

OXFORD STUDIES IN
HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

After Calvin

*Studies in the Development
of a Theological Tradition*



RICHARD A. MULLER

After Calvin

OXFORD STUDIES IN HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Series Editor

David C. Steinmetz, Duke University

Editorial Board

Irena Backus, Université de Genève

Robert C. Gregg, Stanford University

George M. Marsden, University of Notre Dame

Wayne A. Meeks, Yale University

Robert L. Wilken, University of Virginia

Gerhard Sauter, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Susan E. Schreiner, University of Chicago

John Van Engen, University of Notre Dame

Geoffrey Wainwright, Duke University

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN IN THE
SIXTEENTH CENTURY

The Johannine Exegesis of Wolfgang Musculus

Craig S. Farmer

PRIMITIVISM, RADICALISM, AND THE
LAMB'S WAR

*The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century
England*

T. L. Underwood

HUMAN FREEDOM, CHRISTIAN
RIGHTEOUSNESS

*Philip Melancthon's Exegetical Dispute with
Erasmus of Rotterdam*

Timothy J. Wengert

CASSIAN THE MONK

Columba Stewart

IMAGES AND RELICS

*Theological Perceptions and Visual Images in
Sixteenth-Century Europe*

John Dillenberger

THE BODY BROKEN

*The Calvinist Doctrine of the Eucharist and the
Symbolization of Power in Sixteenth-Century France*

Christopher Elwood

WHAT PURE EYES COULD SEE

Calvin's Doctrine of Faith in Its Exegetical Context
Barbara Pitkin

THE UNACCOMMODATED CALVIN

Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition

Richard A. Muller

THE CONFESSIONALIZATION OF HUMANISM
IN REFORMATION GERMANY

Erika Rummell

THE PLEASURE OF DISCERNMENT

Marguerite de Navarre as Theologian

Carol Thysell

REFORMATION READINGS OF THE
APOCALYPSE

Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg

Irena Backus

WRITING THE WRONGS

Women of the Old Testament among Biblical

Commentators from Philo through the Reformation

John L. Thompson

THE HUNGRY ARE DYING

Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia

Susan R. Holman

RESCUE FOR THE DEAD

*The Posthumous Salvation of Non-Christians in
Early Christianity*

Jeffrey A. Trumbower

AFTER CALVIN

Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition

Richard A. Muller

After Calvin

Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition

RICHARD A. MULLER

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2003

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford New York

Auckland Bangkok Buenos Aires Cape Town Chennai
Dar es Salaam Delhi Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi Kolkata
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai Nairobi
São Paulo Shanghai Taipei Tokyo Toronto

Copyright © 2003 by Oxford University Press, Inc.

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Muller, Richard A. (Richard Alfred), 1948–

After Calvin : studies in the development of a theological tradition / Richard A. Muller.
p. cm.—(Oxford studies in historical theology)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Contents: Approaches to post-Reformation Protestantism—Scholasticism and
orthodoxy in the reformed tradition—Ad fontes argumentorum—Calvin and the
“Calvinists,” part I—Calvin and “Calvinists,” part II—Calling, character, piety, and
learning—Vera philosophia cum sacra theologia nusquam pugnat—Scholasticism
Protestant and Catholic—The debate over the vowel-points and the crisis in Orthodox
hermeneutics—Henry Ainsworth and the development of Protestant exegesis in the early
seventeenth century—The covenant of works and the stability of divine law in
seventeenth-century Reformed Orthodoxy.

ISBN 0-19-515701-X

1. Reformed Church—Doctrines—History—16th century. 2. Reformed Church—
Doctrines—History—17th century. 3. Protestant Scholasticism. I. Title. II. Series.

BX9422.3 .M85 2002

230'.42'09—dc21 2002074899

2 4 6 8 9 7 5 3 1

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

Preface

The essays in this volume were researched and written in the course of some two decades of study on the subjects of the thought of the Reformers of the sixteenth century and their relationship to the later forms of Reformed thought identified by the terms “orthodoxy” and “scholasticism.” With one exception beyond the new introduction and afterword, earlier versions of these essays have appeared previously—all of these older studies, however, have been reviewed, bibliographies updated, and arguments recast for the sake of the shape and direction of this book. The earliest of the group, “The Debate over the Vowel-Points and the Crisis in Orthodox Hermeneutics,” dates from 1980, the most recent, “Protestant Scholasticism: Methodological Issues and Problems in the Study of Its Development,” now a section of chapter 2, from 1999. Both in their subject matter and in their actual composition they parallel and supplement the research and writing that eventuated in a series of independent monographs, namely, *Christ and the Decree* (1986), *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius* (1991), *The Unaccommodated Calvin* (2000), and *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1720*, volumes 1 (1987), 2 (1994), and 3–4 (2003). Although, moreover, the conclusions of these studies have consistently enlightened the research that contributed to the larger monographs, virtually none of the material found here was incorporated in full in any of the book-length studies.

Both in form and substance, the essays in this volume stand as a sequel to *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* and as a methodological statement in parallel with the *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* volumes. I have indicated the relationship to the book on Calvin in the subtitle, *Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. Where *The Unaccommodated Calvin* attempts to look at Calvin’s theological works in their historical context and to strip away various twentieth-century theological grids that have clouded our perceptions of the work of the Reformer, these essays carry the approach forward in an attempt to overcome a series of nineteenth- and twentieth-century theological grids characteristic of much of the scholarship on Reformed orthodoxy or what one might less accurately call “Calvinism after Calvin.”

The opportunity to revise and edit these essays has enabled me not only to update the bibliography and, as that has proceeded, to work with the insights of more recent scholarship, it also has pressed me, particularly when recasting the older essays, to raise the question of method from the perspective of several decades spent learning the subject. I have been able to remind myself just how much my own approach to the material has changed, particularly with reference to the establishment of a context of interpretation. My earliest work, whether articles written between 1978 and 1987 or the initial monograph, *Christ and the Decree*, recognized the necessity of identifying medieval backgrounds, noting the relative lack of originality in many of the doctrinal statements of the Reformers and their successors, and examining a fairly broad spectrum of writers in a given era in order to begin to grasp the meaning of texts. From the outset, I saw the need to resist both nineteenth- and twentieth-century doctrinal constructs as keys to understanding sixteenth-century texts and the need to do more than simply read a basic text—such as Calvin's *Institutes* or Theodore Beza's *Tabula*—in order to find its meaning.

In several of the essays in this group, including in the monograph, I was consistently pressed to come to grips with what might be called collateral histories or intellectual contexts needed to interpret the religious or theological works: namely, the patterns of biblical interpretation brought about by the Renaissance and Reformation, including trajectories in the interpretation of particular biblical texts; and developments and changes in the study of philosophy, logic, and rhetoric, particularly as these impinged on issues of method and argument in theological works. Certainly some of these accents were brought to bear in the studies of theological prolegomena and of the doctrine of Scripture that appeared between 1987 and 1996, reaching some sort of a conclusion in the long essay on "Calvin and the Calvinists," found in this volume. There, I attempted to lay out a series of methodological issues standing in the way of much of the older scholarship on the subject of Protestant orthodoxy—many of those issues being directly related to the refusal of the scholarship to deal with the broader contexts in which the individual documents had been written, the international religious-theological-philosophical community of dialogue and debate within which the various documents were produced, the genre and intention of the documents themselves, and the simple fact that none of the documents was produced in order to set the terms of debate, whether positive or negative, for various twentieth-century theological movements.

Identification of the broader contexts from a methodological perspective has been a central concern of my more recent work, most clearly expressed in *The Unaccommodated Calvin* and in the methodological proposals found in the second chapter of this volume. This question of context is basic to the reappraisal of the course of Protestant thought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries both in view of the layers of bias, misrepresentation, and theologized readings of the era that have to be stripped away in order access the intellectual history of the Reformation and post-Reformation eras and in view of perhaps more fundamental question of the nature and viability of intellectual history as a field of inquiry. Specifically, the more recent studies have raised the question of what precisely frames the individual writings and teachings—is the context a contemporary polemic; is it the immediately intended audience whether in the classroom of an academy or university, in a service of worship, in a broader discussion or debate; is it a regional issue or debate, a national matter, or an international religious question; is it a trajectory of interpretation of a text of Scripture bounded less by issues

in the immediate social or political context of the writer than by perennial questions of meaning—or does the seemingly perennial question receive an answer dictated by a particular moment; is the context identified by collateral questions arising from philosophy, political, or even the literary and editorial concerns of an author? Quite simply, the framework for understanding a theological point may not be entirely theological—just as the intention of an author in organizing a more systematic treatise may be academic, traditionary, or literary and editorial, relating more to the chosen genre of the document than to a highly specified dogmatic interest.

Finally, I would like to offer my sincere thanks to the colleagues and friends who have made this work possible and who, at various stages in its production, have offered both help and encouragement. Among those to whom the greatest thanks must go is David C. Steinmetz, first my doctoral mentor, more recently a most supportive colleague, always a friend, and by way of his lectures on the scholastic distinctions of late medieval theology, the *causa proxima et instrumentalis* of my abiding interest in things scholastic. To my colleagues at the University of Utrecht, in the *Onderzoeksgroep Oude Gereformeerde Theologie*, and in the conference that led to the volume on *Reformation and Scholasticism*, I express a profound appreciation, both for the ongoing dialogue that we have had concerning sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thought and for their consistent efforts to refine this field of investigation. I must mention here Willem van Asselt, Eef Dekker, and Anton Vos. My thanks also to Carl Trueman, with whom I have discussed many of the issues addressed in the following pages and who read through several of the chapters and offered sound critique and significant advice. To him go thanks not only for these direct efforts on behalf of the manuscript but also for an ongoing and fruitful dialogue that extends now over half a decade. My graduate assistant Gregory Schuringa read through the penultimate manuscript with great care and offered significant help in producing the final draft for publication.

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

1. Approaches to Post-Reformation Protestantism: Reframing the Historiographical Question, 3

Part I. Reframing the Phenomenon—Definition, Method, and Assessment

2. Scholasticism and Orthodoxy in the Reformed Tradition: Definition and Method, 25
3. *Ad fontes argumentorum*: The Sources of Reformed Theology in the Seventeenth Century, 47
4. Calvin and the “Calvinists”: Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy, Part 1, 63
5. Calvin and the “Calvinists”: Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy, Part 2, 81

Part II. Scholastic Protestantism—Foundational Perspectives

6. Calling, Character, Piety, and Learning: Paradigms for Theological Education in the Era of Protestant Orthodoxy, 105
7. *Vera Philosophia cum sacra Theologia nusquam pugnat*: Keckermann on Philosophy, Theology, and the Problem of Double Truth, 122
8. Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology, 137
9. The Debate over the Vowel Points and the Crisis in Orthodox Hermeneutics, 146
10. Henry Ainsworth and the Development of Protestant Exegesis in the Early Seventeenth Century, 156
11. The Covenant of Works and the Stability of Divine Law in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Orthodoxy: A Study in the Theology of Herman Witsius and Wilhelmus à Brakel, 175

Afterword, 191

Notes, 195

Index, 259

This page intentionally left blank

After Calvin

This page intentionally left blank

Approaches to Post-Reformation Protestantism

Reframing the Historiographical Question

Scholarly perspectives on the phenomenon of post-Reformation Protestantism have altered dramatically in the last three decades. Studies of the Reformed or Calvinistic theology of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries written before 1970 or even 1975 tended to pose the Reformation against Protestant orthodoxy or, in the phraseology then common to the discussion, “Calvin against the Calvinists.” This rather radical dichotomy between the thought of the great Reformer and even his most immediate successors—notably, Theodore Beza—was constructed around a particular set of highly theologized assumptions, concerning the Reformation and Protestant orthodoxy, humanism and scholasticism, piety and dogma. At the heart of the dichotomizing argument was a contrast between the “biblical humanism” and christological piety of John Calvin and the Aristotelian scholasticism and predestinarian dogmatizing of nearly all of the later Reformed theologians, the sole exceptions being those who followed out the humanistic patterns of Calvin’s thought into fundamentally antischolastic modes of thought.¹

Since that time, this view has been increasingly challenged and the attempt to offer a balanced, historically couched as distinct from theologically or even dogmatically-controlled account of the later Protestant development has proceeded on several fronts.² The essays in this volume provide a point of entry into the scholarship of reappraisal, whether from the perspective of the basic definitions of the terms and issues (such as “scholasticism” and “orthodoxy” in the Protestant context), from the perspective of the historiographical problems encountered by the study of post-Reformation Protestantism, or from the perspective of selected examples of Protestant thought as it developed into the era of orthodoxy.

There is, moreover, a similarity in method and approach between the scholarship that has begun to reappraise the transition from Reformation to post-Reformation era thought and the scholarship that, shortly before, had launched a reappraisal of the transition from the later Middle Ages to the Reformation. Specifically, the reappraisal of Protestant scholasticism has been attentive to studies of late medieval scholasticism, both in view of the definitions of the scholastic enterprise developed by scholars of the Middle Ages and Renaissance and in view of the more nuanced conception of “forerunners” of the Reformation arising out of studies of the thought of the fourteenth and fifteenth

centuries. Thus, scholarship on medieval thought has consistently identified “scholasticism” as a method of discourse used in the schools and universities, applicable to nearly all disciplines. So, too, has scholarship identified humanism as fundamentally related to method and to philology rather than to a particular philosophical or theological perspective.³ Given these definitions, moreover, the nature of the conflict between humanists and scholastics has been reassessed.⁴ On the second point, concerning the identification of “forerunners of the Reformation,” a newer scholarship has set aside the examination of reformist rebels, notably John Wyclif, Jan Hus, and Girolamo Savonarola, and sought out currents of thought, and series of issues and problems, that track from the later Middle Ages into the Reformation. The result of this investigation has been to identify a host of thinkers—such as Thomas Bradwardine, Gregory of Rimini, or Wessel Gansfort—virtually none of them rebels and nearly all of them belonging to identifiable traditions within medieval thought, whose positions and arguments led positively toward the Reformation.⁵

Applied to the study of the transition from Reformation to post-Reformation Protestantism, these conclusions concerning the later Middle Ages yield both a revision of the notion of scholasticism and a rethinking of the ways in which continuity and discontinuity of development ought to be charted. On the one hand, the scholasticism of the late sixteenth and of the seventeenth centuries, like the scholasticism of the medieval period, is understood more as a method than as a content. The claim of an intrinsic relationship between the rise of scholasticism among Protestants and the creation of a highly speculative and rigidly predestinarian theology can no longer be maintained. Understood as a method, scholasticism evidences an institutionalization of Protestant thought in its academies and universities, not the rise of a specific doctrinal perspective. On the other hand, the use of particular writers or documents as emblematic of a new theology—the most notable instance being Beza’s *Tabula praedestinationis*—simply doesn’t function as a method for approaching the diverse and varied materials of the developing Protestant theology.⁶ In other words, leaping from Calvin’s *Institutes* of 1559, to Beza’s 1555 *Tabula*, to the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1618–1619), and thence to Francis Turretin’s *Institutio theologiae elencticae* (1679–1685), merely for the sake of documenting the scholastic elaboration of the Reformed doctrine of predestination, overlooks different historical contexts, different issues addressed, contrasting literary genres, and vast numbers of intervening events. The result is a simplistic and flawed picture of post-Reformation thought.

The Course of Orthodoxy: A Brief Chronology

The “orthodox” or “scholastic” era of Protestantism extends for nearly two centuries past the Reformation—a phase of the intellectual development of Protestantism that stands some three times the length of the Reformation. Like the Reformation itself, the era of orthodoxy both drew on and worked to set aside its medieval heritage. Also like the Reformation it both participated in and confronted the shift in European consciousness that belonged to the early modern era.

For convenience of discussion, the span of the post-Reformation era can be divided into four somewhat vaguely defined periods: early orthodoxy, in two phases (ca. 1565–

1618–1640), one leading toward, the other following the Synod of Dort; high orthodoxy, also in two phases (ca. 1640–1685–1725), the former developing the orthodoxy of the confessions in considerable detail both positive and polemical, the latter phase characterized by deconfessionalization and transition; and late orthodoxy (ca. 1725–1770). These periods correspond with the initial framing and formulation of orthodoxy, the large-scale elaboration of the theology, and the decline of the movement in the eighteenth century. The beginnings of Protestant orthodoxy were, certainly, in the Reformation itself, both in normative confessions of the early Reformers, such as the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Tetrapolitan Confession, and the First Helvetic Confession, and in the major theological treatises of the great Reformers, particularly those who are counted as second-generation codifiers, works such as Philip Melancthon's *Loci communes*, John Calvin's *Institutes*, Heinrich Bullinger's *Decades*, or Wolfgang Musculus's and Peter Martyr Vermigli's *Loci communes*. Largely in the seventh decade of the sixteenth century, a significant shift took place, however, marking the beginnings of the early orthodox era: at approximately the same time, the larger number of major national confessions appeared and the majority of the significant second-generation codifiers died. Thus, the Gallican Confession (1559), the Scots Confession (1560), the Belgic Confession (1561), the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (1563), the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), and the Second Helvetic Confession (1566)—and among the major codifiers, Philip Melancthon (d. 1560), Jan à Lasco (d. 1560), Peter Martyr Vermigli (d. 1562), Wolfgang Musculus (d. 1563), John Calvin (d. 1564), Andreas Hyperius (d. 1564), Guillelme Farel (d. 1565), Pierre Viret (d. 1571), and Heinrich Bullinger (d. 1575). The transition to early orthodoxy occurred, therefore, not as a major shift in ethos or direction but as the transition from one generation to another and, specifically, as the transition from the work of a group of thinkers who produced the fundamental Reformed confessional and theological perspective to the work of another group of thinkers whose theology tended to develop within the confessional boundaries and along trajectories of argument set by the writers of the second generation.

The one slight exception in the roster of documents and names just noted is the Heidelberg Catechism, written in large part by Zacharias Ursinus. Although its date of composition places it among the major national confessional documents that together constitute the confessional codification of Reformed teaching, its primary author, together with various advisors such as Caspar Olevianus and Petrus Boquinus, belongs to the next generation of the Reformed. The catechism itself, and especially as augmented by Ursinus's catechetical lectures, stands as a founding document of the early orthodox era. The first phase of early orthodoxy comes to a close with the deaths of a significant series of third- and fourth-generation codifiers and the beginnings of the Arminian controversy: Franciscus Junius (d. 1602), William Perkins (d. 1602), Theodore Beza (d. 1605), Gulielmus Bucanus (d. 1603), Thomas Cartwright (d. 1603), the Lucas Trelcatius Jr. (d. 1607), Jacob Arminius (d. 1609), Bartholomaeus Keckermann (d. 1609), and Amandus Polanus (d. 1610).

We can, therefore, mark a transition from the initial phase of early orthodoxy to the second phase at the time of the Arminian controversy—and the involvement in doctrinal debate of a largely new roster of theologians: Franciscus Gomarus, Antonius Walaeus, Johann Polyander, John Davenant, Johannes Maccovius, and others. In the Arminian controversy (ca. 1605–1619), the confessional settlement of the mid-sixteenth century,

together with the various trajectories of Reformed thought emanating from the second generation and elaborated by the writers of the close of the sixteenth century, were defended and further institutionalized by the canons or theological definitions promulgated at the international Reformed Synod of Dort in 1618–1619.

After the promulgation of the Canons of Dort and the other Reformed confessional statements of the early seventeenth century,⁷ there was a gradual transition to the high orthodox era, defined primarily by the passing of the larger number of Reformed writers who either sat at the Synod of Dort or whose thought matured in the early seventeenth century. This second phase of early orthodoxy (1618–1640) follows the publication of the significant later confessional documents—the Irish Articles (1615), the Confession of Sigismund (1614), the Brandenburg Confession (1615), the Canons of Dort (1619)—that marked out the confessional beginnings of the so-called Second Reformation in northern Europe. This phase of early orthodoxy also corresponds roughly with the religious phases of the Thirty Years' War. By the end of the second phase of early orthodoxy, all of the major theologians of the era of the Synod of Dort were dead or close to the end of their careers: Sibrandus Lubbertus (d. 1625), Matthias Martinius (d. 1630), Benedict Turretin (d. 1631), William Ames (d. 1633), Franciscus Gomarus (d. 1641), Antonius Walaeus (d. 1639), Johann Heinrich Alsted (d. 1638), John Davenant (d. 1641), Samuel Ward (d. 1643), Johannes Maccovius (d. 1644), and Johann Polyander (d. 1646). In addition, by 1640, other controversies, notably those over various teachings of the School of Saumur, were beginning to spread beyond France and to become major issues of debate in the broader Reformed community.

High orthodoxy (ca. 1640–1685–1725) can be defined as the era of post- and intra-confessional conflict as well as the time of the full development and codification of the Protestant orthodox theology in the face of various newer adversaries. The first phase of the high orthodox development was a time of theological development and of the framing of the full, confessional theology in its disputative and scholastic as well as positive, didactic, and catechetical forms. It also was an era of what can be called postconfessional or intraconfessional conflict, in which the process of fully formulating and then teaching the now detailed positions of Reformed orthodoxy brought new and highly defined internal conflicts to the movement: this is the era of the spread of the Amyraldian controversy and of debates with other theologians of the school of Saumur, of the controversy over Cocceian federalism and the eventual absorption of many elements of the federal perspective into the basic model of Reformed orthodoxy. In addition, in this era, the Reformed encountered the full implications of the Socinian challenge and faced questions concerning the development of theology in relation to the new rationalist philosophies, Cartesianism and Spinozism.

There is good reason to mark the end of one phase of high orthodoxy and the beginning of another circa 1685. Certainly, many of the major formulators of the fully developed Reformed orthodoxy had passed or were passing from the scene—Johannes Cocceius (d. 1669), Samuel Maresius (d. 1673), Gisbertus Voetius (d. 1676), Stephen Charnock (d. 1680), John Owen (d. 1683), and Francis Turretin (d. 1687). The revocation of the Edict of Nantes occurred in 1685, signaling a disastrous cultural and social moment for the continental Reformed communities and their theology—and 1685 also signaled the beginnings of the massive British trinitarian controversy that began in debate over Bishop Bull's *Defensio fidei nicaenae*, continued with Sherlock's attempt to restate orthodoxy,

and moved through various stages, including the debate over Samuel Clarke's theology,⁸ lingering on into the second decade of the eighteenth century.

Given the difficulty of identifying a clear ending to the high orthodox era and the fairly clear breakdown of the major confessional models both on the continent of Europe and in Britain around 1725, many of the older histories of Protestant thought have identified an era of transition and deconfessionalization (ca. 1685 to ca. 1725), prior to the beginnings of the late orthodox era.⁹ One might reasonably include these several decades in the declining years of the high orthodox era, inasmuch as many of the major theologians who published and taught between 1685 and 1725, some as late as 1735, belong stylistically to the orthodox era—writers such as Petrus van Mastricht (d. 1706), Herman Witsius (d. 1708), Wilhelmus à Brakel (d. 1711), Salomon Van Til (d. 1713), Johannes Van der Kemp (d. 1718), Melchior Leydekker (d. 1721), Benedict Pictet (d. 1724), Jacob Leydekker (d. 1729), Johannes Marckius (d. 1731), Thomas Boston (d. 1732), and Thomas Ridgley (d. 1734). Still, the thought of these writers was, in the same era, balanced against an equal number of representative thinkers whose thought moved toward a less confessional and more latitudinarian perspective—notably Louis Tronchin (d. 1705), Gilbert Burnet (d. 1715), Pierre Poiret (d. 1719), Samuel Clarke (d. 1729), and the Jean Alphonse Turretin (d. 1737). The result is a time of a unique perspective, neither thoroughly shaped by the ethos of orthodoxy nor fully drawn into the era of a dominant rationalism.

Late orthodoxy (ca. 1725–1775) might be called the beginning of the afterlife for Protestant orthodoxy. The orthodox theology, as a system, had not disappeared and its descendants, particularly the doctrinally orthodox pietists of the *Nadere Reformatie*, still taught lively versions of the older Reformed confessional systems. By contrast, orthodoxy had all but lost its relationship to philosophy and its ties to the scholarly or academic methods of biblical exegesis had been all but broken. In addition, the scholastic method, which had been supported throughout the seventeenth century by the retention of Latin as the language of the classroom and by the use of traditional texts in logic and rhetoric, like those of Spencer and Burgersdijk, no longer was the standard method of the academy and university. Philosophically, logically, and rhetorically, the style of theology was changing, and not in a way that could support the older orthodoxy either in style or in substance.

The deaths of a series of representative writers—in whose work one witnesses both the attempt to carry forward the doctrinal substance of orthodoxy but also the changes brought on by the loss of traditional philosophy and logic, the decline of scholastic method, and the absence of broadly accepted confessional standards in international Reformed thought—mark the close of the late orthodox era: Bernhardus De Moor (d. 1765), John Gill (d. 1771), Alexander Comrie (d. 1774), Johann Friedrich Stapfer (d. 1775), Daniel Wytenbach (d. 1779), and Herman Venema (d. 1787).

The Theological Tradition

The Reformed Tradition: Confessional Unity and Theological Diversity

What I have already begun to describe in this discussion of the successive generations of Reformed theologians and the rise of a scholastic orthodoxy is a single but variegated

Reformed tradition, bounded by a series of fairly uniform confessional concerns but quite diverse in patterns of formulation—not two or more traditions, as is sometimes claimed.¹⁰ The identification of a single, variegated tradition as opposed to multiple traditions is not merely a matter of semantics. It is a major methodological point that influences the historiography of the movement of Reformed thought. The point is perhaps best understood when the history of the Reformed confessional documents is distinguished from the history of theological controversy in the Reformed churches—the former historical discussion serving to identify how the Reformed churches of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries defined their own identity as Reformed and serving, also, to identify the boundaries of controversy between the Reformed and other confessions, whether Lutheran, Roman, Remonstrant, or Socinian; the latter history having both extraconfessional and intraconfessional dimensions, with the extraconfessional dimensions manifesting the differences between the Reformed and various other theological or confessional traditions and the intraconfessional dimensions evidencing the debates that occurred among the Reformed.

Problematic historiography resulting from failure to make the distinction can be easily exemplified. The most basic instance of the problem is the attempt to pose “Calvin” against “the Calvinists.” Not only does this historiographical model fail to address the issues of context, literary genre, and development within a tradition, it also fails to recognize the nature and boundaries of the tradition itself. Calvin was not the sole arbiter of Reformed confessional identity in his own lifetime—and he ought not to be arbitrarily selected as the arbiter of what was Reformed in the generations following his death. Calvin himself recognized the need to balance his own particular theological views with those of his contemporaries in such confessional efforts as the *Consensus Tigurinus*, where the eucharistic teaching was a compromise between Geneva and Zurich.¹¹ Most of the major confessional documents of the Reformed churches produced in the mid-sixteenth century were conceived with a breadth of definition capable of including diverse individual theologies. Each of these individual theologies, moreover, left its mark on its time and on the writers of the early orthodox era, accounting for a series of trajectories of formulation, all within the boundaries set by the confessions. Given the diversity and the fact that the confessional boundaries were set by no single theologian, it is historically inaccurate to identify the later generations in a strict sense as “Calvinists” and it is quite useless to measure them against Calvin as if he were the standard of orthodoxy.

Confusion of confessional history with the history of theological controversies underlies the presentation of Reformed thought in Jan Rohls’s recent *Reformed Confessions*, in which the theological chapters draw nearly exclusively on confessional documents and the historical introduction engages in juxtapositions of Calvin and Beza on predestination, comments on the impact of Ramism on Reformed dogmatics, poses the federal theology of Cocceius against the scholastic orthodoxy of Voetius, and notes the heated debates of the seventeenth century over the theology of Saumur.¹² None of these issues except the problem of the Saumur theologies affected any of the confessions and even the debate over Saumur occurred largely within confessional boundaries. Here, as in Brian Armstrong’s study of Moyse Amyraut,¹³ the result of a mistaken construal of the Reformed tradition is the assessment of the debates between Amyraut and thinkers such as Pierre Du Moulin, Friedrich Spanheim, and Francis Turretin or those between

the Cocceian federalists and the Voetians as battles between opponents and proponents of “scholastic orthodoxy”—whereas the documents of the era indicate battles among the Reformed orthodox and, indeed, among thinkers, all of whom used the scholastic method.

A somewhat different, albeit related, problem is encountered in the efforts of various writers to argue multiple and rather divergent Reformed covenant traditions.¹⁴ I will return to the question of covenant theology later and confine comment here to the issue of tradition or traditions. The core of the argument for distinct Reformed covenant traditions, indeed, in the case of J. Wayne Baker’s version of the argument, two nearly inimical Reformed traditions, rests on the presence of unilateral and bilateral definitions of covenant in the Reformed tradition and the claim of these writers that the definitions are mutually exclusive and held by different thinkers, to the point that the unilateral definition belongs to a more “predestinarian” approach and the bilateral definition to an approach that verges on synergism in its emphasis on human responsibility. The problems with the theory are many: in the first place, many Reformed writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries employ both definitions, the unilateral and the bilateral, in their identification of different aspects or stages in the covenant relationship between God and humanity.¹⁵ In the second place, all of the writers, whether Bullinger and Calvin in the sixteenth century or Perkins and Cocceius in the seventeenth, are mongergistic in their soteriology and intent on defining covenant within the boundaries of the confessional tradition. There is, in other words, one variegated Reformed tradition in which there are several trajectories of thought. Ultimately, whatever differences may be identified between the individual formulations of various theologians, all stood within the Reformed confessional tradition and, more to the point of the present discussion, all stood within the pattern of a developing Reformed orthodoxy. It is only by breaking apart the actual tradition, as defined by its own confessions and by labeling one side of the debate as “orthodox” and the other as an opposition to “rigid orthodoxy,” that the older scholarship has managed to produce its portrait of a rigidly monolithic or monochromatic orthodoxy.

The Theological Task Defined

The success of the Reformation left Protestant forces in command of large geographical areas. With this ground gained, Protestantism increasingly was defined in religious matters by confessional documents and, from an institutional perspective, proved capable not only of surviving but also developing. Such development, framed by confessional definition, in turn provided a context for the rise of educational issues somewhat different from those faced by the Reformers themselves. The Protestant universities now were pressed to formulate and teach theology in detail to generations of students and pastors who had been raised Protestant—and at the same time to identify Protestantism as not only a form but also the correct form of Christianity over against the claims of Rome.

From an educational or pedagogical perspective, the era of early orthodoxy was, for the Reformed churches, an era in which theologians had to concern themselves with methods of education, specifically with the heritage of logic and rhetoric, the practice of exegesis, and the proper identification and arrangement of theological *loci* or topics for the sake of teaching. Increasingly, the Reformed universities and, given the nature of the academic curriculum, the large-scale theological systems, were modeled on scholas-

tic disputations. At the same time, the logical tools of the early Reformation, notably the Agricolan place-logic as modified by Melanchthon, and the later method known as Ramism, were used by Reformed thinkers to give form and structure to their theology. The formal and methodological result of this development was a Reformed scholasticism, a theology academic in its method, structured around the traditional method of disputation and definition, but altered from the medieval versions of scholastic method by its training in late Renaissance logic and rhetoric.

Some definition is necessary here: the place-logic of Agricola and Melanchthon emphasized the examination of the text of a document in order to identify the topics or central issues presented there. This approach led directly to a pattern of biblical interpretation and theological formulation that related the exegesis of the text of Scripture to the task of eliciting *loci communes*, "standard topics" or "places," from Scripture and then using these topics as the core of theology. This approach is found early on in the Reformation in Melanchthon's *Loci communes* (1521; final edition, 1560) and is evident also in Calvin's *Institutes* (1539; final edition, 1559).¹⁶ It is also a significant methodological link between the Reformation and later Protestant orthodoxy, given the tendency of late-sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Reformed thinkers to continue the *locus* method both in their biblical exegesis and in their theological systems.

As is the case with much of the theological development that took place in the sixteenth century, the detailed presentation of rules for theological formulation—whether on the larger scale of methods for the whole of a theological system or on the smaller scale of definitions of theology as a discipline and finely grained arguments concerning the relationship of biblical interpretation to doctrinal formulation—during the rise of Reformed orthodoxy meant the explicit statement of norms and issues that had often been left unstated or barely sketched out by the Reformers. In true Renaissance fashion, however, the Reformers did produce a variety of treatises on theological pedagogy, indicating how theology ought to be studied. Melanchthon and Bullinger are noteworthy for their essays—and here again there is demonstrable continuity in development from the Reformation into the era of orthodoxy.¹⁷

Scripture and Exegetical Issues

One of the erroneous contrasts often made between the theology of the Reformers and that of their orthodox and scholastic successors presents the theology of the Reformation as a biblical and exegetical theology and that of the Reformed orthodox as a highly dogmatic and rational theology, largely negligent of exegetical issues. It is important to remove this fiction explicitly and entirely. Like the Reformers, the Protestant orthodox held Scripture to be the Word of God and understood the relationship between God as the primary author of the whole and the prophets and apostles as the human authors of each part on the analogy of "dictation." This identification of Scripture as the authoritative Word was the basis for the Reformers' insistence that Scripture alone is the final norm for theology and of the Reformed orthodox identification of Scripture as the "cognitive foundation" or *principium cognoscendi* of theology, in contrast to the fallible, albeit useful, standard of the church's tradition and the standards of contemporary teachers, councils, or philosophical argument.¹⁸

We can certainly speak of a development of the Reformed doctrine of Scripture from the Reformation into the era of orthodoxy: the later theologians, honed by debate with Roman Catholics, offer detailed discussions of the clarity and sufficiency of the text. Specifically, they argue that although all texts in Scripture are not equally clear, yet the truth that is necessary to salvation is clearly and sufficiently given. They also insisted that the difficult portions of text can be interpreted by properly trained clergy, in the light of the clear statements found in other places and on the basis of an understanding of the original languages. It is possible to identify, in other words, the development of a fairly refined doctrine of Scripture in the late sixteenth century—but it is quite incorrect to claim that the later writers depart from the basic teaching of the Reformation. It is certainly incorrect to assert that the Reformers understood Scripture as anything other than the infallible, inspired Word of God and the sole foundation for Christian teaching—or to assert that the later orthodox developed a mechanical form of the doctrine of Scripture that was insensitive to power of the preached Word.¹⁹

Far more interesting from a historiographical perspective than modern, dogmatically motivated attempts to read the Reformers' doctrine of inspiration out of context and sever the links between it and the later Reformed orthodox approach is the examination of shared hermeneutical and exegetical approaches and their trajectories of development from the later Middle Ages, through the Reformation, into the era of orthodoxy.²⁰ Underlying the doctrinal formulations of the Reformers and the orthodox is a common tradition of biblical interpretation. Not only do both the Reformers and the seventeenth-century orthodox writers belong to the precritical exegetical tradition, their exegetical results are more often than not in agreement.

Predestination and Covenant

It is one of the more curious errors of interpretation of the Reformed tradition to speak of "Calvin's doctrine of predestination" as if it were his own peculiar formulation and something new grafted on to an earlier, less predestinarian movement. Whereas it is true that there are several different formulations of the doctrine to be found in the Reformed tradition, all three of the basic forms have the same basic implication: some members of the human race are eternally chosen by God to be saved by grace through faith and the remainder are justly damned for their sins. Thus, from the beginnings of the Reformation, we can discern a double predestinarianism, a language of divine election and reprobation, similar to Calvin's in Bucer and probably in Zwingli. Although he included the Fall and human sin in the divine decree (which has led to the identification of his teaching as "supralapsarian"), Calvin quite clearly taught both election and reprobation of human beings, considered eternally by God as created and fallen (what would come to be called the "infralapsarian" view).²¹ While Bullinger could define the doctrine as a double decree, as in his *Decades*, he could also, as in the Second Helvetic Confession, a work largely his, argue a single predestination consisting only in God's election of some, leaving the remainder of humanity to its own devices and, as a result, to its damnation (another form of infralapsarianism). Bullinger differed with Calvin specifically over the inclusion of the fall in the eternal divine decree and over the extent to which predestination ought to be preached—but he consistently assumed that only

the elect would be saved and that election did not rest on divine foreknowledge of human choice. All in all, the differences between Calvin and Bullinger, albeit genuine, can be easily overestimated.²² Rather than use the confession to argue a deep rift between Calvin and Bullinger, the difference between the confession and the *Decades* ought to alert us to the differing needs of personal formulation (as in the *Decades*) and public or corporate statement (as in the confession) and, again, to the relative breadth of the Reformed confessional tradition.

In the work of Calvin's associate and successor, Theodore Beza, we encounter a tendency to argue double predestination, election and reprobation, as defined in the mind of God prior to the will to create—a tendency, therefore, toward the so-called supralapsarian view. Beza's motive in arguing in this fashion was to exclude all possibility of understanding human merit as a ground of the divine choice of some for salvation.²³ Still, Beza's approach appealed only to a minority of the Reformed thinkers of the orthodox era, notably Perkins, Gomarus, and Maccovius, while the infralapsarian model was ensconced as the confessional norm in the Canons of Dort. The Reformed orthodox doctrine of predestination differs from the doctrine found in Calvin and his contemporaries only in its form of presentation and precision of definition: in the era of orthodoxy, it received closely defined scholastic elaboration and debates arose between proponents of the infra- and supralapsarian definitions—the substance of the doctrine, however, was unchanged. In other words, the basic premise of the doctrine, whether formulated as a single or double decree or in infra- or supralapsarian terms, is that salvation rests on the free and sovereign election of God and damnation results from human sin.

A similar issue arises in the development of the Reformed doctrine of the covenant: the doctrine was formulated differently by theologians of the generation of Calvin and Bullinger—with Bullinger providing the more significant doctrinal statement in various treatises and Calvin offering primarily exegetical and homiletical statements. In addition, the trajectory of the development of the doctrine between the time of Calvin and the era of orthodoxy remains somewhat unclear. Both Calvin and Bullinger wrote at length of the covenant of grace—Bullinger in several treatises and in his commentaries and Calvin in both commentaries and sermons, although not in his *Institutes*. Although there are some minor differences in formulation, both Calvin and Bullinger proposed a thoroughly gracious covenant given unilaterally by God as the basis of salvation and both used bilateral language in describing human responsibility in covenant with God. The Reformed doctrine of covenant is, therefore, neither opposed to nor in tension with the Reformed doctrine of predestination, which also declares a grace unilaterally bestowed by God and assumes human responsibility and obedience under and enabled by grace.²⁴

Following 1560, both Musculus and Ursinus proposed, albeit very briefly, a concept of a covenant in creation that had certain affinities with medieval conceptions of creation as an order established and maintained by God. This concept, together with a view of unfallen human nature as capable of understanding God's law, was developed by thinkers such as Caspar Olevianus, Dudley Fenner, William Perkins, Franciscus Gomarus, Robert Rollock, and John Ball (1585–1640) into an elaborate doctrine of two covenants, the covenant of works or nature and the covenant of grace, with the covenant of grace following out a historical pattern of several Old Testament adminis-

trations followed by its fulfillment or complete revelation in the New Testament. This model became increasingly important in the Reformed theology of the seventeenth century, as exemplified in the works of Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669), Franz Burman (1632–1679), and Herman Witsius (1636–1708).²⁵

It is clear that the early orthodox Reformed thinkers do not oblige the excessively neat categories of those modern historians who have claimed “tensions” in Reformed theology between a covenantal and a predestinarian model or between bilateral and unilateral definitions of covenant. Indeed, early synthesizers of covenantal theology such as Fenner, Rollock, and Perkins held to clearly enunciated doctrines of predestination and often were able to fold both unilateral and bilateral definitions of covenant into their theologies. By way of example, Perkins taught a doctrine of full, double predestination and taught a unilaterally bestowed covenant of grace and at the same time (without either apparent contradiction or internal tension) argued a bilateral character of covenant once bestowed, according to which human beings were called on to act responsibly before God. Even so, Cocceius, who is mistakenly described by Baker as teaching a “conditional” doctrine of covenant in “opposition” to the rigid predestinarianism of “Reformed scholasticism,” actually combined the unilateral and bilateral definitions of covenant in a system that taught an orthodox doctrine of predestination.²⁶ Nor can Cocceius’ federal theology be neatly set against the scholastic models of his contemporaries.²⁷

Christology and Atonement

Reformed teaching concerning the Person of Christ was, from its beginnings, fundamentally orthodox and formulated in the context of the great ecumenical creeds, particularly the Chalcedonian Formula. Still, there are at least two highly significant features of the Reformed approach that distinguish it from other approaches to the Person of Christ, particularly that of the Lutherans. From its beginnings, Reformed Christology focused on the issue of the integrity of the divinity and humanity of Christ in his person, teaching what is technically called a *communicatio idiomatum in concreto* or “communication of proper qualities in the concrete.” Reformed thinkers such as Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, and Bullinger were intent on affirming the fullness of Christ’s divinity and the genuineness of his humanity and consistently refused to allow a flow of divine attributes from the divine to the human. Thus, all of the attributes of each of the natures belong to the concrete “person” of the incarnate Word—the Person of Christ is omniscient and omnipotent, according to the divine nature; finite and subject to death, according to the human nature.

The doctrinal point has a series of very specific applications, all of which remain typical of Reformed theology into the era of orthodoxy: the Reformed insist that, in his ascension to heaven, Christ remained fully human, concluding that his humanity could not therefore be present bodily in the Lord’s Supper. This teaching was posed not only against the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation (which claims that the eucharistic elements are transformed into Christ’s body and blood) but also against the Lutheran understanding of a bodily presence of Christ with the bread and wine, by reason of the ubiquity of Christ’s resurrected humanity. From the Reformed perspective, to claim that a human nature has the attribute of being everywhere constitutes a denial of humanity, which can only be in one place.

The other central emphasis of the Reformed Christology, one which it took directly from Calvin, is its understanding of Christ as Mediator in terms of his threefold office as prophet, priest, and king—namely, as the revealer and fulfillment of God’s promise, as the sacrifice for sin, and as the ruler of God’s kingdom. Calvin did not invent the concept, but he gave it a prominence in Reformed thought that continued into the era of orthodoxy. Whereas Calvin had used the threefold office primarily to describe distinct functions of Christ’s work, later Reformed theology developed the doctrine historically as well, indicating that, although each office was eternal and had been revealed in the mediatorial work of the Word throughout history, the prophetic office was most prominent in revelatory work of the Word in the history of revelation, the priestly office in the sacrificial life and death of Christ, and the kingly office in the final reign of God. The significance of the doctrine is certainly to be found in the way in which it roots the understanding of Christ’s person in his historical work and in its stress on the breadth of Christ’s work, not only in his atoning death but also in his revelatory mission and in his rule and headship over the people of God. This latter issue relates directly to the covenantal emphasis of Reformed orthodoxy.

Reformed theology also presented, both in the Reformation and the era of orthodoxy, a doctrine of the mediatorial work of Christ that paralleled the Reformed emphases on salvation by grace alone and divine election. Whereas Calvin, Bullinger, and others of their generation did not make a major issue of the limitation of Christ’s atoning work to the elect alone, later Reformed thinkers elaborated the point, particularly because of the controversies in which they became involved. There has been some scholarly disagreement on this issue—and sometimes a doctrinal wedge is driven between “Calvin” and the “Calvinists,” as if Calvin taught a “universal atonement” and later Reformed writers taught a “limited atonement.” Yet, when the terms and definitions are rightly sorted out, there is significant continuity in the Reformed tradition on this point.

The terms “universal” and “limited atonement” do not represent the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Reformed view—or, for that matter, the view of its opponents. The issue was not over “atonement,” broadly understood, but over the “satisfaction” made by Christ for sin—and the debate was never over whether or not Christ’s satisfaction was limited: all held it to be utterly sufficient to pay the price for all sin and all held it to be effective or efficient only for those who were saved. The question concerned the identity of those saved and, therefore, the ground of the limitation—God’s will or human choice. Thus, both Calvin and Bullinger taught that Christ’s work made full and perfect satisfaction for all, both commended the universal preaching of the Gospel, both taught the efficacy of Christ’s work for the faithful alone—and both taught that faith is the gift of God, made available to the elect only.²⁸ In other words, the inference of a limitation of the efficacy of Christ’s satisfaction to the elect alone is found both in Bullinger and in Calvin, despite differences between their formulations of the doctrine of predestination. The Reformed orthodox did teach the doctrine more precisely. In response to Arminius, they brought the traditional formula of sufficiency for all sin and efficiency for the elect alone to the forefront of their definition, where Calvin and Bullinger hardly mentioned it at all. The orthodox also more clearly connected the doctrine of election to the language of the limitation of the efficacy of Christ’s death, arguing that the divine intention in decreeing the death of Christ was to save only the elect. This solution is presented in the Canons of Dort in concise formulae.

It is well documented that some of the delegates at Dort held that the sufficiency of Christ's death reflected the divine will to save all people, if all would come to believe and therefore found the formulae restrictive.²⁹ As the seventeenth century progressed, Reformed theologians such as John Davenant in England or John Cameron and Moyses Amyraut in France offered various conceptions of a "hypothetical universalism," according to which the sufficiency of Christ's death was willed hypothetically or conditionally for all human beings—on condition of belief—prior to the divine decree to save the elect by grace. This view was considered problematic by the majority of the Reformed orthodox, given that it conceived of an unrealized (indeed, an intentionally unrealized) will in God.³⁰ Still, inasmuch as the doctrine never claimed to broaden the efficacy of Christ's death on the assumption that nonelect individuals might actually believe, it can hardly be identified as an actual alternative to the more typical Reformed teaching of the limitation, by the will of God, of the efficacy of Christ's death to the elect. If there is a difference between "Calvin" and the "Calvinists" (or between Bullinger or Musculus and the Reformed orthodox) on this point, it is simply that, in the case of the Reformers, one must make a little effort to "connect the dots," whereas the Reformed orthodox made sure, against various doctrinal adversaries, that the picture was presented in full. Arguably, in the confessional context of seventeenth-century orthodoxy, this full presentation included both the hypothetical universalism of Davenant, Cameron, and Amyraut and the more strictly divided sufficiency/efficiency formula of Turretin, Heidegger, and the other signatories of the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*; although, equally so, it may be argued that some of the forms of hypothetical universalism included speculative elements that fell outside of the main trajectory of Reformed theology.

Reframing the Historiographical Question

Several of the generalizations and conclusions made in the preceding comments on the theology of the Reformed tradition point directly toward the need to reframe the historiographical analysis of the transition from Reformation to orthodoxy. To begin with the last example: the development of Reformed atonement theory has, in the older literature, consistently pitted Calvin against the Calvinists and in one instance linked a "humanistic" Calvin and a "humanistic" Amyraut in opposition to "scholastic Calvinists." There is good reason to argue the point quite differently, given clarification of the trajectories of scholasticism and humanism through the Reformation and into the era of orthodoxy: inasmuch as scholasticism and humanism represent issues of method rather than issues of theological content, the doctrinal debate over hypothetical universalism hardly stemmed from a difference between humanistic and scholastic trajectories of Reformed theology. What is more, the debate over the question of whether or not the sufficiency of Christ's satisfaction might be construed as a hypothetical or conditional decree of God prior to knowledge that no human beings would choose to believe and his consequent decree to save only the elect is so rarified a notion, so imbedded in the mentality of close distinctions, that it can only be identified as indicative of scholastic method on both sides of the argument. In this view, the Amyraut controversy evidences not a debate between humanistic Calvinians and rigid, scholastic Calvinistic orthodoxy,

but an internal debate of the Reformed orthodox and, therefore, the variety and breadth within confessional orthodoxy, indeed, among the Reformed scholastics.

By extension, the most obvious example of the relationship between the essays found in *The Unaccommodated Calvin* and those included in this volume is the discussion of humanism and scholasticism that runs through both. In *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, I specifically addressed the issue of Calvin and scholasticism, concluding that Calvin's polemics against scholastic theology were more varied and nuanced than sometimes thought and that they indicated neither a rejection of all scholastic theology nor a refusal on Calvin's own part to incorporate scholastic distinctions and arguments in his own thought. This conclusion not only provides a somewhat different perspective on the kind of continuity that exists between Calvin and his predecessors, it also alters one's perception of the relationship between Calvin and his more scholastic Reformed successors—the contrast is not as great as is sometimes supposed. The essays gathered in this volume address the same issue from the opposite side: analysis of the “scholasticism” of later Reformed theology not only manifests its character as a method rather than as a specific theological or philosophical content but also manifests its use as a methodological vehicle for maintaining, in new or changed contexts, the basic theological perspectives of the Reformation. What is more, the “scholasticism” of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is shown to have been different from the scholasticism of the medieval centuries, given modifications in style and method brought about by the Renaissance and Reformation. Thus, the contrast between Calvin and the later Reformed is diminished from both perspectives, that of Calvin and that of the later writers, and the continuities between the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century expressions of Reformed thought are more clearly identified.

A similar point can be made concerning the continuities of humanism. Whereas in *The Unaccommodated Calvin* I attempted to illustrate both scholastic and humanistic elements in Calvin's thought rather than reduce him to the generalized notion of a “biblical humanist,” in the essays gathered here I have identified humanistic elements in the work of the writers nominally identified as Reformed “scholastics.” Most notable here are the methodological continuities of this later scholasticism with the *locus* method developed by Renaissance rhetors and logicians, and the later scholastic continuance of the Renaissance interest in philology and the use of ancient sources in the original languages. If, in other words, it is unsuitable to identify Calvin as a “biblical humanist” utterly opposed to the results of scholasticism, so also is it fundamentally unsuitable to identify the later Reformed writers as scholastics who discarded or scorned the humanistic methods of the Renaissance and Reformation.

The essays gathered together here also form a reasonably cohesive unit, divided into two basic categories. In the first part, “Reframing the Phenomenon—Definition, Method, and Assessment,” all of the essays offer redefinitions or reappraisals of the phenomenon of Reformed orthodoxy and scholasticism. The first essay of this part (chapter 2 of the book),³¹ “Scholasticism and Orthodoxy in the Reformed Tradition: Definition and Method,” represents a programmatic attempt at the identification of the problem of much of the older scholarship in its reading of scholastic orthodoxy—from its tendency to ignore the fundamental identity of “scholasticism” as a method rather than a particular theological or philosophical content, to its unwillingness to recognize that the Reformation itself, as the primary antecedent of Protestant orthodoxy, had the reestablishment

of Christian "orthodoxy" as one of its fundamental goals. The essay concludes with a discussion of methodological issues and problems that need to be addressed for the full reappraisal of the phenomenon of Protestant orthodoxy.

In the second essay (chapter 3),³² "*Ad fontes argumentorum: The Sources of Reformed Theology in the Seventeenth Century*," I move past the basic issue of definition and approach and raise the question of the actual sources and materials used by the Protestant scholastics of the seventeenth century in the fashioning of their theological world, noting the Renaissance and medieval backgrounds of Reformed orthodoxy, and arguing that the sources used and, moreover, the way in which they were used, support the redefinition and reappraisal proposed in the initial study.

The final two chapters in part I ("Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities Between Reformation and Orthodoxy," parts 1 and 2) turn to the issue of redefinition and reappraisal from a more strictly methodological perspective.³³ Underlying their arguments, in parallel with the critical thesis of *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, these essays note both the failure of a highly theologized historiography to provide a balanced and convincing analysis of the transition from the Reformation into the era of orthodoxy and the need for a more objective and balanced historiography to look beyond the purely dogmatic content of the materials in order to ascertain their implications in and for their historical context. In form, these essays examine the grounds and issues facing the study of post-Reformation Protestant thought in series of theses designed to identify problems and issues in the historiography and to serve as points of departure for more detailed arguments concerning the method necessary to the field. Specifically, they take up several of the threads of the more programmatic first chapter and indicate some of the components of the requisite bibliography—given the assumption that much of the problem underlying the older scholarship was its narrow appeal to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Protestant theology in isolation from the medieval and Renaissance antecedents of the Reformation and in isolation from the study of collateral fields of investigation such as the history of biblical exegesis and the history of philosophy.

Part II, "Scholastic Protestantism—Foundational Perspectives," contains six essays that illustrate and develop the definitions and critiques of part one in the form of concrete example. Quite specifically, they take up lines of argument indicated in the preliminary study of the "*Sources of Reformed Theology in the Seventeenth Century*." The essays, moreover, reflect the contents of the initial topics of most Reformed theologies of the orthodox era, namely, the prolegomena and Scripture. The significance of this grouping, therefore, is that all of the essays reflect issues raised consistently by the Reformed orthodox at the presuppositional level of their thought and, therefore, issues the resolution or definition of which carry over into their theology as a whole.

The first essay in this part (chapter 6),³⁴ "Calling, Character, Piety, and Learning: Paradigms for Theological Education in the Era of Protestant Orthodoxy," moves beyond the basic presentation of sources, materials, and methods to the examination of the ethos of study in the seventeenth century. After a preliminary examination of some of the approaches to theological study published by Reformers, the essay looks both at the large-scale program of study and spiritual formation recommended by later Calvinists and at the personal result of that program as detailed by one of its chief exponents. Not only does the essay register a continuity in intention and ethos in the development

of Reformed thought between the time of the Reformation and the era of scholastic orthodoxy, the essay also documents the strong sense of calling and piety that accompanied and enriched the educational programs of the Reformed orthodox. This is, moreover, a significant issue in the reappraisal of the theology of scholastic orthodoxy given the tendency of a fair amount of the older literature to assume the opposite, namely, that the theology of the Protestant scholastics was spiritually arid and quite discontinuous with the piety of the era. The implication of an examination of the curricula, curricular recommendations, and the spirituality of study is that discussions of the piety of the English Puritans or of the Dutch *Nadere Reformatie* that ignore the connection of these movements to the scholastic orthodoxy of the era present at best a partial picture of the era and at worst a rather distorted picture of piety of the seventeenth century.

Two brief examples will suffice. Among the English writers of the era, Richard Baxter is best known for his works on piety and spirituality. Several of his spiritual works—such as *The Reformed Pastor* and *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*—have remained in print fairly consistently since his own time and now belong to a small body of perennial classics of Christian piety that are studied in their own right as spiritual literature, apart from consideration of the broader scope of Baxter's thought. The problematic of such a procedure is evident when Baxter's own sense of his spiritual and theological legacy was bound to works such as his *Catholike Theology*, *Methodus theologiae*, and *Aphorismes of Justification*, none of which are found on the list of popular spiritual classics and that, in fact, belong to the category of seventeenth-century scholastic theology. What is more, a glance at the sources, whether ancient or contemporary, cited by Baxter in the composition of his works evidences a reliance on the older scholastic tradition and a detailed acquaintance with the works of the continental theologians of his time. If Baxter's practical works cannot be understood apart from the larger theological context provided by his more technical works, none of his thought can be understood apart from the broad international context of British Reformed thought in the seventeenth century.³⁵

A second parallel example is the work of the Dutch theologian Gisbertus Voetius, whose approach to theological learning is the subject of one section of the chapter. From one perspective, Voetius is remembered as one of the preeminent scholastic thinkers of his day. He presented his theology in the form of academic or scholastic "disputations" in which the thetically stated doctrines of orthodoxy were defended against heresies, whether ancient or modern, and against various philosophical errors. To this task of defense, Voetius brought a vast bibliography of patristic, medieval, Renaissance, and Reformation sources and an enormous array of linguistic tools. His references evidence a massive knowledge of the Bible in its original languages, and an equally impressive grasp of medieval scholastic theology documented by examinations of Thomist, Scotist, and nominalist argumentation on fairly rarified points of argument. He was an angry opponent of the "federal" or Cocceian school of Reformed thought in the seventeenth century, and he engaged at length and in some depth with Cartesian philosophy, viewing it as a thoroughly problematic mode of thought and no ally of Christian theology. Voetius is remembered also, as it were, by another constituency—students of the piety and spirituality of the Dutch *Nadere Reformatie*: indeed, in his treatises on piety, his work as a catechist, and his assumption that the Reformation of the church must be continued in the ongoing inner reformation of the believer, Voetius is remembered as one of the founding fathers of the late-seventeenth-century spiritual revival. He and his