

Dr. Roger Green, Reformation to the Present,

Lecture 6, Calvin's Theology

© 2024 Roger Green and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Roger Green in his church history course, Reformation to the Present. This is session 6 on Calvin's Theology.

So, we'll journey on. Let's pray, and then we'll start.

Our gracious Lord, we stop again, beginning of another week, and we're grateful for it, and we're grateful in anticipation for being good teachers to one another, for learning from one another, and trying to understand this material and kind of applying it to our own hearts and lives and working through it in that way. We give thanks to people who are faithful to you, faithful to the Scriptures, faithful to your church, for the body of Christ here on earth; we're grateful for them.

People like John Calvin are the ones we are talking about now. And so we pray that you will be with us not only in these discussions in this class but in all of our classes today and throughout the week and all the events that take place at Gordon and that the body of Christ will be strengthened thereby, but also that we will be strengthened as individuals for our learning, for our fellowship one with another, for our community life, that you would aid and assist us in that kind of growth, that kind of maturity. So, with thanksgiving in our hearts for the beginning of this week, we give you thanks, and we pray these things in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

Okay, well, hope you had a good week, and we're just kind of where we should be here. This is lecture two, The Theology of John Calvin.

So, we did Calvin's life, and then we did his work. We talked about what was important in his work, and then we talked about his theology. So, just kind of a reminder, because we haven't been together for a few days, but just a reminder, we gave that pretty long introduction about his theology, and especially the important thing here is to take note about the institutes and why the institutes, how they took shape and form, but also what informed him and what, as he shaped the institutes and so forth.

So, we talked a bit about that. What we're trying to do is we're trying to deal with the theological issues by which he disagreed with the Roman Catholic Church. Remember, the Roman Catholic Church didn't throw him out like it did Luther.

He left of his own will the Roman Catholic Church and moved into the reform movement and so forth. But there were certain issues, certain things that he took issue with, and one would be their doctrine of humankind. We talked about that.

Second would be the doctrine of God, their understanding of God. We talked about that. The third would be the understanding of the church.

If you could just remind me, under the understanding of the church, I think the last thing we got to do was talk about the ministry of the church. We talked about vocation, didn't we? And we talked about the priesthood of all believers. We made a distinction between those two things.

Is that right? Everybody got that? And then we talked about how he held the minister, the one who was a minister by vocation. He held that role in high esteem and so forth. Basically, there were two offices: the office of pastor-teacher and the office of deacon.

Did we mention that? We mentioned that. And that's where we ended. That's where we ended.

So good. That leads us to, we're still under number four, the doctrine of the church, and that leads us to the sacraments. So, we're under the church, and he does have to deal with the nature of the sacraments when he's talking about the church.

So that'll finish that up, and then we'll get to predestination and the two kingdoms. Okay, so let's talk about the sacraments. The first thing is that Calvin denied the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church.

We're going to see when we get to the Council of Trent in the next lecture that the church had, by now, pretty much settled on seven sacraments. And Calvin denied that there were seven sacraments. Calvin said there are two sacraments.

There's the sacrament of baptism, and there's the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Those are the two sacraments. Now, why would he say there are only two sacraments? Based on what? Based on the Bible.

Based on Scripture, he did not find a warrant for the other five sacraments in the Bible. He found a warrant only for these two. So right away, he begins to, in a sense, argue with the church in terms of the number of sacraments.

Now, we should also take note, in terms of the sacraments, there was one person he did kind of disagree with when it came to the sacraments in the Reformed tradition, the Protestant tradition, and that was Zwingli. He's going to take a middle ground with the sacraments. He's basically going to take a middle ground between the

Roman Catholic notion of the sacraments, and especially the Lord's Supper, and Zwingli's notion of the sacraments, especially the Lord's Supper.

Zwingli was a Protestant, so he believed in baptism and the Lord's Supper. But on the Roman Catholic side, on the Zwinglian side, Zwingli saw the sacraments as symbolic. These are symbols.

We baptize as a symbol. We give the Lord's Supper as a symbol. But they were symbolic. In a sense, they were symbolic only.

Calvin didn't believe that. Calvin believed there was something more going on in baptism and the Lord's Supper than merely that baptism and the Lord's Supper symbolize something. There was something far more going on here.

So, he does argue with Zwingli. Also, of course, when it comes to the Roman Catholic Church, when it came to the Lord's Supper, he argued with the Roman Catholic Church because in the Lord's Supper, while Zwingli believed it was just symbolic, the Roman Catholic Church taught that the Eucharist was actually the body and blood of Christ. It was literally the body and blood of Christ.

When it was pronounced blessed, in a sense, by the priest, it became the body and blood of Christ. Now, Calvin couldn't believe that about the Eucharist. So, that is called transubstantiation.

We've talked about that before, but transubstantiation is when the substance actually changes into the body and blood of Christ. Now, the Roman Catholic Church taught that the accidents remain the same. And the accidents are external: it smells like bread, tastes like bread, looks like bread, smells like wine, tastes like wine, looks like wine.

Those are the accidents. That's the external appearance of the bread and the wine in Roman Catholic theology. That's the external appearance of the bread and the wine.

But its substance has changed, and its substance has become the body and blood of Christ. So, what Calvin does is take a middle ground, in a sense, because as far as he's concerned, there's another word we probably talked about or mentioned earlier, and it's the word scholasticism. As far as he was concerned, this Roman Catholic notion of transubstantiation comes out of a scholastic philosophical tradition.

He did not see transubstantiation as biblical. So, he feels this is kind of, again, another instance of mere philosophical reasoning of some biblical doctrine. So, Calvin regards baptism and communion but takes a middle ground, certainly, between Zwingli and the Roman Catholics.

Now, let me just mention each of them if I can. When it comes to baptism, for Calvin, baptism is being initiated into the new community. You are taken into the new community.

You are taken into the body of Christ here on earth. Baptism is not just a private experience for Calvin. It's an experience for the community because it's the community that surrounds you and covenants to rear you in Christ's likeness and so forth.

So, baptism was very important for Calvin, and it was this initiation rite. Now, when it comes to the Lord's Supper, he takes a bit of a middle ground between Zwingli and Luther when it comes to the Lord's Supper. Again, for the Lord's Supper, for Zwingli, it's only a memorial.

It's only symbolic, not for Calvin. For Calvin, something very important is going on here.

Christ is present at the Lord's Supper for Calvin. All right. Now, how does this differ from Luther? Luther taught that at the Lord's Supper, and some of you may not know all your traditions.

Some of you may be of Lutheran background. Perhaps you are. And if you have a Lutheran background, you do know this, or you should know this.

But Luther taught that when you take the Lord's Supper, Christ comes down from heaven and abides with you in that action of taking the Lord's Supper. So, he is present. He is fully present.

There's a real presence of Christ at the Lord's Supper for Luther. Okay. Calvin comes along and says, well, I disagree with Zwingli.

It's not just a memorial here. It's not just a memory thing. Something really is happening.

But on the other hand, I'm going to disagree with Luther on this one. The reason I'm going to disagree with Luther is because Christ is still, as far as Calvin is concerned, seated at the right hand of God the Father. So, you can't have Christ at the right hand of God the Father and also have him every time the Eucharist is celebrated, or the Lord's Supper is celebrated.

So, that's not the way it is, Calvin said. So, when it comes to the Lord's Supper, here's what Calvin believed. Calvin believed that the Lord's Supper takes you up into the presence of Christ.

Now, you can't reason this. You don't want to be a scholastic and say, I'm going to tell you exactly how this happens. But for Calvin, when you take the Lord's Supper, you are somehow in the presence of Christ because you've been taken up to that presence.

So, he took a bit of a middle ground among the Reformers. He took a bit of a middle ground between Zwingli; it's a memorial only, and Luther and Christ have come down. Calvin said, no, I'm going to stand in between here.

I'm going to say you've taken up to Christ, but we can't define that. But you believe it by faith. So, the two sacraments were really important for Calvin, no doubt.

And so, he disagrees with the Roman Catholic Church in terms of number, disagrees with the Roman Catholic Church in terms of the whole business of transubstantiation, and reshapes, in a sense, what baptism is and what the Lord's Supper is. Okay, so that's his understanding of the church, all those kinds of issues about the church, about church life. Are there any questions about that, about his thinking about the church and the life of the church, the offices of the church, the sacraments of the church, or that kind of stuff? Any questions? Yeah.

Yes. For Calvin, baptism is an initiation into a new community. You're being taken into a new community.

And that's the body of Christ here on earth. But it's not a private experience for this child because he believed in infant baptism as Luther did. It's not a private experience, but it's an experience for the community.

So, the whole community bears witness and promises to raise this child in faith and so forth. But it is kind of an initiation. Does that help in terms of... Yeah.

Now, so if you come from a Presbyterian background, if you come from a Calvinistic background, maybe you were baptized as an infant. Maybe at the end of the course, we can find out where you all come from in terms of your background, if you were baptized, and so forth. Any other questions about the church? Okay.

Well, somewhere along life's way, you've got to talk about predestination. It's with John Calvin, so we'll do it here. So, predestination, how are we going to talk about the doctrine of predestination for Calvin? There's a lot that we need to say about it before we go to the doctrine of the two kingdoms.

Okay. So, before we do, I'm going to divide the class in half. You just sit where you are.

And I've got to make a judgment here. I don't know. I think I'm going to make this judgment because there are two fine women on this side.

So, let's divide the class in half. And then I just want to explain this. And then I'll go on to explain his doctrine of predestination.

This class is divided in half. Okay. On this side, you folks have been predestined by God since before time began, before creation, to be saved and redeemed.

You folks, on the other hand, have been predestined by God before creation, to be damned, because Calvin believed in double election, as we'll see. So what should your attitude be toward these people who are saved and in the church? What should your attitude be? Your attitude should be, I'm glad that God's grace has worked in their life in this beautiful way. You should be rejoicing here.

Now, are you likely rejoicing? No, you're not likely to be rejoicing in this crowd. And also, the fact that you're not likely to be rejoicing shows that God was right in damning you all the time. So, he was right in his election because you're such grouches.

Now, what should your attitude be toward this group? Your attitude should be what? There but for the grace of God go I. If it weren't for God's grace, I'd be here. But by God's grace, you've been elected. And your attitude also is, as you look at these folks who are elected to damnation, you also realize that everybody should be sent to hell.

The fact that God has redeemed some people is a miracle. So now, let's put you all together again, and let's not divide the class here. But that's a double election.

So, how are we going to tackle this? I'm going to tackle it by, first of all, making three introductory remarks that are important to take note of. And then, we'll try to get to some absolute characteristics of his doctrine of predestination. So, three introductory remarks.

Number one, this is not Calvin's most important doctrine. You should not judge John Calvin by his doctrine of predestination because you're likely not to agree with it. Maybe some of you do.

I don't know. But you're likely not to agree with it. But you shouldn't judge Calvin by this doctrine.

This doctrine is really buried way into the Institute. You're going to read hundreds of pages before you come to his doctrine of election. So, you need to remember that.

That's important. Don't judge Calvin by this doctrine alone. There are other wonderful doctrines and so forth.

So that's the first thing. Okay. The second thing you want to take note of is that this is called double election because St. Augustine believed in predestination.

Martin Luther believed in predestination. However, they believed in predestination, the election of those who were going to be saved. So it was kind of a single predestination.

The left were left to their own devices in a sense. They didn't have this sharp idea of the double election that Calvin had. So Calvin comes along, and he believes in Augustine.

He believes in Luther. But he said we've got to sharpen this up. We've got to define this more clearly, more biblically.

So, he believes in the double election, not just the election of Augustine or Luther. So, we need to take note of that. Okay.

And the third thing we need to take note of is that in this doctrine, Calvin really believes he is protecting the honor of God and the freedom of God. He is defending, if you want to use that word, he's defending the honor of God, and he's defending the freedom of God when he talks about predestination. Okay.

Having said those three remarks, let's just say some things about predestination here. First of all, Calvin is a perfect example of someone who was elected before the world began. He's got a perfect example.

And who is that perfect example? Jesus Christ. Christ is the perfect example of election. So, we've got someone before our very eyes.

He said that Christ is the mirror of the election. So, if you're going to believe in predestination, you don't have to look very far. You just look at Christ because he's the mirror of the election.

And so that's where it all began. So, another thing we want to take note of about the doctrine, and that is how election relates to faith. That becomes very important for John Calvin. How does election relate to faith? Well, first of all, a person is elected, and then God gives them the gift of faith to embrace that election.

So, how does election relate to faith? Election comes first, and faith then follows as a gift from God. So, for Calvin, it's not like everybody had faith that they could maybe believe in God and what God was doing. No.

The only person who has faith is the person who's elected and can embrace the election that God has granted to them. So, election is a gift, and faith is also a gift. So those two things are very kind of, they kind of go together for Calvin.

Okay, another thing we should just take note of is the doctrine itself. What's the relationship of election and good works? Well, for Calvin, election has nothing to do with good works. Anyone who's elected, and I won't point to this side of the class anymore because we're putting you all together as the good saints of God, but anyone who's elected, they're not elected by their good works.

God elects them according to his own sovereign will. He doesn't elect them because they're doing good work, because they're nice people or something like that. Now, once they are elected, God bless you, and good works will follow that election.

They will want to do good works because they are the children of God, but they don't do good works in order to find God. Now, this is a place where Calvin really pretty heavily attacked the whole system of penance in the Roman Catholic Church because he felt that that whole system of penance was a good works kind of a thing where people were doing good works in order to find God or stay in the good graces of God or something like that. Calvin doesn't like that.

He doesn't think he's happy with that. So, elections and good works go together, but they go together as a result. Good works follow your election.

Another thing for Calvin in terms of the doctrine, and that is, can you be sure that you are a child of God? Can you be sure you're one of the elect? He'll put it in his language. And the answer to that is, yes, you can. You can be sure, and then the answer was by the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

Any believer can have assurance by the testimony of the Holy Spirit. So the doctrine of election, in a sense for Calvin, was to give people a doctrine of assurance, or not a doctrine of assurance, but to give people a feeling of assurance that they were indeed the children of God. That's part of the reason for the doctrine.

Now, let's go back to what we said earlier. What was one of the kind of battle cries of the Reformation? Justification by faith. But the other one was what? It was assurance.

The reformers were convinced that those medieval Roman Catholics, of which they had been part of that, they were convinced that those people didn't have assurance that they were the children of God. Calvin wants to give people assurance. He wants them to know that they are the elect of God.

So, this testimony of the Holy Spirit becomes very, very important. Okay, we've already said this, but those people who are damned in this whole doctrine, the people who are damned, why are they damned? They're damned because of their sins. They're damned because they're in rebellion against God.

Because all humanity is in rebellion against God, so the fact is that all humanity should be damned by God. The fact that he's going to elect anybody to salvation is fantastic.

That's to his glory that he's going to do that. But Calvin, in this whole doctrine of election, he gets in the whole story about sin and our rebellion against God and our kind of deserving the punishment of God and so forth. We all deserve it, but by God's grace, some people are elected to salvation, so they don't have it.

Okay, that's another thing we should take note of. All this predestination is to the glory of God. Now, remember that we said that he was influenced by the nominalists earlier, but we remember nominalism and philosophy, and he's influenced by the nominalists in some way.

But with the doctrine of election, he breaks with nominalism. What's the one place where he disagreed with the nominalists? Do you remember the kind of theological nominalists and the place that he breaks with them? And it's going to be here. It's going to show up here in the doctrine of election.

Okay, just to repeat then, the one place where he breaks company with them is the nominalists taught that God's will is God's will no matter what. God's will is God's will, and it's right no matter what you think about it. It's God's will.

And see, Calvin disagreed with that. He doesn't see that in the Bible. He says God's will is right, but the reason we know it's right is because it comes forth in justice.

It comes forth in mercy. It comes forth in love. So God's will is demonstrated in these ways for Calvin.

So, he's not going to say, like the nominalist said, that God's will is God's will. It's right, no matter what. You just have to believe it, and no, he's not going to say that.

He's going to say that predestination and election are right because they demonstrate the justice of God. It demonstrates the love of God. It demonstrates the mercy of God in a sense.

So here's where he breaks with the nominalists. He tries to be more biblical about it. So, for Calvin, God is not arbitrary.

See, the nominalists had an arbitrary God. God does what he pleases to do, period. Don't ask any questions.

Kind of an arbitrary God. For Calvin, God is not arbitrary. This is not something arbitrary that he is doing.

We should try to understand as much as we can about God's will here in terms of election and predestination, and we won't understand it all. But on the other hand, we don't resign ourselves to kind of an arbitrariness about God's working. No, there is something going on here that we should try to understand, but we can't understand it all.

There's no doubt about that. You can't understand all the will of God when it comes to election. If you try to understand it all, Calvin called that idle speculation.

You get to a point of idle speculation, you won't be able to understand it all. Now, just a couple more things here. Now, what's the relationship between election and foreknowledge? Because God foreknows all things, doesn't he? What's the relationship between election and foreknowledge? Well, Calvin thought it was important to talk about this.

For Calvin, election comes first. Election comes first. He elects those who are going to be saved.

He elects those who are going to be lost. And because he's done that, he foreknows who's going to be saved and who's going to be lost. You see, some people are trying to deal with this doctrine as though God foreknows who's going to be saved and who's going to be lost because he sees everything in the present by their faith, and therefore, he elects.

So, some people are saying foreknowledge comes first, and because he foreknows, he elects. Calvin said, no, that is backward. The right way to understand this is that election comes first, and because he's elected now, he foreknows because he's already done the election before the creation of the world.

Now, one final thing. You should know that not everybody was happy with Calvin's doctrine of the election. There were even people who believed other things that Calvin taught, but they weren't particularly happy about the doctrine of election.

The question is, why weren't they happy? What were their problems with the doctrine of election? All right, there were three. So there were three major kinds of arguments against this doctrine, even in Calvin's day. Okay, the first one is represented by one of Calvin's followers, Theodore Beza.

Let me go to the document camera here. The first one was that this was Beza's second generation after Calvin, so kind of a third-generation reformer. This is Beza's doctrine of election.

Notice the bottom. It says Theodore Beza's diagram represents the logical sequence of human redemption, showing the divine decrees of election, all in Latin, of course. Now, here it is.

Now, just looking at that, does that look like a simple pastoral, biblical kind of understanding of election that the man in the pew would understand? I don't think so. I don't think so. I think it would take you forever to decipher this thing.

But that's where Calvin's doctrine of predestination went. Ironically, Calvin was trying to stay away from scholasticism, and scholasticism is that kind of medieval world trying to understand everything, you know, how many angels dance on the head of a pin kind of stuff. While he was trying to stay away from scholasticism, his followers explained the doctrine in very, very detailed ways.

And this does not help the man in the pew. This is not a pastoral thing to help the person in the pew; it is all written in Latin and so forth. So that's the first thing.

It seems as though the very thing Calvin wanted to stay away from was scholasticism, and the very thing that his people who tried to defend the doctrine of predestination got into was scholasticism. So, Bayes' attempt to explain the doctrine does seem as though it gets a lot more detailed than the Bible allows us to, you know. So this is the perfect example of this.

That's the number one kind of criticism. Okay, the number two criticism of Calvin in his day about the doctrine is while he thought the doctrine was providing a lot of assurance to people, it really caused the opposite. It caused a lot of anxiety in people because people were always saying people are elected to be saved. People are elected to be damned.

Maybe I'm one of the damned. Maybe I'm not one of the saved. Only God ultimately knows anyway.

But now that's not going to be very assuring if that's the way you feel. Okay, now we have a good historical example of that, and that is Martin Luther. When Martin Luther did believe in the doctrine of predestination, when Martin Luther started thinking about the doctrine of predestination relating to himself, it didn't give him any assurance at all.

He really thought he was one of the damned. So here's Luther himself, who taught the doctrine, not as Calvin did because he didn't teach double election, but here's

Luther himself, who taught the doctrine, and yet he feels he is elected to be damned. No assurance there for Luther.

Now, Luther had to find God in other ways, but there was no assurance there for Luther. So that's the second thing, assurance. Calvin believed it would help assure people, but it caused a lot of people a lot of grief, you know.

Okay, and the third thing. The third criticism that started in Calvin's day even was his kind: what kind of an understanding of God do you have if you promote a double election? Is this the God of the Bible? People began to ask that question. Is the God of the Bible a God who would do this, elect people to salvation, elect people to damnation, not allow for their own freedom to respond, and so forth? So, it did begin to call into question the nature of God that Calvin was portraying.

So those were three kinds of responses that came to Calvin, and we're going to see those responses play out in the next century, in the 16th century, 17th century, and 18th century. We're going to see how they kind of played out. Okay, so that's the doctrine of predestination.

Somewhere, when you talk about Calvin, you've got to talk about the election. This is the natural place to do it because he's kind of responding to a Roman Catholic notion that didn't teach election, the Roman Catholic notion of doing the best that you can that's within you, and God is going to redeem you, and so forth. So, any questions about that? Let me just get off of this and go back to the laptop, which I'll need.

But any questions about that, about where we are so far? We've got one more thing with Calvin to do. Okay, one final thing. It's Calvin's doctrine of the two kingdoms.

Okay, the doctrine of the two kingdoms. And what are we doing here? Okay, so what are the two kingdoms? There's the kingdom of God, and there's the civil order in which we live. So you've got the kingdom of God that Jesus said, you know, in the gospel of Mark at the beginning of his ministry, the kingdom of God is at hand.

Repent and believe in the gospel. So, you've got the kingdom of God. And then, on the other hand, you've got the civil government under which you live.

Now, every Christian lives in both of those kingdoms. Every Christian lives in the kingdom of God on the one hand but also lives in the everyday kingdom, the kingdom of humankind, on the other hand. So they are, as far as Calvin was concerned, these are two distinct kingdoms.

You should not confuse these two kingdoms, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of humanity. God is the author of both kingdoms, but you shouldn't confuse them. All right, and there were a group of people who did confuse them.

They were known as the Anabaptists. The Anabaptists brought those two kingdoms together, and the kingdom of God was this, became, for the Anabaptists, the civil government. And Calvin says you must not confuse these two kingdoms.

We need to talk about the kingdom of God. We need to talk about the kingdom of humankind. Both kingdoms are ordained by God, but if you confuse those kingdoms, you're going to be in trouble.

So, Calvin has to distinguish between those two kingdoms. Now, what Calvin doesn't want when it comes to the kingdom of humankind, when you're living in this everyday world, living under the civil government, and he lived under the civil government, what he doesn't want is extreme subservience to the civil government. On the one hand, you shouldn't be so subservient to the civil government that you don't call them out for their injustices.

But on the other hand, he doesn't want anarchy. He doesn't want everybody just doing their own thing, either. So, what was he trying to do? I'm trying to take kind of a middle ground.

Okay, now, the kingdom of God, I think that's pretty easy to understand. The kingdom of God, life in Christ, the body of Christ, the church, and your life in the church. I don't think we need to talk a lot about Calvin there in terms of what he's kind of trying to get at there.

But the kingdom of humankind, let's talk about that then. Basically, as far as he is concerned, we're going to talk about the civil government. We're going to talk about civil life.

We're going to talk about the life in this world in which we live. Like I said, I don't think we need to talk too much about life in the kingdom of God. God bless you in the church and so forth.

But I think it's pretty important to talk about the life in the world in which we live when it comes to Calvin. Okay, first of all, as far as he's concerned, the civil government has two primary functions. Now remember, he's living in a different day from our day, from our world.

However, the civil government has two primary functions. It's a civic function of maintaining public order. So that's the job of the civil government.

That hasn't changed. That's true of, you know, in Western culture, the president of the United States is supposed to maintain public order. And that's what the civil government is called to do.

Okay? Who burned Servetus at the stake? Was it Calvin or was it the civil government? It was the civil government. And they did it for what reason? To maintain public order. Because heresy was a disintegration of public order.

So that's important to remember. Okay, so that's one thing. Okay, now the second function of government, as far as Calvin was concerned, the second function of government was a religious function.

The government has a religious function as well. That's part of the reason why Calvin was brought back to Geneva: to help the government sort out its religious function. But in its religious function, the government is supposed to protect the church and make sure that the church is not violated by blasphemy or sacrilegious, sacrilegious, or stuff like that.

It's supposed to maintain the church. That even went so far, as far as Calvin is concerned, is to establish the public structure of the church. Okay, and how do you establish the public structure of the church? You do that by collecting taxes, building buildings, and hiring ministers.

So, and, you know, many countries in Europe, there are countries in Europe that still collect taxes to support the public churches, to build churches, to hire ministers, and so forth. So that public function is very important. We don't do that in America because we have a separation of church and state for many reasons.

But we have a separation of church and state, so we don't build churches and hire ministers and pay ministers in America. But in that world, Calvin felt that that's what was important and that has carried over even into the modern world. There are still countries in Europe that collect taxes to build churches and to pay ministers.

Now, we wouldn't think of that in our culture, but that's still true in Western Europe in some places. Okay, so as far as he's concerned, those were the two functions. Okay, you need a five-second break on a Monday.

Bless your hearts, Monday morning. We can do this, though. Does any of you have an 8 o'clock class on Monday morning? You do, Ruth, bless your... See, isn't that good? You've got an 8 o'clock class, a 9, 10 class.

By the time you go to chapel, you've had two classes. You're rejoicing in this. But yeah, we love... Does anybody else have an 8 o'clock class? Anybody? No? You guys, no 8 o'clock classes? Okay.

You're here first class? Okay, all right. Give five seconds to stretch, and rest and stretch. Are we taping our rest periods, Ted, or are we able to work those out? We're okay to work those out.

Thank you. I appreciate that. It is hard to explain that I give people, students, time to rest.

Okay, so are you doing okay? All right. Now, just another thing about the kingdom of humankind. There were lots of what he called civic authorities.

There were magistrates, princes, judges, officers of the law, and so forth. But there were a lot of civic authorities in Calvin's day. Now, these were not elected authorities, of course.

This is not a democracy he's living in, not like we're familiar with a democracy. So, you're not electing princes. They're princes by virtue of the fact they're born into families.

And these other positions are, you know, given to people like the magistrates and everything. But here's something I think we can learn. He felt Calvin felt that you should; he felt these people had a very high status.

And Calvin felt that you should really honor these people. You should honor the civic authorities. And when, as much as possible, you should recognize that these people are working by the providence of God.

These people are there because of God's providence. God has placed them there. And he's placed them there to do the kinds of things we've talked about, maintain public order and carry out religious functions and responsibilities.

And if by chance, if by chance you find yourself under a civic authority which is, God, bless you, who doesn't do what he is supposed to do, then Calvin says you have to obey, and you have to suffer. So if you're under a civic authority that is pretty mean, maybe or something like that, then you still have to obey that authority, and you still have to suffer under that authority. There are lessons to be learned.

Now Calvin has a strange way of ending the Institutes because at the end of the Institutes he says, Avengers will come along and take care of that person. But I don't know what he means by that. So, okay.

So, but the place he gives to politicians, if you want to use that term, he gives them a very high status because they're there by God's providence. Now, I get a little concerned about the place we give to politicians because don't we often tend to kind of belittle politicians and people in public service? Don't we tend to? Are there any

political studies majors here, by any chance? Well, don't we tend to belittle them and make fun of them and demean them, those people in public service? Well, Calvin would have nothing to do with that. Calvin felt that they were there by God's providence, and so you have to you should hold them in very high esteem.

But in our day, in our age, I think it's a little different. Anyway, I think maybe we can learn a little from Calvin. Okay, here are just a couple more things about this.

Calvin did allow for just wars. He did allow for just wars. He's a good Augustinian here.

He believes like Augustine and believes like Luther. He allows the government to be violent. He allows for just wars if it means that's what it took to maintain public order.

So, Calvin was not a pacifist. There were some other people in that day who were pacifists, but Calvin was not a pacifist. Okay, and then just one final thing that we'll mention about our relationship to the civic government, civil government.

If there was a choice that had to be made between the civil government and God's law, and the early Christians had to make that choice, if there was that kind of a choice that had to be made, you always follow the law of God. So, if by chance there's a choice, you always follow the law of God, and then you have to be willing to suffer for following the law of God. But that's no choice to be made.

If they're forcing a choice on you, there's no choice. You always follow the law of God. That always takes precedence over civil law if you feel in conscience that you can't follow the civil law.

So, the two kingdoms live in both kingdoms by God's grace. We live in the kingdom of heaven. The church is bearing witness to that for Calvin, but we also live in this everyday world, and we have to act as good citizens in this everyday world and recognize that all these things are done by God's providence.

Okay, so that's the doctrine of the two kingdoms. Let's see if we can talk about John Calvin for a few minutes here and then we'll get on to the next lecture. Any of this Calvin's life, Calvin's work, Calvin's theology, anything about all this stuff that we've talked about with John Calvin? He's trying to answer the medieval Roman Catholic church.

He's trying to be faithful to the Reformation as it was begun by people like Luther. He's often trying to take a middle ground in arguments that come during the Reformation. But is there anything that's a mystery to you still with Calvin? You believe all this? You believe what Calvin taught? So, are these doctrines the main

ones? For this course, if we had a whole course on Calvin, we'd be able to obviously go deeper into these.

But for this course, I try to choose the ones that really speak to his time. And so I think these are his major doctrines, but they're also speaking to his time, answering the Roman Catholic church, and so forth. So that's why I've chosen these in particular.

It doesn't exhaust all of his doctrines, but it gives you the highlights of his major doctrines. And the textbook that you're using does that, too. Anything here about... He takes a long time to discuss each one of these in the institutes.

But anything other stuff, Calvin? No? We'll talk about him more on Friday for sure at breakfast. John Calvin. Okay.

Well, if anything comes to mind, let us know. We're going to come to lecture number three. At least we'll be able to get it started.

Lecture three. And this lecture is the response of the Roman Catholic church to the Reformation. The response of the Roman Catholic church to the Reformation.

I need to change PowerPoint. This response of the Roman Catholic church to the Reformation is all often called the Counter-Reformation or the Catholic Reformation. So those two things are synonymous.

It's called the Counter-Reformation or the Catholic Reformation. Okay? Now, if you just look at your outline quickly here, what I'm going to do with this is three things. I'm going to just mention the Inquisition.

I'm going to mention the Jesuits of the Society of Jesus. And thirdly, I'm going to mention the Council of Trent as a way to see how the Roman Catholic church responded to the Reformation. Okay.

So why did I choose these three things? And how am I going to manage these three things? What I'm doing with these three things is moving from the more visceral response to the Reformation by Roman Catholicism, the Inquisition, to a little more measured response with the founding of the Society of Jesus, to a much more very measured response, the Council of Trent, which took 18 years. So, does that make sense? We're moving from a visceral, kill the Protestants kind of thing to a more manageable, the Society of Jesus, to a much more settling down for 18 years to figure out how we're going to respond to the Reformation. So that's the way we're going.

So, what we'll do, we'll take the Inquisition first. Okay, the Inquisition. Let's first give a definition of the Inquisition.

The Inquisition is a tribunal established by the Pope to deal with heresy. So that's the definition of the Inquisition. A tribunal was established by the Pope to deal with heresy.

That's how we'll describe the Inquisition. Okay, now, it was Gregory IX, and these are the times that he ruled, or it was Pope 1227 to 1241. It was Gregory IX who set up what he called the Commission of the Inquisition.

Okay, now, if you look at those dates, that's when he was Pope. If you just look at those dates for a minute, you say, wait a minute, this is a couple hundred years before the Reformation. What is going on here with the Commission of the Inquisition before the Reformation takes place? Well, actually, there was a pre-reformation going on.

The Reformation didn't begin with Martin Luther. It didn't begin with Calvin. There was a pre-Reformation going on, and there were lots of things happening in the Roman Catholic Church that the Pope was very, very unhappy with because he felt that it challenged the Roman Catholic Church.

So, Gregory IX decided that I was going to set up a Commission of the Inquisition and establish them to deal with heresy. So already you've got heresy around, or I should say, already you've got what he considered to be heretical around. So the Commission predates the time we're talking about, predates the Reformation.

Okay. All right. Now, let me just give you their method, the method that these people used when they went in to try to figure out if there were heretics in town.

The method of the Inquisition of the Commission was this. It had three parts to it, or three aspects to it. So, the Commission of the Inquisition would come to your town.

Okay. The first thing that they would do would be to call all of the townspeople together. There would be a kind of a solemn assembly calling everybody together.

All right. And in that solemn assembly, they would, in a sense, say, we know that there are heretics in this town. So, we are going to give you time to confess that you are a heretic.

And if you confess that right now, right here, right now, your punishment will be light. So that took a couple of weeks, two, three, four weeks. But that's the first step of the Commission of the Inquisition to begin.

And what it did, of course, it began to put fear in the hearts of everybody in town, you know. So, okay. Okay.

Then, step number two. Step number two was to, at the end of that period, do a systematic search throughout the town and try to deal with people that you consider to be heretics. All right.

And this happened a little after. We can't quite blame Gregory IX for this because it didn't happen until 1252. But in 1252, torture was now allowed.

So, as you go through town and you're trying to figure out who these heretics are, torture was allowed by the Roman Catholic Church. You could actually torture people into making a confession that they are heretics. So that is kind of the second step.

And then all you need is two witnesses that this person is a heretic, and that's enough to convict that person. So that's step number two, really find out who the heretics are in town. So, okay.

So that's step number two. Okay. Now, step number three is handing over the heretics to the state.

Is the church going to burn the heretics at the stake? No, that's not the job of the church. It is the job of the state to burn the heretics at the stake because the state's job is to protect, you know, public life, and heretics are a threat to public life. So you turn the heretics over to the state officials, and the state officials would do one of two things.

Either they would burn them at the stake, we saw Servetus being burned at the stake in Geneva a couple hundred years later, or they would be declared to be heretics but be given other kinds of punishments, like beatings and so forth, public beatings. So there's two things, there's two ways to do this. But that became the method of the Inquisition.

Okay, so that became very, very important. All right, now let me just mention that I probably won't have time for Clement VII to come along, and those are the dates when Clement VII was the Pope. Just let me mention Clement VII, and then I'm going to make some announcements, but Clement VII comes along.

Notice his dates compared to Gregory IX. We're talking a couple hundred years later, almost 300 years later. What happened was that Clement VII came along, and the Inquisition languished.

The Inquisition had died down in those 300 years. But notice that when Clement VII comes along, he comes along during the time of the Reformation. So, Clement VII then renews the Inquisition.

He brings the Inquisition kind of back to life again. And we're going to have to talk about that on Wednesday. Thank you.

This is Dr. Roger Green in his church history course, Reformation to the Present. This is session 6 on Calvin's Theology.