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INTRODUCTION

“Puritanism,” like so many “isms” throughout history, has proved very difficult to define, and I am aware that no definitive solution will be found in this essay. Thus, what I offer here is a brief theological and ecclesiastical history of the twin poles that are, with different degrees of emphasis, often seen as constitutive of the Puritan identity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: religious experience, which separates the true believer from one with only an intellectual faith; and the development of Reformed Orthodoxy, particularly as it played out in the ecclesiological struggles in England during this time. Indeed, the key theological debates in Britain at the time, at least as they impacted on the wider history of England Scotland, and Ireland, tended on the whole to address matters of church and state, and the nature of liturgical reform, rather than the kind of issues which we see, for example, in Dutch church history of the time. Thus, while British theologians did produce a vast amount of literature on classical theological themes, such as the doctrine of scripture, God, Christology, and predestination, much of the focus of public debate was on differences in polity and liturgy between Erastians, Presbyterians and Independents. Historians have tended to focus on these matters of being of primary interest.¹ Thus, Puritan studies, a field where perhaps one might have expected more of a theological concern, has been dominated on the whole by those whose interests are more with the sociology and psychology of the movement(s) than with its doctrinal contribution.²

The last twenty years have, however, witnessed the growth in interest among academics in the theological writings of Britain during this time. In part, this is clearly the result of the impact of the wider growth in this area fuelled by the scholarly contributions of Richard A. Muller to the broader field of post-Reformation theological studies, contributions which specifically integrate discussions of British theologians such as Samuel Rutherford, James Ussher, John Owen, and Edward Leigh (among many others) into the wider treatment of
continental reformed Orthodoxy. In the wake of Muller’s work, a number of writers have either pursued historical theological studies of English and Scottish figures which seek to apply his insights to specific English figures or debates, or have sought to integrate sensitivity to issues of historical theology with the more traditional social, political, and literary interests of Puritan studies. The picture that has emerged of Reformed Orthodox intellectual life in Britain in recent scholarship, even as it acknowledges the differences in social and political contexts, has underlined both the close connection between British theology and that of the continent at the time, and the essential catholicity of the British Reformed relative to their patristic and medieval antecedents.

The picture that has emerged of Reformed Orthodox intellectual life in Britain in recent scholarship, even as it acknowledges the differences in social and political contexts, has underlined both the close connection between British theology and that of the continent at the time, and the essential catholicity of the British Reformed relative to their patristic and medieval antecedents.

THE EARLY ENGLISH REFORMATION, 1509-58

The reign of Henry VIII was marked by a break with the Roman church but rather equivocal commitment to Protestantism. Indeed, it was not until the reign of Edward VI (1547-53) that Protestantism found confessional status in England with the First and Second Books of Common Prayer (1549; 1552) and the formulation of the Forty-Two Articles of 1552, produced by Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Articles were essentially Reformed, particularly in their view of the Lord’s Supper but their composition at the end of Edward’s reign meant that they never achieved normative status.

Nevertheless, the lack of formal confessional status did not mean that English theologians were not already debating Reformed theology. The ebb and flow of Protestant fortunes both in England under Henry VIII had guaranteed that, by the time of Edward’s reign, England had not only seen many of its own most progressive theological minds go into exile on the continent but then return, replete with continental Reformed thought. Thus, during the reign of Edward VI, John Hooper and Bartholomew Traheron vigorously debated predestination, the former having been exiled in Bullinger’s Zurich, the latter in Calvin’s Geneva, with their respective cities of exile shaping their approach to the subject. Bullinger was strongly opposed to the double predestinationism of Traheron, and indeed appears to have used synergistic passages from Melanchthon’s *Loci Communes* as the textual source for some of his arguments.

In addition to the return of domestic theologians, England also benefited at this time from the presence of foreign intellectuals, fleeing the continent to avoid Charles V’s anti-Protestant policies. Thus, in the early 1550s, leading continental Reformers were also to be resident in England: for example, among others, Peter Martyr Vermigli took the chair of divinity at Oxford, Martin Bucer the chair at Cambridge, and John Laski pastored a church of exiles in London. These men were significant in the domestic debates among Reformed theologians. Bucer was particularly influential in shaping Cranmer’s views of polity and John Bradford’s views on predestination; and Laski’s presence encouraged the more radically Reformed, such as John Hooper (ca. 1500-1555), to press for more thorough Reformation of the Anglican Church.

One final note regarding Edward’s reign was the emergence of debates surrounding church practices, specifically the use of clerical vestments, the practice of kneeling at communion, and the nature and status of the Book of Common Prayer as defining the English Reformation. Both John Hooper and the exiled Scotsman, John Knox (ca. 1510-72), protested the use of vestments, and the latter was also notorious for his last-minute intervention on the Second Book of Common Prayer’s prescription of kneeling as the appropriate posture for reception of the sacramental elements. For both men, these things were not prescribed by scripture and were thus to be regarded as idolatrous. In making such a case, they were effectively adumbrating the later Regulative Principle of worship, as well as implicitly raising questions about
the extent of state power with regard to church affairs. These were to be the most important issues in British church life for the next century and marked one element of what we might call Puritanism: the desire to see further reformation within the Church of England.

The death of Edward in 1553 brought his Catholic sister, Mary, to the throne and, in the years that followed, persecution of Protestants meant exile for some and death for others. Very little in the way of theological significance was produced by the Reformed during her reign, though it is worth noting the debate that took place in the Tower of London between John Bradford and a shadowy group known as “the Free Will Men” who, as the name suggests, were radical Pelagians upset that the Reformed prisoners enjoyed gambling to pass the time. Bradford’s defences of providence and predestination in this context show the influence of Bucer and probably Calvin.8

It is also significant that John Knox, by then pastor of the English exile church in Frankfurt am Main, clashed with a group of Prayer Book loyalists over his liturgical reforms within the congregation, and consequently lost his pastorate. Again, this was an ominous foreshadowing of problems to come.9

THE ELIZABETHAN ERA

During the reign of Elizabeth, numerous significant developments took place relative to Reformed orthodoxy. First, in 1559 Parliament passed both the Act of Supremacy which re-established the independence of the Anglican Church from Rome and established the monarch as its Supreme Governor, and the Act of Uniformity, which established the Book of Common Prayer as the church’s official liturgy and required certain church attendance from the people. In 1563, the church was then given a sharper doctrinal identity when the Thirty-Nine Articles, a modification of the earlier Forty-Two Articles, passed into law and thus established Reformed Protestant theology as the official position of church and state.

While the Articles embodied a broad Reformed framework for theology, they were not the major source of tension in the 1560s and 1570s in England. Rather, the major controversial foci were, again, the use of vestments and the related issue of state power vis-à-vis church liturgical practice and discipline. Thus, in the 1560s and 1570s, there were significant struggles between those who wished to see an aesthetically simplified form of worship and practice, including increased freedom for the church to determine these matters without giving the state final authority, and those who wished to maintain both the stipulations of the Prayer Book and the prerogative of the state to enforce such.10

In addition, the disputes on these points were intensified by the Geneva Bible, an English translation first produced in 1557 (New Testament) and 1560 (complete Bible). Many of the men associated with the work were English exiles in Geneva who went on to become prominent figures in the struggles over vestments in the Elizabethan church. In fact, it was not so much the translation that was to prove so controversial as the marginal notes which advocated politically and ecclesiastically radical interpretations of key passages, most famously perhaps on the Hebrew midwives deception in Exod 1:19. This text was interpreted as legitimating the telling of lies to tyrannical rulers, a piece of commentary which was to be particularly distressing to Elizabeth’s successor, James I, and which plays directly to those within the church who wished to resist royal incursions on what they understood to be the sphere of the church’s sovereign power. The immediate impact of the Geneva Bible has probably been overestimated but, after its first English printing in 1576, it rapidly became the most influential English translation.11

William Perkins

If English Puritanism in the sixteenth century produced a theologian of international stature, it was William Perkins (1558-1602), a Cambridge theologian whose works covered the full range
of Reformed doctrinal and practical concerns. Indeed, it has been argued that it was the market for his books in the Low Countries that essentially started the tradition of Dutch translations of English works. He is perhaps most famous for his appropriation and elaboration of Theodore Beza’s *Tabula praedestinationis* in his own *A Golden Chaine*, which was a schematic essay on the order of salvation. Perkins’s modification of Beza involved a careful Christological focus, coordinating the elements of the order of salvation with the humiliation and exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ; and he was also much more enamoured with the theories of logic and memory of Peter Ramus, again evident in the chart.

Perkins also produced works of casuistry and practical divinity, something which would become an important part of Puritan literary production, marking the typical dual emphasis among many of the British Reformed Orthodox on doctrinal precision and experimental piety. Indeed, after Perkins, casuistry became quite a Puritan phenomenon, with perhaps the greatest example being provided by Richard Baxter. It also provided one of the strangest ecumenical alliances of the time, at least on the printed page, when Puritan Edmund Bunny reprinted a casuistical book by Jesuit Robert Parson, along with an additional essay of his own.

**The Lambeth Articles**

England, however, was not immune to the kind of debates affecting continental Reformed Orthodoxy, particularly with references to predestination. The Thirty Nine Articles, while clearly Reformed in original intention, were nonetheless much less precise than other similar confessions, such as the Belgic or Second Helvetic. By the 1590s, there were those within ministerial orders who were willing to criticize the received wisdom on issues such as grace and predestination. In particular, this was true of the group centered around Peter Baro (1534–99), the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Of course, the English situation was in part a function of developments on the continent, with tensions on issues such as double predestination becoming increasingly prominent in Lutheran and Reformed conflict, as in the collapse of the colloquy at Montbeliard in 1586. But such became the sensitivities in England that any questioning of double predestination was sometimes liable to place one under suspicion or troublemaking.

While there had been rumblings of trouble regarding the teaching of predestination in the 1580s, matters really came to a head in April 1595, when a member of Peter Baro’s Cambridge circle, William Barrett, of Caius College, preached a sermon (now lost) in which he denied the irresistibility of grace, and also attacked the corollaries of assurance and reprobation. The matter brought him to the attention of the authorities and he was forced to recant (though he later recanted the recantation). Most significantly, the sermon brought to a head the conflict between the Baro party and William Whitaker (1548–95), Master of St. John’s College, Cambridge, and this culminated in Archbishop Whitgift’s promulgation of the Lambeth Articles in November 1595.

The Articles, the result of a conference involving Whitaker, Whitgift, and the Cambridge Heads, were nine brief statements, in Latin, asserting, among other things, double predestination (Art. 1), sin as the basis for condemnation (Art. 4), the reality of full assurance (Art. 6) and the impotence of human beings relative to salvation (Art. 9). V. C. Miller makes the point that there were two agendas behind the Articles: Whitgift wished to see them as a basis for clarifying the Thirty-Nine Articles and thus bringing an end to the conflict at Cambridge; Whitaker and the Heads wished to see them as connecting the Anglican Church to the continental churches by highlighting agreement on the points which they addressed. Arguably, the Articles ended up achieving neither: Peter Baro subsequently launched an explicit attack on Whitaker in a sermon in January 1596 and, in a manner which highlights the problem of
the theological meaning of their confession faced by Anglicans at the time, used the Thirty Nine Articles, specifically Articles XVII (Of Predestination and Election) and XXXI (Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross) to justify his position; and Elizabeth I intervened to make sure that the Articles were not widely circulated on the grounds that she wished to avoid further contention over predestination, “a matter tender and dangerous to weak and ignorant minds.”

In sum, by the end of Elizabeth’s reign, Reformed theology was the official position of the established Church of England, but the situation was far from peaceful or settled. Issues such as the necessity and legitimacy of clerical vestments, the nature of church government, and the meaning of the theology of the Thirty Nine Articles, had all proved to be ongoing sources of tension, and this was to continue into the seventeenth-century.

**THE REIGN OF JAMES I (1603-25)**

When Elizabeth I died without issue, James VI of Scotland succeeded to the English throne in 1603, becoming James I of England. A new religious and political situation was created which required one monarch to forge a religious policy which would assist good government of his three kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland. While James himself appears to have been basically Reformed in theology and, indeed, no theological slouch himself, he was no Puritan and also a firm believer in the King’s right to control the church. This was signaled perhaps most clearly at the very start of his reign when, in response to the Millenary Petition (a petition signed by ca. 1000 ministers, calling for a more thorough reformation of the Church of England) he called the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, where he met with leading Anglicans, including Laurence Chaderton, a Puritan. The outcome of the Conference was disappointing from a Puritan perspective, with the only achievement being the commissioning of what would be published in 1611 as the Authorized, or King James Version, of the Bible. The equivocal nature of this for the Puritans would lead ultimately to the sidelining of the Geneva Bible, particularly hated by James because of the marginal notes justifying rebellion against tyrants.

**Sabbatarianism**

One of the distinctives of British Puritan Reformed piety over against its continental counterpart, was its vigorous Sabbatarianism. This emerged during the reign of Elizabeth, but became a focal point of intense struggle in the reign of James. Of particular note in this regard was James’s publication of the Declaration, or Book, of Sports in 1617-18, which defined which sports could be played on Sunday and other Holy Days, and which was clearly designed as a means of provoking the Puritans and undermining the piety for which they stood. Charles I reissued the book in 1633, with a slightly expanded list of legitimate Sabbath recreations. The declaration ensured that Sabbatarianism would be firmly fixed as a theological and ecclesiastical identity marker among the Puritans.

**The Five Articles of Perth**

In the same year as he was provoking the Puritans with his policy on the Sabbath, James also promulgated the Five Articles of Perth, imposing English ecclesiastical practice on the Scottish kirk. Kneeling was to be required at communion, private baptisms were to be allowed, the sacrament could be reserved for the ill, confirmation was to be administered by a bishop, and certain Holy Days were to be observed. In other words, the practice of the Scottish Presbyterian church was to be made to look more like English Episcopalianism, frustrating the hopes of the more radical Scots and English, who had hoped the English church would become more Scottish in structure and practice. This set the context for the development of increasingly radical Presbyterianism.

**The Irish Articles**

Perhaps the single most important British con-
fessional development during the reign of James I was the production of the Irish Articles of 1615, produced as the result of a decision by the convocation of the Irish church which met between 1613 and 1625.26 There is some debate about who authored the Articles, but it is most likely that they are the product of the pen of James Ussher (1581-1656), later to be Archbishop of Armagh. The Articles are the result of at least two impulses. First, the Irish church was itself beginning to develop a separate institutional identity, and the formulation of its own articles of religion was a logical step in this process.27 Second, the sufficiency of the Thirty Nine Articles as a creedal formula had been called into question by the debates of the 1580s and 1590s relative to predestination, and thus it was also seen as advantageous to produce a more thorough doctrinal statement with the intention of closing some of the perceived loopholes.

Broadly speaking, the content of the Articles represented something of an attempt to draw the Irish church closer in language and confession to the Reformed churches of the continent and thus to address some of the concerns of the more Puritan clergy on issues of polity, forms, and theology.28 On the more specific theological plane, they added considerably to the teaching of the Thirty Nine Articles.

Unlike the Thirty Nine Articles, the Irish Articles were explicitly covenantal in the way that they understood God’s relationship to his creation and, most significantly, included a reference to the covenant of works. Art. 21 makes it clear that Adam was created with the law engraved on his heart and with the promise of eternal life on condition of his perfect obedience.29 Arts. 29-30 then deal with Christ as the mediator of the second covenant, or covenant of grace.30 The Articles also contain a massively expanded section on predestination because they actually include the text of the Lambeth Articles. Thus, while Article 17 of the original Thirty Nine Articles offered a brief statement of single predestination, the Irish Articles offered seven articles (11 to 17) and a clear assertion of double predestination.31 Finally, the anti-Catholicism of the Thirty Nine Articles was intensified, with Irish Article 80 identifying the Pope with the biblical Man of Sin, in other words, the Antichrist.32 In sum, the Irish Articles represented “a comprehensive revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles, which brought them up to date, and systematized and defined the prevailing Calvinist concerns of the English and Irish churches.”33

**THE REIGN OF CHARLES I (1625-59)**

Charles I inherited both his father’s primary political problem—the need to find a unified religious settlement for the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland—and his father’s belief in the Divine Right of Kings. Indeed, he held the latter with even greater passion. What he did not inherit was his father’s political savvy and capacity for intelligent strategy; and this was in no small measure a factor in the wars in which he was forced to engage in Scotland and then in England against parliament, that cost him his crown and his life.34

Within the bounds of the Reformed Orthodox, the years prior to the calling of the Westminster Assembly in 1643 were marked by increasing tension and fractures within the public consensus. Jonathan Moore has called attention to the way in which debates about the nature and extent of Christ’s atonement gradually strained the English Reformed consensus which, at the time of Dordt, happily included men such as Davenant, but the1640s was split between particularists and universalists, although continental Amyraldianism appears to have been only a tangential issue at Westminster.35 Ecclesiology too proved a flashpoint. Theologians agreed on the details of the Reformed Orthodox system of divinity but were ranged against each other on matters pertaining to Anglican ritual, church government, and church-state issues.36 This latter issue became even more acute once the Assembly was summoned in 1643 with a view to revising Anglicanism in a way that would prove more acceptable to the Reformed parties.
Prior to this time, however, the Netherlands and the American colonies had continued to prove attractive to the more radical of the Puritans who bristled under Stuart religious policy. For example, the Reformed theologian William Ames (1576-1633), a student of William Perkins, who had left for the Netherlands under James I, enjoyed a career there as both an outstanding theology professor at Franeker and then as minister in Rotterdam. Ames’s writing exhibits a remarkable breadth, from a summary of theology connected to the Heidelberg Catechism to a system of theology to a standard textbook on casuistry to a critique of ceremonial worship to a major controversial engagement with Robert Bellarmine. As to America, a good example of a more radical Puritan who headed west but remained influential in his homeland is that of John Cotton (1585-1652). Cotton headed to the colonies in 1633, the year William Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury. While he was famous for his controversial engagement with Roger Williams over church-state issues, he was perhaps most influential back in England through his works which advocated Independency as the biblical form of church polity. Indeed, his writings in this area were central to converting John Owen from Presbyterianism and thus providing English Independency with its most significant intellect and leader.

**Antinomianism**

Various controversies and events helped to give Reformed theology in Britain a distinctive shape in the seventeenth century. One of the most significant was the issue of antinomianism. While antinomianism, like modern fundamentalism, is difficult to define, its critics saw it as essentially emphasizing the objective work of Christ to such an extent that the moral imperatives of the Christian life were completely undermined. Evidence suggests that various groups that one might designate as antinomian flourished in pre-Civil War England, and a number of theologians emerged in the 1630s and 1640s whose writings were certainly criticized for antinomianism. In America, the infamous case of Anne Hutchinson in 1636 served as an example of the tensions within Reformed communities on the issue of good works, and, while Hutchinson was herself clearly of a radical bent, even a figure of the unimpeachable orthodoxy of John Cotton was initially sympathetic to her viewpoint.

If the social experiment of the Puritan settlers was one context for such struggles, back in England, the general political and social chaos of the 1640s fuelled fear of antinomianism. This is most evident in the work of the theologically eccentric autodidact, Richard Baxter who, from 1649 onwards, was arguing for a form of justification based upon what amounted to a synthesis of imputation and impartation. He even regarded John Owen and Johannes Maccovius as essentially deviant antinomians because of their understanding that Christ’s atonement as involving a *solutio eiusdem* (identical satisfaction) rather than a *solutio tantidem* (equivalent satisfaction) for human sin. Owen’s response was to defend the application of *solutio eiusdem* to the atonement but to accent the dynamic role which faith played, given that it was instrumental to union with Christ; and only in union with Christ did Christ’s atonement and righteousness become immediately effective for the believer. As linguistic tit-for-tat, opponents of the theology of Baxter and his co-belligerents on this point labeled his position on justification “neonomianism,” a term no more helpful than antinomianism.

**The Theology of the Westminster Assembly**

When the King declared war against Parliament in 1642, the scope for reform of the Church of England was dramatically broadened, and Parliament’s summoning of the Westminster Assembly in 1643 was the primary formal move in this direction. As noted above, antinomianism was a worry to many orthodox theologians at the time, a worry
not allayed by the chaos of civil war. Yet, while debates over justification formed part of the theological backdrop to the Westminster Assembly, the Assembly’s brief was, of course, much wider than justification and, indeed, became much more radical just a few months in to its existence. Ecclesiologically, it was intended to be representative of various parties within the church: Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, and Erastians. The Assembly was originally called for the relatively modest purpose of “the settling of the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from all false calumnies and aspersions.” However, the need to seek the military support of the Scots led Parliament to broaden the Assembly’s brief to include a much more thoroughgoing reformation of the government of the church in order to bring it closer into line with the continental reformed churches and especially the Church of Scotland. Thus, the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant by Scots and English Parliament on September 25, 1643, opened the way not only for Scottish military intervention on Parliament’s side in the Civil War (the underlying purpose of the agreement) but also for Scottish commissioners to join the Assembly. While they did not have votes, their powerful intellects and personalities ensured that they put their distinctive stamp upon the proceedings.

The Assembly sat between 1643 and 1652 and produced six documents: the Confession of Faith, the Larger Catechism, the Shorter Catechism, the Directory for Public Worship, the Directory for Church Government, and the Psalter. The theology contained in these is on the whole consistent with the continental Reformed tradition, the one notable exception perhaps being the very vigorous sabbatarianism which the Westminster Standards contain, particularly in the Larger Catechism, Questions 115 to 121. This reflects precisely that English (and then Scottish) sabbatarianism which had emerged as a key identity marker between the Puritans and the Reformed Anglican establishment under Elizabeth.

Further, it is also notable that the Catechisms do not follow the long-established catechetical structure of using the Apostles’ Creed, the Decalogue, and the Lord’s Prayer as providing the basic framework. The exclusion of the Creed as an explicit structuring device has been the subject of some discussion among scholars, but the conclusion of John Bower, that the Creed’s basic substance is there in the Catechisms but that the abandonment of its use as a literal framework afforded the Assembly much greater scope for developing “advanced and sophisticated” content seems entirely adequate.

A particular area of note is that of justification. Here, there was significant debate about whether the Confession should contain an explicit statement affirming that Christ’s whole obedience, active and passive, was imputed to the believer in justification. This was, of course, a point of contention in the wider theological world between the Reformed and the Arminians. Arminius himself located the start of Christ’s humiliation, and thus salvific work, with the trial before Pilate. By the 1640s the distinction between the two, with an emphasis on only the passive obedience as being part of justification, was no Arminian distinctive. Indeed, no less an orthodox figure than William Twisse (1578-1646), first Prolocutor of the Assembly, himself held to the imputation of Christ’s passive obedience alone. The work of Johannes Piscator appears to have shaped the thinking of Thomas Gataker (1574-1654), a delegate at the Assembly, and that of his colleague, Richard Vines, who together led a minority group that expressed concern over notions of imputation of whole righteousness, and, given Gataker’s brilliance and the need for the Assembly to find a consensus, it was inevitable that there would be significant discussion on this point. Indeed, another delegate to the Assembly, George Walker, had pursued another proponent of imputation of passive obedience alone, one Anthony Wotton, from 1611, and continued his campaign even after...
Wotton’s death in 1626, finally redirecting his ire at Gataker.56

In addition to the influence of the writings of men like Piscator, there are other possible reasons for the concerns of men like Twisse and Gataker with regards to this issue. First, as noted above, antinomianism was considered a serious threat and, in the turmoil of the 1640s, this threat would have been perceived as far more than simply a cause of contention in the classroom. With England apparently on the verge of anarchy, antinomianism was regarded as profoundly dangerous, and there is evidence to suggest this was a significant factor in the minds of the delegates as they debated the issue.57 Van Dixhoorn has put the matter nicely: by 1643, the enemy was not found in Madrid but in London.58 Second, the impact of the argument of Anselm in Cur Deus Homo, whereby Christ’s active obedience effectively equips him to be the mediator, should not be discounted, as it can be found in the works of men like Gataker.59

It is clear that a majority of the Assembly were in favour of including Christ’s whole obedience in its statement on justification. The original proposed revision of Article 11 of the Thirty Nine Articles spoke of “his whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed to us”;60 but in the end the adjective “whole” was omitted from the key passages in Chapter 11.61 The issue is highly instructive for understanding British Reformed Orthodoxy, because it not only shows how British reformed theologians were self-consciously operating against the background of the broader European theological scene, but also how the particularities of the national context gave debates and even confessional theology a specific and distinctive shape.

THE COMMONWEALTH AND PROTECTORATE (1649-1660)

The period of the Commonwealth and Protectorate marked the high point of influence of John Owen, the leading Independent Puritan theologian and one of the most significant Reformed Orthodox thinkers of the seventeenth century. Owen was not alone, however, in the elaboration of Reformed theology in England at this time. Other noteworthy theologians included Edward Leigh (1602-71), a remarkable layman who yet managed to write works on ancient history, devotional aids, studies of biblical linguistics, and a major systematic treatment of the Reformed faith, which went through several revisions and editions.62 James Ussher’s theological system, originally published in the 1640s, enjoyed numerous reprints during this time. It is perhaps misleading to regard him as the author of this work, since it was structured by catechetical questions, the answers to which he drew from the works of others. Thus, he was really the compiler and organizer of what is essentially a topical concatenation of the words of others writers.63 Also of note is the major philosophical study of God, produced by Thomas Barlow (1607-91), John Owen’s Oxford tutor, lifelong friend, and Episcopalian.64

John Owen

John Owen’s voluminous writings span the 1640s to the 1680s; yet particularly significant contributions were made during the Commonwealth and Protectorate, when he served variously as Cromwell’s chaplain, dean of Christ Church, and Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University. Most noteworthy during the 1650s were his criticism of Brian Walton’s London Polyglot, particularly for its advocacy of a late date for the Masoretic vowel points; and his theological refutation of Socinianism.

While the actual extent of Socinian impact in England in the 1650s is unclear, it is obvious that Parliament considered the matter to be most serious.55 In particular, a series of works by the English Socinian writer, John Biddle (1615-62), served to stir up concern on this matter.66 This led the Council of State to commission John Owen to produce a major refutation of Biddle’s work and also of the Racovian Catechism, which he did in Vindiciae Evangelicae (London, 1655), address-
ing such issues as trinitarianism and atonement, but also questions about divine embodiment and spatial presence drawing deeply on the medieval Thomist tradition.\(^6^7\) In addressing Socinianism, Owen also changed his own position on divine justice, arguing that, if God was to forgive sin, then incarnation and atonement were necessary as a result of his being, not simply by an act of his will. This distanced him from other Reformed theologians, such as John Calvin, William Twisse, and Samuel Rutherford, and from his own arguments in his treatise, *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ* (London, 1648).\(^6^8\)

Perhaps Owen's most original contribution to Reformed Orthodoxy, in addition to his practical work on the psychology of indwelling sin in the believer,\(^6^9\) was his development of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Incarnation, a point which he built upon the patristic insights in the anhypostatic nature of Christ's humanity considered in itself. This enabled Owen to develop a Trinitarian understanding of the communication of properties which both allowed him to understand the Incarnation in Trinitarian terms and to offer an account of Christ's life which preserved the dynamic movement of the Jesus depicted in the Gospels.\(^7^0\)

CONCLUSION

The Restoration of the monarchy in 1660 effectively marked the end of the Puritan project, both politically and theologically. A series of Parliamentary Acts, known collectively as the Clarendon Code, served to enforce rigid conformity to the Book of Common Prayer and to the Anglican hierarchy. Those who refused to conform—nearly 2,000 ministers—left the church in the so-called “Great ejection” on August 31, 1662, the day the Act of Uniformity came into force and also the anniversary of the St Bartholomew’s Day massacre.\(^7^1\)

The result was that the internal struggle for a more Reformed Anglicanism was brought to a dramatic end; and, perhaps even more significantly, those who would not conform wholeheartedly to the Book of Common Prayer were also excluded from the educational, civic, and political establishment; thus, English non-conformists were shunted to the margins of cultural and intellectual life. While the situation in Scotland was somewhat better for the Reformed—the Church of Scotland remaining Presbyterian in polity and Reformed in confession—the era of the great English Puritan intellects was drawing to a close.

Puritan theology remains of interest to the church today, however, for several reasons. First, it represents a serious attempt to trace out the implications of Reformed theology for pastoral practice and Christian experience. Secondly, it was a significant factor in the formulation of the creeds and confessions of the Protestant Reformed churches, and thus is a vital part of understanding the heritage of the same. Third, in their concern both for the great theological trajectories of catholic doctrine and for the souls placed under their care in their churches, the Puritans offer instructive examples of how doctrine and life are to be connected together in the lives of believers and churches.
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