question of how this Reformed teaching on election "traveled" through the two-century period after 1800. Her stimulating essay demonstrates that while, from Schleiermacher through Barth, Calvin's emphasis on the sovereignty of grace was maintained, there was clear modification of Calvin's insistence that grace is administered in a particularistic fashion. For all of Barth's known repudiation of the influence of Schleiermacher, McDonald is still able to show that both of these theological writers parted company with Calvin by a common insistence that an individual's resistance to the gospel message is no necessary indicator of that person's being beyond the reach of salvation.

This writer found the treatment of the fourth theme, Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, to be handled in a more stimulating fashion than any other in the volume. Sue Rozeboom provides a sure-footed, exposition of Calvin's doctrine of the Supper carefully placed in its early Reformation setting. Employing terminological categories furnished by Brian Gerrish, she describes Calvin's teaching as comprising one of three early Reformed positions. While Zwingli's teaching on the Supper may be said to have comprised "symbolic memorialism" and his successor, Bullinger, to have taught a "symbolic parallelism" between symbol and reality, Calvin's position is described as "symbolic instrumentalism." According to the latter, the sacramental symbols are capable not only of representing spiritual realities, but of conveying these realities to faith under the operation of the Holy Spirit. Rozeboom shows that while Calvin's eucharistic teaching spread in Reformation Europe, it was not the uniform understanding of the Reformed churches. She finds, for instance, that the Westminster Standards' teaching on the Supper incorporates emphases traceable both to Bullinger and Calvin. And in a strikingly interesting follow-up essay, Timothy Hess-Robinson shows that Calvin's teaching on the Lord's Supper was not closely followed in the eighteenth century, as represented by Jonathan Edwards. Echoes of Calvin's eucharistic teaching emerge, however, in John W. Nevin and the teaching of leaders of Hess-Robinson's own Stone-Campbell tradition in the mid-nineteenth century.

Finally, Jeannine Olson surveys Calvin's influence in and upon the Genevan city-state with which he came into long association immediately after its declaration of independence from Savoy in 1536. She helpfully describes the subjugation of the newly reformed church by the city government; this confronted Calvin at his first arrival. She also outlines his long-term project of carving out a measure of independence for the church against considerable opposition (one expression of which was his temporary exile to Strasbourg). This workmanlike chapter is perhaps eclipsed by the wider-reaching sequel: David Little's treatment of Calvin's wider influence in the emergence of representative government on both sides of the Atlantic. Calvin is depicted as a decided champion of the idea of a constitutional government under which the rights of citizens are enshrined.

Standing back from this stimulating collection of essays, two major questions arise. First is that of whether—having set aside (initially) the old notion that Calvin was both the "father" of the Reformed tradition and the measuring rod by which later teaching in the Reformed tradition would be judged—this collection of essays does not extensively restate him into that role. While the volume does track how Calvin's teaching has interacted with in subsequent centuries (and the right to modify or depart from Calvin is never denied), it remains the case that Calvin is still (on this reckoning)

the \textit{terminus a quo}. Granted that Reformed thinkers in subsequent centuries read and reflected on Calvin, what is the significance of that fact when it is known that they read Calvin's contemporaries also? What of the fact (not directly addressed in this volume) that Reformed thinkers extensively disregarded Calvin for nearly two centuries beginning c. 1650? All this to say that we have not yet completely eluded the "Calvin as the Father of the Reformed tradition" view which the book actually exists to counter.

Second, there is a notable recurring lacuna in this volume's attempts to trace interactions with Calvin in subsequent ages. With two very rare exceptions (note pp. 118 and 168) the eighteenth century draws a complete blank. And yet the eighteenth century was a time of considerable activity as Reformed theology interacted with the age of Enlightenment. The general trend of \textit{CTR} is to vault from the era of the Westminster Assembly to the career of Schleiermacher. As well, with very rare exceptions (note pp. 31-85, 176-81) Schleiermacher is the only nineteenth-century representative of the Reformed tradition treated. This, with its high concentration on Barth as the representative of Reformed theology in the twentieth century drives the reader to the conclusion that—space constraints aside—the "coverage" of the intervening centuries of the Reformed tradition might have been more carefully allotted. But with these caveats aside, here is a fine volume that will repay reading.

\textbf{Kenneth J. Stewart}\n\textit{Covenant College}\n

The theme of this volume is one that has proved problematic for at least the last century and a half. As co-editor Patrick Collinson makes plain in his helpful introduction, English historical writing during the nineteenth century leaned to the view that England's experience of the Reformation was only intermittently intertwined with similar events on the Continent. That sustained attitude of virtual denial gave way to a reaction beginning in 1930, according to which England's indebtedness to various Continental Reformation centers and pillar-figures has received extended attention. In its most extreme forms this more recent view has suggested that the British Reformations were, in effect, only local expressions of European movements. Yet paradoxically, the extended English minimizing of the influence of the Continental Reformation was not replicated north of the Tweed, for historically Scotland had made much of its solidarity with the movements and leaders of Europe's age of religious Reform. Collinson's co-editor, Polly Ha, therefore stresses in her parallel introduction that "reception-history"—the investigation of how ideas and ideologies reached new audiences, and how those new audiences sometimes reciprocally influenced those who had first set the new ideas in motion—is a concept full of utility for examining the web of interrelationships in the age of Reform.

The impressive volume which follows provides clear evidence that the old insular attitudes of a century or more ago reflected both a lack of curiosity about pan-European
relationships and a lack of industry in sifting through archival material. Among the highlights of the volume are the following chapters.

Bruce Gordon draws attention in a first chapter to a hitherto-neglected aspect of early Reformation church life: the determination to produce improved versions of the Latin Vulgate. These, while not intending to eliminate the place of vernacular Scripture translations for Christian believers, were expected to provide scholars and ministers within a given Protestant territory a standardized and improved text as the basis for their scholarly writing and international scholarship. Though from this distance we might suppose that the Reformation spelled the end of the Protestant use of the Vulgate, Gordon shows that international and trans-confessional dialogue required that the Vulgate (in as purified a form as possible) continue to function. Continued scholarly use of the Vulgate also demonstrated that early Protestants had not ceded the era of the church fathers to the unreformed church. Archbishop Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556) sought to enlist the Strasbourg refugee-theologians Bucer and Fagius in the production of just such an improved English Vulgate at their coming into England in 1549. The two had had prior exposure to such projects in Europe.

John Craig investigates a theme regarding Reformation-era literature in his chapter. What is to be made of the English requirement (from 1547) that every parish church obtain a copy of Erasmus’s Paraphrases on the Gospels and Acts (a requirement still being enforced in 1587)? In due course, other titles such as John Foxe’s Acts and Monuments (1563) and John Jewel’s Apology for the Church of England (1567) would similarly be required to be held by local churches and made available for congregational reading. By 1577 English bishops were urging their clergy to obtain Heinrich Bullinger’s fifty sermon Decades. The juxtaposition of the Erasmus paraphrases with the other, decidedly Protestant literature tells us something of importance regarding the English crown’s determination to comprehend within the Church of England the widest possible range of persons with broad pro-Reformation sympathies; they tell us also of the crown’s determination to utilize Reformation materials from sources most in sympathy with the aims of the reformed Church of England.

Carl Trueman and Carrie Euler collaborate in re-telling (in a more nuanced way than we may be accustomed to) the story of Martin Luther’s influence in England over a century and a half. While the window of time during which Luther’s distinctive views of Christology and the Eucharist were actively considered in Britain was relatively short (ending c. 1540), the conception of Luther as father to the Reformation was preserved beyond the Tudor into the Stuart era. Indeed, John Bunyan, writing in the post-Restoration context, kept sounding some of Luther’s early “notes.”

It is with the fascinating essay of Torrance Kirby on Peter Martyr Vermigli’s role in Britain’s Reformation movements that we begin to find evidence of the reception reciprocity hinted at by co-editor Ha in her introduction. That Vermigli came to England in 1547 (as did Bucer and Fagius two years later) to escape the compromises required at Strasbourg under the terms of the Augsburg Interim and that he occupied an Oxford professor’s chair for six years is well known. Less well known is the Italian reformer’s involvement with Archbishop Cranmer in revising the initial 1549 Book of Common Prayer and his forthright defense at Oxford of the Reformed understanding of the Lord’s Supper in debate with Catholic theologians. Critically, reports Kirby, Vermigli’s six-year experience of the Church of England influenced his thinking forever after concerning the inter-relationship between the monarch (or magistrate) and the church in a Protestant state. Like his future colleague at Zurich (to which he proceeded after a brief sojourn—again—at Strasbourg), Bullinger, Vermigli took the steady line that the royal supremacy in religion was compatible with a robust allegiance to the theology of the Reformation. Proto-Puritan dissenters who found fault with Queen Elizabeth’s ecclesiastical policies upon her accession in 1559 were therefore able to draw only the most limited encouragements from Vermigli (as from Bullinger). Kirby has earlier written on the vastly under-estimated moderating role that Bullinger played in the Elizabethan church; to this he has now added insight regarding Vermigli’s similar role.

Of a highly similar cast is the chapter by Anthony Milton on the role played by Heidelberg and the German Palatinate in Elizabethan and early Stuart English Protestant affairs. The Palatinate, like Zurich, Basel, and Bern, had a church-state relationship somewhat similar to that of England inasmuch as the established Protestant churches of each recognized the supremacy of the government in matters of religious policy. Milton, whose earlier research has shed much light on British involvement in the subsequent international Synod of Dort (1618–1619), here shows that the previously existing English-Palatine friendship provided the background for the prominent involvement of each at Dort. The friendship endured while James was king and eventuated in the marriage of his daughter, Elizabeth, to Frederick, Prince-Elector of that principality. In Milton’s portrayal we see the Church of England keeping up Continental Reformed connections beyond what is popularly supposed.

With such mounting evidence of ongoing participation of England in the international Reformed community, a certain nagging question begs attention. That is the question of how England and her northern neighbor, Scotland, could both be part of this international Reformed community and yet have ecclesiastical relationships with one another that could be characterized as angular. Jane Dawson traces this frosty ecclesiastical relationship between the two Reformed Protestant nations to the closing of the Marian period at which time, from Geneva, John Knox and Christopher Goodman (both individuals who had served the pre-Marian Protestant Church of England) launched printed challenges to the rule of Mary. Not only the persecuting aspects of her reign had been criticized; no, both Knox and Goodman had challenged her right to rule as female. Since this critique obliquely touched Mary’s half-sister, Elizabeth, who stood ready to succeed to the throne after Mary’s passing in 1558, an ongoing estrangement was set in motion. It was an estrangement that cost not only Knox and Goodman their former welcome in England, but Calvin his influence there. Whereas the Elizabethan Church of England was determined to participate in the international Reformed community on its own terms (i.e., presided over by a female monarch), the Reformed Kirk of the nation to the north boasted of its affinity with the model provided at Geneva which, under Calvin, had achieved a measure of autonomy from political authority. This telling chapter is most illuminating, though it does tend to project onto the Scottish Reformed Church as a whole the angular opinions which were most obviously those of two who were indelibly changed by their Geneva years. The number of Scottish reformers who had personal links with Geneva was in fact paltry.
The volume provides a superb window into the ways in which recent research enables us to see the Reformation-era relationship between Britain and the Continent as reciprocal. For readers of this journal, a close reading will warrant some re-assessment of our existing conception of relations between Scotland, England, and the Swiss-South German Reform.

KENNETH J. STEWART
Covenant College


John Fesko, fed up with the distortions of the Reformed tradition’s view of the order of salvation, justification, and union with Christ as propounded by some influential, present-day systematicans and biblical exegetes (notably Richard Caffin and Mark Garcia), has with this book done a great service to scholarship by returning to the original sources to see how a range of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thinkers actually dealt with these important themes. In so doing, he puts John Calvin in his (proper) place, as one among many important thinkers of the time (as opposed to the equivalent of what one might call a “Reformed Luther”), and he shows the variety of ways that Reformed (and early Lutheran) theologians handle these important, interconnected themes.

The *dramatis personae* in this book, in addition to those contained in a brief overview of some ancient and medieval thinkers, represent a “Who’s Who” of Reformation and Reformed theologians from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Luther, Melanchthon, Juan de Valdés, Bullinger, Vermigli, Girolamo Zanchi, Faustus Socinus (by way of stark contrast to the others), William Perkins, Jacob Arminius, John Owen, Richard Baxter, Francis Turretin, and Herman Witsius. Missing (by intent) is John Calvin, whose thought in Fesko’s opinion has overwhelmed and distorted research into this question. Surprisingly, however, one also finds little mention of Ulrich Zwingli, Martin Bucer, Wolfgang Musculus (whose 1567 *Loca* was translated into English in the sixteenth century) and especially Andreas Osiander—given that Osiander offered a counterpoint for much of what later theologians had to say on the question of participation and its relation to justification. Indeed, it is not clear to this reviewer what criteria the author employed to single out these particular theologians (except for the fact that most of what Fesko cites from them is also available in English).

Having begun this review with general and important praise for what the author has attempted here, I need to point out there are nevertheless serious problems in execution that mar his argument. While rightly attacking the “Whiggish” history of other scholars (defined as the effort to study the past with constant reference to the present), he commits the same error himself by not paying full attention to the historical context in which these theologians employed concepts like participation, union with Christ, justification, or sanctification. For example, while noting Zanchi’s criticism of the Council of Trent (pp. 217-18), Fesko ignores the fact that the long section on *koinonia* in De

*religione Christiana falsi* is a thinly veiled attack on the Lutheran understanding of the real presence. (Differences over this doctrine led to Zanchi’s departure from Strasbourg.) For another thing, by largely ignoring the debate with Andreas Osiander over participation (his name does not even appear in the index), Fesko fails to show the reader how theological disagreements with Osiander, even over biblical passages (such as 2 Pet 1:4), played a role in later reflections (especially true in Zanchi and Wolfgang Musculus). This failure is also reflected in the chapter on Philip Melanchthon, where (in addition to not being fully apprised of the most recent secondary literature) Fesko ignores the significant changes in Melanchthon’s *Loci communes* from the Latin versions of 1555 and 1545 to the final German version of 1585, occasioned by the Osiandrian controversy.

These specific examples (which could be multiplied) point out a far greater weakness in the book. Fesko does not define the categories he uses carefully enough and thus often imports later Reformed sensibilities into earlier debates. The term *participatio* was already a technical philosophical term in medieval theological discussions, where the question of the *nature* of participation was crucial. Did this word imply an ontological union of the believer with Christ? Or, in the terms of the debate between Lombard and Thomas (reflected in Gerson), does the Holy Spirit indwell the individual believer or merely the Holy Spirit’s gifts? Thus, while adequately describing Gerson’s position in the chapter on union with Christ and justification before the Reformation, Fesko does not seem cognizant of the complexities of these earlier debates. Nor does he adequately note how later thinkers address the question. All of these thinkers talk about being “in Christ”; many discuss terms like *koinonia* and passages like 2 Pet 1:4. But just discussing these matters does not mean that they have a particular view about the *nature* of participation—especially given the almost universal rejection of Osiander’s position.

If participation and union do not receive precise historical definitions, the categories of justification and sanctification are introduced under the assumption that they (like Reformed understandings of covenant or the order of salvation) are obvious biblical and theological categories for these thinkers. In point of fact, they first begin to appear as separate categories among Protestant theologians in the wake of the Osiandrian controversy of the 1550s, when Lutherans answered the question of union with Christ by referring it to the work of the Holy Spirit that comes after (at least logically speaking) the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, a position reflected in many Reformed thinkers (perhaps beginning with Calvin’s attack on Osiander in the 1559 *Institutes*, 3.11.6). By ignoring the historical developments of these terms, the author assumes that these theologians were making careful distinctions when in fact these categories were still emerging and being clarified. This lack of sophistication is all the more disappointing, given that his main arguments (e.g., that Reformed theologians consistently used any of a number of approaches to the *ordo salutis* and argued for the logical priority of [forensic] justification in the believer’s salvation over sanctification) go a long way in correcting the (by-and-large Barthian) misreading of Calvin and other Reformed thinkers.

In short, Fesko’s instincts are correct and represent an important step forward in the four areas he outlines at the conclusion of his book (pp. 380-82): demythologizing Calvin’s role in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Reformed theology; showing the diversity of approaches to the *ordo salutis* among Reformed theologians; indicating