

Did Calvin Have a Better Understanding of Modern Economics as Luther?

Max Weber's Ideas to the Test

Andreas Pawlas¹

¹ Department of Theology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Correspondence: Andreas Pawlas, Department of Theology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia. E-mail: Andreas.Pawlas@web.de

Received: November 3, 2014

Accepted: November 22, 2014

Online Published: January 4, 2015

doi:10.5430/rwe.v6n1p36

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/rwe.v6n1p36>

Abstract

For the Christian tradition there seems to be a critical attitude towards economy, its perspective and its logic. But it can be shown that not only the language of Luther and Calvin is dominated economically, but even the language of the Bible itself. Purpose of that is to bring the Christian faith in the "everyday life" of each era. And thus just Luther and Calvin had made use of economic terms and have dealt engaged with economic (everyday) questions. But by the works of Max Weber it became quite popular to estimate Luther low compared to Calvin concerning economic relationships. In this paper these ideas of Max Weber shall be tested: namely concerning the representative economic topics "property", "vocation/ profession" and "interest". It will be shown that there is nearly no reason to estimate Luther low compared to Calvin

Keywords: Martin Luther, Johannes Calvin, Max Weber, property, vocation, profession, interest, modern economics

1. The Perspective of Modern Economics and the Strangeness of the Gospel

To deal with economic issues is popular in present times. Again and again you can hear the much recited sentence of Walther Rathenau, who formulated for the modern society: "The economy is our destiny" (Note 1).

However, it must be non-negotiable for the Christian tradition and will remain, that it never could regard an anonymous dimension "economy" as authoritative for its own fate, but only God's fruitful work and joining - for the individual and for the whole cosmos. To this extent theology and church seem inevitably to have to take a critical attitude towards economy, its perspective and logic. If now the widespread secularization thesis would be true, such a position of Christianity would be without further interest for the current public. And also the ideas of Max Weber established in 1905 only would be of historiographical interest, that from the Reformation from the Calvinist embossing or Calvinist groups was triggered a mental change that made modern capitalism possible. (Note 2)

But if it is true that despite all the secularization, religious embossing has significant influence on attitudes, behavior or social capital (Note 3) in society (Note 4), and is not only the subject of polemics (Note 5), but even is object to the newly developed discipline of "economics of religion" (Note 6), then the relationship between religion and economy must not be unimportant for present and future.

It is often seen to Luther and Calvin (Note 7) in this context, - despite all the warning of modern research, relying solely on these outstanding reformers focus, since they are rather to be regarded as part of a broad movement (Note 8).

Anyway, this paper only allows very woodcut-like view on important theological and economic structures and argumentations now. And again, here is worthwhile a view of Max Weber, who has described the decisive consciousness from this perspective. For the purposes of the economically dominated modernity, he formulated the popular criticism of the traditional theological ideas, which were dominated by the charity, and that in modern times there would be only the need for a substantive economic rationality. And that this modern thinking then also seemed to prove as extremely successful. But actually Weber's critique is a criticism of Luther and Calvin and their criticism of the economy. And specifically Weber stresses the "autonomy" of areas of life in the sense of modernity and says: "As the economic and political rational action follows its own laws, any other rational action of man remains bound inescapably to the conditions of the world without charity. But these conditions must be the means or purposes of modern man. And somehow he gets in tension with the ethics of brotherhood." (Note 9)

Interestingly, this concept of a self-regulatory distance between Christian piety and the everyday life of the ordinary people could be accepted by some modern theologians such as Georg Wünsch. As the separation of these areas of life means "a deep truth. Because we people actually belong to two worlds, the world of brotherly love and Christian faith and the world of struggle, work and business" (Note 10). There is just on the one hand an external reality, "a world in itself, whose transition by their own laws expires" and the other "the interior of the human breast". Therefore "Christianity as a religion" stays "essentially unaffected by the problems of historical, cultural change" (Note 11).

Now of course to these sentences must be added that there has risen a theological critique of any ideas of the "autonomy" and the thinking in "own laws" in recent years. And this critique was supplemented by an allegation of neglect of the study of economic questions. And these allegations were now specifically against the Lutheran tradition (Note 12) and the Lutheran "Doctrine of the two Kingdoms" (Note 13) till to the reverse assumption that Lutheranism in presence is no longer capable to "present the gospel as a real alternative to consumer-capitalist ideology" (Note 14). Regarding the criticism of Lutheranism, so you will also find notes in the works of Max Weber, for he saw Calvinism as "conducive" for the "development capitalist spirit" as Lutheranism and spoke of a "moral impotence of Lutheranism". (Note 15)

And as well already Ernst Troeltsch said that, Lutheranism is "naturally very limited" (Note 16) in its benefits "for ethical and social reconstruction of the society" compared with Calvinism. So it became quite popular to put back Luther and to look on Calvin concerning economic relationships. (Note 17) However, it should not be forgotten that Calvin himself has spoken quite respectful of Luther, who had been a "torch" for him and had pointed him to the path of salvation. (Note 18)

All the more important it must be to take a look using the most relevant sources on how Luther and Calvin deal with the economy, in order to check whether Luther is criticized rightly stronger compared to Calvin. Naturally this now can take place only on selected examples, (Note 19) namely with respect to the topics "property", "vocation/profession" and "interest". Initiated, however is this view of the economic statements of Luther and Calvin by some perhaps paradoxical observations. Despite of all the critical distance between theology and economics both reformers have yet used economic terms and facts positively to illustrate the content of the gospel.

2. To Proclaim the Gospel in Economic Categories

For some economists it might be surprising how much not only the language of Luther and Calvin is dominated economically, but the language of the Bible itself (Note 20) - eg in the parables of Jesus from the laborers in the vineyard (Mt 20.1 to 16), of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16.1 to 13), from the tribute money (Mt 22.15-22) etc.. (Note 21) And these parables Luther (Note 22) and Calvin (Note 23) have interpreted many times, and thus used economic issues to make the gospel clearer in their time with their help. (Note 24)

This hermeneutic approach also used by some church fathers (Note 25) can thus be found in Luther's time repeatedly when he uses not only about the terms "treasure", "coin", "Gulden", but also the underlying expectations and relationships. However, it is important that Luther criticized the purely economic logic in the same breath. So he talks about a "Treasure of the Church", but at the same time he emphasizes that the true treasure of the Church is the Holy Gospel and that Christ had left his disciples not "mines, hundredweights (of silver), money or denarii" (but the gospel). And he also emphasizes that Christ uses these words to make them aware that it is quite about a real treasure. (Note 26) And it is also "hidden in the field" (Note 27) (as well as a coin-treasure).

And in the dispute with Karlstadt he used a similar picture when he stresses that the body and blood of Christ would be for him, as if for him is provided and buried "a box full of guilders and a great treasure" (Note 28).

In any case, there would be in true faith enough reason to happiness and thanksgiving (eucharistia) "for such comforting, rich, blessed testament ... just as someone thanks, praises and is joyful, whom a good friend has bequeathed a thousand or more florins." (Note 29) The use of such economic terminology for theological questions, however, can only surprise those who are ultimately shaped by the modern separation of the living areas of theology and economics. For the previous times theology and economics just were part of everyday life. And always there were made more or less successful attempts to bring the Christian faith to bear when differences occur in the "everyday life" of each era. (Note 30) And to that extent it is not surprising that just Luther and Calvin made use of economically terms and have dealt engaged with economic (everyday) questions. (Note 31) For this purpose, now a quick glance at the representative topics "property", "vocation/profession" and "interest".

3. Property

Traditionally, one finds relating to the ownership and its elemental affiliation of human existence the reference to the protection of property by the seventh of the Ten Commandments. In the Old Testament the subject is crucial, that

God, the Creator, the world and all their things are appropriated (Ps 24). God as the owner of the land gives it to Israel as a fiefdom for its livelihoods (Ex 19.5). Only in this sense, ownership is then protected by the Decalogue.

In the New Testament there are no fundamental statements about the nature or right of private property in our modern sense. Indirect however is to tap something on the wealth criticism of Jesus. For it is matched with a remarkably free attitude to property in spite of all its sharpness. So Jesus himself lives without possessions, but presupposes almost for granted ownership and possession in his immediate environment.

What now regards the ownership in the Middle Ages, so the conditions are complicated. (Note 32) In any case, the world of that time expected instructions concerning the property question from the rediscovered Gospel by Luther and the Reformers, in view of the opinion of the Anabaptists (Note 33) that private property was illegally among Christians. In total, Locher and Wünsch judge "in line with the overall research" that Calvin and Calvinism join substantially Luther in the question of property. (Note 34)

However, it is not always explicitly stated that for both reformers - in addition to the basic aspect of the created nature of man - the conviction is crucial starting point that the believer himself is the *property of Christ*, (Note 35) and thus ultimately will serve the "glory of God". (Note 36) And on this basis for Luther then - closely following the biblical findings - property is "only property entrusted for the service of others" why it was not allowed "to proceed arbitrarily with it" (Note 37).

The right to property is just limited by the charity. (Note 38) And accordingly he says "Who has property, let him be the master of that property. ... But is he the master of that property, so the property has to serve him, and he has not to serve the property... Then he supports the poor of that property and gives those who have nothing". (Note 39) In a certain sense, for Luther dealing with property is worship; as "Because God does not need our property, it is clear that that what we let our neighbor benefit belongs to him". (Note 40)

So it is to hear similar from Calvin. (Note 41) But there is a separate accent, that concerning property he sees in responsibility (and caring for the poor "non-owners") not only the individual but the Christian community. (Note 42) Luther however developed the concept of the "Gemeynen Kasten" (public charity fund) in this context, i.e. the municipal organized poor relief. (Note 43)

Overall, it is clear to Luther that the world can not exist without certain goods: "It belongs to secular government that one has money, property, honor, power, land and people have money and can not exist without this ... And therefore it was not the opinion that one must be poor that one has nothing of one's own". (Note 44) And Calvin may even highlight that private property is necessary for peace among the people. (Note 45) Furthermore, Luther emphasized as well as Calvin, that the Christian is committed to radical sacrifice, but is explicitly against the idea of collective ownership. (Note 46) Because, in order to be able to give, the Christian must once have something. (Note 47) And similar as Calvin Luther sees work ethic closely related to property, because he can say: "Work that you get goods, that's right." (Note 48) In this way, property is then connected to the divine moulding job in one's profession. (Note 49)

4. The Lutheran Vocational Idea

It may be irrelevant whether it was indeed Luther, who had dominated the word "Beruf" (Vocation/Profession) at first, or whether his merit lies more in bringing this term in general circulation with new meaning and giving it a new sound. The result is important. And there is no doubt that Luther developed a very unique teaching of the "Beruf" (Vocation/Profession) in connection with his re-discovery that a man is justified by faith alone before God. And furthermore he designed a very own economic ethical concept, (Note 50) which, according to Weber, had been one of the most momentous achievements of the Reformation.

Therefore, especially Luther's teaching of the "Beruf" (Vocation/Profession) was the "central dogma of all Protestant denominations" (Note 51) of which still something resonates today, for example if you talking to another you usually introduce yourselves by your *profession* and not by your hobby. By Luther, the immediate reference to the word "Beruf" is found only since 1522. (Note 52) The medieval division of labor in society after which some were praying for salvation, while the other worked for the prayers then, was to break through the replacement of the vocational idea of the sole use by monasticism and clergy.

Because now every Christian had the right and the duty to care himself in prayer for being preserved and having success for himself and the whole, in the sense of the universal priesthood of the believers. Therefore, then Luther calls the Christians again and again in similar formulations to perform their "Beruf" (vocation/ profession). He says, for example: let's not tempt you, "to seek for goods as the wicked. Trust you God, and dwell in your "Beruf" (vocation/ profession). For it is the Lord even easy to make a poor man rich." (Note 53)

However, that does not abolish the activity of the Christians nor the elimination of piety, but a concentration of both. Everyone - not just special clergy - was now called to serve for the glory of God and helping one's neighbor, where

he lived and worked. The basic idea of this new, incredibly invigorating and motivating (Note 54) understanding of the "Beruf" (vocation/ profession) will then be found after a few detours (Note 55) in accordance with Calvin. (Note 56) He cannot only inculcate: "Who does not what requires his job regarding the others, takes on good of the others!" (Note 57) But Calvin also can pass on the assurance as a wonderful consolation: "if we obey only our vocation, so no work is be unsightly and small that it does not shine before God and is considered very delicious!" (Note 58)

In any case, this new understanding of the "Beruf" (vocation/ profession) was just as *sensational, liberating* and *inspiring* as in Luther's time. And it did not give space for lies and fraud, theft or embezzlement. Rather, with this the scene was prepared - in all matter of course - for the economically essential virtues of honesty, loyalty, diligence and honesty.

Understandably there were always doubts and questions whether one should feel so called of God in everyday life. But it's worth it to hear there at Luther, since he even hears a calling in one's "Beruf" (vocation/ profession) in the direct call to Peter to follow Christ (John 21.19-24). (Note 59) And further Luther takes all still existing doubts seriously when he continues, "How is it possible that you are not called? You'll still be in any state. You're about a husband or wife or child or daughter or servant or maid. Take the lowest level for you: Are you a husband, you mean, you would not have enough to work in this state? To govern thy wife, child, and household goods, that all goes in obedience to God and that you are not doing somebody injustice? Yes, if you would have four heads and ten hands, it would still be too little." (Note 60)

The Christian therefore is called by God to the tasks immediately preceding one's own hands - from the prince up to the broom-wielding maid. (Note 61) However, here for both, for the Prince as well as for he handmaid, the obedience of faith is crucial. Here, the broom-wielding of the maid is not worship because she really reached cleanliness the end, but because she does her work in *faith*. Because the behavior in the professional orders is not justified by the efficiency, but by faith respectively forgiveness (Note 62). In this sense, every Christian in the same way (Note 63) has his living place, i.e. has a "Beruf" (vocation/ profession) to which he is called of God. (Note 64)

And Luther also was convinced that the meaning of all professions established by God is, to serve the neighbor. That is why he says: "All professions are messed up braided to help each other". (Note 65) And in the exercise of that charity a man in his "Beruf" (vocation/ profession) is in a sense "Cooperator Dei". (Note 66) Looking at such a high estimation of the professional/vocational activity and in contrast to our often-oriented leisure culture of the present, for a Christian people it must not be bad if the whole day is filled with work. (Note 67) After Luther this belongs to to a "pious (frommen)" life - and that ment "useful" life in the medieval sense. Rather, Luther must hold for problematic leisure or idleness, (Note 68) because idleness leads to lust and sin. (Note 69) In contrast, it is just human (male) task to work to feed one's wife and children (Note 70) and being so diligent in that, as if to live forever. But in the same time you still should be minded, as if you should die in this hour. (Note 71)

Such an attitude only can be understood from the deep knowledge, that ultimately it is the blessing of God, which is the relevant at each success. (Note 72) And of course, this fundamental belief of Luther exactly is shared by Calvin, who can say e.g.: "We hold this as a general rule: The riches the people receive they receive them by no means due to their power, nor their wisdom nor their work, but only on the basis of the divine blessing." (Note 73) Under no circumstances that will express fatalism. But apparently that wants to resonate when after Oermanns perspective Weber rather want's to see at Luther represented "a traditionalist vocational term, in which the "Beruf" (vocation/ profession) simply is "accepted". In contrast, Calvin would place more emphasis on the idea that "the professional work is an important task asked by God." (Note 74)

Rather stays after Luther that the Christian is demanded to effort in his vocation and to hard work. But he is allowed to rely on God's care for him and therefore must not languish himself in concern. (Note 75) In the light of this promise of God's blessing Luther can rather call to care, (Note 76) loyalty (Note 77) and diligence. Remarkably, because of the promises of blessing that trust can grow up which is then as important as now: that Christians are not only happy people, (Note 78) but also well motivated people; because "similar as the Holy Spirit is courageous and despises death and all the danger, so are righteous Christians, in which is the holy spirit, are determinated and courageous". (Note 79)

Further in that time one question meant a particular challenge – even for determinated and courageous Christians - namely whether and how far a Christian could or should demand interest. And actually it should make us think that today many it lacks understanding completely for that problem. Even more important to bring this in memory now in some highlights with the most important arguments.

5. The Dispute over the Interest

Often strong emotions arise in ecclesiastical or theological context if it is spoken about money and interest. Then quick quoting of corresponding passages ("You can not serve God and mammon" [Matthew 6:24]) easily prevents a thorough penetration of the question. And also Luther developed considerable polemics on the subject of money and

interest. So you can from hear him e.g.: "Money is the word of Satan, by which he creates everything in the world, as God creates everything by the true word." (Note 80) or "The current monetary despises the current God." (Note 81) or in sharp criticism of Mammon (Note 82): "Where there is great wealth and power, there are also great sins and injustice. Money makes the thief." (Note 83)

However, Luther does not make the radical critique to his own, with which the religious poverty movement of the 13th century encountered the monetary economy. (Note 84) In contrast to a also nowadays happening mixture of criticism of mammon and ideals of poverty he denounces Mammon, but without idealizing poverty. (Note 85)

Now it is not possible to illuminat the backgrounds of the money economy in more detail at this point, but it should be noted only briefly about how seriously they wanted to take the warnings against the so-called "Mammon" and his ungodly risks in the Middle Ages - and thereby was involved in so much contradictions: for example, one thought on the one hand, to be able to buy with money free from debt by the indulgences. On the other hand, there was the Church's prohibition to take interest and to give interest, although church was dependent on the interest or lease payments for church assets simultaneously. (Note 86) The ecclesiastical prohibition of interest on the one hand was derived from some Old Testament passages (Note 87) that even in the ancient people of God were understood as a protective laws for the distressed fellow. But the taking of interest from foreigners was simply considered for permitted, as it is to read in Deut 23, 19f.: "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of any thing that is lent upon usury: Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury: that the LORD thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand to in the land whither thou goest to possess it."

On the other hand, it was understood the New Testament Luke 6,34f. (Note 88) as a prohibition of paying interest, namely as a natural way of living among Christian brothers who helped each other without being asked. To the extent, however, as from the small communities of Christian brothers in which it was well familiar then grew up to a great church for the whole people, there arose the necessity of general rules. Therefore, the early church decided a prohibition of interest in several councils e.g. in Arles 314; (Note 89) Nicaea 325; (Note 90) Carthage 345-48 (Note 91) etc.. (Note 92) And further several popes confirmed these prohibitions. But ultimately such interest prohibitions were always somehow bypassed (Note 93) - and were canonically abrogated practically without further justification in 1830. (Note 94)

Bu after Brunner interest but still remains "an ethically suspicious size. For he reasoned, if not powerless, yet unearned income" (Note 95) - a caveat, which is also called Luther much. (Note 96) As for Luther, however, some modern economist says that Luther had erred most with respect to the interest phenomenon. (Note 97) And for this reproach there may be good purely economic reasons. But for Luther not profit maximization is at its highest here, but the commandment of charity, however. And that in turn leads him to a very differentiated view of the interest phenomenon. Because if he repeatedly refuses any interest (Note 98) and any usurer, (Note 99) he still sees it as a Christian duty to pay the required interest. (Note 100) At total regarding Luther it can not be overlooked in contrast to the present time, that in money matters Luther mainly has in mind the private individual in distress - in this case the one can not afford a suddenly required payment of money.

And there he sees commanded rightly first direct care according the gospel, namely, "that we should give free and for nothing everybody who is in need or craving". (Note 101) In such immediate emergency can in fact - if you are capable of doing - only the gift is necessity, the free transfer, the free gift of charity, but not credit and interest rate. There is to see a close connection to Calvin, who as well calls again and again that you can not take a usury interest of the poor (Note 102) and also that usury has to be rejected in principle. (Note 103) But in spite of that it is to perceive the fact that Calvin then still has other perspectives than Luther and even more clearly than Luther will not reject the taking of interest. (Note 104) But first, let's look at Luther's arguments for his principled stance of interest. Here Luther refers primarily on the one hand on the Gospel (Lk 6,34f.) (Note 105) and the other hand on natural law (such as the Golden Rule Matthew 7:12) or the reason, (Note 106) and reminds also the ancient and medieval standard arguments (Note 107) against the interest rate of the infertility of money. (Note 108)

Here, the idea of infertility stirred apparent from the usual formation of funds by living cattle herds in the ancient and therefore is actually overtaken in the Reformation period. In this respect for Luther remains primarily the argument of charity against the taking of interest as well as the reason. If Calvin now ultimately emphasizes the rationality aspect more, it is striking how careful he gropes in his much-quoted paper "De Usuris" on the topic. (Note 109) Therefore you can not say as Honecker does: "usury is not viewed by Calvin as a problem." (Note 110) Or that Calvin thought usury for quite legal "according to the usual in cities practice" and thus released "on the part of Reformed theologically the way for modern capitalism." (Note 111) Here Calvin manifests himself quite different than in the radiant certainty of faith of his Institutio, because it was dangerous to give answer here. (Note 112) And then he says, "if we completely prohibit usury, we bind the conscience with a tighter band than God himself. ... First, there is no testimony in the Scriptures, by which usury is prohibited completely. For the saying of Christ, which is

usually estimated for very obvious, namely "borrows" (Lk 6:35), has been falsely twisted in this sense." (Note 113) And there he certainly has already in mind - like later in his Ezekiel commentary and in his remarks on Deut 23,12 - that the Old Testament argument that usury was forbidden does not apply, as indeed it was allowed there, to take interest from the foreigner. (Note 114) Next Calvin doubted the outdated ethical argument against usury, that money brings forth no money, and asks: "Does that the sea? The ground? I get a payment for the rental of a house. Is that because the money grows there? But they (= the usurious interest rates) come from areas where the money is made. Also the homeliness of the houses can be bought with money. And how? Is the money not more fruitful in the exchange of goods as other possessions, which might be called? It should be allowed to rent a piece of land and it levy a rate, and it shall be unlawful to take an income from the money? How? If you buy a field, does then not bring money money out?" (Note 115) And then Calvin brings a sample that perhaps could show that he as an urbane lawyer could judge Finance and modern economy better than than the supposedly more rural shaped (Note 116) and rural retarded (Note 117) monk Luther, whom seem to lack "sophisticated macro economic knowledge of European finance". (Note 118)

So often is assumed that Calvin's perspective would be just urban and would be determined by the problems of the great and wealthy cities in which they knew to appreciate the advantages of large trading companies. (Note 119) But probably this is judged rashly, as it is apparent Luther has engrossed in economic issues and it is even said of him that he had already discovered the marginal utility and capacity expansion effect. (Note 120) And after Strohm Luther and his followers had the new type of individualistic "business" not only "in the families of Fugger and Welser, but also in the urban trade patricians of European cities clearly" in mind. (Note 121) And this type is characterized by the "rational non-traditional approach to the reality, the urge for something new, the calculation in the long run". (Note 122)

However, Luther knows that these "experts" despised him. Thus he writes: "And as I write again against usury the holy usurers laughed on me and said: The Luther does not know what usury is. He might like to read his St Matthew and the Psalms. But now, am I a preacher of Christ, and is my word the word of God, as I am not doubting? So you cursed usurer either the Turkish or another else wrath of God teach you, that Luther had well understood and known, what usury is. For this I bet a good guildler". (Note 123)

This irony of Luther now must not stop to look at Calvin's example of the usefulness of interest payments. And he says:

"There is a rich man with possessions or income therefrom, but has no money on hand. There is another mediocre rich with good prospects, at least not small, at least one that will very soon have more money. If there is an opportunity this would buy a possession of his money. During those first invited him with a large petition that he lends him money. It is in the power of this (man) imposing a fee for his benefit under the title of the purchase contract, until the money is refunded. And in this way the situation (of the first man) is improved: Yet he is satisfied with the usurious interest. Why is the one contract just and honorable, the other wrong and evil?" (Note 124) After Wykes Calvin here describes a "win-win"-situation and moves the debate from the field of theology and law on the field of balance of activity in the market. (Note 125) Here he is following a way of thinking in which a pure "capital orientation" potentially could gain ground in the Weberian sense. However, Luther also had dealt with similar arguments. And to the argument of creditors that it is served to the debtor by borrowing against interest but and "do him well", why the debtor then give the interest as a voluntary gift gladly, Luther replies that even adulterers and adulteress were serving each other or would "do well" to each other. (Note 126) In this respect, the mere the argument of "common benefit" cannot withdraw the question of interest from ethical reasoning.

But also Calvin does not see the discussion be terminated with his example in "De Usuris". He gave some more advice together with the Commandment not to take usury from the poor. (Note 127) Stückelberger summarizes Calvin's advice briefly: "1. not charge interest from the poor, 2. neglect neither the necessary of your duties for the profit nor disregard your poor brothers, 3. only regarding natural justice (Golden Rule), 4. which borrows shall have as much or more income from the borrowed money than the creditor, 5. no orientation after the general and traditional custom with respect to the interest rate but only according to the word of God, 6. not only searching the personal benefit, but also what is use for the public, 7. not exceed the measure, which grant the laws of the area or of the place." (Note 128)

Obviously here is to find as in Luther (Note 129) the reference to the "natural equity" and long-standing custom, but also an emphasis on the "public interest" and good measure. It is noteworthy that Luther will refer such arguments of fairness also on the risk allocation, namely that the risk could not only layed on the interest rate payable interest man who has the interest to pay regardless of changing crop yields or business success. (Note 130)

Instead, Luther pleads for a kind of risk adjustment (Note 131) under the aspect of charity. Nowadays you try to distinguish clearly whether an investor will only invest money or participate in an entrepreneurial manner, in spite of

that this proposal could make sense in certain situations even today. After his counsels of 1545 Calvin was now regarded by many of his contemporaries, but especially in later times as that one who had basically approved the taking of interest (Note 132) and thus the money "freedom and fertility". (Note 133) And by this is forgotten that in addition to the above advice you will find with him also quite confining the direct limit of the interest rate to 5%, (Note 134) and even this very careful restrictions, if such interest payment should concern a poor. (Note 135) To that extent should the claim, Calvin had basically approved the taking of interest, does not discern his actual intentions.

However, Calvin's extension of the usury issue from the pure usury of money loaned out to other borrowed items and their return (Note 136) is not only legitimate but productive too. And that ultimately affects the question of the reasonable profit margin. As for Luther, he had argued concerning the issue of a reasonable profit margin elsewhere in the calculation questions, (Note 137) but not in relation to the hire of goods. Luther could - apart of his fundamental criticism of the former kind to take interest or to make exceptions to the practice in a dualistic way (Note 138) - only accept three ways that a Christian can take more back, as he has borrowed: the "Zinskauf" (interest rate purchase), "Notwucher" (usury out of need) and the "Schadewacht" (compensation of damage). After looking on these exceptions it is proved that the criticism of the Calvinist tradition is baseless that Luther criticized usury being completely uncompromising arrested in centuries-old tradition of scholastic (Note 139) and so would bring to radiate Calvin's renewal in contrast to Luther's conservatism. (Note 140)

1. To the "Zinskauf" (interest rate purchase),

Luther's confrontation with the "Zinskauf" (interest rate purchase) takes a considerable space in his works. And he laments its churchly and governmental releasing as great misfortune. (Note 141) However, it would not be productive, to deal with it in detail from today's perspective. (Note 142) Because obviously the "Zinskauf" is a historical construct to bypass the canonical prohibition on interest. (Note 143) And that Luther is sharply denouncing (Note 144) and he demands the abolishing of the "Zinskauf" by the Pope, Emperor, the princes and anyone. (Note 145) But he also believes that in the former situation it (yet) not appropriate to prohibit it. (Note 146)

2. The "Notwucher" (usury out of need)

It is then the motive of charity unifying Calvin and Luther, that Luther - despite all the polemic against any usury - leads to accept (Note 147) a personal "not Wucherlin" (Note 148) (small usury) in particular (emergency) cases and about for widows and orphans. The charity and thus the urge to satisfy need, Luther drives to break through the rigid principle of the prohibition of interest, because "Not bricht eisen" (Note 149) (emergency even breaks iron). The problem is that Luther here - as noted T. Dieter rightly (Note 150) - gives no criteria for when such an emergency situation is reached to take legitimately interest. For such "Notzinsnehmen" (emergency usury) and in exceptional cases Luther appear at most 4-6% interest per year as allowed: (Note 151) "The less on the hundred, the more divine and Christian the (interest rate) purchase is." (Note 152) The more emphatically he denounces therefore higher interest rates or yields (eg 30% or 40%), which yes "eat" (Note 153) with compound interest also great merchants, counts or kings. At the same time he opposes Jacob Strauss, who was initially understood as if he wanted to abolish interest and generally prohibit the debtor to pay interest. (Note 154)

And when Luther also welcomes a general reduction of interest rates in Eisenach to 5%, (Note 155) so he does not recommend both his ruler and the city of Danzig a general prohibition of interest transaction. (Note 156) But he suggests doing two approaches in terms of Aequitas (fairness), namely, that a mortgage of 5% was indeed cheap, but should be reduced if the income had become to less, and that interest takers should receive interest in any case if they are old and without means. (Note 157)

3. The "Schadewacht" (compensation of damage).

It is the subject of equity (Aequitas) and charity, that then Luther drives to the demand for compensation for damage in the sense of the "Schadewacht" (compensation of damage). This shows that he understands very well to delimit the usury of any adjustments made pursuant to law and equity compensation for an *effective* and not only in purely mathematical lost profits or even to be paid (arrears) interest rates (the so-called "Schadewacht"). (Note 158) And then from the principle of equity (Aequitas) and charity Luther rejects the 28 items from Erfurt also, where among other things, they wanted to stop all interest payments. (Note 159) For it is true that is against the Gospel, to take interest from a distressed. But it must follow not from that, to deprive another of that, what is entitled to him under secular law rightly, if one is capable of doing.

4. Interest on Productive Loans?

However, the productive loan dealing with very different contexts and even its interest calculation comes neither Luther nor many of the current fundamental critics of money in mind.

For Calvin, however, there is more reminiscence of the economic ways of thinking which are usual concerning productive loans e.g. when investing in real estate. (Note 160) After Prier Luther had indeed affirmed the function of

money as means of circulation, but he had combated the "becoming independent of money to capital" and thus the moving in of greed at the expense of charity and fairness, and that because he was able to observe so sharp the negative consequences of this development. (Note 161) In contrast, it is to be expected that from a Lutheran perspective there is no reason not to accept an allocation on grounds of fairness, as it represents the interest paying, and to expect productive impulses for the community, if there is an orderly economy, in which (approximately as at present in a socially cushioned market economy) is cared for the people in need, and that not greed is primary economic goal is an activity.

6. Outlooks

Weber was well aware that Calvin himself refused the "works" (the deeds of a person) as features of the validity before God with great emphasis, "even though they were to him, as the Lutherans, the fruits of faith". (Note 162) Nevertheless, Weber was interested in the works of the Calvinist tradition, to which he quite liked the buzzword of the "nursery of capital economy". (Note 163) However, it is likely to bring in mind by the here addressed sources that the insinuation that Calvin *himself* was to be considered as the "father of modern capitalism" is hard to maintain. (Note 164) It is to remember that the focus of the investigation of Weber is on certain forms of the (later) Calvinism and not at Calvin himself. (Note 165) However, it is hard to imagine talking about Calvinism without Calvin. And so far it had to be looked here at Calvin in comparison to Luther - in order to discover that there are hardly any significant differences between the reformers in the representative business ethical positions. If one is remembered that Calvin was always looking for the will of God in all of life's questions comparable intense as Luther, so Honecker can be agreed that Calvin certainly not recommend a purely economic or even greedy disposition, but has it opposed. (Note 166)

And what further terms now Calvin's business ethical positions, so it is *not flashy*, that they are dominated by the issues of predestination, (Note 167) as Max Weber has assumed for certain Calvinist sects. (Note 168) And it is questionable whether Calvin's interpretation of 1 Corinthians 15:19 that was regarded rightly by Oermann as evidence of an "inner-worldly asceticism" shows enough also in the problematics of predestination. (Note 169) For in the end of the here relevant third chapter of his *Institutio* from 1559 Calvin features first a way of self-denial (III, 7.1 (Note 170)), love attitude (III, 7.7 (Note 171)), trust in God's blessing (III, 7.9 (Note 172)) and carrying the Cross (III, 8.1 (Note 173)) for the justification by faith (III, 11.1 (Note 174)). And after this he comes on the topic "From the eternal election, by that God has predetermined some to salvation and the other to destruction" (III, 21.1 (Note 175)). And then he goes on to say: "There is no heavier and more dangerous contestation, with the Satan can shake the faithful, as if he troubles them with the doubt of their election and at the same time he incites them to the evil desire, to investigate after it outside the right path." (III, 24.4 (Note 176)).

Since Calvin still knows about doubts, he continues: "But sometimes the fear comes to us concerning our future state! ... But of such concern Christ has freed us. What we are now supposed to learn from it according to the will of Christ? But this that we shall confident trust it: we shall be blessed forever because once we had become his property" (III, 24.6 (Note 177)). This clearly shows how it peels out as the clou of Calvin's doctrine of predestination ultimately the reference to Christ as "mirror of the election" (Note 178) and not the self-assurance by appropriate "works" in one's vocation (profession). These avert the the topic of self-assurance must not deny that Calvin has probably appreciated more than Luther private initiative, self-interest and profit as drives economic activity (Note 179) and may have been more open and receptive to the beginning of rational monetary system in the 16th century than Luther. And thus Calvin may have put the course for a business sense, that "could unfold an enormous productivity in an economy founded in capitalism." (Note 180)

In addition may come something what lights less from Calvin's direct statements to business ethics questions, but what is part of the implementation: here speaks Weber of a "methodology of ethical conduct, which forced Calvinism in contrast to Lutheranism." (Note 181) It's about the "establishment of rational procedures and structures". And so it goes around the bottom for a "rational economic system, which - only framed by further rationalizing institutions - unfolds its full force, and becomes increasingly self-supporting due to the achieved efficiency and productivity in the production and distribution of goods, and (then unintentionally (Note 182)) can spare increasingly the ethical religious roots." (Note 183)

And Weber sees this capitalist spirit arise and become effective "after the acme of **purely** religious enthusiasm was already exceeded, the spasm of searching for the kingdom of God began to gradually dissolve in sober professional virtue, the religious roots died out slowly and gave place utilitarian worldliness." (Note 184)

But that the promotion of such a spirit never was wanted neither by Luther nor by Calvin in their intense devotion to the living God, is likely to be significantly rise from the study of the sources. Rather, just as for Luther as for Calvin was crucial, that you have to give glory to God in the economic field and you have to turn to the disadvantaged in charity. This may be regarded as a decisive impulse of both reformers for the current economic culture. One might

come to mind, that after all the people of Germany has given themselves the "Grundgesetz", the constitution, "in the consciousness of their responsibility before God and men" (Note 185) as "basic ethical consensus" of our society. (Note 186) And with the in it established "social market economy" is submitted a comprehensive set of rules to protect the disadvantaged, what hardly could be imagined without these impulses of the Reformers.

But it might be true - what Weber even more clearly stresses in the economic ethics of the world religions than in the Protestant ethic - that "the relationship between economics and ethics determined not only religious, but always also a product of their political-cultural environment and historical genesis" (Note 187) and especially are dependent by the "inner posture of humans to their environment". (Note 188) Then it would certainly not be without significance even for the modern secular society that later in the landscapes of Calvinist tradition could be found a tendency to higher productivity (Note 189) due to the stronger rational structure compared to the Lutheran tradition.

In contrast, the later Lutheran tradition may have transported more permanent vocational (professional) embossing despite later secularization, as eg Elert has observed. (Note 190) And it could not be excluded - in view of the current church life - that it has broadly developed some stronger moralization of living in the Calvinist tradition compared to the Lutheran tradition. But this could depend on many diverse factors, perhaps even of what importance attributed to the liturgy in one's own life and the church. But such discussions are not the subject of these investigations.

References

- Bettertogether, Religion and Social Capital. Retrieved February 3, 2014 from www.bettertogether.org/pdfs/Religion.pdf
- Beyer, M. (2002). Wirtschaftsethik bei Martin Luther. In Udo Kern (Hg.), *Wirtschaft und Ethik in theologischer Perspektive* (pp. 85-110). Münster.
- Biéler, A. (1959). *La pensée économique et sociale de Calvin*, Genève.
- Bogaert, R. (1976). Art. Geld (Geldwirtschaft). In Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum hrsg. v. Th. Klauser u.a., Bd. IX, Stuttgart.
- Born, K. E. (1994). Die ethische Beurteilung des Geldwesens im Wandel der Geschichte. In H. Hesse/ O. Issing (Hrsg.), *Geld und Moral*. München.
- Brecht, M. (1986). *Martin Luther*, Vol. II. Stuttgart.
- Brunner, E. (1978). *Das Gebot und die Ordnungen. Entwurf einer Protestantisch-Theologischen Ethik*. Zürich.
- BSLK. (1979). *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgerischen Konfession 1930, Göttingen.
- Büsser, F. Calvins Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik. Zu André Biélers Werk: «La pensée économique et sociale de Calvin», Librairie de l'Université, Georg & Cie S.A., Genève 1959, in *Zwingliana* 11/6 (1961), p. 395-409.
- Calvin, J. (1833). *Johannis Calvinii in Novum Testamentum Commentarii* (A.Tholuck, Editor.), Vol. 1 Berlin.
- Chua, A., & Rubenfeld, J. (2014). *The Triple Package: How Three Unlikely Traits Explain the Rise and Fall of Cultural Groups in America*. New York.
- Concilium Arelatense I. Retrieved February 26, 2014, from http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0314-0314__Concilium_Arelatense_I__Documenta_Omnia_LT.doc.html
- Concilium Carthaginense. Retrieved February 26, 2014, from http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0345-0348__Concilium_Carthaginense_I__Documenta_LT.doc.html
- Concilium Nicaenum I. Retrieved February 26, 2014, from http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0325-0325__Concilium_Nicaenum_I__03_Constitutio_Cum_Subditis_Capitulis_Suis__LT.doc.html
- CR = CORPUS REFORMATORUM. Joannis Calvinii opera quae supersunt omnia. CALVIN, Jean, CUNITZ, E./ BAUM, J.-W. / REUSS, E. W.E. (Ed.). Braunschweig 1834ff.
- Deppermann, K. (1992). Martin Luther - Bahnbrecher der Neuzeit? In: Klaus Deppermann, *Protestantische Profile von Luther bis Francke. Sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte*. Edited by Thomas Baumann, Christoph Dittrich, Frank Hugelmann, Herbert L. Müller, Göttingen, p. 5-21.
- Dieter, T. (1995). Zinskauf und Wucher. Luthers theologische Kritik an einem Rechtsinstitut der Wirtschaft seiner Zeit, in: *Luther-Bulletin* 4 (1995), 47-64.

- Elert, W. (1958). *Morphologie des Luthertums*, Bd. I, München.
- Elliot, C., Usury: A Scriptural; Ethical and Economic View. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/21623/21623-h/21623-h.htm> vom 9.1.2014
- Endemann, H. (1874/1883). *Studien in der romanisch-kanonistischen Wirtschafts- und Rechtslehre bis gegen Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, Vol. I.
- Fabiunke, G. (1963). *Martin Luther als Nationalökonom*. Berlin.
- Fischer, J. (2010). *Luther in der Wirtschaftswissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Auswirkungen auf moderne Wirtschaftsethik. Berlin.
- Goertz, H.-J. (1976–2004). Eigentum V. Mittelalter. In G. Müller/ H. Balz/ G. Krause (Edit.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Vol 9, pp. 417-423). Berlin (abbreviated TRE).
- Goertz, H.-J. Eigentum VI. Reformationszeit. In TRE 9, p 423-428.
- Grisar, H. S. J. (1912). *Luther*, Vol. 3. Freiburg i. Br.
- Gunsteren, W. F. (1934). *van, Calvinismus und Kapitalismus*. Amsterdam.
- Helmer, C. (2013). United And Divided: Luther and Calvin in Modern Protestant Theology. In R. W. Holder (Ed.), *Calvin and Luther: The Continuing Relationship*. Göttingen.
- Holder, R. W. (2013). Calvin and Luther: The Relationship that Still Echoes. In R. W. Holder (Ed.), *Calvin and Luther: The Continuing Relationship*. Göttingen.
- Holl, K. (1965). Die Geschichte des Wortes Beruf. In K. Holl (Ed.), *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, (Vol. III, p. 217). Der Westen, Darmstadt.
- Holl, K. (1923). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. I Luther. Tübingen.
- Honecker, M. (1998-2007). Art. Eigentum IV. Kirchen- und theologiegeschichtlich, ethisch. In H.D. Betz/ D.S. Browning/ B. Janowski/ E. Jüngel (Edit.), *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Tübingen 1998-2007 4. Ed. (abbreviated RGG), Vol 2., col. 1147-1152.
- Honecker, M. (1984). Art. Geld, I. Historisch und ethisch In G. Krause/ G. Müller (Hrsg.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* Bd. XII (p.279-298). Berlin/New York.
- Honecker, M. (1995). *Grundriß der Sozialethik*. Berlin/New York.
- Iannaccone, L.R. (1998, September). Introduction to the Economic of Religion. *Journal of Economic Literature*, XXXVI, 1465-1496.
- Isensee, J. *Essener Gespräche zum Thema Staat und Kirche*, Bd. 11.
- Kelly, R. A. (2000). Luthertum als Gegenkultur? Die Rechtfertigungslehre und der Konsumkapitalismus. In W. Greive (Hrsg.), *Rechtfertigung in den Kontexten der Welt, Stuttgart 2000* (p. 195-198). (LWB Dokumentation Nr. 45).
- Kerber, W. (1989). Art. Zins, III. Zins und Wirtschaftsethik, In *Staatslexikon* (Vol. V). Freiburg/Basel/Wien.
- Lachmann, W. (1987). *Wirtschaft und Ethik*. Maßstäbe wirtschaftlichen Handelns. Neuhausen/ Stuttgart.
- Lezius, F. (1898). Luthers Stellung zu den sozialen Fragen seiner Zeit. In *Verhandlungen des 9. Ev. soz. Kongresses*. Berlin.
- Locher, G. W. (1962). *Der Eigentumsbegriff als Problem evangelischer Theologie*. Zürich/Stuttgart.
- Luther, M., D. *Martin Luthers Werke*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel. Weimar 1930ff. (abbreviated WABr).
- Luther, M., D. *Martin Luthers Werke*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Tischreden. Weimar 1912ff. (abbreviated WATR).
- Luther, M., D. *Martin Luthers Werke*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Weimar 1883ff. (abbreviated WA).
- Luther, M., D. *Martin Luthers Werke*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Deutsche Bibel. Weimar 1906ff.
- Maurer, A. (2007). Der Geist des Kapitalismus - Eine institutionentheoretische Interpretation der Protestantischen Ethik. In M. Held/ G. Kubon-Gilke/ R. Sturn (Eds.), *Ökonomie und Religion* (pp. 63-87).. Jahrbuch Normative und institutionelle Grundfragen der Ökonomie Bd. 6. Marburg.
- McGrath, A. E. (1990). *A Life of John Calvin*. Oxford.
- Meckenstock, G. (1997). *Wirtschaftsethik*. Berlin/New York.
- Mehring, F. (1964). Calvin und Luther. In Mehring, F. (Ed.), *Gesammelte Schriften* (Vol. 5). Berlin.

- Müntzer T., Haumann, J. B., & Keipf, U. E. Bekantnus Thomas Müntzers, etwa Pfarrer zu Altstat und yetzo in dem auffrurischen hauffen zu Franckenhausen befunden geschehenn in der güete Pfynstag nach Cantate anno 1525, Retrieved February 20, 2014, from <https://download.digitale-sammlungen.de/pdf/1392935240bsb10985562.pdf>
- Obermann, H. A. (1989). *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*. Tübingen, p. 168.
- Oermann, N. O. (2007). Anständig Geld verdienen? Protestantische Wirtschaftsethik unter den Bedingungen globaler Märkte. Mit Geleitworten von Noam Chomsky, Stanley Hoffmann und Jeffrey D. Sachs, Gütersloh.
- Orel, A. (1930). *Oeconomia perennis*, Vol. II. Mainz.
- Pangritz, A. Zur Prädestinationslehre bei Johannes Calvin, Karl Barth und darüber hinaus, p. 7. Retrieved February 27, 2014, from http://www.ev-theol.uni-bonn.de/fakultaet/ST/lehrstuhl-pangritz/pangritz/copy5_of_texte-zumdownload/praedestinationslehre
- Panther, S. (2002). Sozialkapital und Religion - das Beispiel China. In Hans G. Nutzinger (Hg.), *Religion, Werte und Wirtschaft China und der Transformationsprozess in Asien* (p. 243-266). Marburg.
- Prien, H.-J. (1992). *Luthers Wirtschaftsethik*. Göttingen.
- Ramp, E. (1949). *Das Zinsproblem*. Eine historische Untersuchung, Zürich.
- Rathenau, W. (1924). Rede auf der Tagung des Reichsverbandes der deutschen Industrie. Gehalten in München am 28. September 1921. In W. Rathenau (Ed.), *Gesammelte Reden* (p. 241-264). Berlin.
- Schmidtchen, D. Ökonomik der Religion. In Economic Series No. 0003, Saarbrücken Februar 2000, p. 1-38. Retrieved February 3, 2014, from <http://www.wiwi.uni-saarland.de/economicwp/pdf/wp0003.pdf>
- Schmitt, H. (1976). Demokratische Lebensform und religiöses Sendungsbewußtsein. Die philosophische Analyse der evangelischen Sozialethik, München; Paderborn; Wien.
- Schulze, W. A. (1971). Luther und der Zins. In *Luther*, H. 3, p. 139-146.
- Smidt, C. E. (2003). *Religion as Social Capital: Producing the Common Good*. Waco.
- Stegmüller, D. (2010). Religiöse EU-Bürger: Staatliche Hilfe soll auf wenige Bedürftige begrenzt bleiben, In *Forschung Frankfurt* 2/2010.
- Strohm, Th. (1983). Luthers Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik. In H. Junghans (Ed.), *Leben und Werk Martin Luthers von 1526 bis 1546. Festgabe zu seinem 500. Geburtstag. Im Auftrag des Theologischen Arbeitskreises für Reformationsgeschichtliche Forschung* (Vol. I, p. 205-223). Göttingen.
- Stükelberger, C. (2009). Keine Zinsen von den Armen. Calvins Wirtschafts- und Bankenethik. In C. Stükelberger, & R. Bernhardt (Eds.), *Calvin und die Wirkungen. Glaube gestaltet Gesellschaft. Ringvorlesung der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Basel* (p. 1-14). Basel.
- Stümke, V. (2007). Das Friedensverständnis Martin Luthers. Grundlagen und Anwendungsbereiche seiner politischen Ethik. Stuttgart.
- Thielicke, H. (1951). *Theologische Ethik I*. Tübingen.
- Troeltsch, E. (1923). *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*. Tübingen.
- Unternehmerisches Handeln in evangelischer Perspektive. Eine Denkschrift des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland. Gütersloh 2008
- WA = Luther, M., D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Weimar 1883ff.
- WABr = Luther, M., D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel. Weimar 1930ff.
- WATR = Luther, M., D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Tischreden. Weimar 1912ff.
- Weber H. (1980). Evangelische Sozialethik zwischen christlichem Proprium und werturteilsfreier Analyse? In Th. Strohm (Hrsg.), *Christliche Wirtschaftsethik vor neuen Aufgaben. Festgabe für Arthur Rich zum siebzigsten Geburtstag* (p. 145-162). Zürich.
- Weber, M. (1920). Die Protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus. In M. Weber, (Ed.), *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie I*. Tübingen.
- Weber, M. (1989). Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen. Konfutianismus und Taoismus: Schriften 1915-1920. In Gesamtausgabe, Band I/19, hrsg. von H. Schmidt-Glintzer. Tübingen.
- Weber, M. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie I*.

- Wingren, G. Art. Beruf II. Historische und ethische Aspekte, in: TRE 5,p.
- Winter, M. Gibt es im Himmel einen Lohn? Zur exegetischen und theologischen Bedeutung der neutestamentlichen Anschauung vom Lohn. In Deutsches Pfarrblatt 2/2014, p. 90 + 99-103.
- Wulf, F. Alltag und Alltäglichkeit, in: LThK3, Bd 1, col. 356
- Wünsch, G. Evangelische Wirtschaftsethik, Tübingen 1927
- Wünsch, G. Luthers Beurteilung der Zinswirtschaft. In Die Christliche Welt, 29 Jg. 1915.
- Wykes, M. (2003). Devaluing the Scholastics: Calvin's Ethics of Usury. *CALVIN THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL*, 38, 27-51.
- Zademach, W. (1983). Luther und Marx. Assoziationen zu zwei Gedenktagen. In Junge Kirche 44, p. 671.
- Zak P.J., & Knack, S. (2001, April). Trust and Groth. *The Economic Journal*, 111, 295-321.
- Zorn, W. (1971). Sozialgeschichte 1500 – 1648. In H. Aubin, & W. Zorn (Eds.), *Handbuch der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte, Bd. 1*, Stuttgart.

Notes

- Note 1. W. Rathenau, Rede auf der Tagung des Reichsverbandes der deutschen Industrie. Gehalten in München am 28. September 1921, in: W. Rathenau, *Gesammelte Reden*, Berlin 1924, p. 241-264, (264).
- Note 2. See M. Weber, *Die Protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus*, in: M. Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie I*, Tübingen (1920). To this ideas Iannaccone remarks: „Despite numerous studies challenging the empirical validity of this argument, the Protestant Ethic thesis lives "as an article of faith in such varied texts as (nearly all) sociology primers, international business textbooks of all stripes, [and] the middlebrow press““. See L.R. Iannaccone, Introduction to the Economic of Religion, in: *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol. XXXVI (September 1998), pp. 1465-1496 (1474).
- Note 3. E.g. Panther says: „Die Höhe des Sozialkapitals korreliert stark mit dem dominanten religiösen Hintergrund einer Gesellschaft: Eine protestantische bzw. konfuzianische Prägung geht mit einem vergleichsweise hohen Sozialkapital einher, ein katholischer bzw. moslemischer Hintergrund mit einem vergleichsweise niedrigen.“ See S. Panther, *Sozialkapital und Religion - das Beispiel China*, in: Hans G. Nutzinger (Hg.), *Religion, Werte und Wirtschaft China und der Transformationsprozess in Asien*, Marburg 2002, p. 243-266 (243); see further Smidt, Corwin E., *Religion as Social Capital: Producing the Common Good*. Waco, 2003; or see *Bettertogether: Religion and Social Capital*, in: www.bettertogether.org/pdfs/Religion.pdf (3.2.2014)
- Note 4. See e.g.: „At the level of individuals and households, economic behavior and outcomes do correlate with religion.“ See L.R. Iannaccone, Introduction, p. 1475: see further D. Stegmüller, *Religiöse EU-Bürger: Staatliche Hilfe soll auf wenige Bedürftige begrenzt bleiben*, in: *Forschung Frankfurt* 2/2010, p. 60: „Gerade ein zunehmend säkular geprägtes Umfeld kann Menschen, die sich nach wie vor mit einer Konfession identifizieren, mobilisieren, ihre Werte und Vorstellungen von einer als moralisch richtig empfundenen Politik zu vertreten. Unabhängig von der Rolle und Position von religiösen Institutionen (wie Kirchen und Verbände) spielt Religion dann eine wichtige Rolle für die Überzeugungen und Entscheidungen von gewöhnlichen Menschen.“ For a global View see e.g. P.J. Zak/ S. Knack, *Trust and Groth*, in: *The Economic Journal* 111(April) 2001, p. 295-321
- Note 5. See the Discussion on the current book of A. Chua/ J. Rubenfeld, *The Triple Package: How Three Unlikely Traits Explain the Rise and Fall of Cultural Groups in America*, New York 2014
- Note 6. See e.g.: L.R. Iannaccone, Introduction, pp. 1465-1496; or see D. Schmidtchen, *Ökonomik der Religion*, in: *Economic Series No. 0003*, Saarbrücken Februar 2000, <http://www.wiwi.uni-saarland.de/economics-wp/pdf/wp0003.pdf> (3.2.2014), p. 1-38
- Note 7. There are, however, apparently not many studies, examining the relationships between Luther and Calvin.. So Holder says: „And yet, in many ways the movements built on the teaching of Luther and Calvin developed in relationship and resonance—not only opposition—with one another. Despite this fact, very few scholars have explicitly considered the relationship between Calvin and Luther or between Calvinism and Lutheranism.“ See R. W. Holder, *Calvin and Luther: The Relationship that Still Echoes*, in: R. W. Holder (ed.), *Calvin and Luther: The Continuing Relationship*, Göttingen 2013, p. 8
- Note 8. See C. Helmer, *United And Divided: Luther and Calvin in Modern Protestant Theology*, in: R. W. Holder (ed.), *Calvin and Luther: The Continuing Relationship*, Göttingen 2013, p. 202: „Early modern studies has dramatically changed over the past decade. The time of narrow specialization is over. No longer is Luther viewed as sole hero of the Protestant Reformation, standing alone speaking truth to power; no longer is Calvin to be studied in isolation from the movements with which he was intimately involved and from his relationships with other

theologians and church people. The scholarly trend is moving decisively away from focusing on slivers of sixteenth-century time.“

Note 9. See M. Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie I*, p. 552

Note 10. G. Wünsch, *Luthers Beurteilung der Zinswirtschaft*, in: *Die Christliche Welt*, 29 Jg. 1915, p. 130

Note 11. G. Wünsch, *Luthers Beurteilung*, p. 27

Note 12. So you can read eg. by H. Weber in: “*Evangelische Sozialethik zwischen christlichem Proprium und werturteilsfreier Analyse?*” In: Th. Strohm (Hrsg.), *Christliche Wirtschaftsethik vor neuen Aufgaben. Festgabe für Arthur Rich zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Zürich 1980, p. 145

Note 13. See e.g. H. Schmitt, *Demokratische Lebensform und religiöses Sendungsbewußtsein. Die philosophische Analyse der evangelischen Sozialethik*, München; Paderborn; Wien 1976, p. 15, zustimmend zitiert bei N. O. Oermann, *Anständig Geld verdienen? Protestantische Wirtschaftsethik unter den Bedingungen globaler Märkte*. Mit Geleitworten von Noam Chomsky, Stanley Hoffmann und Jeffrey D. Sachs, Gütersloh 2007, p. 110

Note 14. See eg. R. A. Kelly, *Luthertum als Gegenkultur? Die Rechtfertigungslehre und der Konsumkapitalismus*. In: W. Greive (Hrsg.), *Rechtfertigung in den Kontexten der Welt*, Stuttgart 2000 (LWB Dokumentation Nr. 45), p. 195-198, here p. 196

Note 15. M. Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik*, p. 28; p. 125

Note 16. See e.g.: E. Troeltsch, “*Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*”, Tübingen 1923³, p. 605

Note 17. See e.g.: G. Wünsch, *Evangelische Wirtschaftsethik*, Tübingen 1927, p. 6 und p. 717; oder see André Biéler, *La pensée économique et sociale de Calvin*, Genève 1959, S.19, 29, who says critical to Luther: «Seul le renouveau de la foi intéresse le réformateur». But that is criticized correctly by F. Büsler, *Calvins Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*. Zu André Biélers Werk: «*La pensée économique et sociale de Calvin*», Librairie de l'Université, Georg & Cie S.A., Genève 1959, in *Zwingliana* 11/6 (1961), p. 395-409, here p. 408. And so G. Meckenstock, *Wirtschaftsethik*, Berlin/New York 1997, p. 104 speaks of the great social effects of the reformation-theology of Luther. See K. Deppermann, *Martin Luther - Bahnbrecher der Neuzeit?* In: Klaus Deppermann, *Protestantische Profile von Luther bis Francke. Sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte*. Hrsgg. von Thomas Baumann, Christoph Dittrich, Frank Hugelmann, Herbert L. Müller, Göttingen 1992, p. 5-21 here p. 20

Note 18. „*Deus initio Lutherum et alios excitavit, qui nobis facem ad reperendam salutis viam praetulerunt...*“ See *CORPUS REFORMATORUM. Joannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*. CALVIN, Jean, CUNITZ, E./ BAUM, J.-W. / REUSS, E. W.E. (Ed.). Braunschweig 1867, (following abbreviated CR), VOL. XXXIV, col. 459

Note 19. It is not possible to look on possible developments in the konceptual thinking as of Luther as of Calvin. See. Th. Strohm, *Luthers Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*, p. 206f.. To the writings of Luther on economic ethics see M. Beyer, *Wirtschaftsethik bei Martin Luther*, in: Udo Kern (Hg.), *Wirtschaft und Ethik in theologischer Perspektive*, Münster 2002, p. 93ff.

Note 20. See *Unternehmerisches Handeln in evangelischer Perspektive. Eine Denkschrift des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*. Gütersloh 2008, p. 33

Note 21. See the considerations on the firstly economic category of payment at M. Winter, *Gibt es im Himmel einen Lohn? Zur exegetischen und theologischen Bedeutung der neutestamentlichen Anschauung vom Lohn*. In: *Deutsches Pfarrerblatt* 2/2014, p. 90 + 99-103

Note 22. Luther is preaching on Mt 22,15-22 (tax coin), first looking on his teaching of the two kingdoms. (see D. Martin *Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Weimar 1883ff. (following abbreviated WA), Vol. 29, p. 598-605 (1529); WA 32, 178-187 (1530); WA 37,190-195 (1533); WA 52, 529-537 (1533); WA 10 I 2,417ff.(1526); WA 10 III, 428ff.(1522)). But he gives explanations to the economic logic of taxes too. See WA 52, 536,37-537,3 (1533).

Note 23. Calvin interprets eg Mt 22,15-22 (tax coin) in: *Johannis Calvini in Novum Testamentum Commentarii* (A. Tholuck Hrsg.), Bd. 1 Berlin 1833, p. 217ff.; Mt 20,1-16 (workers in the vineyard) ibd. p. 171ff.

Note 24. Thus Luther was indeed in society some supporters of the via moderna which was influencing him strongly, such as Gabriel Biel and Nicholas of Cusa. Apparently it was not just the nominalism that "could provide conceptual apparatus" for the understanding of monetary processes, as Oberman initially thinks. Rather, "economic theory and theology (grasp) into one another" here and again in all times. See H. A. Obermann; *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, Tübingen 1989, p. 168

Note 25. See R. Bogaert, Art. *Geld (Geldwirtschaft)*, in: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* hrsg. v. Th. Klauser u.a., Bd. IX, Stuttgart 1976, Sp. 858 mit entsprechenden Belegen: „Die Kirchenväter der ersten drei J(ahr)h(underte) haben Ausdrücke der G(eldwirtschaft) manchmal auch bildlich gebraucht. Besonders das G(eld) selbst, νομισμα,

βασιλικον χρυσιον oder νομισματα δογμα (argentum probatum, pecunia domini) bedeutet regelmäßig die Lehre des Herren.“

Note 26. probably concerning Mt 13,47-50

Note 27. „Verus thesaurus Ecclesiae est sacrosanctum Euangelium gloriae et gratiae dei. ... Nihil enim reliquit in mundo Christus praeter solum Euangelium. Unde et nihil servis vocatis tradidit quam m(i)nas, talenta, pecunias, denarios, ut ex iis ipsis vocabulis thesaurorum ipsum verum thesaurum esse ostenderet. ... Et Christus thesaurum absconditum in agro, Et hoc ipsum, quod est absconditus, facit, ut sit pariter et neglectus. WA 1,616,11-19 (Resolutiones disputatum de indulgentiarum virtute 1518)

Note 28. See WA 18,203,6-13

Note 29. See WA 6,231, 7-9

Note 30. See F. Wulf, Alltag und Alltäglichkeit, in LThK³, Bd 1, col. 356.

Note 31. In this sense Oermann notes: "Luther was interested in questions about the ethics of economics only insofar as they determine the life of a Christian that takes place at market places as well as in parliaments, workbenches, or in worship. Questions regarding economy, money and trade therefore are always closely oriented questions to the human reality of worldly justice. In this context, justice becomes for Luther the decisive scale of economic acting, where secular justice is for him only if part of divine justice, as one who has the latter experienced through faith, will seek naturally to secular justice and a just economic order. Only in this sense one can speak of a Lutheran "business ethics" *per se* at all, which is not a systematic treatise, but most applied ethics." See N. O. Oermann, Anständig Geld verdienen, p. 111

Note 32. See H.-J. Goertz, Eigentum V. Mittelalter, in: G. Müller/ H. Balz/ G. Krause (Edit.): Theologische Realenzyklopädie. Berlin 1976–2004 (following abbreviated TRE) Vol 9, p. 417

Note 33. See eg. T.Müntzer/ J.B. Haumann/ U.E. Keipf, Bekantnus Thomas Müntzers, etwa Pfarrer zu Altstat und yetzo in dem auffrurischen hauffen zu Franckenhausen befunden geschehenn in der güete Pfyntag nach Cantate anno 1525, in: <https://download.digitale-sammlungen.de/pdf/1392935240bsb10985562.pdf> v. 20.2.2014, der in dem (unter Folter gemachten) Geständnis als Ziel bekennt „omnina sunt comunia“(S. 3). Against This opinion see namely BSLK 70,15f.; 246,36-40; 824,28-31

Note 34. See G.W. Locher, Der Eigentumsbegriff als Problem evangelischer Theologie, Zürich/Stuttgart 1962², p. 36

Note 35. See eg. „das was Christus hatt, das ist eygen der glaubigen seele, was die seele hatt, wirt eygen Christi.“ (WA 7,25,20-22) Or see Inst III, 7,1 (CR 30 Calvin 02, Sp. 506) „Nostris non sumus: ergo ne vel ratio nostra, vel voluntas in consiliis nostris factisque dominetur. ... Nostris non sumus: ergo quoad licet obliviscamur nosmetipsos ac nostra omnia. Rursum, Dei sumus: illi ergo vivamus ac moriamur. Dei sumus: cunctis ergo nostris actionibus praesideat sapientia eius et voluntas. Dei sumus: ad illum igitur, tanquam solum legitimum finem, contendant omnes vitae nostrae partes.“

Note 36. See W.F. van Gunsteren, Calvinismus und Kapitalismus, Amsterdam 1934, p. 187, approvingly quoted by N. O. Oermann, Anständig Geld verdienen, p. 119

Note 37. See M. Brecht, Martin Luther, Vol. II, Stuttgart 1986, p. 147

Note 38. See M. Honecker, Grundriß der Sozialethik, Berlin/New York 1995, p. 481

Note 39. See WA 10 I, 2,376,6-14

Note 40. „Quia deus nostris bonis non eget, statuit ut quicquid proximo retribuimus, sibi retributum sit et sic satisfactum.“ See WA 3,210,37f.

Note 41. From Calvin (exaggerated) is said that at his scruples are missing, Luther joined with the private property. See, H.-J. Goertz, Eigentum VI. Reformationszeit, in: TRE 9, p 427. Or Locher says that unlike Luther, Calvin can not feel the problem of property as such. See, G.W. Locher, Der Eigentumsbegriff als Problem evangelischer Theologie, Zürich/Stuttgart 1962², p 36. This at least not sounds out from his institution where he says (Inst II, 8,45f.): „Finis: quoniam abominationi est Deo iniustitia, ut reddatur unicuique quod suum est. Summa igitur .erit, nos vetari rebus alienis inhiare, ac proinde iuberi, suis unicuique conservandis bonis fidelem operam impendere. Sic enim cogitandum est, unicuique evenisse quod possidet, non fortuita sorte-, sed ex distributione summi rerum omnium Domini; (CR 30,298). ... 46. Rite ergo sic parebimus mandato, si nostra sorte contenu nullum nisi honestum et legitimum lucrum facere studeamus; si non appetamus cum iniuria ditescere, nee fortunis diruere proximum moliamur, quo res nobis accrescat (CR 30,299) ... quod si cum perfidis ac fallacibus negotium fuerit, ex nostro potius aliquid cedere parati simus, quam ut contendamus cum Ulis. Neque id modo: sed quos rerum difficultate videri-mus premi, eorum necessitatibus communicemus, ac nostra copia sublevemus eorum inopiam.“ (CR 30,299)

Note 42. See Inst. III,7,5 see CR 30, 509f.

Note 43. See Luthers Order for such a „Gemeynen Kasten“ for the town of Leisnig in WA 12,11-30

Note 44. See WA 32, 307

Note 45. „neque etiam convllitur ordo politicus, quo suas unicuique facultates privatim possidere licet, ut necesse est, pacis inter homines conservandae causa, rerum dominia inter ipsos propria et distincta esse.“ (Inst IV, 1,3 see CR 30, col.748)

Note 46. See WA 15,306,33-36

Note 47. See WA 51, 384, 4ff.: „Sol ein Christ geben, so mus er züvor haben“

Note 48. See WA 29,551

Note 49. See K. Holl, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, Bd. I Luther, Tübingen 1923³, p. 258

Note 50. It is certainly undervalued when Wingren writes that "Luther only the term "Beruf" (calling/ profession) had given an exclusively worldly sound. See G. Wingren, Art. Beruf II. Historische und ethische Aspekte, in: TRE 5,p. 657

Note 51. See M. Weber, Die protestantische Ethik, p. 69,72

Note 52. See K. Holl, Die Geschichte des Wortes Beruf, in: K. Holl, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, Bd. III, Der Westen, Darmstadt 1965, p. 217 related to WA 10 I/1, 306: "Unangesehen aller heyligen exempell und leben soll eyn iglicher warttem, was yhm befolhen ist und warnhemen seynis beruffis" oder WA 10 I/1, 309 "Sihe, wie nu niemand on befelch und beruff ist, szo ist auch niemand on werck".

Note 53. See Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Deutsche Bibel. Weimar Vol 12, p.178 (of 1534) to Jesus Sirach 11,20-22: „Bleib jnn Gottes wort, vnd vbe dich drinnen, vnd beharre jnn deinem beruff, Und las dich nicht jrren, wie die Gottlosen nach gut trachten, Vertraue du Gott, vnd bleib jnn deinem beruff, Denn es ist dem HERRN gar leicht, einen armen reich zu machen.“ See also WA 12,128,21: „Eyn iglicher bleybe ynn dem ruff, darynnen er beruffen bist“. See also WA 12,132,27-29: „Bleybe yn dem ruff, darynnen du beruffen bist, das ist, wie dich das Evanglion trifft, un dwie dich seyn ruffen findet, so bleybe.“

Note 54. It's really amazing when Weber says regarding the Lutheran profession idea: "what remained an unsafe, purely constructive-mental approach with him (Luther), was now at the Calvinists a characteristic part of their ethical system." See M. Weber, Die protestantische Ethik, p. 100

Note 55. Thus Max Weber is tracing the use of the word "Beruf": "The creation of the word "Beruf" in our modern sense by him (Luther) remained first thoroughly Lutheran. The Apocrypha the Calvinists seemed as uncanonical. The Calvinists have only the Lutheran term "Beruf" accepted and now strongly emphasized in the wake of that development, which pushed interest in the "probation" in the foreground; but in the first (Romanesque) translations did not have an appropriate word available and no power to create word in the already stereotyped language spoke in use." See M. Weber, Die protestantische Ethik, p. 68

Note 56. So Stückelberger can say: "This message of faith of Calvin that God's rich blessing be upon all men, led him as Luther and Zwingli to what is called the Protestant work ethic and is part of business ethics: to work hard, to work out a living on one's own and not to be dependent to live as a mercenary or beggar, and at the same time to live entirely from the grace, knowing that salvation does not depend on good works." See C. Stückelberger, Keine Zinsen von den Armen. Calvins Wirtschafts- und Bankenethik, in: C. Stückelberger / R. Bernhardt, Calvin und die Wirkungen. Glaube gestaltet Gesellschaft. Ringvorlesung der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Basel. Basel 2009, p. 10f.

Note 57. See Calvin Inst. II, 8, 46: „Alienuin enim et retinet et praevvertit, qui non exsoquitur quod ex suae vocationis munere aliis debet.“(CR 30,299), (deutsch nach Johannes Calvin, Unterricht, p. 246)

Note 58. See CR 30,532: „Hinc et eximia consolatio nascetur, quod nullum erit tam sordidum ac vile opus, quod (modo tuae vocationi pareas) non coram Deo resplendeat et pretiosissimum habeatur.“

Note 59. „Unangesehen aller heyligen exempell und leben soll eyn iglicher wartten, was yhm befolhen ist, unnd warnhemen seynis beruffis. O, das ist ßo eyn nottige, heylsame lere!“ See WA 10 I, 306,17-19

Note 60. See WA 10 I, 308,6-14

Note 61. See WA 10 I, 308ff "Item: bistu eyn furst, herr, geystlich odder weltlich, wer hatt mehr tzu thun denn du? das deyn unterthan recht thun, frid sey, niemant unrecht geschehe. (308f.)

Sihe wie nu niemand on befelch und beruff ist, szo ist auch niemand on werck, szo er recht thun will. Ist nu eynem iglichen drauff tzu mercken, das er ynn seynem stand bleybe, auff sich selb sehe, seynis befelchs warnhem unnd

darynnen gott diene und seyn gepott hallte, szo wirtt er tzu schaffen szo viell ubirkommen, das yhm all tzeit tzu kurtz, alle stett tzu enge, alle krefft tzu wenig seyn werdenn. (309,14)

Daher kompts, das eyn frum magt, szo sie ynn yhrem befehl hynngeht unnd nach yhrem ampt den hoff keret oder mist ausztreget, oder eyn knecht ynn gleycher meynung pflugt und fehret, stracks tzu gen hymel geht, auff der richten straß, dieweyll eyn ander, der tzu sanct Jacob odder tzur kirchen geht, seyn ampt und werck lest, stracks tzur hellen geht. (310,9ff.)

Sihe, da sagt S. Peter, das die gnaden und gaben gotis nit eynerley, sondern mancherley sey. Und eyn iglicher soll der seynen wahrnehmen, dieselbigen uben und damit den andern nutz seyn. Wie gar eyn feyn weszen were es, wo es also tzugienge, das eyn iglicher des seynen warttet und doch dem andern damit dienete und also hewfflich auf der rechten strasz mitteynander gen hymell furen"(311,3)

Note 62. See H. Thielicke, *Theologische Ethik I*, Tübingen 1951, p. 11

Note 63. See WA 49,609,29-34

Note 64. So Stümke can specify that the state, the office and the secular profession of Christians in soteriological terms played no role after Luther's doctrine of justification. Because "this" indifference of the profession" for Luther has now two meanings since 1522. It says on the one negative that due to the respective profession no validity of Christians can be claimed before God (that is eg. the critique of the claims of monasticism of 1521). On the other hand, it implies that the professions are equivalent to each other - and for two reasons. Firstly, you are all unfit to justify and secondly, they are all willed by God as a design possibility of faith". See V. Stümke, *Das Friedensverständnis Martin Luthers. Grundlagen und Anwendungsbereiche seiner politischen Ethik*. Stuttgart 2007, p. 171

Note 65. See WA 11, 179,11f.: „Sic omnes artifices sind durch einander geflochten, das einer dem anderen helfff“.

Note 66. See eg. WA 18,754,5-7

Note 67. WA 40 III,237, 32-238,13

Note 68. See eg. WA 31 I, 437, 7-9 or WA 43, 617,21-27

Note 69. See WA 1, 505, 26-29. See similar WA 6,268,32-269,9

Note 70. See WA 17 I, 23,36-38

Note 71. See WA 45, 384, 21-24: „Man soll arbeiten, Alß wolt man Ewig leben, Und doch alßo gesynnet sein, Alß solten wir diße stund sterben.“

Note 72. See eg. WA 15,368,9-11: „Also soll und mus der mensch auch erbeyten und ettwas thun, Aber doch daneben wissen, das eyn ander sey der yhn neere denn seyne erbeyt, nemlich Göttlicher segen,...“. Es ist erfreulich, dass in der Gegenwart W. Lachmann, *Wirtschaft und Ethik. Maßstäbe wirtschaftlichen Handelns*. Neuhausen/Stuttgart 1987, p. 174ff. die Bedeutung des Segens wieder herausstellt

Note 73. „Tant y a qu'il nous faut avoir ceste reigle generale, que les richesses ne viennent point aux hommes par leur vertu, ni sagesse, ni labour: mais que c'est par la seule benediction de Dieu.“ See CR 54 Calvin 26, col. 627. Or see Calvins conviction „prosperitas, ut Dei donum est, non erat per se damnanda“. See CR 65 Calvin 37, col. 167. Overall Goetz comments: "In Calvin is success is at work without a problem as long as it is not used to own glory, but for the glory of God. This also applies to the profession of merchant and banker". See H.-J. Goertz, *Eigentum VI. Reformationszeit*, in: TRE 9, p. 428. However, taking into account with respect to the Bankers not Calvin's reluctance to De Usuris. See CR 38I, col. 248

Note 74. See N. O. Oermann, *Anständig Geld verdienen*, p. 131

Note 75. See WA 22,80,38 – 81,11; see also D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Tischreden. Weimar 1912ff. (following abbreviated WATR) Vol 3,191, Nr. 3145c

Note 76. See WA 43,617, 21-27

Note 77. See eg. WA 43, 512, 16-26 or WATR 2433

Note 78. if not, they were tempted by the devil! See WATR 522

Note 79. See WATR 6896

Note 80. See WATR 391

Note 81. See WATR 2347

Note 82. „Nun mammon haßt, wenn ainer hat überige narung, damit er dem anderen helffen sol, und sich nit verderb. Darnach nennet es der herr ain ungerecht mammon das man das gut, das man überig hat, sol nennen mammon iniquitatis, darumb das es täglich sei in dem brauch des unrechten“. See WA III, 274,17-31

Note 83. See WA 19, 381,4-6

Note 84. See K. E. Born, Die ethische Beurteilung des Geldwesens im Wandel der Geschichte, in: H. Hesse/ O. Issing (Hrsg.), Geld und Moral. München 1994, p. 9

Note 85. So he says, although in WA 36, 349.20 to 24 "Nothing in the world prevents the faith as much as wealth and mammon. Who is rich and has something that beats the word of God in the wind and is running with feet about it," but then added, "Those who are poor, who will do anything to fend off poverty. So it goes neither to the right nor to the left".

Note 86. See W. Kerber, Art. Zins, III. Zins und Wirtschaftsethik, in: Staatslexikon Bd V⁷, Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1989, p. 1161

Note 87. See eg. Ex 22,24: „If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury. Or see Lev 25,35-7: „And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him, or increase: but fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase.“ Or see Neh 5,7b: „Then I consulted with myself, and I rebuked the nobles, and the rulers, and said unto them, Ye exact usury, every one of his brother. And I set a great assembly against them.“ Or see Ps 15,5: (LORD, who shall abide in thy tabernacle?) „He that putteth not out his money to usury“. Or see Ez 18,8: (But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right,) ... “He that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase, that hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man,“ (he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord GOD.)

Note 88. „And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil.“

Note 89. canon „XII Ut clerici feneratoris excommunicentur. ... De ministris, qui fenerant, placuit eos iuxta formam divinitus datam a communione abstinere.“ in: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0314-0314__Concilium_Arelatense_I__Documenta_Omnia__LT.doc.html v. 26.2.2014

Note 90. canon „XVIII De clericis usuram aut ampliationem accipientibus. ... DE CLERICIS USURAM AUT AMPLIATIONEM ACCIPIENTIBUS ... XVIII Quoniam multi clerici avaritiae causa turpia lucra sectantes obliti sunt divini praecepti, quo dictum est: Qui pecuniam suam non dedit ad usuram, fenerantes centesimas exigant, statuit hoc sanctum concilium: Si quis inventus fuerit post hanc definitionem usuram accipere vel ex quolibet tali negotio turpia lucra sectari vel etiam species frumentorum ad sescuplum dare, omnis, qui tale aliquid conatus fuerit ad quaestum, deiciatur ex clero et alienus ab ecclesiastico habeatur gradu.“ in: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0325-0325__Concilium_Nicaenum_I__03_Constitutio_Cum_Subditis_Capitulis_Suis__LT.doc.html v. 26.2.2014

Note 91. canon 13: „Vt non liceat clericis faenerari. ... Abundantius episcopus adrumetinus dixit: in nostro concilio statutum est ut non liceat clericis fenerari.“ in: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0345-0348__Concilium_Carthaginense_I__Documenta__LT.doc.html v. 26.2.2014

Note 92. Ollover see the survey of R. Bogaert, Art. Geld (Geldwirtschaft), col. 879

Note 93. As it is well known, that the Fugger conceded considerable interest bank charges and extortion related foreign exchange gains despite the official ban. See W. Zorn, Sozialgeschichte 1500 - 1648, in: H. Aubin/ W. Zorn, Handbuch der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte, Bd. 1, Stuttgart 1971, p. 486f.; see also C. Stückelberger, Keine Zinsen von den Armen, p. 6

Note 94. See DS 2722-24

Note 95. See E. Brunner, Das Gebot und die Ordnungen. Entwurf einer Protestantisch-Theologischen Ethik. Zürich 1978⁴, p. 421

Note 96. „Nam pecunia est res sterilis, Populus autem ad laborem manuum est sollicitandus“. See WATR 4, 524,20-22 Nr. 4805; see also WA 6,466; WA 37,12; WATR 5, Nr. 5429

Note 97. See eg. F. Lezius, Luthers Stellung zu den sozialen Fragen seiner Zeit, in: “Verhandlungen des 9. Ev. soz. Kongresses”, Berlin 1898

Note 98. With relation to the prohibition of interest in the Old Testament see WA 6, 3f.

Note 99. So public usurers should be done under the spell (WATR 5216; similar WATR 4496). They should not be allowed to the sacrament, not to be baptized, not be allowed into the Christian community (WA 51, 422). In a specific example, he argues for the exclusion of a nobleman of the sacrament, because he borrowed for 30% (WATR 5216). However, must be completed by Luther usurers, if they repent and make a restitution for the for that they had taken away (WATR 5593).

Note 100. See eg. WA 10 III, 285,17-18

Note 101. See WA 6, 41.

Note 102. See eg. CR 38 I, 246; 248f.

Note 103. eg in the Geneva Church Order of 1541: „Mais premièrement fault noter quil y a des crimes qui sont du tout intollerables en un ministre ... Hérésie Scisme Rebellion contre lordre ecclésiastique. Blaspheme manifeste et digne de peine civile. Simonye et toute corruption de presens ... Usure. ... See CR 38 I, 19. See also the Church Order of 1561, CR 38 I,97; or see the commentary on Ps 15,5 (1557) See CR 59, 147; or see the commentary on EZ 18,8 (1565) See CR 68, 430

Note 104. See eg. CR 68,430: „Videtur itaque ex his duobus locis posse colligi foenus per se esse illicitum. Sed quia lex Dei complectitur summam et perfectam iustitiam, ideo tenendum est, foenus nisi cum lege Dei pugnet, non esse prorsus damnabile: alioqui ignominia, ut apparet, irrogatur legi Dei, nisi praescribat nobis veram et integram iuste vivendi regulam. Atqui in lege ea est perfectio, ad quam nihil possit accedere. Si ergo volumus statuere an foenus sit illicitum, necesse est venire ad normam legis, quae fallere non potest. Atqui non reperiemus quodlibet foenus esse legi contrarium. Hinc ergo sequitur, neque semper foenus posse damnari.“

Note 105. See WA 6, 4; but also with relation on Mt 5,42 or Deut 15,7f.. See WA 6, 47

Note 106. See G. Wünsch, Luthers Beurteilung der Zinswirtschaft, in: Die Christliche Welt, 29 Jg. 1915, p. 89ff.,. He also mentions as third reason that is prohibited for Luther usury (but was rarely used by him), because the elapsed time you felt as a value and could be paid through interest could not be paid because it was a free gift of God to all people.

Note 107. That H. Endemann, Studien in der romanisch-kanonistischen Wirtschafts- und Rechtslehre bis gegen Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts, Berlin 1874/1883, I, p. 41 recognizes correctly. But he has not in mind Luther's emphasizing the charity the coming of the Gospel what goes beyond the canon law. In this respect he was not, as H. Grisar S. J., Luther, Bd. 3, Freiburg i. Br. 1912, p. 586, claims he has not stopped at the handed down medieval prohibitions.

Note 108. He simply refers to Aristotle: „Gelt ist von natur unfruchtbar, und mehret sich nicht, Darumb wo sichs mehret, als ym wucher, da ists wider die natur des gelds. Denn es lebt noch tregt nicht wie ein baüm und acker thut der alle iar mehr gibt Denn er ligt nicht mussig noch on frucht, wie der gulden thut von natur“. See WA 51,360,9-13

Note 109. See Calvin Elliot, Usury: A Scriptural; Ethical and Economic View. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/21623/21623-h/21623-h.htm> vom 9.1.2014, p. 78, who remarks „the timid manner in which he (Calvin) treats the subject“. Wykes then says „One of the most striking aspects of De Usuris is his cautious introduction.“ See Michael Wykes, Devaluing the Scholastics: Calvin's Ethics of Usury, in: CALVIN THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL 38 (2003), (S. 27-51) here p. 42

Note 110. See M. Honecker, Art. Eigentum IV. Kirchen- und theologiegeschichtlich, ethisch, in: H.D. Betz/ D.S. Browning/ B. Janowski/ E. Jüngel (Edit.), Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Tübingen 1998-2007 4. Ed.(following abbreviated RGG), Vol 2., col. 1147-1152, here col. 1149

Note 111. See Th. Strohm, Luthers Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik, p. 217

Note 112. See CR 38I, col. 245

Note 113. „car si totalement nous défendons les usures nous estraignons les consciences dun lien plus estroit que Dieu mesme. Premièrement il ny a point de tesmoignage es escritures par lequel toute usure soit totalement condamnée. Car la sentence de Christ vulgairement estimée très manifeste, cest ascavoir prestez (Luc. 6, 35) a este faulsement destournee en ce sens: car ainsi comme ailleurs reprenant les convives sumptueux et les conviements ambitieux des riches il commande plustost dappeller les aveugles les boy-teux et aultres pauvres des rues quilz ne peuvent rendre la pareille, aussi en ce lieu voulant corriger la coutume vitieuse du monde de prester argent nous commande de prester principalement a ceux desquelz il ny a point despoir de recouvrer.“ See CR 38 I,245f.

Note 114. See CR 68,430. Interestingly, that he further deals with this argument elsewhere, as he asks, when it was forbidden to take of his own interest brothers, who were that "brothers" today. But as Christ had come to all people, there is now a brotherhood of all men. Therefore should not (not even a so-called foreigners) take damage by usury

and thus he emphasized the argument of charity so strongly: „Mais le principal est, que nous appliquions ce passage à nostre profit. Il a esté dit aux Iuifs: Vous n'exercerez point usure envers vos frères.- Auioird'huy qui sont nos frères? Nous savons que nostre Seigneur Iesus est vonu pour , estre nostre paix, afin, de reconcilier à Dieu et ce qui estoit lointain, et ce qui estoit près de luy. Il y a donc une fraternité commune entre tous hommes, depuis que nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ nous a declairé que nous sommes tous adoptez, et qu'il n'y a plus ne Iuif ne Payen, comme l'Escriture en parle. Quand donc il est dit que nous sommes frères, voire sans aucune distinction : concluons que l'équité que devoient garder les Iuifs entr'eux, auioird'huy nous la devons garder entre nous. Et ainsi, il ne nous sera iâmais permis de ronger nulle creature vivante, par usure. “ Calvin, LE CINQUIESME SERMON SUR LE CHAP. XXIII. V. 18-20. DU MARDI 28E DE IANVIER 1556. See CR 56, 117

Note 115. See CR 38 I,247 “Icy on fait une obiECTION que auioirdhuy aussi les usures nous seront illicites par une mesme rai-son quelles estoyent défendues aux Iuifz, pource que entre nous il y a coniuccion fraternelle. A cela ie responds: que en la coniuccion politique il y a quelque différence, car la situation du lieu auquel Dieu avoyt colloque les Iuifz et beaucoup dautres circonstances faisoient quilz traffiquoient entre eulx commodément sans usures. Nostre coniuccion na point de similitude. Parquoy ie ne recpnois pas encore que simplement elles nous soyent défendues, sinon entant quelles sont contraires a équité ou a charité. La raison de saint Ambroyse laquelle aussi pretend Ohrysostome est trop frivolle a mon iuge-ment: ascavoir que l'argent nengendre point l'argent. La mer, quoy? la terre, quoy? le recois pension du louage de maison. Est ce pourece que l'argent y croist? Mais elles procèdent des champs dou l'argent se fait. La commodité aussi des maisons se peust raschepter par pecune. Et quoy? L'argent nest il pas plus fructueux es marchandises, que aul-cunes possessions quon pourroit dire? Il sera loysible de louer une aire en imposant tribut, et il sera illicite de prendre quelque fruit de l'argent? Qupy? Quand on aschepte un champ, ascavoir si l'argent nengendre pas l'argent?”

Note 116. See M. Wykes, *Devaluing the Scholastics*, p. 39

Note 117. See K. E. Born, *Die ethische Beurteilung des Geldwesens im Wandel der Geschichte*, in: H. Hesse/ O. Issing (Hrsg.), *Geld und Moral*. München 1994, p. 11; or see also F. Mehring, *Calvin und Luther*, in: Ders. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 5, Berlin 1964, p. 256f.; see also G. Wunsch, *Luthers Beurteilung der Zinswirtschaft*, in: *Die Christliche Welt*, 29 Jg. 1915, p. 68 und p. 107; see also M. Honecker, *Art. Geld, I. Historisch und ethisch*, in: G. Krause/ G. Müller (Hrsg.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* Bd. XII, Berlin/New York 1984, p. 286f.; see also G. Fabiunke, *Martin Luther als Nationalökonom*, Berlin 1963, p. 148

Note 118. See Michael Wykes, *Devaluing the Scholastics*, p. 40. Or her refers (S. 38) eg. to McGrath, der sagt: The „fact that Luther’s economic thought—if one can dignify it with such a title—was hostile to any form of capitalism largely reflects his unfamiliarity with the sophisticated world of finance then emerging in the great free cities.” See A. E. McGrath, *A Life of John Calvin*, Oxford 1990, p. 231.

Note 119. See Michael Wykes, *Devaluing the Scholastics*, p. 42: “Calvin’s approach to the problem of interest was that of the father of an urban movement writing in the environment not of a self-sufficing economy of peasant farmers and small craftsmen and traders but of large and prosperous cities that knew the advantages of large scale commercial enterprise.”

Note 120. See J. Fischer, *Luther in der Wirtschaftswissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts. Auswirkungen auf moderne Wirtschaftsethik*, Berlin 2010, p. 149; 153; 278ff.; 332f.

Note 121. See M. Beyer, *Wirtschaftsethik bei Martin Luther*, in: Udo Kern (Hg.), *Wirtschaft und Ethik in theologischer Perspektive*, Münster 2002, p. 87f..

Note 122. See Th. Strohm, *Luthers Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*, p. 205

Note 123. See WA 51, 589,29-590,20

Note 124. “La chose sera plus claire par un exemple. Il y aura quelque riche homme en possessions et en revenus, il naura pas argent present. Il y en aura ung anlre médiocrement riche en ohevanoe, pour le moins aulcunement plus bas mais lequel aura plus d'argent tout prest. Sil ce présente quelque opportunité voluntiers oestuy cy achepteroit une possession de son argent. Cependant oeluy la premier luy demandera aveo grande requests quil luy preste argent. Il est en la puissance de cestuy oy soubz tiltre daschapt dimposer pension a sa chevanoe iusques l'argent luy soit rendu. Et en oeste manière la condition seroit meilleur: neantmoins il sera content dusure. Pourquoi sera celle pache iuste et honneste, ceste cy faulse et meschante?” See CR 38 I,248

Note 125. See Michael Wykes, *Devaluing the Scholastics*, p. 45: „In other words, his theory would only work in rare “win-win” propositions. Calvin has moved the debate away from both theology and law and toward the economic equivalence of operations in the market. “

Note 126. See WA 51, 339,1-3: „Es ist nicht alles, dienst und wolgethan dem nehesten, was man heisst, dienst und wolgethan, Denn eine ehebrecherin und ehebrecher thun einander grossen dienst und wohlgefallen“

Note 127. “En après ie nappreuve pas si quelcun propose faire mestier de faire gain dusure. En oultre ie nen; concede rien sinon en adioustant certaines exceptions. La premiere est que on ne prenne usure du pauvre et que nul totalement estant en destroit par indigence ou afflige de calamite soit contrainct. La seconde exception est que celui qui preste net soit tellement intentif au gain quil defaille aux offices necessaires, ne aussi voulant mettre son argent sourement il ne deprise ses pauvres freres. La tierce exception est que rien nintervienne qui naccorde avec equite naturelle, et si on examine la chose selon la rigle de Christ: ascavoir ce que vous voules que les hommes vous fassent etc. elle ne soit trouvee convenir partout. La quatriesme exception est que celui qui emprunte face autant ou plus de gain de largent emprunte. En cinquiesme lieu que nous nestimions point selon la coustume vulgaire et receue quest ce qui nous est licite, ou que nous ne mesurions ce qui est droict et equitable par liniquite du monde, mais que nous prenions une rigle de la parolle de Dieu. En sixiesme lieu que nous ne regardions point seulement la commodite privee de celui avec qui nous avons affaire, mais aussi que nous considerions ce qui est expedient pour le public. Car il est tout evident que lusure que le marchand paye est une pension publique. Il fault donc bien adviser que la pache soit aussi utile en commun plustost que nuyisible. En septiesme lieu que on nexcede la mesure que les loix publiques de la region ou du lieu concedent. Combien que cela ne suffit pas tousiours, car souvent elles permettent ce que elles ne pourroyent corriger ou reprimer en defendant. Il fault donc preferer equite laquelle retranche ce que il sera de trop.” See CR 38 I,248f.; but see also CR 59, 147 and more.

Note 128. See C. Stükelberger, *Keine Zinsen von den Armen*, p. 8f.

Note 129. See the letter to the council of Danzig from Mai 1525 in D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel. Weimar 1930ff. (following abbreviated WABr), WABr 3, 485,24-27: “Aber das soll man tun mit den Zinsen, daß man menschliche Ordnung, Gesetze und Gebräuche in solchen Zinsen, so sie zu weit greifen, zurechtbringe und nach der Billigkeit, das man heißt *επιεικεια* oder aequitas, richte”.

Note 130. See WA 6, 54, 30-32: „Dan gelt auf zinßen hott eyn grund, der on unterlaß wechst und tregt auß der erden on sorg der vorlust an der haubt summen“. Instead of that Luther demands, that the borrower only has to get interest fees, if the loaner is “seyner arbeyt frey, gesund un on hynderniß prauchen muge”. See WA 6, 57,3-4

Note 131. See WA 6, 57,17-19: “wiltu eyn interesse mit haben zu gewinnen, mußtu auch ein interesse mit haben zuvorliren.” See also WABr 3, 485,41-47

Note 132. eg. Elliot talks of „A mere hint of encouragement to the usurer“ in this context. See Calvin Elliot, *Usury*, p. 73; or see F. Büsler, *Calvins Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*, p. 405. But later he is modifying this thesis.

Note 133. See M. Wykes, *Devaluing the Scholastics: Calvin’s Ethics of Usury*, in: *CALVIN THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL* 38 (2003), (p. 27-51) here p. 50

Note 134. See Calvin in the *Ordonnances sur la police des Eglises de la Campagne* (dependantz de la Seigneurie de genesve) von 1547: „Que nul ne preste a usure ou a prouffit plus aut de scinq pour cent, sur poienne de confiscation du principal et destre condamne en amende arbitraire selon lexigence du cas.“ See CR 38 I, 56f.

Note 135. „Et au reste retenons ce qui a esté declairé, que ce n'est pas le tout aussi que la police nous excuse. Car voila la Loy' qui sera de cinq pour cent. Or c'est une loy generale, d'autant que les Magistrats ne peuvent point à chacun cas donner taxe certaine: mais ils ordonne-ront qu'on prenne cinq pour cent. Et pourquoy? Pour les traffiques : d'autant qu'on ne se peut pas-ser de cela. Or est-ce à dire pourtant qu'il soit tousiours licite de prendre cinq pour cent? Nenni. Car si un homme vient à moy, et qu'il soit en di-sette : il est certain que quelque excuse que l'ameine, quand ie prendray de luy quelque tribut, ie seray réputé larron „et usurier devant Dieu : car il est en disette, ie luy doy subvenir : et ie ne le fay pas.“ Calvin, *LE CINQUIESME SERMON SUR LE CHAP. XXIII. V. 18-20. DU MARDI 28E DE IANVIER 1556*. See CR 56, 121

Note 136. „Et ainsi c'est une sottise trop lourde, quand on vou-dra dire, que l'usure n'est sinon en- l'argent: car nous voyons que Dieu l'a estendue à toutes espèces de profit: que quand nous prenons accroist en bled, ou en vin, tousiours nous sommes usuriers.“ ...

„L'ay désia dit qu'au-cuns, quand ils n'auront point prins argent, cuide-ront estre eschappez. Et pourquoy? On a prins ceste raison frivolle: Qu'argent n'enfante point argent. Et pourtant qu'il n'est point licite d'en rien recevoir. Or de moy, ie ne prendray point d'ar-gent, mais on me donnera tant de bled sur une somme d'argent que i'auray preste. Et le bled n'est-ce point la substance d'un povre homme? Et ie luy viendray desrober ce dequoy il devoit. estre nourri et substanté? Il n'aura point dequoy manger, à cause que i'auray usé de cruauté envers luy: et cependant ie diray que ie-ne suis point usurier? et il vaudroit mieux que ie luy.eusse prins l'argent de sa bource, que luy oster ainsi sa nourriture. Et pourtant ne nous abusons point au mot.“ Calvin, *LE CINQUIESME SERMON SUR LE CHAP. XXIII. V. 18-20. DU MARDI 28E DE IANVIER 1556*. See CR 56, 118ff.; or „Sed aliud est foenerari quam foenus accipere. Quum enim quispiam mensam erexit, iam utitur ea arte perinde atque, agricola laborem suum ponit in agris suis cōlendis. Sed poterit quispiam foenus accipere, qui tamen non foenera-bitur. Exempli gratia, erit quispiam nummatus,

et si partem pecuniae suae det mutuo, poterit inde quaestum accipere. Id autem faciet semel, neque propterea dicendus erit foenerator. Hic autem valere debet sententia illa, Neque passim, neque semper, neque omnia, neque ab omnibus.“ See CR 68,431

Note 137. See WA 15, 296f.

Note 138. See A. Orel, *Oeconomia perennis*, Bd. II, Mainz 1930, p. 96

Note 139. Luther's economic ability was thus jejune and uncritical of centuries-old scholastic and canonical teaching.“ See Michael Wykes, *Devaluing the Scholastics*, p. 38

Note 140. See eg. Michael Wykes, *Devaluing the Scholastics*, p. 38, who says: „Calvin's devaluation of scholastic usury theory is brought into focus by illustrating how Luther, responding innovatively to the theological inadequacy of scholastic thought in so many other important ways, failed to reach the conclusions about usury that Calvin himself would expound. The German Reformer adheres to an uncompromising critique of usury; thus, Luther's conservatism serves to highlight Calvin's innovation.“

Note 141. See WA 6, 466

Note 142. For a more detailed discussion of the “Zinskauf“ and Luther's criticism of it see H.-J. Prien, *Luthers Wirtschaftsethik*, Göttingen 1992, p. 97ff.; see also E. Ramp, *Das Zinsproblem. Eine historische Untersuchung*, Zürich 1949, p. 16ff. und p. 48ff.; see further T. Dieter, *Zinskauf und Wucher. Luthers theologische Kritik an einem Rechtsinstitut der Wirtschaft seiner Zeit*, in: *Luther-Bulletin* 4 (1995), 47-64

Note 143. See Th. Strohm, *Luthers Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*, p. 217f.

Note 144. „Alßo hat sich die welt gepessert, was vorzeyten hieß leyhen, das ist darnach yn eynen zinß kauff vorwandelt“ See WA 6, 58,3-5; see ferner z.B. WA 6,6ff. oder WA 6, 51ff. oder WA 6,466

Note 145. See WA 6, 52,27f.

Note 146. See WABr 3, 307,43-50

Note 147. See eg. the acquisition of a capital endowment, the income from which poor theology students should be supported in (WABr 6, 273)

Note 148. See WA 51, 372,4; „not Wücherlin“ in WA 51,372,20; see auch WABr 3, 485,53-57

Note 149. See WA 51, 372,16

Note 150. See T. Dieter, *Zinskauf und Wucher. Luthers theologische Kritik an einem Rechtsinstitut der Wirtschaft seiner Zeit*. In: *Luther-Bulletin* 4/1995, p. 61

Note 151. See WA 51, 371 and WA 6,6 or WA 6,58 or WABR 3,307

Note 152. See WA 6, 58

Note 153. See WA 51, 364f.

Note 154. See WABr 3,176,19-23

Note 155. WABr 3,313,15

Note 156. See WABr 3, 485,24-27; and see also W. A. Schulze, *Luther und der Zins*, in *Luther* 1971, H. 3, p. 144, with relation to EA 53, 246 und 296

Note 157. See WABr 3, 485

Note 158. See WA 51, 348ff. und 344

Note 159. See WA 18, 540,11-16

Note 160. See CR 38 I, col. 247

Note 161. See H.-J. Prien, *Luthers Wirtschaftsethik* Göttingen 1992, p. 139 with relation to W. Zademach, *Luther und Marx. Assoziationen zu zwei Gedenktagen*, in: *Junge Kirche* 44 (1983), p. 671

Note 162. See M. Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik*, p. 104 mit Bezug auf *Institut*, III, 2, 37, 38

Note 163. See M. Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik*, p. 27

Note 164. See the rejection of this thesis coming from M. Weber also by N.O. Oermann, *Anständig Geld verdienen*, p. 120. Among others protests also C. Stückelberger, *Keine Zinsen von den Armen*, p. 10f. against this assumption. And also the designated investigator of the Reformation H.A. Obermann, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation* Tübingen 1977, p. 187 Fn. 84 is missing for this thesis of Weber any evidence.

Note 165. So Stückelberger criticizes that Weber hardly cited Calvin himself in his investigation. See C. Stückelberger, *Keine Zinsen von den Armen*, p. 12f.

Note 166. See M. Honecker, Art. Eigentum IV. Kirchen- und theologiegeschichtlich, ethisch, in: RGG Bd. 2 4. Ed., col. 1147-1152, hier col. 1149; see also H.-J. Goertz, Eigentum VI. Reformationszeit, in: TRE 9, p. 428; see also F. Büsser, *Calvins Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*, p. 406

Note 167. See W. Zorn, *Sozialgeschichte 1500 - 1648*, in: H. Aubin/ W. Zorn, *Handbuch der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, Bd. 1, Stuttgart 1971, p. 488, who thinks that Calvin never clearly taught, "to interpret the economic success as a visible konfirmation of the divine election."

Note 168. See M. Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik*, p. 192

Note 169. See CR 77,544f. „Secunda ratio est, quod fideles, etiamsi divitiis et bonis omne genus abundant, non tamen luxuriantur, neque se ingurgitant securi: denique non fruuntur mundo, ut infidèles : sed sollicita incedunt, ingemiscentes assidue, partim infirmitatis suae conscientia, partim futurae vitae desiderio. Infidèles autem in eo sunt toti, ut se inebrient praesentibus delitiis.“

Note 170. See CR 30,505

Note 171. See CR 30,511

Note 172. See CR 30,512

Note 173. See CR 30,515

Note 174. See CR 30,533

Note 175. See CR 30,678: „De electione aeterna, qua Deus alios ad salutem, alios ad interitum praedestinavit.“

Note 176. See CR 30,714: „Nulla tentatione vel gravius vel periculosius fideles percillit satan, quam dum ipsos suae electionis dubitatione inquietans, simul prava eius extra viam inquirendae cupiditate sollicitat.

Note 177. See CR 30, 717f. „At subit futuri status anxietas. ... sed enim ista sollicitudine liberavit nos Christus Quid hinc nos discere voluit Christus, nisi ut confidamus perpetuo nos fore salvos, quia illius semel facti sumus?“

Note 178. See A. Pangritz, *Zur Prädestinationslehre bei Johannes Calvin, Karl Barth und darüber hinaus*, http://www.ev-theol.uni-bonn.de/fakultaet/ST/lehrstuhl-pangritz/pangritz/copy5_of_texte-zum-download/paerdestinationslehre.v.27.2.2014, p. 7

Note 179. See M. Honecker, Art. Eigentum IV. Kirchen- und theologiegeschichtlich, ethisch, in: RGG Bd. 2 4. Ed., col. 1147-1152, hier col. 1149

Note 180. See H.-J. Goertz, Eigentum VI. Reformationszeit, in: TRE 9, p. 428

Note 181. See M. Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik*, p. 124

Note 182. So the argument of F. Büsser: "Weber did not believe that the reformers themselves had represented a capitalist spirit, but they had achieved unintentionally effects by their emphasis on the ethical value of work that went far beyond the religious sphere. The thought of probation of faith in professional life had as a result a rationalization of life and finally legalized the formation of capital through ascetic rigor." See. F. Büsser, *Calvins Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*, p 406

Note 183. See A. Maurer, *Der Geist des Kapitalismus - Eine institutionentheoretische Interpretation der Protestantischen Ethik*, in: M. Held/ G. Kubon-Gilke/ R. Storn (Hg.), *Ökonomie und Religion. Jahrbuch Normative und institutionelle Grundfragen der Ökonomik Bd. 6. Marburg 2007*, p. 63-87 hier p. 81-83

Note 184. See M. Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik*, p. 197

Note 185. See the Präambel of the German „Grundgesetz“ (Constitution).

Note 186. See J. Isensee, in: *Essener Gespräche zum Thema Staat und Kirche*, Bd. 11, p. 92ff.

Note 187. See N. O. Oermann, *Anständig Geld verdienen*, p. 134 with relation to M. Weber, *Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen. Konfutianismus und Taoismus: Schriften 1915-1920*, in: *Gesamtausgabe, Band I/19*, hrsg. von H. Schmidt-Glintzer, Tübingen 1989, p. 85

Note 188. See N. O. Oermann, *Anständig Geld verdienen*, p. 136

Note 189. See N. O. Oermann, *Anständig Geld verdienen*, p. 131

Note 190. „Es zeigt sich hier, dass die vom Luthertum ausgegangenen Motive eine überindividuelle Lebenskraft besitzen, die auch da wirken und Einzelne in ihren Dienst nehmen, wo persönliche Bindung an den evangelischen Ansatz nicht mehr vorhanden ist.“ See W. Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums*, Bd. I, München 1958, p. 9