

## ABRAHAM KUYPER AND THE THEONOMY DEBATE

MARK VANDER HART

When Abraham Kuyper, F.L. Rutgers, and others led the Doleantie movement out of the Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk in 1886, Kuyper was then serving as an elder in the Amsterdam church consistory and not as a regular minister. Since 1874 Kuyper had served as a member of the Dutch Parliament. He also was deeply involved in the development of the recently established Free University in Amsterdam. Any student of Kuyper's career and life's work knows that the man was very vigorous in the work of God's kingdom in the many dimensions of societal life. Kuyper was driven by the biblical conviction that Christ was King not only in the church; He was also the King of the whole world and of all life within that world.

The Doleantie came about because of the recognition that faith and unbelief could no longer exist in any sort of church union, especially when the church boards began to act in a hierarchical manner. The departure of thousands from the State Church of the Netherlands permitted those Reformed believers the freedom to pursue God's will for the church. A pluralistic church was smothering the truth, or at least it was tolerating unbelief.

Kuyper was concerned that God's will be implemented and obeyed in all societal life. Such a program of work and obedience occurred in a European country that had been influenced deeply by the liberalism and modernism of the nineteenth century, a liberalism and modernism that were firmly rooted in the Enlightenment. The Doleantie must be seen in the context of reformational efforts that embraced a wide front of societal life.

In the 1970's American society has seen the emergence of what has been variously called the "new religious Right." This movement is concerned with pressing the law of God in the political, social,

and educational life of North America. Such a movement is by no means monolithic. Each of the various leaders identified with this resurgence gives his own nuance as to the task for Christianity in the current cultural context. But a unifying theme among this growing Christian movement is a concern to have the state and the schools, for example, be obedient to God's will, as that will is revealed in the Scriptures.

Such a program underlies the approach of the so-called theologians or Christian reconstructionists. Reformed leaders among the theologians include Greg Bahnsen, Gary North, and Rousas J. Rushdoony. Another theologian group is the Chalcedon Foundation. This group represents a current revival among some (largely Presbyterian) evangelical Reformed circles of post-millennialism. Theologians are often aggressive in the presentation of their viewpoint. Theonomy brooks no compromise as it declares that Christ is the Victor over sin and death right now, and that the Christian community must enter every area of life to work out God's will in each area. But *how* the Christian community is to proceed and *what* the standard is for action are where differences of opinion arise. Hence arises the debate. In this article we will first set forth the outline of the debate and then conclude with some observations of where Kuyper's own position would be.

Greg Bahnsen sets forth his position on how to bring Christian principles to bear in political life in his study entitled *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* and in *By This Standard*. Bahnsen's concern is much broader than an address to the State. He views God's law as addressing all of life. We will, however, limit ourselves largely to his views concerning the State and its responsibility towards God's law.

### General Contours of Theonomy

Bahnsen observes in the beginning of *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* that the modern state is secular precisely because it has thought itself to be free from God's law. The modern political state "has turned away from Scripture's moral law as the standard of political and legal obligation within society."<sup>1</sup> This is the spirit of revolution, which may or may not lead to actual violent revolution (e.g. France in 1789, Russia in 1917). The problem which lies at the heart of the modern state's secularism is that "the state is viewed as the sole originator of law" and "that its legislation aims to create a perfect social order by rehabilitation of criminals, pervasive welfare and revenue sharing, guardianship of the world and foreign

aid, all of which are done irrespective of justice and questions of moral obligation in order to realize the 'higher' principle of love."<sup>2</sup> Because of such a movement in recent history there has come a great concern over the moral decline of Western society. The problem the Christian faces then in society is autonomy. "The follower of Christ today confronts a political tradition which has divorced itself from God's sovereign authority over it, a long developing attitude of autonomy in social affairs, and now specific acts by his government that violate the revealed law of God."<sup>3</sup>

It should be observed at this point that it was expressly with the antichristian spirit of revolution that Kuyper was very much concerned. The very first truly organized political party of the Netherlands was the Anti-Revolutionary Party. Kuyper built on the pioneering efforts of G. Groen van Prinsterer who laid the groundwork for such political development in the 1870's. Groen's lectures on "Unbelief and Revolution" were seminal for the organized political efforts of confessional Calvinists in the Netherlands. Both Groen and Kuyper were convinced that the spirit of the French Revolution was at its religious heart antichristian, and that such a spirit could only be successfully counteracted by the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ revealed in the Bible. If the Word of God did not lie at the center of the Christian political movement, such a movement was bound to fail.

Such an analysis is echoed today by the theologians. A large part of the problem lies in the Christian community's failure to apply God's law to social and political matters. Morality has been reduced to only personal affairs. Bahnsen observes,

The business of "Christian ethics" has justly fallen into disrepute in the course of the past hundred years or so. The absence of a theologically viable, philosophically vigorous, and socially adequate ethic in the Christian church today is the embarrassing result of a disengagement from scriptural theology and assimilation with humanism that took root in the last century. Even early twentieth century liberalism, with its singular interest in Christian morality, ran its status-quo ethic head-long into the brink of arbitrariness by rejecting the authority of Scripture.<sup>4</sup>

The answer to autonomy is theonomy. Roman Catholicism, Fundamentalism, Lutheranism, and even much of Calvinism have not given adequate answers to the social problems of this age. They have taken away the specific applications of theonomy, God's law.

Bahnsen gives theonomy this definition. "By 'theonomy' I will mean that verbalized law of God which is imposed from outside man and revealed authoritatively in the words of Scripture."<sup>5</sup>

Bahnsen places his understanding of Scripture squarely in the Calvinist tradition by claiming that he presupposes the definitions and creedal explanations of the Westminster Standards.<sup>6</sup> Bahnsen assumes the full authority, saving perspicuity, canonical unity, and inerrancy of the Bible. He refuses to reduce the Biblical message to moralism or politics.<sup>7</sup>

In the book *Theonomy In Christian Ethics* Bahnsen attempts to show from the Bible that "the Christian is obligated to keep the whole law of God as a pattern of sanctification and that this law is to be enforced by the civil magistrate where and how the stipulations of God so designate."<sup>8</sup> This law is not just broad generalities; it is specific and all-inclusive as Bahnsen makes explicit: "Theonomy is crucial to Christian ethics, and all the details of God's law are intrinsic to theonomy. Here is the heart of the present thesis."<sup>9</sup> Bahnsen is saying that the Bible is giving us a set of rules and laws that Christians are bound to implement in our day and age because they are God's law. Where the New Testament has not abrogated laws given in the Old Testament, the valid presumption is that those Old Testament laws are still in force.

This viewpoint is closely tied to the eschatological hope of many (but not all) theonomists. Meredith G. Kline, who has entered into debate with the theonomists of the Chalcedon group, says that one millennial prospect "to which Chalcedon looks is that of a material prosperity and a world-wide eminence and dominance of Christ's established kingdom on earth, with a divinely enforced submission of the nations of the world to the government of the Christocracy."<sup>11</sup> Bahnsen points out that he wishes to promote Christocracy and not merely a theocracy. Theocracy refers to the sovereign, providential rule of God over creation throughout history. Christocracy, on the other hand, is "the moral (i.e. *Messianic*, in distinction from sovereign or providential) rule of Jesus Christ."<sup>12</sup> This is to happen because the prophets expected a time when the nations would submit to the law of Israel.<sup>13</sup> This is to happen now that Christ has come and has shown Himself to be the King of kings and Lord of lords.

Bahnsen's hermeneutical method is an important element in the theonomy debate. He states his position in a critique of M.G. Kline. Bahnsen points out that he knows of three types of

analogies: explanatory, argumentative, and hypothesis-suggestive. Scripture uses the first two but not the third. An example of the third kind of analogy would be the use of extra-Biblical information (e.g. knowledge concerning Hittite suzerainty treaties) to deduce doctrinal truth. Scripture never speculates but gives us authoritative revelation. Says Bahnsen:

Although the knowledge of historical parallels...may be an interesting literary supplement or apologetic tool which accompanies the direct work of exegesis, the hermeneutical principle which must be *authoritative* for us (even with respect to canons and covenants) is that set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter I, section 9—Scripture is its *own* infallible rule of interpretation.<sup>14</sup>

His logic is simple: "All the various covenants pertain to the *one* sovereignly administered promise...and we are instructed to live by *every* word from God's mouth...which means all of Scripture...therefore, there is ample reason to see *one* central canon for God's people, contrary to Kline's scheme."<sup>15</sup>

### The Theonomic View of the Law

The thesis of many theonomists is that "the Mosaic law, more or less in its entirety, constitutes a continuing norm for mankind and that it is the duty of the civil magistrate to enforce it, precepts and penalties alike."<sup>16</sup>

This is a position quite the opposite of Dispensationalists and most Fundamentalists, who understand the Mosaic legislation as no longer binding in the church age but that it may be again in the millennium kingdom. Many American evangelicals would in practice agree with such an understanding, even if they might demur from the dispensational eschatology.

Some of the genius of Reformed Christianity has always been its recognition of the great comprehensiveness of the law in the Old Testament. A distinction has been frequently drawn between the moral, the civil, the ceremonial laws. Such a distinction is theologically useful, although the Scripture itself does not make such clear demarcations explicit. Traditionally, Reformed theologians have said that the civil and ceremonial laws are no longer binding; only the moral law (e.g. the Ten Commandments) is still binding.

For the theonomists, if God gave the law, it is still binding. Kline

observes, "The main exception Bahnsen acknowledges is the 'ceremonial' law by which he means the laws of priestly ritual expressive of the restorative-redemptive principle. And even here he comments that the obligation entailed in the laws was honored in their fulfillment in the priestly accomplishments of Christ."<sup>17</sup> Bahnsen wants God's law to have its full impact in human life. He says, "The law of God has social, interpersonal, and political directions as well as dictates for the individual heart. The Christian is remiss if he, retreating into a quietistic, pietistic ecclesiology which will not give God's directives to the world, refuses to heed the whole law of God with its extra-personal, extra-ecclesiastical content."<sup>18</sup>

Bahnsen builds his case upon extensive attention to Matt 5:17-19 where Jesus declares that He came not to destroy or abrogate but to fulfill (*pleroo*) the law. Jesus says that every jot and tittle of the Old Testament law will remain in force as long as heaven and earth last. Thus Jesus affirms "the abiding validity of the law in exhaustive detail." His exegesis attempts to say that in Matt 5:17 we are concerned with "the Messianic attitude toward, and interpretation of, the law—not Jesus' own personal obedience to the commandments."<sup>19</sup>

Bahnsen is saying that Jesus maintains the continuing validity of the socio-political laws of the Old Testament and the necessity for their implementation in every human society. However, two observations can be made. First, if all that Jesus were saying was that He affirmed a formal obedience to Old Testament laws, He would have been speaking as an orthodox Jew and nothing more. Then it could be said that the righteousness of Jesus would not have exceeded that of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt 5:20). "To fulfill" (*plerosai*) means more than just the opposite of "to abolish," although admittedly Jesus is giving a ratification of the law. Jesus' ratification comes precisely in His complete obedience to the law. In His complete submission to the law He fulfills all righteousness and thus ushers in the kingdom. His obedience leads even to the death on the cross. In His death and resurrection He ushers in a new redemptive-historical epoch in which the types and shadows of Israel must necessarily pass away.

Secondly, Kline feels that it is arbitrary for Bahnsen to "acknowledge the typological-redemptive nature of the socio-political laws of the Old Testament and yet to insist they are still normative, while simultaneously arguing from the typological-

redemptive nature of the cultic laws of the Old Testament that they are now abrogated."<sup>20</sup> The theonomist response would be that the laws of the Old Testament embody general and universal principles which regulate life, even all life. Their particular administration (e.g. in Israel) may have been typological-redemptive, but the principles of the law have abiding significance and validity.

### The Theonomic View of the State

Bahnsen and other theonomists build a case from Old Testament study which says that the nations were obligated to obey God's law given to Israel. This was to include even "matters of social morality and the magistrate's duty to promote justice."<sup>21</sup> God will not have a double standard in His judgment because His law has international validity beyond the boundaries of the covenant community. "Therefore, there is no initial reason why we should expect there to be ethical discontinuity between the divine norms God will use in judging Israel and those in judging other nations."<sup>22</sup> Kline says, "What is distinctive in the Chalcedon position is that it does not regard the case laws dealing with the socio-political life of Israel as another major exception to its claim of the continuing and universal obligation of Old Testament law."<sup>23</sup>

It then stands to reason that the theonomist position is insistent that in this modern day the civil magistrate as the *minister* of God must promote the good and punish evil (Rom 13) by a strict enforcement of the Mosaic case legislation. This would include the first four laws of the Decalogue, which are addressed to man's duty toward God, and it would include the sanctions of these laws as well as their stipulations. This means the state would be bound to treat murder, adultery, unchastity, sodomy, bestiality, homosexuality, rape, incest, incorrigibility in children, sabbath breaking, kidnapping, apostasy, witchcraft, sorcery, false pretension to prophecy, and blasphemy as capital crimes.<sup>24</sup>

Such a suggestion seems novel in our day and age in which pluralism and individualistic rights are the current political ideologies. The theonomist program would strike at what Americans have understood as the illegality of the State to legislate in favor of the morality of any one religion. Bahnsen, however, clarifies his position, and he does so in a way consistent with certain traditions of the Reformed understanding of the State's duty to punish evil.

The law does not grant the state the right to enforce matters of conscience...but it *does* have the obligation to prohibit and restrain *public* unrighteousness...The state is not an agent of evangelism and does not use its force to that end; it is an agent of God, avenging His wrath against social violations of God's law. If one's outward behavior is within the bounds of the law he has nothing to fear from the civil magistrate—even if one is an idolator, murderer, or whatever in his heart.<sup>25</sup>

Bahnsen has made appeal to biblical precept, biblical illustration, and the Westminster standards for his theory of theonomic politics. Has he presented a convincing case? Kline thinks not when he says, "Whatever support may be found in the Westminster standards for the Chalcedon theory of theonomic politics, when it comes to assessing it in terms of the church's only infallible standard, that theory must be repudiated as a misreading of the Bible on a massive scale."<sup>26</sup> Bahnsen's exegesis of Matt 5:17-19 has failed to take into account the larger context of the whole sweep of Biblical redemptive-history. He fails to remember that the social-geopolitical life of Israel was typological.

A response can be made to Kline's objections. It could be argued (and Bahnsen virtually does) that history cannot annul a timeless law. History cannot remove God-given norms. Undoubtedly this is true. History does not create norms, and it cannot in turn annul them. But such a response avoids the point of Kline's objections. The law itself, summed up by love, is timeless, but the applications of the laws' principles vary according to the historical-cultural situation. This Bahnsen recognizes.<sup>27</sup> Israel was a religiously covenanted community, redeemed by God in order to be holy and separate from the world. *Everything* in the life of this covenant community is qualified by this redemptive (restorative) factor. For this reason Israel's leaders can never be simply equated with the civil magistrates of the other nations, because God gives Israel those leaders for a *redemptive* purpose.<sup>28</sup> That is why David and his sons are the song of Israel, because Israel's "salvation" rests on these messianic kings (cf. Ps 32). Kline is correct when he says,

The Davidic Covenant also stands in outright contradiction to Chalcedon's equation of Israelite kingship with kingship in other nations, for in that covenant the Lord defined the theocratic dynasty as a kingship invested with the cultic-redemptive function of building the house of God—the mis-



sion antitypically performed by the messianic Son of David.<sup>29</sup>

Certainly there was a political dimension to Israel's life, but it was only one dimension of the holy nation. Historical differentiation had not separated that political dimension fully from the cultic life of the covenantal community of Israel.

The theonomist response would be that historical differentiation does not remove the obligations of the state and its civil magistrates from obedience to the revealed will of God. It was Kuyper who spoke of the great relevance of the doctrine of "common grace" for truly Christian antithetical activity in the political and social affairs of the nations. Even "common grace" holds out before the civil leaders of the nations God's ordinances for life. His ordinances are law, revealed in Scripture, a "revelation which harmonizes with the general revelation made of God's standards through the created order and man's conscience."<sup>30</sup>

All that has been said above should make it obvious that any attempt to discern a Christian approach to the State is not a futile attempt. In this New Testament age Christian life is to be conducted in a way different from that under Old Testament legislation.<sup>31</sup> The modern state may not be approached neutrally since the state is also to be governed by God's law. "The State can no more be neutral in this respect than science. The political slogan of neutrality is as much under the leading of an attitude of faith and as certainly originates from a basic religious commitment as any other political conviction."<sup>32</sup> To treat the State neutrally would be idolatry. The State is an institution of common "grace", but Jesus Christ is King of common "grace".<sup>33</sup> The concern of the State is the promotion of public social justice in which the rights and interests of each institution, sphere, and faith community are respected.<sup>34</sup> The state certainly is entitled to bear the sword but only as the minister of God to protect what is good and to punish evildoers. Kline observes:

A basic and essential structure of that common grace order is the institution of the common state. This civil institution, unlike the nation Israel, which was separated unto a distinctive institutional identity as a holy, redemptive, theocratic kingdom, is not a holy but rather common institution, with its citizenry a mixture of both the holy and the non-holy.<sup>35</sup> The Old Testament clearly distinguished the holy and the non-holy. The modern state may not do so because it does not possess

Christ's eschatological judgment sword. Kuyper and most theologians would not disagree on this last point.

### The Theonomic View of the Church

For Kuyper and for the theologians the church is already a Christocracy. Christ rules as King of the church. He gave His apostles and the church the great commission to disciple the nations and to teach them to obey Christ's law (Matt 28:18-20). This great commission intends for the nations to become a Christocracy.<sup>36</sup> The great commission means that the Christian church must teach the nations both the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Law of God.<sup>37</sup> Keeping in mind the necessary redemptive-historical distinctions, the duties of both the church and the state become clearer.

The church as an institution must be sharply distinguished from the institution of the state. Their tasks are quite distinct. Kuyper gave expression to this idea in his formulation of "sphere sovereignty." In the theologians' view a Christian state would not be one that actively promoted the Gospel for the church or established a State Church, but it would be a state that enforced legislation arrived at from a strict interpretation of the legislation of a typological state (Israel). Such legislation would not be in its typological cast, but applicable in its general, principal root. Kline points out what he sees are inevitable consequences of Chalcedon's program.

[If Chalcedon says] that when the ideal state of affairs set forth in the law and the prophets arrives, nations that do not submit to Christ utterly perish (i.e. Deut 13:12-16 is enforced), that ideal must be the legal norm which ought to be followed all through the church age. This means that according to theonomic politics God has given the church the mandate to gather the harvest of the mission field but at the same time he has given the state a mandate to destroy the mission field.<sup>38</sup>

In the minds of those who oppose theonomy, this is a strange message to bring to the world.

The theologians' emphasis is that God's law always must be the norm and standard for Christian life and actions. They have attempted to approach questions on the state from a principled, normative position. They have laid a good stress on the universal force of God's law and on the universal reign of God. In that sense all Reformed Christians are theologians. Reformed Christianity could

never be antinomian in principle, unlike some other Protestant traditions.

### Kuyper's Contribution

One risks a very obvious historical anachronism by speaking of Kuyper's contribution to the discussion of theonomy. When Kuyper addressed himself to socio-political issues that have been taken up by present-day theonomy, he spoke from a situation of actual involvement in the statecraft of the Netherlands. Kuyper wrote and gave addresses as a member of the Dutch Parliament. In his 1891 address to the First Christian Social Congress, Kuyper gave a very stirring analysis of and prescription for the social questions of the time. Man's problem is that he has not ordered his societal life in the light of his eternal destiny as an image bearer of the majestic Lord. This is why man has no comfort and no comforter.<sup>39</sup>

Kuyper asserted that the purpose of human life was the exercise of dominion over all created life under the absolute sovereignty of God. In his well-known Stone Lectures Kuyper said that "the chief aim of all human efforts remains what it was by virtue of our creation and before the fall—namely dominion over nature." Such dominion would be exercised by using the power of creation's own ordinances, "innate in nature itself."<sup>40</sup> Sin had not destroyed the law-governed structure of creation.

A consistent theme in Kuyper is the *organic* nature of human life. Individualism would thus be destructive to societal life because it must ultimately end in revolution. State socialism would also be destructive of the organism of life since it does not respect the various spheres of social (societal) responsibilities that are inherent in creation and its historical unfolding. So the question that confronted Kuyper was what do the ordinances of God say positively to the organic nature of life and to the role of the state in life.

Kuyper believed that society must allow for a free church in a free state. The Doleantie of 1886 knew something of what the Afscheiding of 1834 experienced when the State Church was able, albeit in a limited way, to bring the power of the state against those holding to the Reformed confessions and church order. Kuyper addressed himself to this in the Stone Lectures when he maintained that government force against false religions was a Constantinian development, not a Calvinist one. John Calvin departed from the

medieval idea derived from the Constantinian arrangement of persecuting all those who dissented from the Church of Rome. Rome's mistake was that it identified the visible and invisible Church. From this John Calvin dissented.<sup>41</sup>

Kuyper thus would maintain that Calvinist countries alone were the ones that allowed for liberty of conscience. The historical phenomenon of the pluriformity of the church forced the state to abandon any attempt to decide which was the true church.

Nevertheless, Kuyper did not hold that the state's task was to moderate in an arbitrary or neutral way between competing interests of a variety of confessional and political groups. All government authority comes from God. The magistrate, said he, has the "terrible right of life and death."<sup>42</sup> But Kuyper also stressed that the government should work for the care of its own people to allow for the full flowering of all of society's organic life. This last-mentioned idea is not often stressed by modern theologians.

The magistrates are God's servants, receiving their power from Him. They must recognize Him as the Supreme Ruler and rule according to His holy ordinances, ordinances sought for in natural life and in His Word. Kuyper goes so far as to say that God's supremacy must be constitutionally recognized.<sup>43</sup>

He recognized fully the ravages wrought in a society losing touch with Christ. Only the power of the Christian faith can bring healing to society. In fact, the church is the healed organism of mankind. He affirms, "Rightly viewed, it must even be professed that in the church of Christ the original organism of humanity, now purified, lives again."<sup>44</sup>

Theologians utilize the phrase "God's law." Kuyper's preferred terms were "the ordinances of God." Theologians stress God's inscripturated revelation; Kuyper wanted to do full justice to the will of God also expressed naturally in creation. The Christian confession of belief in God committed the Christian to this program: an acknowledgement that "there is an ordering of nature by God, and an ordinance of God over our conscience; a higher will, to which we as creatures have to submit ourselves."<sup>45</sup> Kuyper, as do theologians, believed that God's Word fully addressed the modern social question when he said that "for our national existence and for our social life together, God's Word gives us fixed ordinances; it marks out lines that are very clearly visible . . ."<sup>46</sup>

### Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this essay is not simply to portray Abraham Kuyper as a turn-of-the-century Dutch theologian. It is to alert us to many emphases common to both Kuyper and modern theologians, commonalities sometimes missed by many of Kuyper's disciples. Kuyper ascribed all ultimate sovereignty to the God of creation and redemption. For him the state had God-given, yet limited, authority to exercise the use of the sword. Furthermore, only by applying God's laws and ordinances, can the organic life of man be restored to a semblance of wholeness.

Differences also exist between Kuyper's program and North American theologians. Many theologians would be somewhat more sympathetic to the Constantinian triumph of the church. Also, in the areas of concrete application of God's laws and ordinances there would be differences. Kuyper denied that Christians should create a modern-day theocracy. That was to be found only in ancient Israel.<sup>47</sup> He also strongly advocated a Christian historical consciousness that took into account the historical differentiation that has gone on in creation. Nevertheless, both Kuyper and the theonomy school would affirm that confessing Christ as King and Lord in the political and social arenas of human life means that God's law must be put into practice, as that law is revealed in God's Word.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Greg L. Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* (Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1977), 7.

<sup>2</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 7.

<sup>3</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 9.

<sup>4</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 11.

<sup>5</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 33.

<sup>6</sup>Presbyterians who favor a postmillennial eschatology have argued that the Westminster Standards are postmillennial documents. Such an argument is not without some justification. Some may say that the Westminster Standards arose during a situation of (temporary) Puritan triumph in England, and thus they reflect the triumphalism of the historical situation. That would not fully explain the eschatological position of the Westminster Standards.

<sup>7</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 33.

<sup>8</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 34.

<sup>9</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 35.

<sup>10</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 36.

<sup>11</sup>Meredith G. Kline, "Comments on an Old-New Error: A Review Article," *Westminster Theological Journal* 41 (Fall, 1978), 183.

<sup>12</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 428.

<sup>13</sup>E.g. Isa 60:3, "And nations shall come to your light, and kings to the brightness of your rising." (RSV) Other passages could also be cited.

<sup>14</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 573.

<sup>15</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 577. Bahnsen demonstrates his approach to Scripture in an article entitled, "Law and Atonement in the Execution of Saul's Seven Sons," *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 2 (Winter, 1975-76), 101-109.

<sup>16</sup>Kline, "Comments," 172.

<sup>17</sup>Kline, "Comments," 173.

<sup>18</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 36.

<sup>19</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 61. One might expect that Chalcedon's eschatological vision of the universal theocratic kingdom to be a "Christianized version of the civil state." This is not so, however. Bahnsen finds himself unable to identify his millennial Christocracy-theocracy with the state, for the state would then have to become "an organized expression of the redeemed community" and it would then "operate in the name of the Redeemer", and Bahnsen has to acknowledge that such would be contrary to the nature of the state.

<sup>20</sup>Kline, "Comments," 175.

<sup>21</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 339.

<sup>22</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 342.

<sup>23</sup>Kline, "Comments," 173. "Bahnsen says that Israel as a kingdom was just another civil government and Israel's king just another civil magistrate" (p. 176).

<sup>24</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 445ff.

<sup>25</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 427.

<sup>26</sup>Kline, "Comments," 175.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. *By This Standard* (Tyler, TX: Institute of Christian Economics, 1985), 5-6.

<sup>28</sup>"According to Bahnsen's theory that the Israelite king was just another civil magistrate like the king of the nations, the request of the Israelites was quite proper and the dim view of that request taken by Samuel and the Lord must be regarded as mistaken, unfair, and unjust" (Kline, "Comments," 176).

<sup>29</sup>Kline, "Comments," 176.

<sup>30</sup>Bahnsen, *Standard*, 176.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Richard J. Mouw, *Political Evangelism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 30ff. Bahnsen notes that the *localized imperative* of Israelite gaining Palestine by the sword is not authoritative for Christians today (*Standard*, 5).

<sup>32</sup>Herman Dooyeweerd, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*; William S. Young, David H. Freeman, H. de Jongste, trans.; vol. 3 (N.p.: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1969), 503.

<sup>33</sup>Dooyeweerd, *Critique*, vol. 3, 506ff.

<sup>34</sup>Dooyeweerd, *Critique*, vol. 3, 446.

<sup>35</sup>Kline, "Comments," 183.

<sup>36</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 428.

<sup>37</sup>Bahnsen, *Theonomy*, 448.

<sup>38</sup>Kline, "Comments," 187. Chalcedon faces a dilemma, according to Kline. "It is a dilemma of what would be a contradiction within God's preceptive will, a head-on conflict between two of God's major mandates, as though he had confusedly designed the mission he assigned to the State to contravene the mission he gave to the church" (188).

<sup>39</sup>Abraham Kuyper, *Christianity and the Class Struggle*. Dirk Jellema, trans. (Grand Rapids: Piet Hein Publishers, 1950), 22-23.

<sup>40</sup>Abraham Kuyper, *Lectures on Calvinism* (Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors, n.d.) 56.

<sup>41</sup>Kuyper, *Calvinism*, 62.

<sup>42</sup>Kuyper, *Calvinism*, 51. "The principal characteristic of government is the right of life and death . . . the magistrate bears the sword . . . of justice . . . of war . . . and of order . . ." (57).

<sup>43</sup>Kuyper, *Calvinism*, 63.

<sup>44</sup>Kuyper, *Class Struggle*, 41, n. 27.

<sup>45</sup>Kuyper, *Class Struggle*, 51.

<sup>46</sup>Kuyper, *Class Struggle*, 55. "The Bible gives us not only *ideas* but also definite *rules*, and Christians who say they bow down before God's Word, but along with the men of the French Revolution in their social and political ideas, are not integrated men; they lead an ambiguous life; and they manifestly do not fully realize the power of the Scriptures and the Word" (55, n. 39).

<sup>47</sup>Kuyper, *Calvinism*, 52.