johannes Heinrich. *Theologia scholastica didactica, exhibens locos commvnes theologicos methodo scholastica, quatuor in partes tribute.* Frankfurt: Conrad Eifrid, 1618.

Alting, Johann Heinrich. *Theologia problematica nova: sive Systema Problematum Theologicorum in inclyta Academia Groningae & Omlandiae.* Amsterdam: Johannes Janssonius, 1660.

Ames, William. *The Marrow of Theology.* Translated by John D. Eusden. 1629. Reprint, Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1968.

———. *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity: Drawne out of the Holy Scriptures, and the Interpreters Thereof, and Brought into Method.* London: Edward Griffin for John Rothwell, 1643.

———. *Medulla s.s., theologiae: Ex sacris literis, earumque interpretibus, extracta, & methodice disposita per. Editio Quarta.* London: Apud Robertum Allotium, 1630.

Aquinas, Thomas. *On Kingship, to the King of Cyprus.* Westport, Conn: Hyperion Press, 1979.

———. *Opera Omnia Iussu Impensaque, Leonis XIII. P. M. Edita.* Romae: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1882.

———. *The Summa Contra Gentiles.* Trans. The English Dominican Fathers. 5 Vols. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1929.

———. *Summa Contra Gentiles.* Rome: Editio Leonina Manualis, 1934.

———. *Summa Theologiae.* Ed. by Thomas Gilby. 61 Vols. London and New York: Blackfriars and McGraw-Hill, 1964–80.

Arquerius, Johannes. *Dictionarium Theologicum, Ex Sacrosanctis Bibliis Veteris Translationis Et S. Patribus….* Basel: Johannes Oporinus, 1567.

Augustine. *The City of God*. Trans. by Marcus Dods. Intro. by Thomas Merton. New York: The Modern Library, 1950.

———. *The City of God*. Trans. by Marcus Dods. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Augustin: City of God, Christian Doctrine, Vol. 2. Ed. by Philip Schaff. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.

———. *The Enchiridion of Augustine: Addressed to Laurentius: Being a Treatise on Faith, Hope, and Love.* London: Religious Tract Society, 1900.

———. *On the Gospel of St. John* in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church.* Edinburgh; Grand Rapids: T&T Clark; Eerdmans, 1989.

———. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini in Iohannis Evangelium tractatus CXXIV.* Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 36. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.

———. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Trinitate.* Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina v. 50–50A. Turnholti: Brepolis, 1968.

———. *A Treatise On Rebuke and Grace.* Vol. 5. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings, ed. Philip Schaff (1887; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 485 (Chap. 33).

Beardslee, John W. III., ed. *Reformed Dogmatics: J. Wollebius, G. Voetius, F. Turretin*. Library of Protestant Thought. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Bellarmino, Roberto Francesco Romolo. *Controversies of the Christian Faith*. Trans. by Kenneth Baker, S.J. Saddle River: Keep the Faith, Inc, 2016.

———. *Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini...De controuersiis christianae fidei aduersus huius temporis haereticos: quatuor tomis comprehensae….* 4 Vols. Paris: Tri-Adelphorum Bibliopolarum, 1613.

Brakel, Wilhelmus à. *The Christian's Reasonable Service*. 3 Vols. Trans. by Bartel Elshout. Ed. by Joel R. Beeke. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 1999.

———. *Logike Latreia, Dat Is, Redelijke Godsdienst….* Rotterdam: Bolle, 1800.

Brandt, Geeraerdt. *G. Brandts Histoire der reformatie, en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen in en ontrent de Nederlanden.* 4 Vols. Amsterdam: Jan Rieuwertsz., Hendrik en Dirk Boom, Boekverkoopers, 1671.

———. *The history of the Reformation and other ecclesiastical transactions in and about the Low-Countries, from the beginning of the eighth century, down to the famous synod of Dort, inclusive….* 4 Vols. London: T. Wood, for Timothy Childe, at the White Hart at the West End of St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1720.

Brüderliche Vereinigung (Brotherly Union or Schleitheim Confession), in *The Legacy of Michael Sattler*, 34–43. Trans. by John H. Yoder. Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1973.

Bucanus, Guilelmus. *Institutiones theologicae: seu locorum communium christianae religionis….* Geneva: Samuelis Chouët, 1648.

Bucer, Martin. *De Regno Christi Iesu servatoris nostri….* Basel: Johannes Oporinus, 1557.

———. *De regno Christi: Libri Duo 1550.* Ed. by F. Wendel. Martini Buceri Opera Latina, 15. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955.

Bullinger, Heinrich. *Confessio Helvetica Posterior.* Ed. Eduardus Böhl. 1561, Vindobonae: Guilielmum Braumüller, 1866 repr.

———. *The Decades of Henry Bullinger.* 2 Vols. Ed. by Thomas Harding. Intro. by George Ella and Joel R. Beeke. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2004 repr.

Burman, Francis. *Synopsis theologiae & speciatim oeconomiae foederum Dei.* Amsterdam: Johannes Wolters, 1699.

Calvin, John. *Brieve Instruction pour armer tous bons fideles contre les erreurs de la secte commune des anabaptistes.* Ed. by Mirjam van Veen. Ioannis Calvini Opera Omnia denuo recognita [*COR*], series IV, volumen II. Librairie Droz: Genève, 2007.

———. *Calvin: Theological Treatises.* Ed. by J.K.S. Reid. Library of Christian Classics XXII. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.

———. *Commentaire de M. Iean Calvin sur le Premier Livre de Moyse, Dit Genese.* Geneva: Jean Gerard, 1554.

———. *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations*. Trans. by John Owen. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1854.

———. *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis* (1554). Trans. by John King. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847.

———. *Contre la secte phantastique et furieuse des Libertins qui se nomment sprituelz*. Ed. by Mirjam van Veen. Ioannis Calvini Opera Omnia denuo recognita [*COR*], series IV, volumen II. Librairie Droz: Genève, 2007.

———. *Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra Trinitate, contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serveti Hispani*. Geneva: Robert I Estienne, 1554.

———. *The Epistles of Paul The Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*. Trans. by Ross Mackenzie. Calvin's Commentaries. Ed. by David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

———. *The Gospel According to St. John 11–21 and the First Epistle of John*. Trans. by T. H. L. Parker. Calvin's Commentaries. Ed. by David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

———. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* 2 Vols. Ed. by John T. McNeill. Trans. by Ford Lewis Battles. Library of Christian Classics, no. 20–21. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

———. *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536). Trans. and Ed. by F. L. Battles. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

———. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1541, French Edition. Trans. and Ed. by E. A. McKee. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. *Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*. Ed. by Guilielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, and Eduardus Reuss. 59 Vols. *Corpus Reformatorum*, vols. 29–87. Brunsvigae: C.A. Schwetschke et filium, 1863–1900.

———. *Joannis Calvini Opera Selecta*. Ed. by Petrus Barth and Guilelmus Niesel. 5 Vols. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1926–52.

———. *John Calvin: Selections from His Writings*. Trans. by Elsie A. McKee. Ed. by Emilie Griffin. New York: HarperCollins, 2006.

———. *Sermons on Deuteronomy*. Edinburgh; Carlisle: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.

———. *Sermons on Genesis*. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2009.

———. *Sermons sur la Genèse, Chapitres 1,1–11,4*. Supplementa Calviniana, XI/1. Ed. by Max Engammare. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000.

———. *Tracts and Letters*. Ed. by Jules Bonnet. Trans. by Marcus Gilchrist. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1858.

———. *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines*. Trans. and Ed. by Benjamin W. Farley. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982.

Chrysostom, John. *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Chrysostomi In Divi Pauli Epistolam ad Corinthios Priorem Homiliae XLIV*. Ed. by Frederick Field. Oxonii: T. Combe, 1847.

———. *A Select Library of the Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: First Series*. Edinburgh; Grand Rapids: T&T Clark; Eerdmans, 1989.

Cochrane, Arthur C., ed. *Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

DeMoor, Bernhardinus. *Commentarius perpetuus in Johannis Marckii Compendium theologiae christianae didactico-elencticum*. Leiden: Johannes Hasebroek, 1765.

Denzinger, Heinrich and Adolfus Schönmetzer, ed. *Enchiridion Symbolorum: Definitionum Et Declarationum Derebus Fidei Et Morum*, 32d ed. Barcinone: Herder, 1963.

Dickson, David. *A Brief Explication of the First Fifty Psalms*. London: T.M. for Ralph Smith, at the Bible in Cornehill, neer the Royal-Exchange, 1653.

———. *A Brief Explication of the Last Fifty Psalms, from Ps. 100 to the End*. London: T.R. and E.M. for Ralph Smith, 1654.

———. *A Brief Explication of the Other Fifty Psalmes, from Ps. 50. to Ps. 100*. London: T.R. & E.M. for Ralph Smith, at the Bible in Cornhill, near the Royal Exchange, 1653.

———. *A Brief Exposition of the Euangel of Jesus Christ According to Matthew*. Glasgow: George Anderson, 1647.

———. *Expositio Analytica Omnium Apostolicarum Epistolarum: Seu, Brevis Introductio ad pleniores Commentarios, in Usum Studiosorum Theologiae.* Glasgow: Georgius Andersonus, 1647.

———. *An Exposition of All St. Paul's Epistles, Together With an Explanation of those other Epistles of the Apostles, St. James, Peter, John & Jude: Wherein the sense of every Chapter and Verse is Analytically unfolded, and the Text enlightened.* London: R.I. for Francis Fglesfield, 1659.

———. *Select Practical Writings of David Dickson.* Vol. 1. Edinburgh: John Greig, 1845.

———. *Therapeutica Sacra: Shewing briefly the method of healing the diseases of Conscience concerning Regeneration.* Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1664.

———. *Truth's Victory Over Error: A Commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith.* Ed. by John R. de Witt. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2007.

———. *Truths Victory over Error. Or, An Abridgement of the Chief Controversies in Religion, which since the Apostles days to this time, have been, and are in agitation, between those of the* Orthodox Faith, *and all Adversaries whatsoever; a list of whose names are set down after the* Epistle to the Reader…. Edinburgh: John Reed, 1684.

———. *Truth's Victory over Error: Or, The True Principles of the Christian Religion, Stated and Vindicated Against the Following Heresies….* Glasgow: John Bryce, 1764.

Dickson, David and James Durham. *The Sum of Saving Knowledge, with Introduction and Notes by Rev. John Macpherson.* Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students. Ed. by Marcus Dod and Alexander Whyte. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, [1886?].

———. *The Sum of Saving Knowledge: Or, A Brief Sum of Christian Doctrine…Together with the Practical Use Thereof.* Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter, & Co., 1871.

Gerhard, Johann. *Loci theologici: cum pro adstruenda veritate….* Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1863.

———. *Theological Commonplaces*. St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 2006.

Gillespie, George. *Aaron's Rod Blossoming, Or, The Divine Ordinance of Church Government Vindicated....* Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, and Oliver & Boyd, 1844.

Gomarus, Franciscus. *Opera theologica omnia*. 3 Vols. Amsterdam: Joannis Janssonii, 1644.

Gomarus, Francis, Jacob Arminius, and Lucas Trelcatius. *Syntagma disputationum theologicarum, in Academia Lugduno-Batava quarto repetitarum, clariss. viris doctor. & professoribus Francisco Gomaro, Iacobo Arminio & Luca Trelcatio Iuniore, praesidibus.* Rotterdam: Joannes Leonardus, 1615.

Hackspan, Theodoricus. *Termini distinctiones et divisiones philosophico theologicae*. Altdorff: Georg Hagen, 1664.

Heidegger, Johann Heinrich. *Corpus theologiae christianae...*. Tiguri: Ex Officina Heideggeriana, 1732.

———. *Medulla theologiae christianae*. Tiguri: Davidis Gessneri, 1697.

Heppe, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources.* Trans. by G. T. Thomson. Ed. by Ernst Bizer. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1950.

Junius, Franciscus. *D. Francisci Junii opuscula theologica selecta*. Ed. by Abraham Kuyper. Bibliotheca Reformata 1. Amsterdam: F. Muller and J.H. Kruyt, 1882.

———. *De theologia vera, ortu, natura, formis, partibus, et modo illiu: libellus recens, quo omnes Christiani de sua dignitate, et Theologi de gravitate sui ministerii secundum Deum admonentur*. Leiden: ex officina Plantiniana, 1594.

———. *Opera Theologica Francisci Junii Biturgis sacrarum literarum professoris eximii. Quorum nonnula nunc primimum publicantur. Praefixa est vita autoris. Omnia cum indicibus VII acuratissimus*. 2 Vols. Heidelberg: in officina Sanctandreana, 1608.

———. *Sacrorum Parallelorum Libri Tres: Id Est Comparatio locorum Scripturae sacrae, qui ex Testamento vetere in Novo adducuntur: summam utriusque in verbis convenientiam, in rebus consensum, in mutationibus fidem veritatemque breviter & perspicue ex fontibus*

Scripturae S. genuinaque linguarum Hebraeae & Graecae conformatione monstrans ... Francisci Iunii Biturigis. Heidelberg: Commelinus, 1588.

———. *A Treatise on True Theology: With the Life of Franciscus Junius*. Trans. by David C. Noe. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014.

Junius, Franciscus, Lucas Trelcatius, and Franciscus Gomarus. *Compendium theologiae thesibus in Academia Lugduno-Bat. ordine a D.D. et professoribus Fr. Junio, Luca Trelcatio, et Francisco Gomaro publice propositis, ab anno 1598 usque ad annum 1605 concinnatim.* Hanover: Guilielmum Antonium, 1611.

Kolb, Robert and Timothy J. Wengert, eds. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Leigh, Edward. *A Systeme or Body of Divinity: Consisting of Ten Books.* London: A.M. for William Lee, 1654.

Luther, Martin. *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1883–1993.

———. *Luther's Works*. Eds. by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut Lehman. Philadelphia and St. Louis: Fortress and Concordia, 1955–86.

Marckius, Johannes. *Christianae Theologiae Medulla Didactico-Elenctica*. Philadelphia: J. Anderson, 1824.

Maresius, Samuel. *Systema Theologicum cum Annotationibus.* Groningen: Aemilius Spinneker, 1673.

Melanchthon, Philipp. *Scholia in Epistolam Pauli Ad Colossenses.* Wittenberg: np, 1528.

Migne, J.-P., ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus ... Series Graeca.* Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1857–66.

Ockham, William. *Dialogus inter magistrum et discipulum de imperatorum et pontificium potestate* (*On the Power of Emperors and Popes*). Trans. by Annabel S. Brett. Durham: University of Durham, 1998.

———. *A Short Discourse on Tyrannical Government.* Ed. by Arthur Stephen McGrade. Trans. by John Kilcullen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Pareus, David. *In Divinam Ad Corinthios Priorem S. Pauli Apostoli Epistolam Commentarius*. Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1614.

Pauck, Wilhelm, ed. *Melanchthon and Bucer.* The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. 19. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

Pelikan, Jaroslav and Valerie Hotchkiss, eds. *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition.* 3 Vols. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2003.

Perkins, William. *The Workes of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ in the Universitie of Cambridge, M.W. Perkins*. Cantrell Legge, Printer to the University of Cambridge: Cambridge, 1609.

Pictet, Benedict. *Christian Theology*. Trans. by Frederick Reyroux. London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1834.

———. *Medulla theologiae christianae didacticae et elencticae.* Geneva: Societatis, 1711.

———. *Theologia christiana ex puris sanctarum.* Geneva: Cramer & Perachon, 1696.

Polanus, Amandus. *Svbstanec* [*sic*] *of Christian Religion*. London: Arn Hatfield for Felix Norton, 1600.

———. *Sylloge Thesium Theologicarum, Ad Methodi Leges Conscriptarum*. Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1597.

———. *Syntagmatis Theologiae Christianae*. 2 Vols. Hanau: Claudium Marnium, 1609.

Polyander, Johannes, Andreas Rivet, Antonius Walaeus, and Antoine Thysius. *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae: disputationibus quinquaginta duabus comprehensa ac conscripta per Johannem Polyandrum, Andream Rivetum, Antonium Walaeum, Antonium Thysium, S. S. theologiae doctores et professores in Academi a Leidensi*. Ed. by Herman Bavinck. 1625; Leiden: D. Donner, 1881.

Polyander, Johannes. *Disputationum Theologicarum, quae ex ordine repeti consueverunt, vigesima octava, de Statu exaltationis Christi.* Leiden: Ex Officina Bonaventurae & Abrahami Elzevir, 1631.

Quenstedt, Johannes Andrea. *Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologicum in Duas Sectiones.* Leipzig: Thomam Fritsch, 1715.

Registres du Conseil de Genève. Tome XIII du 3 juillet 1534 au 23 mai 1536. Vol. 27 à 29. Geneva: Albert Kundig, 1940.

Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes. 3 vols.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890.

Scharpius, Johannes. *Cursus Theologicus, in Quo Controversiae Omnes De Fidei Dogmatibus, Hoc Seculo exagitatae, nominatim inter nos & Pontificios, pertractantur; Etad Bellarmini argumenta respondetur. In Duos Tomos Divisus.* Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1620.

———. *Symphonia prophetarum et apostolorum.* Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1625.

———. *Theses Theologicae de Peccato Quas Spiritu Sancto Praeside, D. Andrea Melvino Sacrae Theologiae Doctore...Joannes Scharpius ad diem III. & IV. Julij in Scholis Theologicis Academia Andreanae.* Edinburgh: Robertus Walde-grave, 1600.

———. *Tractatus de Justificatione hominis coram Deo.* Geneva: Paulus Marcellus, 1609.

———. *Tractatus de misero hominis statu sub peccator.* Geneva: P. & J. Chouët, 1610.

Schweizer, Johann Caspar. *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus e patribus graecis exhibens quaecunque phrases, ritus, dogmata, haereses....* 2 Vols. Amsterdam: J. Henricus Wetstenius, 1682.

Te Velde, Dolf and Willem J. van Asselt, eds. *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (Synopsis of a Purer Theology).* Trans. by Riemer A. Faber. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions. 3 Vols. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014–.

Trelcatius, Lucas. *A Briefe Institution of the Common Places of Sacred Divinitie.* Trans. by John Gawen. London: T.P. for Francis Burton, 1610.

Turretin, Francis. *Francisci Turrettini Opera.* 4 Vols. Edinburgh: John D. Lowe, 1847.

———. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology.* 3 Vols. Trans. by George M. Giger. Ed. by James T. Dennison Jr. Phillipsburg: P&R, 1992–97.

Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture, Church.* Ed. Joseph McLelland. PML I. Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994.

———. *The Peter Martyr Reader.* Eds. J.P. Donnelly, F.A. James, J.C. McLelland. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 1999.

Witsius, Herman. *De oeconomia foederum Dei cum hominibus libri quattuor.* Leeuwarden, 1685; Utrecht, 1694.

———. *Sacred Dissertations on the Lord's Prayer.* 1689; Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1994 repr.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Disputationum Theologicarum Repetitarum Vicesima-Octava, de Statu exaltationis Iesu Christi.* Leiden: Ex Officina Bonaventurae & Abrahami Elzevir, 1627.

———. *Opera Omnia.* 2 Vols. Leiden: Ex officina Francisci Hackii, 1643.

Wollebius, Johannes. *The Abridgment of Christian Divinity: So exactly and Methodically compiled, That it leads us, as it were, by the hand To the Reading of the Holy Scripture, Ordering of Common-Places, Understanding of Controversies, Clearing of some Cases of Conscience.* Trans. by Alexander Ross. 2nd ed. London: T. Mab for John Saywell, 1656.

———. *Compendium Theologiae Christianae.* Oxford: H. Hall, 1657.

Zanchi, Jerome. *D. Heir[onymi] Zanchii omnium operum theologicorum tomi octo* [*ZOT*]. Geneva: Samuel Crespin, 1619.

———. *De religione christiana fides—Confession of Christian Religion.* Eds. Luca Baschera and Christian Moser. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, 135. Ed. Robert J. Bast. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.

———. *Operum theologicorum d. Hieronymi Zachii.* Geneva: Stephen Gamonet, 1613.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Sharon and Julian Goodare, eds. *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions.* Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2014.

Althaus, Paul. *The Ethics of Martin Luther.* Trans. by Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

———. *The Theology of Martin Luther.* Trans. by Robert C. Shultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Backus, Irena, ed. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists.* 2 Vols. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2001.

Bangs, Jeremy Dupertuis. *Church Art and Architecture in the Low Countries Before 1566.* Kirksville, Mo: Truman State Univ Press, 1997.

———. *Strangers and Pilgrims, Travellers and Sojourners: Leiden and the Foundations of Plymouth Plantation.* Plymouth, MA: General Society of Mayflower Descendants, 2009.

Barth, Karl. *Community, State, and Church: Three Essays.* Intro. by Will Herberg. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1968.

———. *Eine Schweizer Stimme, 1938–1945.* Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1948.

Battles, Ford Lewis. *Interpreting John Calvin.* Ed. by Robert Benedetto. Intro. by I. John Hesselink and Donald K. McKim. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996.

Bavinck, Herman. *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek.* 4 Vols. Kampen: Kok, 1928.

———. *Reformed Dogmatics.* 4 Vols. Trans. by John Vriend. Ed. by John Bolt. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

Beach, J. Mark. *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace.* Reformed Historical Theology. Ed. by Herman J. Selderhuis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.

Beardslee, John W. III, "Theological Development at Geneva Under Francis and Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1648–1737)." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1956;

Beeke, Jonathon. "Martin Luther's Two Kingdoms, Law and Gospel, and the Created Order: Was There a Time When the Two Kingdoms Were Not?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 73 (2011): 191–214.

Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Berkof, Louis. *Systematic Theology.* 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Billings, J. Todd and I. John Hesselink, eds. *Calvin's Theology and Its Reception: Disputes, Developments and New Possibilities.* Louisville: WJK Press, 2012.

Bornkamm, Heinrich. *Luther in Mid-Career: 1521–1530.* Trans. by E. Theodore Bachmann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

———. *Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms in the Context of his Theology.* Trans. by Karl H. Hertz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Bower, Alexander. *The History of the University of Edinburgh: Chiefly Compiled from Original Papers and Records, Never Before Published.* 2 Vols. Edinburgh: Alex Smellie, 1817.

Braaten, Carl E. *Principles of Lutheran Theology.* 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Bradley, James A. and Richard A. Muller. *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Brady, Thomas A. Jr. "Luther and Society: Two Kingdoms or Three Estates? Tradition and Experience in Luther's Social Teaching." *Lutherjahrbuch* 52 (1985): 197–212.

Burleigh, John H. S. *A Church History of Scotland.* Edinburgh: Hope Trust, 1988.

Burnett, Amy Nelson. *The Yoke of Christ: Martin Bucer and Christian Discipline.* Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies. Vol. 26. Kirksville: Northeast Missouri State University, 1994.

Cameron, Nigel M. de S., ed. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Cargill-Thompson, W. D. J. *The Political Thought of Martin Luther.* Ed. by Philip Broadhead. Sussex and New Jersey: Harvester Press and Barnes & Noble, 1984.

Cassidy, James J. "Francis Turretin and Barthianism: The Covenant of Works in Historical Perspective." *The Confessional Presbyterian* 5 (2009): 199–213.

Chenot, Aug. "Jean L'Archer: Ministre a Héricourt 1563–1588." *Bulletin historique et littéraire* 33 no. 11 (1884): 481–493.

Clark, Scott R. "Calvin on the *Lex Naturalis*." *Stulos Theological Journal* 6/1–2 (May–November 1998): 1–22.

Clarke, Samuel. *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical History: Contained in the Lives of One Hundred Forty Eight Fathers, Schoolmen, First Reformers and Modern Divines Which Have Flourished in the*

Church since Christ's Time to This Present Age. London: Printed for T.V., 1654.

Cobban, Alan. *English University Life In The Middle Ages.* London: UCL Press, 1999.

Coffey, John. *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford.* Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge, U.K.: New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Cottret, Bernard. *Calvin: A Biography.* Trans. by M. Wallace McDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Craufurd, Thomas. *History of the University of Edinburgh, from 1580 to 1646; to Which Is Prefixed, the Charter Granted to the College by James VI. of Scotland, in 1582.* Edinburgh: A. Neill, 1808.

Crouse, Robert C. "Two Kingdoms and Two Cities: Mapping Theological Traditions of Church, Culture, and Civil Order." PhD diss., Wheaton College, 2016.

De Budé, Eugène. *Vie de Bénédict Pictet, theologien genevois (1655–1724).* Lausanne: Georges Bridel, 1874.

———. *Vie de François Turrettini: Théologien Genevois 1623–1687.* Lausanne: Georges Bridel, 1871.

De Greef, W. *The Writings of John Calvin: An Introductory Guide*, Trans. by Lyle Bierma. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Duchrow, Ulrich, ed. *Lutheran Churches – Salt or Mirror of Society? Case Studies on the Theory and Practice of the Two Kingdoms.* Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977.

Ebeling, Gerhard. "The Necessity of the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," in *Word and Faith.* Trans. by James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.

Estes, James. *Peace, Order and the Glory of God: Secular Authority and the Church in the Thought of Luther and Melanchthon, 1518–1559.* Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions CXI. Ed. by Andrew C. Gow. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Evans, William B. "The Two-Kingdoms Theology and Christians Today." *The Aquila Report*, www.theaquilareport.com/the-two-kingdoms-theology-and-christians-today-2/. (June 27, 2018).

Frame, John. *The Escondido Theology: A Reformed Response to Two Kingdom Theology.* Lakeland, FL: Whitefield Media Productions, 2011.

Gerrish, Brian. *Grace and Reason.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Godfrey, Robert W. "Kingdom and Kingdoms." *Evangelium* 7 (2009): 6–9.

Good, James I. *History of the Swiss Reformed Church since the Reformation.* Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1913.

Grabill, Stephen J. *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

Graham, W. Fred. *The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin & His Socio-Economic Impact.* Richmond: John Knox Press, 1978.

Greschat, Martin. *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Gribben, Crawford. "Robert Leighton and the Presbyterian Consenus." In *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550–1700*, 159–183. Ed. by Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.

Guichonnet, Paul, ed. *Histoire de Genève.* Toulouse: Privat, 1974.

Haas, Guenther H. *The Concept of Equity in Calvin's Ethics.* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997.

Hall, David W. *Calvin in the Public Square: Liberal Democracies, Rights, and Civil Liberties*. The Calvin 500 Series. Phillipsburg: P&R, 2009.

Hart, Darryl. *A Secular Faith: Why Christianity Favors the Separation of Church and State*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006.

———. "Two Kingdoms: A New or Old Idea? Review of *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms by David VanDrunen.*" *Ordained Servant* 19 (2010): 150–153.

Heckel, Johannes. "*Im Irrgarten der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre. Zwei Abhandlungen zum Reichs-und Kirchenbegriff Martin Luthers.*" *Theologische Existenz Heute* 55 (1957): 3–39.

———. *Lex Charitatis: Eine juristische Untersuchung über das Recht in der Theologie Martin Luthers.* München: Beck, 1953.

———. *Lex Charitatis: A Juristic Disquisition on Law in the Theology of Martin Luther.* Trans. and Ed. by Gottfried G. Krodel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Hillerbrand, Hans Joachim, ed. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation.* 4 Vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Holt, Mack P. *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629.* Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Höpfl, Harro. *The Christian Polity of John Calvin.* Cambridge Studies in the History and Theory of Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Horton, Michael. "Why Two Kingdoms?: Dual Citizenship on the Eve of the Election." *Modern Reformation* 9/5 (October 2009): 21–25, 28.

Howie, John. *Biographia scoticana: or, a brief historical account of the lives, characters, and memorable transactions of the most eminent Scots worthies, noblemen, gentlemen, ministers, and others.* 2nd ed. Glasgow: John Bryce, 1781.

Hughes, Philip E., ed. *The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004.

Inman, Benjamin T. "God Covenanted in Christ: The Unifying Role of Theology Proper in the Systematic Theology of Francis Turretin." Ph.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2004.

Israel, Jonathan I. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806*. Oxford History of Early Modern Europe. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Jackson, L. Charles. *Riots, Revolutions, and the Scottish Covenanters: The Work of Alexander Henderson.* Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2015.

Jeon, Jeong Koo. "Calvin and The Two Kingdoms: Calvin's Political Philosophy in Light of Contemporary Discussion." *Westminster Theological Journal* 72/2 (2010): 299–320.

Judisch, Douglas. "A Translation and Edition of the *Sacrorum Parallelorum Liber Primus* of Francis Junius: A Study in Sixteenth-Century Hermeneutics." 3 Vols. PhD. diss., University of St. Andrews, 1979.

Keate, George. *A Short Account of the Ancient History, Present Government, and Laws of the Republic of Geneva.* London: for R. and J. Dodsley, 1761.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines.* Second edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Kennedy, Simon P. and Benjamin B. Saunders. "Characterizing the Two Kingdoms and Assessing Their Relevance Today." *CTJ* 53.1 (2018): 161–173.

Kerr, Hugh Thomson, ed. *A Compend of Luther's Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943.

Kilcullen, John. "The Political Writings." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*, 302–25. Ed. by Paul Vincent Spade. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Kirby, Torrance. "A Reformed Culture of Persuasion: John Calvin's 'Two Kingdoms' and the Theological Origins of the Public Sphere." In *Calvin@500: Theology, History, and Practice*, 52–66. Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2011.

Klauber, Martin I. *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671–1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva.* Cranbury; London, Canada: Associated University Press, 1994.

———. "The Eclipse of Reformed Scholasticism in Eighteen-Century Geneva: Natural Theology from Jean-Alphonse Turretin to Jacob Vernet," 129–142. In *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564–1864.* Ed. by Martin Klauber and John B. Roney. Westport: Praeger, 1998.

———. "Family Loyalty and Theological Transition in Post-Reformation Geneva: The Case of Benedict Pictet (1655–1724)." *Fides et Historia* 24:1 (Winter/Spring 1992), 54–67.

———. "Francis Turretin on Biblical Accommodation: Loyal Calvinist or Reformed Scholastic?" *WTJ* 55 (1993): 78–86.

Kloosterman, Nelson. "A Response to 'The Kingdom of God is Twofold': Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms in the Thought of Herman Bavinck by David VanDrunen." *CTJ* 45 (2010): 165–176.

Kolb, Robert and Charles P. Arand. *The Genius of Luther's Theology: A Wittenberg Way of Thinking for the Contemporary Church.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Komlósi, Péter Attila. "Dual Aspects of Ministerial Training in Late Sixteenth Century: Edinburgh's 'Tounis College' and the formation of ministers' early career with special regard to the 'Exercise.'" PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2012.

Kooi, Christine. *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572-1620.* Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, v. 82. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.

Lambert, Thomas A. "Preaching, Praying and Policing the Reform in Sixteenth-Century Geneva." PhD. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998.

Lane, Anthony N. S. "The City of God: Church and State in Geneva." In *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: A Fourteen-Volume Anthology of Scholarly Articles*, 10:140–51. Ed. by Richard C. Gamble. New York: Garland Pub, 1992.

———. *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers.* Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.

Lazareth, William H. *Christians in Society: Luther, the Bible, and Social Ethics.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Le Mercier, Andrew. *The Church History of Geneva, in Five Books. As Also a Political and Geographical Account of That Republick. By the Reverend, Mr. Andrew Le Mercier Pastor of the French Church in Boston*. Boston, New-England, 1732.

Lief, Jason. "Is Neo-Calvinism Calvinist? A Neo-Calvinist Engagement of Calvin's 'Two Kingdoms' Doctrine." *Pro Rege* 37, no. 3 (March 2009): 1–12.

Lillback, Peter A. *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology*. Text and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought. Gen. ed. by Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

Lim, Paul C. H. *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Littlejohn, W. Bradford. "The Freedom of a Christian Commonwealth: Richard Hooker and the Problem of Christian Liberty." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2013.

———. *The Peril and Promise of Christian Liberty: Richard Hooker, the Puritans, and Protestant Political Theology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

———. *The Two Kingdoms: A Guide for the Perplexed.* Davenant Guides. Np: The Davenant Trust, 2017.

Lohse, Bernhard. *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development.* Trans. and Ed. by Roy A. Harrisville. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

M'Crie, Thomas. *The Story of the Scottish Church: From the Reformation to the Disruption.* London: Blackie & Son, 1875.

Macleod, John. *Scottish Theology in Relation to Church History Since the Reformation.* Edinburgh; Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1974.

Manetsch, Scott M. *Calvin's Company of Pastors: Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church, 1536–1609.* Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Mattox, Mickey L. *"Defender of the Most Holy Matriarchs": Martin Luther's Interpretation of the Women of Genesis in the* Enarrationes in Genesis, *1535–45.* Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought. Ed. by Andrew C. Gow. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Maxfield, John A. *Luther's Lectures on Genesis and the Formation of Evangelical Identity.* Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2008.

McCallum, John. *Scotland's Long Reformation: New Perspectives on Scottish Religion, c. 1500-c. 1660.* St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2016.

McIlhenny, Ryan. "Christian Witness *As* Redeemed Culture." In *Kingdoms Apart: Engaging the Two Kingdoms Perspective*, 251–275. Phillipsburg: P&R, 2012.

———. "A Third-Way Reformed Approach to Christ and Culture: Appropriating Kuyperian Neo-Calvinism and the Two Kingdoms Perspective." *MAJT* 20 (2009): 75–94.

McKay, W. D. J. *An Ecclesiastical Republic: Church Government in the Writings of George Gillespie*. Rutherford Studies in Historical Theology. Carlisle, Cumbria, U.K.: Published for Rutherford House by Paternoster Press, 1997.

McNair, Philip. "Biographical Introduction." In *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture, Church*, 3–26. Joseph McLelland, ed. Peter Marytr Library, Vol. I. Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994.

———. *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Meinhold, Peter. *Die Genesisvorlesung Luthers und ihre Herausgeber*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936.

Molhuysen, P.C. *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidsche Universiteit*. 7 Vols. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1913–24.

Monter, E. William. *Calvin's Geneva*. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Motley, John Lothrop. *The Rise of the Dutch Republic: A History*. 17 Vols. New York ; London: Harper & Bros, 1900.

Muller, Richard A. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. Gen. ed. by David Steinmetz. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

———. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally From Protestant Scholastic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.

———. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. 4 Vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2003.

———. "Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology." *Church History* 55/2 (June 1986): 193–205.

———. "Toward the Pactum Salutis: Locating the Origins of a Concept." *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 18 (2007): 11–65.

———. *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Naef, Henri. *Les Origines de la Réforme à Genève*. 2 Vols. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1968.

Naphy, William G. *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation: With a New Preface*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture.* London: Faber and Faber, 1952.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Nature and Destiny of Man.* Vol. II. New York: Scribner's, 1941.

Niesel, Wilhelm. *The Theology of Calvin*. Trans. by Harold Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.

Oberman, Heiko Augustinus. *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

———. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism.* 1963; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000 repr.

———. *Luther: Man between God and the Devil.* Trans. by Eileen Walliser-Schwarzbart. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Ostella, Christopher A. "The Merit of Christ in the Covenant of Works: Francis Turretin and Herman Bavinck Compared." Th.M. thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, 2007.

Otterspeer, Willem. *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid: De Leidse universiteit, 1575–1672 (Groepsportret met Dame 1)*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2000.

Ouweneel, Willem J. *The World is Christ's: A Critique of Two Kingdoms Theology.* Toronto: Ezra Press, 2017.

Preus, Robert D. *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*. Saint Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1970.

Prögler, Daniela. *English Students at Leiden University, 1575-1650.* Surrey: Ashgate, 2013.

Reid, J. M. *Kirk & Nation: The Story of the Reformed Church of Scotland.* London: Skeffington, 1960.

Reid, Steven J. "Andrew Melville and the Law of Kingship." In *Andrew Melville (1545-1622): Writings, Reception, and Reputation*, 46–74. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Ed. by Roger A. Mason and Steven J. Reid. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

———. *Humanism and Calvinism: Andrew Melville and the Universities of Scotland, 1560-1625*. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Farnham, England; Burlington: Ashgate PubCo, 2011.

Steven J. Reid, "Andrew Melville and the Law of Kingship." In *Andrew Melville (1545-1622): Writings, Reception, and Reputation*, 46–74. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Ed. by Roger A. Mason and Steven J. Reid. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

Rester, Todd. "*Theologia Viatorum*: Institutional Continuity, Theological Pedagogy, and the Reception of a Prolegomenal Framework in Bernhardinus De Moor's 'Commentarius Perpetuus.'" PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2016.

Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. 8 Vols. 3rd ed. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.

Schotel, Gilles Dionysius Jacobus. *De Academie te Leiden in de 16e, 17e, en 18e eeuw*. Haarlem: Kruseman & Tjeenk Willink, 1875.

Schreiner, Susan E. *The Theater of His Glory: Nature and the Natural Order in the Thought of John Calvin*. Studies in Historical Theology 3. Gen. ed. by David Steinmetz. Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1991.

Selderhuis, Herman J. *John Calvin: A Pilgrim's Life*. Trans. by Albert Gootjes. Downers Grove and Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

———. *Marriage and Divorce in the Thought of Martin Bucer*. Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies. Vol. 48. Trans. by John Vriend and Lyle D. Bierma. Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999.

Sinnema, Donald. "The Attempt to Establish a Chair in Practical Theology at Leiden University (1618–1626)." In *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*, 415–441. Ed. by Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma, and Jason Zuidema. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions. Volume 170. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013.

Sinnema, Donald and Henk van den Belt. "The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as a Disputation Cycle." *Church History & Religious Culture* 92, no. 4 (December 2012): 505–537.

Skinner, Quentin. *Visions of Politics*. Vol. 1: *Regarding Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Smith, James. "'Reforming Public Theology: Two Kingdoms, or Two Cities?' *Calvin Theological Journal* 47 (2012): 122–137.

Spencer, Stephen. "Francis Turretin's Concept of the Covenant of Nature."In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, 71–91. Ed. by W. Fred Graham. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.

Sprunger, Keith L. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought, v. 31. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Stanglin, Keith D. *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609.* Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Stanglin, Keith D. and Thomas H. McCall. *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Steinmetz, David C. *Luther in Context.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002 repr.

Stephenson, John R. "The Two Governments and the Two Kingdoms in Luther's Thought." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 34 (1981): 321–337.

Stephenson, John R., ed. *God and Caesar Revisited.* Lutheran Academy Conference Papers No. 1. Shorewood, MN: Luther Academy, 1995.

Stevenson, David. *The Scottish Revolution, 1637–1644; the Triumph of the Covenanters.* Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1973.

———. "Twilight before Night or Darkness before Dawn? Interpreting Seventeenth-Century Scotland." In *Why Scottish History Matters*, 53–64. Ed. by Rosalind Mitchison. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Saltire Society, 1997.

Stewart, Andrew. "David Dickson—Covenanter and Commentator." *The Reformed Theological Review* 68, no. 1 (April 2009): 46–61.

Stump, Eleonore. *Aquinas.* Arguments of the Philosophers. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Thielicke, Helmut. *Theological Ethics: Volume 1: Foundations.* Ed. by William H. Lazareth. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Thomas, Derek W.H. "The Mediator of the Covenant." In *A Theological Guide to Calvin's Institutes: Essays and Analysis*, 205–225. Calvin 500 Series. Phillipsburg: P&R, 2008.

Thomson, Andrew. *Samuel Rutherford.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1884.

Torrell, Jean-Pierre. *Saint Thomas Aquinas: The Person and His Work.* Vol. I. Trans. by Robert Royal. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 2005.

Trueman, Carl. "Luther and the Reformation in Germany." In *The Reformation World*, 73–96. Ed. by Andrew Pettegree. London; New York: Routledge, 2000.

Trueman, Carl R. and R. Scott Clark, eds. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment.* Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999.

Tuininga, Matthew J. *Calvin's Political Theology and the Public Engagement of the Church: Christ's Two Kingdoms.* Cambridge Studies in Law and Christianity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

———. "'The Kingdom of Christ is Spiritual': John Calvin's Concept of the Restoration of the World." In *For the Healing of the Nations: Essays on Creation, Redemption, and Neo-Calvinism*, 81–104. Ed. by Peter Escalante and W. Bradford Littlejohn. Lexington, KY: Davenant Trust, 2014.

———. "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine, Part Two: John Calvin." *Reformation 21.* www.reformation21.org/articles/the-two-kingdoms-doctrine-part-two-john-calvin.php#sthash.6s3LPJvK.dpuf (July 31, 2015).

Van 't Spijker, Willem. *Calvin: A Brief Guide to His Life and Thought*. Trans. by Lyle Bierma. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

———. "The Kingdom of Christ According to Bucer and Calvin." In *Calvin and the State: Papers and Responses Presented at the Seventh and Eighth Colloquia on Calvin & Calvin Studies*, 109–132. Ed. by Peter De Klerk. Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1993.

Van Asselt, Willem J. "The Fundamental Meaning of Theology: Archetypal and Ectypal Theology in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought." *WTJ* 64 (2003): 319–335.

———. *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism.* Reformed Historical-Theological Series. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.

Van Asselt, Willem J. and Eef Dekker, eds. *Reformation and Scholasticism.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.

Van Asselt, Willem J., J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde, eds. *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology.* Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought. Gen. ed. Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

Van der Kooi and Gijsbert van den Brink. *Christian Dogmatics: An Introduction*. Trans. by Reinder Bruinsma with James D. Bratt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

Van Oort, Johannes. *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's* City of God *and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities.* Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Van Til, Henry R. *The Calvinist Concept of Culture.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001 repr.

Van Vreeswijk, B.J.D. "An Image of Its Maker: Theses on Freedom of Franciscus Junius (1545–1602)." In *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology*, 95–125. Ed. by W. J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

VanDrunen, David. "Abraham Kuyper and the Reformed Natural Law and Two Kingdoms Traditions." *CTJ* 42 (2007): 283–307.

———. *A Biblical Case for Natural Law.* Grand Rapids: Acton Institute, 2006.

———. "Calvin, Kuyper, and 'Christian Culture.'" In *Always Reformed: Essays in Honor of W. Robert Godfrey*, 135–153. Escondido, CA: Westminster Seminary California, 2010.

———. "The Context of Natural Law: John Calvin's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms." *A Journal of Church and State* 46, no. 3 (2004): 503–525.

———. "The Importance of the Penultimate: Reformed Social Thought and the Contemporary Critiques of the Liberal Society." *Journal of Markets & Morality* 9/2 (Fall 2006): 219–249.

———. "'The Kingship of Christ is Twofold': Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms in the Thought of Herman Bavinck." *CTJ* 45 (2010): 147–164.

———. *Living in God's Two Kingdoms: A Biblical Vision* for *Christianity* and *Culture.* Wheaton: Crossway, 2010.

———. "Medieval Natural Law and the Reformation: A Comparison of Aquinas and Calvin." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 80/1 (2006): 77–98.

———. *Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms: A Study in the Development of Reformed Social Thought.* Emory University Studies in Law and Religion. Gen. ed. by John Witte Jr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

———. "The Two Kingdoms: A Reassessment of the Transformationist Calvin." *Calvin Theological Journal* 40 (2005): 248–266.

———. "The Two Kingdoms and the *Ordo Salutis*: Life Beyond Judgment and the Question of a Dual Ethic." *WTJ* 70 (2008): 207–224.

———. "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine and the Relationship of Church and State in the Early Reformed Tradition." *Journal of Church and State* 49 (2007): 743–763.

Venema, Cornelis P. "One Kingdom or Two? An Evaluation of the 'Two Kingdoms' Doctrine as an Alternative to Neo-Calvinism." *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 23 (2012): 77–129.

Visser, A. S. Q. *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility Of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620.* Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Vos, Geerhardus. *Reformed Dogmatics*. 5 Vols. Trans. and Ed. by Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2012.

Vos, Johannes G. *The Scottish Covenanters: Their Origins, History and Distinctive Doctrines.* Edinburgh: Blue Banner Productions, 1998.

Wallace, Peter J. "The Doctrine of the Covenant in the Elenctic Theology of Francis Turretin." *Mid-America Journal of Theology* (2002): 143–179.

Wedgeworth, Steven and Peter Escalante. "John Calvin and the Two Kingdoms – Part 1 and 2." The Calvinist International, www.calvinistinternational.com/2012/05/29/calvin-2k-1/; www.calvinistinternational.com/2012/05/29/calvin-2k-2/ (Accessed February 3, 2018).

Weisheipl, James A. *Friar Thomas D'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Work.* Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1974.

Wells, Vaughan T. "Sharp, John," 50:23–24. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: In Association with the British Academy: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000.* Ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Wengert, Timothy J. *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness: Philip Melanchthon's Exegetical Dispute with Erasmus of Rotterdam.* Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. Ed. by David C. Steinmetz. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Wengert, Timothy J., ed. *Harvesting Martin Luther's Reflections on Theology, Ethics, and the Church.* Lutheran Quarterly Books. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Whitford, David M. "*Cura Religionis* or Two Kingdoms: The Late Luther on Religion and the State in the Lectures on Genesis." *Church History* 73 no. 1 (March 2004): 41–62.

Whytock, Jack C. *"An Educated Clergy": Scottish Theological Education and Training in the Kirk and Secession, 1560–1850.* Studies in Christian History and Thought. Eugene: Wipf and Stock; Paternoster, 2007.

Wiley, Charles Aden III. "Responding to God: The Church as Visible and Invisible in Calvin, Schleiermacher, and Barth." PhD. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 2002.

Williams, Carol A. "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant: David Dickson and the Covenant of Redemption." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2005.

Wind, John. "The Keys to the Kingdoms: Covenantal Framework as the Fundamental Divide Between VanDrunen and His Critics." *Westminster Theological Journal* 77/1 (2015): 15–33.

Witte, John Jr. "Between Sanctity and Depravity: Law and Human Nature in Martin Luther's Two Kingdoms." *Villanova Law Review* 48 no. 3 (2003): 727–762.

———. *Law and Protestantism: The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Witte, John Jr. and Robert Kingdon. *Sex, Marriage, and Family in John Calvin's Geneva*. Religion, Marriage, and Family. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Wolters, Al. *Creation Regained: A Biblical Basis for a Reformational Worldview.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998 repr.

Woo, Byunghoon. "The *Pactum Salutis* in the Theologies of Witsius, Owen, Dickson, Goodwin, and Cocceius." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2014.

Woolsey, Andrew. *Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study in the Reformed Tradtion to the Westminster Assembly.* Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.

Wright, David F., ed. *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Wright, William. *Martin Luther's Understanding of God's Two Kingdoms: A Response to the Challenge of Skepticism.* Text and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought. Gen. ed. Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

Zuidema, Jason. *Early French Reform: The Theology and Spirituality of Guillaume Farel*. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Farnham ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.

Academic Summary (English)

This historical study considers the various sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Reformed expressions regarding the *duplex regnum Christi* (the twofold kingdom of Christ), or, as especially denominated in the Lutheran context, the "doctrine of the two kingdoms." While this research examines a sampling of the patristic and medieval sources for these formulations, it concentrates its investigation on select magisterial Reformers of the sixteenth century and representative intellectual centers of the seventeenth century (notably, Geneva, Leiden, and Edinburgh). A primary concern of this study is to examine the development of these formulations over the two centuries in question, and relate its maturation to the intellectual and political context of the early modern period.

Although Luther's two kingdoms doctrine has received a great deal of attention in secondary scholarship, far less historical studies are devoted to analyzing Reformed versions of the twofold kingdom—and the studies that do exist are largely systematic in nature. Even more neglected is the period of Reformed orthodoxy. While select articles and sections of monographs seek to articulate the Reformed orthodox position on the twofold kingdom of Christ, no full-length work has made this its particular focus. This study takes initial steps towards filling this lacuna in secondary scholarship.

The overarching argument of this study is that the Reformed orthodox portrayal of the twofold kingdom of Christ (distinguished most often as the *regnum essentiale* and *regnum mediatorium*) stands in continuity with the early Reformers' articulations, and yet there is in the second half of the sixteenth century, and even into the seventeenth century, significant and ongoing development and maturation of the *duplex regnum Christi*. Moreover, this dissertation argues that there were at least three primary reasons for this doctrine's refinement: (1) new theological challenges (e.g., Socinianism), combined with a desire for more precise

terminology to meet these needs; (2) related to these polemical concerns, the exegesis of particular Scripture passages describing a transfer of authority to/from Jesus Christ (i.e., 1 Cor. 15:24); and (3) development in other areas of theology, especially covenant theology. This dissertation further argues that although some variation is evident when comparing the formulations of Reformed orthodox authors, the consensus among the Reformed in the seventeenth century is that a twofold kingdom can be attributed to Christ, and that the two aspects of this singular kingdom are distinguished according to the manner by which Christ rules. On the one hand, the Son, equal with the Father and Holy Spirit, administers an essential kingdom as second person of the Trinity, and on the other hand, as mediator and God-man, Jesus Christ governs a mediatorial kingdom that is specially focused on the redemption of his people.

While other factors may have contributed to this relatively homogenous explanation of the *duplex regnum Christi*, it is further evident that this common christological distinction held true in varied political scenes of the seventeenth century. In other words, while the twofold kingdom distinction was at times used by the Reformed orthodox in the context of delineating the church's role from the magistrate's, it does not appear that the level of political stability had a significant impact on the doctrine's formulation. This study tested this argument by focusing on the varying political contexts of three prominent intellectual centers (i.e., Geneva, Leiden, and Edinburgh), and examining the writings of prominent Reformed orthodox theologians who taught at the theological schools associated with these cities.

Although the intention of this study is not to referee the contemporary debate surrounding the Reformed "two kingdoms" (R2K), nevertheless it seeks to address several common tendencies perpetuated by those involved in this dialogue. The first two tendencies concern terminology. First, nearly every English work addressing the subject of Christ's twofold reign has employed the term "two kingdoms," or some variation of this phrase that denotes a plurality of kingdoms; nearly absent from the contemporary discussion is any acknowledgement of the *singularity* of Christ's kingdom as indicated by the prolonged use of the

term "*duplex regnum*" (or "twofold kingdom") within the Reformed tradition.

A second related tendency is to employ Calvin's adjectives of "spiritual" as opposed to "political/civil" or "temporal" when describing the twofold kingdom. Arguments are made that the civil kingdom concerns temporal matters and is governed by God through civil magistrates, whereas the spiritual kingdom is concerned with heavenly or eternal matters and is governed by God ministerially through officers of the church. Although some have shifted this terminology as of late (opting now for "common kingdom" as distinct from "redemptive kingdom"), the labels of civil/spiritual and common/redemptive continue to assume that the distinction is based on the activity conducted by the non-Christian or Christian. As this study argues, the Reformed orthodox carefully chose labels associated with Christ's twofold kingdom (such as *regnum essentiale* and *regnum mediatorium*) that did not highlight the activity of the believer/non-believer, but rather focused on the person and work of Jesus Christ. In other words, according to the Reformed orthodox, the foundation for distinguishing a *duplex regnum Christi* is entirely christological. Advocates of a Reformed "two-kingdoms theology" may wish to reconsider the labels they use by drawing upon the precise terms and definitions of the Reformed orthodox—terms that highlight the singular nature of Christ's kingdom, as well as the christological basis for distinguishing two aspects to his singular rule. Perhaps this may go a long way in alleviating the concerns of those who have so far opposed this distinction.

A third tendency is that most contemporary authors think in terms of scope when discussing the "two-kingdoms" distinction. Thus, often the conversation focuses on the perplexing question that seeks to locate the activity of the Christian. To what kingdom does activity "X" belong? The question is therefore posed, "Does the 'house-building' of the Christian builder belong to the 'common' kingdom or the 'redemptive' kingdom?" Or perhaps more troubling, "How (if at all) does the Christian's education, art, or science relate to or fit within the 'redemptive' kingdom?" But with each of these scenarios, the contemporary questioner is asking a fundamentally different question than that addressed by the Reformed orthodox. When the Reformed orthodox delineated the twofold reign of Christ, they were not

seeking to label one cultural activity as common and another as redemptive (or even as a mix of both). The distinction of Christ's essential kingdom from his mediatorial kingdom was a logical (or modal) distinction rather than a spatial one; as such, the Reformed orthodox could maintain that Christ's rule is singular and comprehensive, and at the same time that it has distinct purposes for his people.

The contemporary question that has sparked much of this debate has a "bottom-up" approach (i.e., "How does this particular human activity fit within Christ's kingdom?"), whereas the Reformed orthodox distinction has a "top-down" focus as it addresses the mode of Christ's reign. Rather than beginning with the question of "In what sphere does the activity of the Christian plumber belong?"—which immediately assumes the presence of at least two spheres categorized according to human activity—those claiming the Reformed heritage should begin with the seventeenth-century question that asked, "In what manner does Christ rule the plumber who confesses Christ as Redeemer?" Beginning with the proper question is key if any resolution is to be hoped for within the present divide on this subject.

Finally, those discussing the Reformed two-kingdoms distinction have either politicized or flattened the historical development of this doctrine within the Reformed tradition. This final tendency is understandable given the natural proclivity to lump complex historical factors and positions into more manageable categories. Likely owing to the political and ecclesiological contexts within which the Lutheran two-kingdoms and early Reformed twofold-kingdom distinction surfaced, contemporary interpreters have largely understood this distinction only within this dimension. Related to this tendency, too often the "two-kingdoms" distinction is presented as a stagnate doctrine void of any maturation. While contemporary interpreters rightly claim that there is much continuity between the Reformed and Reformed orthodox on Christ's twofold reign, Turretin's formulation (to select one Reformed orthodox figure) differs from Calvin's in significant ways that as yet have not been adequately addressed. While this study has attempted to detail some of this development (especially in the context of the early-modern European university), further work must examine the contributions of many more

Reformed orthodox figures, and thus assess the argument of this dissertation in light of a broader spectrum of evidence.

Academische Samenvatting (Nederlands)

Deze historische studie gaat in op verschillende zestiende- en zeventiende-eeuwse formuleringen met betrekking tot de *duplex regnum Christi* (het tweevoudige koninkrijk van Christus) of zoals het in de Lutherse context vaak heet: "de leer van de twee rijken." Hoewel dit onderzoek kijkt naar enkele voorbeelden uit de patristische en middeleeuwse tijd concentreert deze studie zich voornamelijk op enige gezaghebbende Reformatoren uit de zestiende eeuw en op representatieve intellectuele centra uit de zeventiende eeuw (in het bijzonder, Geneve, Leiden, en Edinburgh). De doel van deze studie is om de ontwikkeling van deze formuleringen te onderzoeken in de eerdergenoemde twee eeuwen, en deze ontwikkelingen te relateren aan de intellectuele en politieke context van de vroegmoderne tijd.

Hoewel de twee rijken leer van Luther veel aandacht heeft gekregen van wetenschappelijk onderzoek, zijn er minder historische-theologische studies geweest die de Gereformeerde visie op het tweevoudige koninkrijk hebben geanalyseerd—en de studies die er zijn, zijn meer systematisch-theologische van aard. De periode van de Gereformeerde orthodoxie is zelfs nog meer verwaarloosd. Hoewel er een select aantal artikelen en monografieën is dat probeert de Gereformeerde orthodoxie positie weertegeven met betrekking tot het tweevoudige koninkrijk van Christus, is er geen volledige studie waarin deze formulering centraal staat. Deze studie is de eerste stap om in deze leemte te voorzien.

Het overkoepelende argument van deze studie is dat de Gereformeerd-orthodoxe presentatie van het tweevoudige koninkrijk van Christus (in het algemeen onderscheiden als het *regnum essentiale* en het *regnum mediatorium*) in continuïteit staat met de visies van de vroegere reformatoren. Desondanks is er in de tweede helft van de 16de eeuw, en mogelijk zelfs tot in de 17de eeuw, een ontwikkeling en rijping gaande van de *duplex regnum Christi*. Bovendien beargumenteert dit proefschrift dat er drie redenen waren voor deze leerstellige verfijning namelijk: (1) nieuwe

theologische uitdagingen (bijv. het Socinianisme), gekoppeld aan het verlangen naar beter gedefinieerde terminologie om zo in de behoefte te voorzien; (2) gerelateerd aan deze polemische belangen, de exegese van bepaalde schriftgedeelten die de overdracht beschrijven van het koningschap van en naar Jezus Christus (met name 1 Kor. 15:24); (3) de ontwikkelingen in andere gebieden in de theologie, in het bijzonder de verbondstheologie. Tenslotte, beargumenteert dit proefschrift, dat ondanks dat er enige variaties zichtbaar zijn als wij formuleringen van de Gereformeerden naast elkaar zetten, er een overeenstemming is bij de Gereformeerden in de zeventiende eeuw, dat het tweevoudige koninkrijk aan Christus toegeschreven kan worden, en dat de twee aspecten van dit ene koninkrijk toegewezen kunnen worden aan de manier waarop Christus regeert. Aan de ene kant bestuurt hij als de Zoon, gelijk met de Vader en de Heilige Geest, een wezenlijk koninkrijk als de tweede persoon in de Drie-eenheid. Aan de andere kant, als de Middellaar en God-mens, regeert Jesus Christus in een middellaarskoninkrijk dat zich met name richt op de verlossing van zijn onderdanen.

Verschillende factoren hebben mogelijk bijgedragen aan de eensgezindheid in de uitleg van de *duplex regnum Christi,* maar het is evident dat deze algemene christologische onderscheiding zich staande hield in verschillende politieke situaties in de zeventiende eeuw. Met andere woorden, ondanks dat het onderscheid van het tweevoudige koninkrijk door de Gereformeerd orthodoxe theologen werd gebruikt in de context van de afbakening van de kerkelijke rol ten opzichte van die van de magistraten, ziet het er niet naar uit dat de mate van politieke stabiliteit enige invloed had op de formulering van de leer. Deze studie beproefde deze aanname door zich te richten op de politieke situaties van drie prominente intellectuele centra (d.w.z. Geneve, Leiden, en Edinburgh) en door de geschriften van verschillende prominente Gereformeerd orthodoxe theologen te onderzoeken, die les gaven aan de theologisch scholen die geassocieerd werden met deze steden.

Hoewel deze studie niet bedoeld is om een scheidsrechter te zijn in het huidige debat over de Gereformeerde "twee rijken" (in het Engels Reformed "two kingdoms," vaak afgekort als R2K), wil deze studie toch enkele algemene tendensen adresseren die in dit debat spelen. Ten eerste,

bijna elke Engelse studie die het onderwerp van Christus' tweevoudige heerschappij adresseert, gebruikt de term "twee rijken" of een variant daarvan dat op een meervoud van rijken wijst. In de hedendaagse discussie ontbreekt echter de erkenning van de enkelvoudigheid van het koninkrijk van Christus zoals het aangeduid wordt in het langdurige gebruik van de term "*duplex regnum*" (of "tweevoudige koninkrijk") binnen de Gereformeerde traditie.

Een tweede tendens is dat Calvijns bijvoeglijk naamwoord "geestelijk" geplaatst wordt tegenover "politiek/burgerlijk" of "tijdelijk" als het tweevoudige koninkrijk beschreven wordt. Dan wordt betoogd dat het burgerlijk koninkrijk enkel tijdelijke zaken bevat en geregeerd wordt door God met behulp van burgerlijke overheden, terwijl het geestelijke koninkrijk de hemelse en eeuwige dingen betreft en ambtelijk geregeerd wordt door God door de dienst van ambtsdragers in de kerk. Hoewel sommigen de terminologie de laatste tijd hebben veranderd (nu opterend voor "algemeen koninkrijk" in onderscheid van "verlossend koninkrijk"), blijvende aanduidingen als burgerlijk/geestelijk en algemeen/verlossend suggereren dat het onderscheid gebaseerd is op de activiteiten van mensen die al of geen christen zijn. Zoals deze studie beargumenteert, kozen de Gereformeerd-orthodoxen bewust termen die betrekking hadden op Christus tweevoudige koninkrijk (zoals *regnum essentiale* en *regnum mediatorium*) en niet de activiteiten van gelovigen/ongelovigen accentueerden, maar focusten op de persoon en werk van Jezus Christus. Met andere woorden, volgens de Gereformeerd-orthodoxen, is het fundament om van een *duplex regnum Christi* te spreken, volledig christologisch. Pleitbezorgers van de Gereformeerde "twee rijken theologie" zullen de labels die zij gebruiken opnieuw moeten overwegen, op basis van de exacte termen en definities van de Gereformeerd-orthodoxen. Dat geldt ook voor de enkelvoudige natuur van Christus koninkrijk en de christologische basis om de twee verschillende aspecten van zijn heerschappij te onderscheiden . Misschien helpt dit om de zorgen weg te nemen van hen die zich tot nu toe tegen dit onderscheid verzetten.

Een derde tendens is dat hedendaagse auteurs denken in termen van omvang als zij het onderscheid tussen de "twee rijken" bediscussiëren. Daarom richt het debat zich vaak op de verwarrende vraag waar de

werkzaamheden van Christenen te lokaliseren zijn. Tot welk koninkrijk behoort activiteit "X"? De vraag wordt daarom gesteld, "Vallen de bouwwerkzaamheden van een christelijke bouwvakker onder het 'algemene' koninkrijk of het 'verlossende' koninkrijk?" Of misschien meer alarmerend, "Hoe kunnen wij (als dit al mogelijk is) christelijk onderwijs, kunst en wetenschap relateren aan of inpassen in het 'verlossende' koninkrijk?" Maar in beide gevallen vraagt de hedendaagse vraagsteller iets essentieel anders dan de Gerefomeerd-orthodoxen. Wanneer zij over de tweevoudige heerschappij van Christus spraken, probeerden zij niet om de ene culturele activiteit te labelen als algemeen en de andere als verlossend (of zelfs als een mix van beide). Het onderscheid tussen Christus essentiële koninkrijk en zijn bemiddelende koninkrijk was eerder een logische (of modaal) onderscheid dan een ruimtelijk onderscheid. Op deze wijze konden zij de heerschappij van Christus aanduiden als enkelvoudig en allesomvattend, terwijl het tegelijkertijd unieke oogmerken had voor zijn volk.

De hedendaagse vraag die veel discussie heeft opgewekt heeft een "bottom-up" benadering (d.w.z., "Hoe passen typische menselijke werkzaamheden in het koninkrijk van Christus?") Het Gereformeerd-orthodoxe onderscheid heeft echter een "top-down" focus omdat het de wijze van de heerschappij van Christus adresseert. In plaats van te beginnen met de vraag, "In welke gebied passen de werkzaamheden van een christelijke loodgieter?"—deze vraag veronderstelt immers meteen twee verschillende gebieden van menselijke werkzaamheden—zouden zij die de reformatorische erfenis claimen, moeten beginnen met de zeventiende-eeuwse vraag, "Op welke wijze regeert Christus over de loodgieter die Hem als Verlosser belijdt?" Het is van belang dat wij beginnen met de juiste vragen te stellen als wij tot een goede oplossing willen komen van het huidige conflict over dit onderwerp.

Ten slotte, degenen die het Gereformeerde concept van de twee rijken bediscussiëren hebben de historische ontwikkeling van de leer in de Gereformeerde traditie ofwel gepolitiseerd ofwel afgevlakt. Deze tendens is begrijpelijk gezien de natuurlijke neiging om complexe historisch factoren en posities samen te voegen in meer hanteerbare categoriën. Het komt waarschijnlijk door de politieke en ecclesiologische contexten waarin de Lutherse twee-rijken-leer en de vroege-Gereformeerde leer van het

tweevoudige koninkrijk ontstonden dat hedendaagse uitleggers dit onderscheid vaak alleen maar bezien vanuit deze dimensie. Gerelateerd aan deze tendens wordt het onderscheid tussen de twee rijken te vaak gepresenteerd als een statische leer zonder enige verdere ontwikkeling. Terwijl hedendaagse uitleggers terecht beweren dat er veel overeenkomsten zijn tussen het reformatorische en de Gereformeerd-orthodoxie beeld van de heerschappij van Christus, verschilt de formulering van Turretini (om slechts een Gereformeerd-orthodoxe auteur te noemen) in vele opzichten van die van Calvijn. Deze verschillen waren nog niet nader onderzocht. Terwijl deze studie poogt deze ontwikkelingen gedetailleerd te beschrijven (met name in de context van de vroege-moderne Europese universiteiten) is meer studie nodig om de bijdragen van andere Gereformeerd-orthodoxe theologen te onderzoeken om het argument van dit proefschrift in het licht van een breder spectrum van bewijzen te plaatsen.

About the Author

Born on December 18, 1979, Jonathon was raised in Ontario, Canada within a family that would eventually include fifteen members. After completing an undergraduate degree (with a History honors major and double major in Religion) at Redeemer University College, Ancaster, Ontario (1999–2003), Jonathon married his loving wife, Allyson, on July 2, 2004. Six months later, Jonathon and Allyson moved to Escondido, California, where he completed his Master of Arts in Religion (Historical Theology). In 2006, Jonathan and Allyson traveled to Cambodia as missionary educators for one year. After working for a short period in Canada, from 2009–2011 Jonathon completed PhD coursework (12 courses) at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. Jonathon and Allyson moved back to Grand Rapids, MI in 2011, at which time he became Director of Admissions and Registrar at Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary, a position he holds currently. In 2014, Jonathon formally began the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) program (Christianity and the History of Ideas) at the University of Groningen. Jonathon is also ordained as a ruling elder and serves in this capacity at Redeemer Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Ada, Michigan. Jonathon and Allyson are blessed with four children: Kezia (10), Owen (7), Isla (5), and Kiri (3).