

A Comparison of the Church-State Relationship as seen by Catholics, Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, and the Anabaptists during the Reformation

Otniel Murza

*PhD, "Timotheus" Brethren Theological Institute of Bucharest, Romania
otnielmurza@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT: The history of the Church and countries with a majority Christian population is dotted about with good or bad opinions on the role of the Church in relation to the government or the State. Sometimes the Church is accused of interfering with the government or local authorities over issues that should be only under the State jurisdiction. Some Christians would consider it a normality because they see God as a supreme King over the whole world, and therefore his will stated in the Bible should be made law and prevail in every country. On the other hand, secular people oppose such ideas and try to exclude any ties of the Church in politics, economics, and social life. From Constantine the Great to medieval Europe, there was a constant tension between the secular kings and the popes or the Church leaders. Some popes were able to make kings submit under the Church leadership. Should this be normality nowadays? Are there any models that can shine a light on that? During the Reformation, the tension between Church and State leaders and princes came to a new climax. This study focuses on comparing the Church-State relationship as seen by Catholics, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and the Anabaptists during the Reformation. Did the reformers touch only the spiritual side of the European society or also its social, economic, and political side? So, is it worth letting or encouraging the Church to get involved in the affairs of the State? If yes, are there any models that our contemporary society should copy?

KEYWORDS: State, Church, State, and Church relationship, Roman-Catholic, Lutheran, Zwinglian, Calvinist, Anabaptist, education, social welfare, labor

Introduction

There is a constant tension in relations between the State and the Church, as some people believe that the State should be ruled according to Christian principles, while others who do not like Christianity or religion, in general, argue that the Church should not interfere in the affairs of the State. From Constantine the Great to the Reformation period, the Church was, in various forms, an integral part of the life of the State. Therefore, the intention of this study is to observe whether any of the patterns of relationship between State and Church from the Christian period to the end of the 16th century could be considered as a standard to be adopted by today's society. To this end, the concepts and practices of the Roman-Catholic Church, Martin Luther, Huldrych Zwingli, John Calvin, and the Anabaptists will be analyzed in turn. In the case of the Anabaptists, extremist factions will not be considered.

This study is not intended to diminish the esteem of any Church or religious organization and starts from the realization that any human system can be degraded by the actions of the people who form or lead it. As a result, the advantages or disadvantages are not analyzed from the perspective of orthodoxy to the Word of God but from the point of view of effectiveness in accommodating the individual in society. Inevitably, the Christian faith was at the heart of the life of European society, and at times, this topic will be touched upon.

Mainly, the reformers' individual views will prevail, regardless of the influence of other personal advisers or circles of influence. The analysis follows a chronological order according to the emergence of each organizational model and traces the relationship between the State and the Church on three coordinates: political-religious organization, the concept of labor and social welfare, and the educational system. In the end, some conclusions are drawn as to which model or parts of a model would be recommendable.

1. Roman-Catholic Church and State relationship development

Following the reign of Emperor Constantine, the Great, who promoted the Church very much, the Church discovered that it could strongly influence political life. At first, there was a balance in the State-Church relationship, and the bishops were somewhat in obedience to the emperor. In fact, it was Constantine the Great, an unbaptized catechumen, who summoned the Council of Nicaea (325). He also presided over the inaugural session and was involved in some of the discussions, and seems to have pushed on certain ideas. At that time, the State was in a somewhat superior position. In view of the emperor's concessions and openness to the Church, it was considered good that a person of such rank should pave the way for society to accept the Church's teaching. "Eusebius of Caesarea considered the Christian *imperium* of Constantine a gift of God, the beginning of the messianic kingdom prophesied in the Old Testament, the ideal form of government" (Popescu 2003, 74).

The change was slow and not well seen by all Roman-Catholic theologians. For example, Augustine of Hippo (354-430), who could see the changes that were taking place in society based on the growing union between State and Church, believed that the State was "a remedial instrument, which prevents greater evils. While Eusebius adopted the assumption that the Christian Roman Empire could embrace the standards of the Gospel, Augustine stressed that the two cities cannot be united in a perfect Christian State" (Popescu, 2003, 75). Augustine was trying to prove that what the State possesses are, in fact, instruments necessary because of the fall into sin, which originally did not exist in the natural world, created by God. In this regard, the greatest proof was "the law, the private property, and the army" (Popescu, 2003, 75).

However, the Church continued to be involved in imperial life, and what began in the time of Constantine the Great eventually led to a shift in the center of gravity as to whose authority was greater: that of the State or that of the Church? The mere fact that God is the King of kings was enough for the Church to demand and claim supremacy.

Pope Gregory VII can be considered a reforming pope because he tried to restore the position of the papacy. In the *Papal Decree* of 1075, he claimed that "only the pope can appoint and dismiss bishops, that he can dismiss kings and emperors, that his dominion extends over earthly rulers - who had to kiss his foot when they contacted him" (Hill 2008, 188).

The 11th century saw the emergence of the feudal system, and "the Church was caught in the web of the feudal system, forming part of that system. For example, a monastery could own land, and those who worked the land did not pay a local lord, but the monastery" (Hill 2008, 184). But even in these situations, the tension of authority between State and Church continued. The appointment of the clergy was made by the nobles, and the Church tried to resist this. Erasmus later concluded that the State [*civitas*] is nothing more than a large monastery. Diarmaid MacCulloch sees that "in Erasmus's ideal society, everyone was to become an active citizen of a *civitas*, as in the Greek city-states, and everyone was bound to behave as purely as the monks had to behave under the monastic rule... the person who made sure people did this was the prince" (MacCulloch 2011, 543).

Little by little, all this culminated in the 12th - 13th centuries in actions that proved the undeniable supremacy of the Church, when the Church came under the leadership of Pope Innocent III (in office during 1198-1216), who considered that he had authority over all temporal things because he was the vicar of Christ. At the same time, the fact that theologically all men needed forgiveness of sins brought them under the authority of Christ's substitute on earth. Jonathan Hill observed that "after all, all human actions, in every sphere, had spiritual overtones: all human actions were marked by sin and as such theologically significant, thus falling under papal forgiveness, which meant that he was not only the spiritual master of all Christians but also that of their political leaders" (Hill, 2008, 192). Thus, he successfully interfered in the political life of Europe, changing Emperor Otto and forcing England and France to cease their war with each other, forcing King John of England to "formally cede to him the whole kingdom which he had received back from the hands of the Pope to govern it. In this way, the King of England became merely the vassal of the Pope, under strict subordination according to the feudal system" (Hill 2008, 192-193).

At the same time, the emperors' advisors told them that their duty was to strengthen the Catholic faith by defending the Church from pagan attacks. They believed that "the Church could not be truly Catholic unless it had universal primacy over all otherworldly powers" (Pelikan, IV, 2006, 145). Later, in the papal bull *Unam Sanctam* (1302), Pope Boniface formalized the idea of the Pope's authority in temporal and spiritual matters, even to the point of dethroning those rulers who opposed him. This idea became a tradition of the Roman Catholic Church (Timothy, 1998, 118). To this was added one of the basic doctrines of the Jesuit order led by Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), which demanded "absolute obedience to God, therefore also to His representative on earth, the Pontiff, and to the supreme general of the Society [of Jesus]" (Eliade 2011, 219).

While the popes and emperors fought for their place at the helm of the Holy Roman Empire, the social welfare of the poor remained mainly on the shoulders of the Church.

Benjamin B. Warfield believes that the Reformation did not designate any winners but only helped the Church because "the problem that Augustine bequeathed to the Church for a solution, the Church required a thousand years to solve. But, even so, it is Augustine who gave us the Reformation. For the Reformation, inwardly considered, was just the ultimate triumph of Augustine's doctrine of grace over Augustine's doctrine of the Church" (Warfield 1971, 338).

Although the Church has managed to interfere and impose itself in social, economic, and political life, the prerogatives it has assumed have not always led to a better, more moral society from which poverty, immorality, wars, and oppression would disappear. On the contrary, when things went wrong, whether the fault lay with corrupt and unspiritual prelates or with some secular ruler, it ended up with blame from both sides: the parishioners and the world. One thing is quite clear: secular positions or offices held by the Church do not guarantee a better society, as the appointees may be vulnerable or in a rush for wealth.

2. Martin Luther's concept on Church-State relationships

In contrast to the tendency of the Roman Catholic Church to impose itself on the State, Martin Luther promoted the idea of the independence of the State from Church control. He developed the doctrine of the two kingdoms (spiritual and temporal) in opposition to the Roman Catholic model. In this respect, his former membership of the Augustinian order of monks can be seen, as Augustine promoted the idea of the Heavenly City and the Worldly City.

Bogdan Popescu adds the fact that there is a fine difference between Augustine's thought and Luther's in the way they define the secular State. For Luther, "the secular power is no longer considered to be a necessary evil invented by the children of this world. God is the creator of the two governments and gives the right and the authority to the earthly rulers" (Popescu 2003, 76). But Luther has a problem with his day's system and goes on to affirm that "the pope was not only the enemy of the emperor, but of all Christendom... he was the Antichrist; moreover, the whole apparatus of the Church was like the pope" (MacCulloch 2011, 551). He argued that the Pope should not intervene in the civil domain and that when needed, it was the rulers who should reform the Church. Eugen Jugaru understands that Martin Luther, although of a more rebellious nature, did not have a problem with the civil authority of princes but with the authority of the Pope. And this was because of the abuses that were being committed by the clergy in society and the Church (Jugaru 2017, 187).

As a result, Luther "placed ecclesiastical power in the hands of the civil authorities, who were considered representatives of the Christian community" (Renwick and Harman 2005, 99). Many princes agreed with Luther's ideas because they were to their advantage, allowing them better control of the Church in their territories and especially because he did not agree with revolutions to overthrow the rulers, believing that God would remove them when he was done with them.

He observed that German princes could command subjects and thus be of great help against those who did not wish to reform. In his conception, Luther claimed that God had entrusted the sword to the ruler of the State to maintain order and ensure peace for the faithful. On the other hand, he was aware that "the State was instituted by God as a concession to human sin. The State is not

the agent of God’s saving purpose for mankind” (Timothy 1998, 120). However, the State is endowed by God with limited powers, and as a result, “the earthly leaders were responsible before God for the use of their authority. The subjects had to obey them, even if their decisions were not always the best” (Jugaru 2017, 188).

The main difference in Luther’s thinking about the role of the State and the Church can be seen in the following point of view: the State could coerce those who did not seek to become good and righteous, while the Church, through its preachers, dealt with people who wanted to become good and righteous in order to inherit eternal life. For this, as mentioned above, he developed the teaching of the two kingdoms, which are like the two hands of God. Thus, the Christian is in the worldly kingdom, which is the State, and in the spiritual kingdom, which is the Church, and “must observe the laws of both kingdoms” (De Long 2006, 249). As to how the Christian was to be guided in the life of the city, Luther does not give sound biblical arguments, and at times seems to contradict himself, as he did in the case of the Peasants’ War. Yet, one thing is clear to Luther: “the teaching of the Scriptures is valid only in the spiritual realm” (De Long 2006, 249). Bogdan Popescu shows that, in fact, Luther encouraged the people to accept the civil State and institutions because if somebody is “a real child of God does not need all these external institutions and restrictions but accepts them for the sake of others” (Popescu 2003, 76).

Mirela de Long believes that the public’s attention to Martin Luther’s words and actions were drawn very strongly not because he burned the papal bull that excommunicated him, but because he burned the “Canonical Corpus” [*Corpus Juris Canonici*], which stated that anyone who disobeyed it would face eternal damnation. She believes that Luther touched with brutality “institutions that ensured the running of society at the time” (De Long 2003, 44). Luther did that by elevating obedience to baptized Christians holding public office to the same level as obedience to priests and bishops (De Long 2003, 261). In his view, any resistance to the State by force or rebellion was a sign that those people were under the leadership of the Devil of devils (De Long, 2006, 283-284).

The problems with the State were to be resolved by informing the nobility and princes, i.e., by peaceful discussion (De Long 2006, 269), and their response was to be considered as something God had granted. If it was an unfavorable response, the people had to wait for God to do something with the person placed in that position of authority.

In the case of the authorities’ interventions against rebellions or civil wars, Luther believes that the State and the authorities have a “God-given right” and obligation to punish by sword and death. Primarily because such mobs indulge in all kinds of robbery and plunder, break their oath of obedience to those higher in office, are disobedient and defilers of God (De Long 2006, 286).

Luther did not formulate a specific doctrine regarding the offices the Christians occupied in the State but confined himself to allowing Christians to hold positions as magistrates. Probably the main reasons remained that “the State was instituted by God as a concession to human sin” and that “the State is not the agent of saving purpose for mankind” (Timothy 1998, 120). As a result, he seems to indirectly encourage Christian involvement in the political and judicial life of the city.

In the area of work, Luther takes up the words of the apostle Paul in *2 Thessalonians* 3:10. He has the audacity to apply them even to the nobility. People of any social class were supposed to work for their riches because nobody should consume another’s labor for free. (De Long 2003, 317). Yet, getting rich on the basis of your own labor was considered a blessing from God.

By doing so, he encouraged the whole society to work. One of the major contributions in this regard comes from the statement “*Sola Gratia*,” whereby salvation no longer depended on works or labor. Perhaps the economic success of Western Europe may be due to some extent to this approach to the work ethic. Anyhow, Marius Nechita concludes that Protestant countries have understood, for example, that poverty is a social problem, and through the actions, they had taken, they promoted responsibility towards vulnerable people through the systems they built, but above all, through their example, they have influenced other countries (Nechita 2017, 321-322). For Luther, it did not matter what kind of work someone did because the work of a peasant was as valuable as that of a craftsman.

In the area of social welfare, Luther called for the secularization of monastery property and the conversion of monastery buildings into hospitals and schools. (De Long 2003, 40). The authority to implement these projects belonged to the State, represented at the time by the nobility and princes. Peter Forna believes that the reason the nobility supported him in this direction was due to the fact that his references were only to monastery estates, “leaving the enormous feuds and their system of administration untouched. It is also the reason why most representatives of the high nobility supported him.” (De Long 2003, 53). Along with these, the worldly authority also had to deal with the reintegration of monks and nuns into the lay society and the care of those who, for reasons of health or age, could no longer support themselves (De Long 2003, 53).

The unusual part for 21st century Christians is that Martin Luther did not necessarily base all his program on the Gospel. At least, this is clear from what he wrote to the imperial knight Ulrich von Hutten: “The Holy Scripture cannot be used as a means of shaping society because it is not a social-political program” (De Long 2006, 249).

In the field of education, Martin Luther called for educating young people and children and working to form a new intellectual class. The need for such an intellectual stratum was primarily to be found in the necessity to be able to carry on the Reformation. He encouraged the inclusion of ‘worldly’ disciplines in the curriculum. He gave two reasons for this: “for these would, on the one hand, curb the ecclesiastical influence on education, but, on the other, they would bring about a complete education.” (De Long 2003, 54). It should be noted that a good number of these requests are addressed directly to the German ruling class in two of his writings: *To the Christian Nobility of the German nation* (1520) and *To the Lords Councilors of all the cities of Germany to erect Christian schools and maintain them* (1524).

Spiritually, Luther believed that the Devil is strongly opposed to teaching or education because his power over young people is weakened by knowing the Word of God (De Long, 2006, 215). He noted this by comparing the fact that before, young people who were educated were trapped in the cloisters of the monasteries and could not leave, and after the Reformation began, many began to believe that education was no longer necessary because every believer is a priest before God. In part, it is possible that his call for education was adopted because he was able to equate the lack of education with neglect of the younger generation, with the greatest sin that could burden the world before God, worse even than the defilement of a virgin or a woman (Cf. De Long 2006, 218-219).

It seems that his categorical attitude was echoed, and the education program was implemented so that all over Europe, one can see schools being built or arranged in the vicinity of Lutheran churches. Marius Nechita points out that the successful society in which we live was created by the Reformation social transformations, and especially the educational transformations. These led to the development of a ‘scientific Christianity’ (Nechita 2017, 323).

3. Huldrych Zwingli’s concept on Church-State relationship

As for the differences between Martin Luther’s concepts and those of Huldrych Zwingli, there would seem to be few. The Reformation initiated by Zwingli was sustained by its originator for a much shorter period than Luther did in Germany. The Reformation led by him can be considered to have begun in 1519 with his appointment as people’s priest in Zurich, and he led it until his death in 1531. This would be about 12 years, while Martin Luther’s Reformation is thought to have begun in 1517, and he led it until 1546, or 29 years.

While Luther approached the nobility and princes to lead the Reformation, Zwingli “wanted a bourgeois-republican hue” (De Long, 2003, 63). He believed that if the rule of the Pope and emperor were overthrown, then “a new era, almost a reign of the saints, could begin” (Potter 1976, 418). He considered the visible Church to be the very local congregations composed of those who have accepted Christ (Potter 1976, 395). Zwingli entrusted authority and decision-making power to the State. Thus, “the civil councilors became legitimate ecclesiastical representatives, and the clergy had to carry out the will of the State” (Popescu 2003, 77). In fact, Zwingli defended human justice

and “used it to legitimate close cooperation with the State” (Popescu 2003, 77). Through this close cooperation, he also promoted social welfare programs.

However, in contrast, particularly with the Anabaptists, Zwingli considered that it was the Christian community that should choose its civil government, and in this way, the two were theocratically united. He argued that any Christian government had a duty “to ensure that the name of God is honored among its subjects, and the kingdom of God is extended” (Pelikan 2010, 212) and that it follows “the rule of Christ,” that is, that the commandments and laws they give are in accordance with God’s will. If the government or magistrates did not conform to “the rule of Christ,” they could be brought down in the name of God.

His ideas on the organization of education are contained in his treatise *Quo pacto ingenii adolescentes formandi sint* (1523). Zwingli recommended the study of Greek and Latin, some mathematics, a little music, some history, the art of conversation. He encouraged the learning of Greek and Latin because it was useful for people to be able to reach a pure knowledge of the Scriptures.

Military training must be included since any man may be called upon to defend his Fatherland. All schoolboys, including intending ministers of religion, should, in any case, learn a trade or a craft for the benefit of the community and for the avoidance of pernicious idleness. Games were encouraged when they were in some way instructional or served to keep the body in good health – the running, the jumping, the fencing, and the throwing stones or rocks were suitable for the young Swiss, but not the wrestling and the swimming only in great moderation. (Potter 1976, 218)

In fact, compared to the modern education that Martin Luther encouraged, Zwingli’s interest in education was based on spreading the knowledge of God’s Word, and for that, people who could read and preach were needed. In fact, G. R. Potter insists that Zwingli did not ask the authorities to invest in school buildings from the public budgets. (Potter 1976, 219). In this, the educational model proposed by Zwingli lacks the force and appeal promoted by Luther.

4. Jean Calvin’s concept on Church-State relationship

Zwingli’s ideas were taken further by John Calvin, who was very convinced that the leadership of the Church should be chosen by its members and that “in spiritual matters, the Church should be independent of the State. However, he asserted that civil government was also a divine institution and that Church and State had to cooperate while respecting each other’s fields of activity.” (Renwick and Harman 2005, 106). Calvin was very careful to avoid some of the problems that Zwingli and Luther had. Therefore, Diarmaid MacCulloch is of the opinion that he kept some distance “between existing Church structures and town authorities” (MacCulloch 2011, 574-575).

For him, the Church was above the civil authorities, and in this respect, it seems like his idea resembled the Roman-Catholic one. Although he harmonized this idea well in Geneva, others who took up his ideas started revolutionary movements in Holland, Scotland, and France. In fact, he believed that “no man - no pope or emperor - can claim absolute power” (Shelley 1995, 261) and encouraged the growth of representative assemblies which, he said, had “their own right to resist the tyranny of monarchs” (Shelley 1995, 261). Calvin understood that God created the Church and State for the good of the people, and as a result, they were to work together in harmony. Bruce L. Shelley sees that the relationship between the State and the Church was one of submission and mutual help. The Church was to submit to secular authorities only in secular matters, but at the same time, it was “to guide secular authorities in spiritual matters” (Shelley 1995, 261). However, Bogdan Popescu sees this relationship at a level of mutual obligation: “Theology has to influence the political system ideologically, and the State must protect its source of inspiration. God is the absolute sovereign, and naturally, the word of God also becomes law in the political world.” (Popescu 2003, 78).

Bogdan Popescu comments that, according to Luther's model, a Christian ruler should not mix the inner Christian life with the outer responsibilities of his ruling office because one cannot always rule according to Christian principles. But Calvin is at the opposite pole because he states that those Christians who are placed in civil office must act on the basis of their faith and should influence political and social life (Popescu 2003, 79).

For Calvin, when there is a conflict between civil power and religious power, priority must be given to obedience to God. Eugen Jugaru points out that if a ruler chose not to obey divine commands, then he lost his authority (Jugaru 2017, 190). This observation is in some contradiction with that of Ciprian Terinte, who quotes Calvin regarding the fact that the people must "gladly submit to magistrates, for they have been installed by God to protect the human race" (Terinte 2017, 203) and that when abuses, cruelty, and tyranny occur from some people in authority, "the divine order is not invalidated by the weakness and sinfulness of the human nature" (Terinte, 2017, 205). Even so, the way to resist the State authorities had to be in a peaceful manner. Violent demonstrations would lose God's blessing. At the same time, Ciprian Terinte presents two of Calvin's principles regarding the moments or periods when the State abuses and does not fulfill its role correctly. On the one hand, it is a sign of "divine punishment for the sins of the people; therefore, the government still acts as an agent of God's justice. Civil government - be it just or unjust - is the instrument of divine justice anyway." On the other hand, these situations "facilitate the process of self-edification towards spiritual perfection." (Terinte 2017, 212).

Calvin considers that the State's main role is

to cherish and support the external worship of God, to preserve the pure doctrine of religion, to defend the constitution of the Church, to regulate our lives in a manner requisite for the society of men, to form our manners to civil justice, to promote our concord with each other, and to establish general peace and tranquility (Calvin, IV, XX, 2).

Following the organization of consistories of pastors and elders to oversee the theology and morals of the community and to impose punishments by excommunication, Calvin "used the State to impose more severe punishments. Such punishments proved far too severe, with 58 people executed and 76 exiled in 1546" (Earle 1997, 304). He believed that people should follow the religion of the State and that if they disobeyed, they could be punished even by death. On this point, Calvin resembles the Roman-Catholic Church and Luther, and partly Zwingli.

In the field of labor and social welfare, Bogdan Popescu believes that the term 'Christian socialism' was determined by the large number of laws passed by the Geneva government in this area. Based on these laws, the poor could borrow loans, jobs were provided, and public health and welfare services were organized (Popescu 2003, 78). In this area, Mircea Eliade believes that Calvin "anticipated the series of political theologies in vogue in the second half of the 20th century: labor theology, liberation theology, anti-colonialism theology, etc." (Eliade 2011, 217). Looking from these points of view, Mircea Eliade observed that Calvin's personal example demonstrated "the function and theological importance of political activity" (Eliade 2011, 217). Ciprian Terinte thinks that "some democratic ideals of the founding fathers of the United States, such as the republicanism, equality, and resistance to tyranny, had sprouted from the seedbed of Calvinistic ethos" (Terinte 2017, 193).

In the field of education, Calvin refined the work of Luther, and Mircea Eliade believes that the contribution of Luther and Calvin led to a slow process of desacralization of education. Thus, by organizing individual freedom and reforming public education, the 'modern world' was made possible (Eliade 2011, 217).

5. Anabaptist concept on Church-State relationship

When comparing Luther and Calvin to those of the Anabaptists, one could see that they "opposed to the idea of a State Church as envisioned by Luther and Zwingli" (Renwick and Harman 2005, 99). They

came into direct conflict with Zwingli because they were originally in the territory where he was carrying out his Reformation. “The more radical Anabaptists, who opposed State control of religion, were jeopardizing his [Zwingli’s] plans to rally conservative authorities to the side of the Reformation” (Earle 1997, 297). In fact, the Anabaptists were also in opposition to the Roman Catholic conception and totally separated the Church from the State. As mentioned earlier, this study does not consider the ideas of the extremist groups that broke away from Anabaptism.

Although they “did not deny that magistrates are appointed to office by God to maintain law and order” (Timothy 1998, 335), they nevertheless denied the necessity of the union between Church and State, that is, the right of the State to govern religious life. Anabaptists advocated the total separation of the State from the Church. They also had problems because they objected to taking the oath in court, accepting civil office, and using arms at the command of the rulers. One of their leaders, Menno Simons, argued that Jesus’ command not to resist those who did them wrong and not to swear was to be obeyed literally (Timothy 1998, 321). He also demanded obedience to the State “in all matters that do not prejudice the requirements of faith” (Timothy 1998, 310).

Their separation from civil society went so far that they implemented ‘the interdiction,’ a form of separation from the community or exclusion of members who were corrupt or who were complicit in the affairs of the State. It seems that the Anabaptists were looking for a form of world organization consistent with the organization of the early Church. For Menno Simons, the organization of the Catholic, Lutheran, and Zwinglian churches was a demonstration of convenience, and as a result, he classified them as sects (Timothy 1998, 334).

In the area of work and welfare, Anabaptists believed that people in the community should devote themselves to each other, work, help each other with love, and in some groups, it was decided that property should be held in common. Although they are not the forerunners of modern socialism, in this regard, one can glimpse a socialist model that is truly based on biblical principles and is functional in Mennonite and Amish communities even in the 21st century.

Conclusions

Little by little, the Roman-Catholic Church lost the authority and influence it claimed over the State. The Anabaptists failed to influence the State, and the Lutherans became weakened by the very fact that they allowed the rulers to interfere in Church affairs. Instead, it seems that Calvin’s ideas about the right to resist magistrates and monarchs who did not live by the ‘rule of Christ’ were “a key factor in the development of modern constitutional governments” (Shelley 1995, 261), and his ideas about the principles of popular representation led to the development of democracy. This could be the seedbed of the political organization of most states as democratic. Communist states that did not allow a democratic development, such as Romania, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, lost out to democracy. In fact, James D. Hunter believes that the State has interfered so heavily in all areas that it has reached the stage where it can effectively prohibit all the society’s systems if there is anything contrary to its interest (Hunter 2010, 154).

The Roman-Catholic model of the relationship between the State and the Church has not been successful, especially after being so strongly challenged by the Reformation. In fact, in today’s society, it could not be followed at all, as most people would oppose having priests, pastors, and bishops in all political offices. Yet, there are countries where the Roman-Catholic Church is the main actor in social welfare or education work. But it no longer strictly follows the model it had before the Reformation. Catholic schools are not closed like the monasteries’ cloisters were, and pupils and students are free to go out and learn subjects that are not solely of the Christian spiritual realm. From this point of view, it seems that the Roman-Catholic Church and modern society have followed the model proposed by the reform programs of Luther and Calvin.

Regarding the concept of ownership, concepts that promoted and honored the covenant of poverty or the enrichment of prelates came to be opposed, challenged, and changed during the Reformation. The concept they developed of labor and earning a living and wealth resulted from personal labor gained ground, and the same idea is perpetuated today. That is why poverty, begging,

and idleness, or oppressing others for self-enrichment are not looked upon kindly and are even punished by law. However, the welfare systems promoted by Roman Catholics and reformers are functional, appreciated, and constantly improving in all modern countries. Even though some countries have social services closer to one of the Catholic or Reformed systems, it seems that no one perfect social welfare service can be implemented.

Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin were magisterial reformers. That is, they used the official authorities or the magisterium to support the Reformation. On the other hand, the Anabaptists had a radical Reformation in which they separated Church and State. In today's systems, it can be seen that the Church continues to be involved in social projects, education, and politics, but it does not always do so through its ecclesiastical leadership as in the Roman-Catholic model before the Reformation, nor according to the Lutheran or Zwinglian model, but rather according to a Calvinist one, because the involvement is through individuals who have understood that they can make a change in their sphere of activity. These individuals are responsible for proving their faith by the decisions and actions they take in each situation.

To this, we can add that Christians of all kinds and laypeople often get involved in helping the poor, providing free food and all kinds of materials and money to their fellow citizens or members of their own family or Christian community. We can see a trace of the Anabaptist welfare concept in this aspect. Any of these analyzed concepts or models individually taken would not fit perfectly for adoption in today's society. As a result, only a combination of theological and cultural ideas and actions that have been successful over time can be recommended for a successful situation. Even then, it is up to each society or community to choose whether they would like to apply that system.

References

- Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, translated by John Allen, vol. 2, Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.
- Earle, E. Cairns. 1997. *Creștinismul de-a lungul secolelor, O istorie a Bisericii creștine [Christianity over the centuries, A history of the Christian Church]*. Oradea: Cartea Creștină Publishing House.
- Eliade, Mircea. 2011. *Istoria credințelor și ideilor religioase [History of religious beliefs and ideas]*, vol. 3, translated by Cezar Baltag. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Hill, Jonathan. 2008. *Ghid al istoriei creștinismului [Guide to the History of Christianity]*. Oradea: Casa Cărții Publishing House.
- Hunter, James Davidson. 2010. *To Change the World: The Irony, Tragedy, and Possibility of Christianity in the Late Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Jugaru, Eugen. 2017. "Christian Attitude Towards Authority According to Reformed Theologians Luther and Calvin." In *The Reformation: 500 Years of Theological Ecclesiastical and Social Impact*, edited by Rotaru Ioan-Gheorghe (ed.), and Rusu Ieremia (ed.), 181-192. Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint Publishing House.
- De Long, Mirela (ed.). 2003. Martin Luther, *Scrieri*, vol. 1, translated by Petru Forna, Cluj-Napoca: Logos Publishing House.
- De Long, Mirela (ed.). 2006. Martin Luther, *Scrieri – Reforma și viața socială [Writings - Reform and social life]*, vol. 2, translated by Petru Forna, Cluj-Napoca: Logos Publishing House.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. 2011. *Istoria creștinismului: primii 3000 de ani [The history of Christianity: the first 3000 years]*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Nechita, Marius. 2017. "The Contribution of the Reformation in the Development of the Social Assistance System." In *The Reformation: 500 Years of Theological Ecclesiastical and Social Impact*, edited by Rotaru Ioan-Gheorghe (ed.), and Rusu Ieremia (ed.), 319-327. Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint Publishing House.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. 2006. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, Volume 4: Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)*, vol. 4 of 5, Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. 2010. *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Popescu, Bogdan. 2003. "Church and State: The Symphony of the Two Kingdoms." *World Student* (1): 72-83.
- Potter, G. R. 1976. *Zwingli*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Renwick, A. M., Harman A. M. 2005. *Povestea Bisericii [The story of the Church]*, Cluj-Napoca: Discipolul Publishing House.
- Shelley, L. Bruce. 1995. *Church History in plain language*, Updated 2nd Edition, Dallas, Texas: Word Publishing.

- Terinte, Ciprian Flavius. 2017. "John Calvin's Perspective on Secular Authority as Reflected in his New Testament Commentaries." In *The Reformation: 500 Years of Theological Ecclesiastical and Social Impact*, edited by Rotaru Ioan-Gheorghe (ed.), and Rusu Ieremia (ed.), 193-215. Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint Publishing House.
- Timothy, George. 1998. *Teologia reformatoarelor [The theology of the Reformers]*. Oradea: Publishing House of the Biblical Institute "Emanuel" from Oradea.
- Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge. 1971. *Calvin and Augustine*, Philadelphia, PA.: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.