



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

**Unity in diversity : English puritans and the puritan reformation,
1603-1689**

Pederson, R.J.

Citation

Pederson, R. J. (2013, November 7). *Unity in diversity : English puritans and the puritan reformation, 1603-1689*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/22159>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/22159>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/22159> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Pederson, Randall James

Title: Unity in diversity : English puritans and the puritan reformation, 1603-1689

Issue Date: 2013-11-07

**UNITY IN DIVERSITY:
ENGLISH PURITANS AND
THE PURITAN REFORMATION**

1603-1689

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van

de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. Carel Stolker

volgens besluit van het College voor promoties

te verdedigen op 7 November 2013

klokke 15:00 uur

door

Randall James Pederson

geboren te Everett, Washington, USA

in 1975

Promotiecommissie

Promotores: Prof. dr. Gijsbert van den Brink

Prof. dr. Richard Alfred Muller, Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA

Leden: Prof. dr. Ernestine van der Wall

Dr. Jan Wim Buisman

Prof. dr. Henk van den Belt

Prof. dr. Willem op't Hof

Dr. Willem van Vlastuin

Contents

Part I: Historical Method and Background

Chapter One: Historiographical Introduction, Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure	1
1.1 Another Book on English Puritanism? Historiographical Justification	1
1.2 Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure	20
1.2.1 Narrative and Metanarrative	25
1.2.2 Structure	31
1.3 Summary	32
Chapter Two: Seventeenth-Century Background	34
2.1 Introduction	34
2.2 The Political, Religious, Social, and Theological Contexts	35
2.2.1 The Early English Reformation (1534-53)	36
2.2.2 Marian England (1553-58)	41
2.2.3 The Elizabethan Period (1558-1603)	43
2.2.4 The Early Stuart Period (1603-42)	47
2.2.5 The English Revolution (1640-60)	50
2.2.6 The Later Stuart Restoration (1660-89)	53
2.2.7 Summary	54
2.3 The English Puritanism of the Seventeenth Century: Thematic Elements	55
2.3.1 The Precisianist Strain	57
2.3.2 The Mystical Strain	61
2.3.3 The Antinomian Strain	63
2.3.4 The Neonomian Strain	66
2.4 Conclusion	69

Part II: Puritans

Chapter Three: John Downname (1571-1652)	71
3.1 Introduction	71
3.2 Social Contexts	74
3.3 Downname's Writings in Historical Context	84
3.3.1 <i>The Christian Warfare</i> (1604-18, 1612, 1634)	85
3.3.2 <i>A Guide to Godlynesse</i> (1622, 1629)	88
3.3.3 <i>Lectvres Vpon the Fovre First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea</i> (1608)	90
3.3.4 <i>A Briefe Concordance of the Bible</i> (1630, 1635)	92
3.3.5 <i>Annotations upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament</i> (1645, 1651, 1657-58)	93
3.3.6 <i>The Summe of Sacred Divinitie</i> (1620)	96
3.3.7 <i>A Body of Divinitie</i> (1645)	99
3.4 Downname's Theology in Historical Context	100
3.4.1 Doctrine of God and Humanity	101
3.4.2 Predestination and Assurance	105
3.4.3 Covenant of Works and Grace	110

3.4.4	Justification and Sanctification	112
3.4.5	Law and Gospel	115
3.4.6	Christian Life and Piety	115
3.5	Conclusion	116
Chapter Four: Francis Rous (1580/1-1659)		118
4.1	Introduction	118
4.2	Social Contexts	122
4.3	Rous's Writings in Historical Context	136
4.3.1	<i>The Heavenly Academy</i> (1638, 1656; Latin 1655, 1674)	142
4.3.2	<i>The Great Oracle</i> (1641; 1656; Latin, 1655, 1674)	146
4.3.3	<i>The Mystical Marriage</i> (1631, 1635, 1653-56; Latin, 1655, 1674)	147
4.4	Rous's Theology in Historical Context	150
4.4.1	Doctrine of God and Humanity	151
4.4.2	Predestination and Assurance	153
4.4.3	Covenant of Works and Grace	155
4.4.4	Justification and Sanctification	156
4.4.5	Law and Gospel	157
4.4.6	Christian Life and Piety	157
4.5	Conclusion	158
Chapter Five: Tobias Crisp (1600-1642/3)		160
5.1	Introduction	160
5.2	Social Contexts	167
5.3	Crisp's Writings in Historical Context	171
5.3.1	<i>Christ Alone Exalted</i> (1690)	173
5.4	Crisp's Theology in Historical Context	175
5.4.1	Doctrine of God and Humanity	177
5.4.2	Predestination and Assurance	179
5.4.3	Covenant of Works and Grace	181
5.4.4	Justification and Sanctification	183
5.4.5	Law and Gospel	188
5.4.6	Christian Life and Piety	189
5.5	Conclusion	191

Part III: Unity in Diversity

Chapter Six: <i>Unitas</i> within <i>Diversitas</i> : Downname, Rous, and Crisp		192
6.1	Introduction	192
6.2	Reformed Theological Unities and Diversities	193
6.3	Reformed Theological Unities and Diversities within Puritanism	195
6.4	Unity in Society	200
6.5	Unity in Reformed Theology	200
6.5.1	Doctrine of God and Humanity	201
6.5.2	Predestination and Assurance	203
6.5.3	Covenant of Works and Grace	203
6.5.4	Justification and Sanctification	204

6.5.5	Law and Gospel	205
6.5.6	Christian Life and Piety	206
6.6	Conclusion	206
Chapter Seven: Defining Puritans and Puritanism: Narrative and Metanarrative		208
7.1	Introduction	208
7.2	Defining Puritanism	211
7.3	Narrative and Metanarrative	219
7.4	Identifying Puritans	221
7.5	Conclusion	225
Chapter Eight: Conclusion		227
English Summary		233
Nederlandse samenvatting		236
Bibliography		240
Index of Names		285
Curriculum Vitae		288

Chapter 1

Historiographical Introduction, Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure

1.1 Another Book on English Puritanism? Historiographical Justification

Only in the past sixty-five years has the study of English Puritanism gained serious academic credence.¹ Prior to this, popular perceptions of Puritans ranged from admirable to ignoble. In the *sixteenth century*, John Whitgift, adversary of Elizabethan Puritanism and future Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote that “this name Puritane is very aptely giuen to these men, not because they be pure no more than were the Heretikes called Cathari, but because they think them selues to be *mundiores ceteris*, more pure than others, as Cathari dyd, and separate them selues from all other Churches and congregations as spotted and defiled.”² Thomas Cartwright, the leading Presbyterian of the sixteenth century, rejected “Puritan” and thought that it should be applied only to Anabaptists.³ In the *seventeenth century*, Oliver Ormerod mocked the Puritans in his oft-cited dialogue *The Picture of a Puritane* (1605).⁴ Henry Parker, one of Ormerod’s contemporaries, sought to

¹ Most historians have used “English Puritanism” as a standard reference to this sixteenth and seventeenth-century movement (or series of movements); however, other historians refer to “British Puritanism” or “Dutch Puritanism” or “Scottish Puritanism” or “American Puritanism” or even “Irish Puritanism” to reflect the diversity of thought present within Puritanism and argue for an expansive presence outside England. I refer to “English Puritanism” in its English and British (i.e. international) contexts; that is, I assume that Puritanism was not *only* an occurrence in England and its colonies but had a strong presence elsewhere, especially in the Netherlands. It is in this sense that I refer to the “Puritan Reformation.” For studies of Puritanism outside of England, see Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1982); Willem op’t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1598-1622* (Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987); David George Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 402-412; Janice Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1994); and Crawford Gribben, “Puritanism in Ireland and Wales,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 159-173. John Coffey has recently questioned the use of “Scottish Puritanism” in “The Problem of ‘Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638,’” in *Enforcing the Reformation in Ireland and Scotland*, ed. Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 68-90, and Keith Brown has rejected it in “Review of *Scottish Puritanism*,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002), 396. That the term “Puritan” was applied to the Scottish context by early modernists should neither be overlooked nor exaggerated.

² John Whitgift, *An Answere to a Certen Libel Intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* (London: Imprinted by Henrie Bynneman, 1572), 18; quoted in Richard L. Greaves, *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981), 7. In response to Whitgift, Thomas Cartwright, an early modern Presbyterian leader, denied the imputation of Catharism and asserted that the only purity that concerned Christians was Christ’s innocence and the sanctification he bestows. For an introduction to Elizabethan Puritan political ideas, see Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *Puritan Political Ideas, 1558-1794* (1965; repr., Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2003), xiii-xlviii, 1-74; and Leonard J. Trinterud, ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 3-16.

³ Thomas Cartwright, *A Second Replie* (London, 1575), 38.

⁴ Oliver Ormerod, “The Picture of a Puritane,” in *Images of English Puritanism: A Collection of Contemporary Sources, 1589-1646*, ed. Lawrence A. Sasek (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 238-54.

defend his fellow evangelicals from “this detested odious name of Puritan,” by stating that they upheld godliness and morals in the realm.⁵ Giles Widdowes observed its ambiguity in 1631 and John Yates found it offensive in 1625, calling for a statute to “define it and punish it.”⁶ In the *eighteenth century*, David Hume called the Puritans “obstinate reformers” and referred to their “wild fanaticism” and “gloomy spirit.”⁷ Nineteenth-century Hawthornian biases predominated Victorian studies; so much so, that the classic caricature of the English Puritan throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was that of “a gaunt, lank-haired kill-joy, wearing a black steeple-hat, and compounding for sins he was inclined to by damning those to which he had no mind.”⁸ Even the great *nineteenth-century* English poet, Matthew Arnold, used “Puritan” “a term of opprobrium and a powerful cultural weapon...[in a] campaign to replace Christianity with culture.”⁹ H. L. Mencken, a *twentieth-century* satirist, opined that Puritanism was “the haunting fear that someone, somewhere, may be happy.”¹⁰ George Orwell reiterated these Victorian sentiments in his essay “The English People.”¹¹ These popular perceptions trace to early modern anti-Puritan biases in Restoration England.¹² Consequently, Puritanism continues

⁵ Henry Parker, “A Discourse Concerning Puritans,” in *Images of English Puritanism*, 164, 166-71. For deeper explorations into Parker, see Michael Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public’s “Privado”* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), 114-15. Parker’s *Discourse* is important because, as Catherine Gimelli Martin has observed, “Parker divided the movement into ecclesiastical Puritans...religious Puritans or dogmatic Calvinists; moral Puritans, or scrupulous precisians in conduct; and political Puritans.” Martin, *Milton Among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 61.

⁶ David Scott Kastan, “Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama,” in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 168.

⁷ David Hume, *The History of Great Britain, Vol. I: Containing the Reigns of James I and Charles I* (Edinburgh, 1754), 8, 81, 396.

⁸ Leland S. Person, *The Cambridge Introduction to Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 16-19; Perry Miller and T. H. Johnson, eds., *The Puritans* (New York, 1938), 2. John Netland challenges this view of Victorian sentiment, in part, by stating that contrary to popular perception Victorian England made great strides in “rehabilitating” the Puritans by employing various aspects of their politics and romanticism to justify contemporary stances. While I concede the point, Netland does say, rightly so, that as Puritanism “signified the accumulated moral capital of a newly valorized past, it also continued to bear social stigma.” Netland, “Of Philistines and Puritans: Matthew Arnold’s Construction of Puritanism,” in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Cranbury: University of Delaware Press, 2003), 68-9.

See also John W. Beardslee III, ed., *Reformed Dogmatics: J. Wollebius, G. Voetius, and F. Turretin* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 279f, where Gisbertus Voetius mentions those who are styled “Precisionists, Puritans, Roundheads, or shorthairs, foolish-wise, joyless, sad-humored, clothed in melancholy, Sabbatarians...salty-sour Zeelanders...etc.”

⁹ Laura Lunger Knoppers, “Introduction,” in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (New ark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), 14; Netland, “Of Philistines and Puritans,” 67-84.

¹⁰ Cited in Carl N. Degler, *Out of Our Past: The Forces that Shaped Modern America* (New York: HarperCollins, 1984), 9.

¹¹ George Orwell, “The English People,” in *Orwell, As I Please, 1943-1945: Essays, Journalism and Letters*, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (Boston: David R. Godine, 2000), 10-11.

¹² Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 217. For the rise of anti-Puritanism, see Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1-12, 28-59; Peter Lake, *The Anti-*

to mystify modern readers and remains a much-misunderstood aspect of British and American lineage.¹³

Recent scholarship has come a long way in “rehabilitating” and re-defining the Puritans. As Gordon S. Wakefield wrote in 1957, “No longer can he [the Puritan] be pilloried as the would-be *saboteur* of the Church of England, the fierce opponent of everything ‘Anglican.’”¹⁴ Far more complex identities have emerged than the small but assertive early modern “hotter-sort of Protestant” whose aesthetic tastes excluded ceremonies and happy times.¹⁵ Puritanism could no longer be defined solely in its relation to Anglicanism. Patrick Collinson described the Puritan tradition within the established church as “not alien to the properly ‘Anglican’ character of the English church but...equivalent to the most vigorous and successful of religious tendencies contained within it.”¹⁶ G. R. Elton observed “that within the Church there existed both high and low streams of opinion, and that at least before the age of [William] Laud these did not represent a conflict between Anglican and Puritan as much as a struggle for ascendancy between two sections of the English Church.”¹⁷ In fact, Nicholas Tyacke has recently brought early modern “Anglicanism” into question, citing the religious complexities of one of its chief intellectual architects, Lancelot Andrewes.¹⁸ The “Anglican versus Puritan”

Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 521-78; Peter Lake, “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 80-97; William Holden, *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572-1642* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954); and Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1-15; 45-73; 104-123. Poole shows how Puritans were portrayed satirically in the period’s literature as gluttonous, sexually promiscuous, monstrously procreating, and even “worshipping naked.” This last charge is no doubt an inference from the many Puritans who spoke of “naked worship” before God; that is, coming to God without any merits or claims for a hearing other than Christ’s magisterial mercy, and their insistence on the removal of such mediates as pictures, statues, and icons. Cf. Gerald R. Cragg, *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 197.

¹³ Francis J. Bremer, *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 1.

¹⁴ Gordon S. Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety* (London: Wakefield Press, 1957), 1.

¹⁵ Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 67. For a discussion of Puritans as “the hotter-sort of Protestants,” see Doreen Rosman, *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor England* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 60-67. Judith Maltby cautions against the Puritan’s monopoly of hot-tempered religion in Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 9-10. For Puritan sensibility, see Bernard S. Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); and Leland Ryken, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990).

¹⁶ Patrick Collinson, “A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31:4 (1980): 484, 488.

¹⁷ G. R. Elton, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government, Papers and Reviews, 1946-1972, Volume 2: Parliament [and] Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 165-66. For similar views, see William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1938); and Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1958; repr., New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997).

¹⁸ See Nicholas Tyacke, “Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (London: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), 5-12; 32-33. Tyacke correctly notes that the term “Anglicanism” first appeared in nineteenth-

antithesis, however, still permeates modern understanding of early modern English religious culture.¹⁹ What has supplanted this older consensus is one of a rather robust, early modern “Calvinist consensus” that incorporates a broader spectrum of individuals and thought, including non-Anglicans, which are aptly dubbed “experimental [i.e. experiential] Calvinists.”²⁰ David C. Steinmetz, however, has cautioned against equating Puritanism with Calvinism since “Calvinism was a more pervasive religious and intellectual movement than Puritanism.”²¹ Whether all Puritans were Calvinists, however, has been contested by John Coffey, and others.²² So while older models for understanding

century English print. For Andrewes’ place in English society and religion, see Thomas A. Mason, *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon, 1582-1663, Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England and Archbishop of Canterbury* (Cranbury: Associated University Press, 1985), 33; and Peter E. McCullough, ed., *Lancelot Andrews: Selected Sermons and Lectures* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), xi-lvii.

¹⁹ For examples, see: J. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan, the Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964); Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, vols. I, II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970, 1975), i-ii; Greaves, *Society and Religion*; J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620-1670* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976); John Booty, “Anglicanism,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans Hillerbrand, 4 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1:38-44. Booty’s article shows how Puritans can still be cut-off from the pre-Restoration Church of England. For a challenge to the Anglican versus Puritan thesis, see David Underdown, *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 23. Underdown writes, “Puritans were people within the Church of England who wished to reform it further, not people criticizing the church from without. We can distinguish between Puritans and non-Puritans within the Anglican Church; but we cannot speak of Puritans and Anglicans, because the Puritans were Anglicans.” See also Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988); and Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590-1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), 47-120.

²⁰ Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion, 1558-1603* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 23-24, 26; Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution,” in *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*, ed. Margo Todd (New York: Routledge, 1995), 53-70. The phrase “experimental Calvinists” seems to have originated in R. T. Kendall’s *Calvinism and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979). The use of “Calvinist” is not without dispute. While modern historians continue to employ the term (and often equate it erroneously with “Puritan”), its use often misrepresents the relation between Reformation and post-Reformation orthodoxy, fails to address the fact that many early modern “Calvinists” despised its use, and presents a false homogenization of early modern Protestant identities.

²¹ David C. Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 5. Steinmetz allows for Puritanism as a special type of Calvinism but sees Calvinism as much broader and more encompassing than Puritanism, touching anti-Puritans and Puritans, Anglicans and Dissenters, High Churchmen and Low. Depending on one’s definition of Puritanism, however, one may see strong (if not equal) tendencies towards pervasiveness within Puritanism itself. Cf. Geoffrey Nuttall, *The Puritan Spirit: Essays and Addresses* (London: Epworth Press, 1967), 11-21. Also, I agree with Richard A. Muller that given the diversity within Reformed theology and development, it is more accurate to speak of the “Reformed tradition” than of “Calvinism,” though because of the pervasive use of “Calvinism” in scholarship, I have, at times, retained its use. Further, use of the “Reformed tradition” is not without its problems as it less clearly expresses predestinarian motifs. See Richard A. Muller, “John Calvin and Later Calvinism: The Identity of the Reformed Tradition,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 130-49.

²² While Coffey acknowledges a strong Calvinistic presence among the Puritans, he argues that John Goodwin, a convert to Arminianism, was as firmly within the Puritan tradition as the high Calvinist Samuel Rutherford (thus, both persons reflecting certain polarities within Puritanism). Perhaps a better taxonomy would be “Reformed,” though it is questionable whether Goodwin was “Reformed orthodox.” William den Boer contends that Arminius’s theology “remain well within the scope of Reformed theology.”

the Puritan crisis in the Elizabethan church have moved towards more diverse understandings of these Reformed Protestants, questions still linger as to their precise religious identity or for a more reliable taxonomy that incorporates these diversities. Reflecting on the problem of pluralities in early modern religion, Tracy Fessenden, Nicholas F. Radel, and Magdalena J. Zaborowska made the deconstructionist statement that “there are only Puritans, Puritanisms, and Protestantisms.”²³ Though this observation accurately identifies diverse systems of thought and practice in the early modern period, it does not assess whether there was a *unitas in diversitate* within Puritanism, nor adequately address confessionality among Puritans.²⁴

Since the rise of English Puritan studies in the mid-twentieth century, nearly every facet of Puritanism has been explored, shedding light on numerous problems associated with early modern English religious culture.²⁵ The most conspicuous result of these studies

This assertion has not gone without challenge, however, and it remains to be seen how Arminianism will eventually be classified. Suffice it to say that work on this is ongoing, and far from settled. Den Boer, *God's Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius, 1559-1609* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 326. Cf. Peter Rouwendal, “The Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 568.

Carl R. Trueman has recently questioned the usefulness of “Puritanism” because of its apparent minimalist criteria (e.g. the “quasi-Arian” John Milton is reputed to be a Puritan). See John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 1-12; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 5. Trueman prefers “Reformed orthodox” to “Puritan” to classify Owen for its more definitive characteristics. I am not opposed to this classification but find it incomplete since it does not adequately describe Owen’s distinctive pietism, which historically has been classified as “Puritan.”

²³ Tracy Fessenden, Nicholas F. Radel, and Magdalena J. Zaborowska, “Introduction,” in *The Puritan Origins of American Sex: Religion, Sexuality, and National*, ed. Tracy Fessenden, Nicholas F. Radel, and Magdalena J. Zaborowska (New York: Routledge, 2001), 13.

²⁴ Even the most radical and heterodox of writers, such as John Eaton, had a strong *sensus unitatis* with the earlier patristic and Reformation periods which is seen in Eaton’s “Honey-combe” on justification, which is reminiscent of medieval florilegia, in that its margins cite, among others, Augustine, Chrysostom, Jerome, Luther, Calvin, Beza, John Foxe, Jerome Zanchi, William Perkins, William Sclater, and Joseph Hall, all authorities of the “mainstream.”

²⁵ For a critical examination of recent trends in Puritan studies, see Richard L. Greaves, “The Puritan-Nonconformist Tradition in England, 1560-1700: Historiographical Reflections,” *Albion*, 17 (1987), 449-86; Michael McGiffert, “American Puritan Studies in the 1960s,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser. XXVII (1970), 36-67; and Michael S. Montgomery, *American Puritan Studies: An Annotated Bibliography of Dissertations, 1882-1981* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1984). One of the major areas of advance has to do with our understanding of English Puritan literature and its impact on other societies. See, for instance, Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London: Maney Publishing, 2006); Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); and Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Providence Island, 1630-1641: The Other Puritan Colony* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Another area of continuous debate has to do with the rise of Puritanism and its impact on science and capitalism. The former proposed positively by Robert K. Merton (thus the “Merton thesis”) suggests that aesthetic Protestants were disproportionately represented among the burgeoning seventeenth century scientific community; and the latter was positively stated by Max Weber (thus the “Weber thesis”), whose “Protestant ethic” was the foundation of modern capitalist thought. See respectively, I. Bernard Cohen, ed., *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990); and Robert W. Green, ed., *Protestantism, Capitalism, and Social Science: The Weber Thesis Controversy*, 2nd ed. (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1973). See also Richard L. Greaves, “Puritanism and Science: The Anatomy of a Controversy,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (1969): 345-68; John Morgan,

is that we have become much more aware of the enormous difficulty and complexity of “Puritanism.”²⁶ This complexity is expressed not only in its broad, trans-Atlantic and trans-insular identities,²⁷ but also in its theological and ideological kinship, one that dates past through early Reformed Protestantism, through medieval, and even to early Christian times.²⁸ Yet, even with the mass of literature now extant on Puritanism, several core questions continue to mystify researchers: precisely how should “Puritan” and “Puritanism” be defined? What are its chief cultural, historical, political, social, literary and intellectual characteristics? How does toleration and religious dissent in early modern England inform us about Puritanism’s diversities? To what degree did Puritanism borrow

“The Puritan Thesis Revisited,” in *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, ed. David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, and Mark. A. Noll, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 43-74.

The current survey of literature in this chapter is an attempt to be thorough and detailed pertaining to issues in Puritan historiography. It is not an attempt to be exhaustive of literature produced in the past 50-70 years. Rather, I have attempted to engage more current issues and cutting-edge ideas within this literature.

²⁶ Thus, Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson have called Puritanism “the most conspicuous, the most sustained, and the most fecund” aspects of the “American mind.” Miller and Johnson, *The Puritans*, 1.

²⁷ S. Scott Rohrer wrote, “The Puritans represent the mother lode of American Protestantism: no other early American group has received as much attention from historians.” *Wandering Souls: Protestant Migrations in America, 1630-1865* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 299. While historians today distinguish between American and British Puritanism, it should be noted that in the seventeenth century there was no such distinction—Puritanism was a whole, comprehensive, movement, bound by theology, social identity, and vision, and which can be seen as the attempt of the godly for a Puritan Reformation. Thus, “English Puritanism” is perhaps better understood as the “British Puritanism” which consists of both English and American developments.

²⁸ Surprisingly little has been written about Puritanism’s connection with either the medieval or the early Christian church. Three notable exceptions are David M. Barbee’s “A Reformed Catholike: William Perkins’ Use of the Church Fathers” (PhD. Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2013); Ann-Stephane Schafer, *Auctoritas Patrum? The Reception of the Church Fathers in Puritanism* (New York: Peter Lang, 2012) and Theodore D. Bozeman’s *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988). Barbee correctly concludes that “The normative reading of Puritans as biblicists who exclude tradition [should be] overturned” (Ibid., 306).

For an analysis of the British contexts of Puritan New England, see Joseph A. Conforti, *Saints and Strangers: New England in British North America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006) and Walter A. Woodward, *Prospero’s America: John Winthrop, Jr., Alchemy, and the Creation of New England Culture, 1606-1676* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 1-13. Puritanism’s relation to earlier Reformed Protestantism can be seen in its affinity to Protestant scholasticism. Cf. Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 3-21. For a detailed study of the relation between humanism and scholasticism in the Puritan tradition, see Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 53-95. While some historians have depicted Protestant scholasticism as being antithetical to piety and thus embracing more rationalist strains, this is an improper caricature since Protestant scholastic theologians pursued reason in order to defend and understand divine revelation and thus to import piety. See Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, “Introduction,” in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R.S. Clark (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), xi-ixx; Willem van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603-1669* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 94-105; Adriaan C. Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht, 1630-1706: Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 189-202; and James E. Dolezal, “A Practical Scholasticism? Edward Leigh’s Theological Method,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 71 (2009): 337-54, esp. 342-44.

or exploit earlier Catholic or Lutheran religious expressions?²⁹ What about early modern “Puritan” heresiographies and how do they illumine our understanding of “mainstream Puritanism?”³⁰ What about the diverseness of Puritan religion during the English Revolution and its impact on early modern families?³¹ What about Puritanism’s origins?³² What about Puritanism’s impact on other societies?³³ What impact did fringe beliefs have in Reformed consensus?³⁴ Who are Puritans and who are not?³⁵ Can Puritanism *even* be defined?³⁶ Or is it, as Michael P. Winship has suggested, an “unavoidably a contextual,

²⁹ See Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 61-92; and John Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 174-85.

³⁰ See Ann Hughes, *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 55-129.

³¹ Several modern studies probe the parallel “orthodoxies” of religion during the English Revolution: David Little, *Religion, Order and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969); Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (New York: Viking Press, 1973); Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (New York: Penguin, 1993); Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); and Nicholas Tyacke, ed., *The English Revolution, c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008). For the impact of the English Revolution on early modern families, see Christopher Durston, *The Family in the English Revolution* (Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 160-74.

³² As historians continue to refine definitions of Puritanism, its origins will likewise need to be reassessed. See Karl Gunther, “The Intellectual Origins of English Puritanism, ca. 1525-1572” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2007), 9-30; Gunther, “The Origins of English Puritanism,” *History Compass* 4/2 (2006), 235-40; and Dan G. Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1555-1560* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1999), 1-14.

³³ The English Puritan best-seller, Lewis Bayly’s *The Practice of Pietie* (1611), was one of the first English publications to impact early German pietism, and was equally popular in the Netherlands from 1620. See Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany*, 59-70; Jan van de Kamp, “Die Einführung der christlichen Disziplinierung des Alltags in die deutsche evangelische Erbauungsliteratur durch Lewis Baylys *Praxis Pietatis* (1628),” *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 37, ed. Udo Sträter (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011): 11-19; Cornelius W. Schoneveld, *Intertraffic of the Mind: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Anglo-Dutch Translation, with a Checklist of Books Translated from English into Dutch, 1600-1700* (Leiden: Brill, 1983); Op’t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands*, 169-78.

³⁴ Case studies of such divergent Puritans as John Preston, John Howe, and John Goodwin have all confirmed flexibility in our understanding of early modern Reformed orthodoxy. See Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 217-229; David Field, *Rigide Calvinisme in a Softer Dresse: The Moderate Presbyterianism of John Howe, 1630-1705* (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2004), 18-29; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 291-297.

³⁵ Historians continue to question whether James Ussher, John Goodwin, Joseph Hall, or others should be considered as “Puritans.” In the case of Ussher and Hall there were definite puritan leanings. Goodwin stands in a class of his own and is an interesting test case. Though Arminian, Goodwin was appointed vicar of one of London’s leading Puritan parishes in 1633. See Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 10, and (fn 22) above. Cf. David Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 238-244.

³⁶ In his book *Fire from Heaven*, David Underdown challenges readers who question the historical validity of the term “Puritan” to read his book and reconsider their opinion. Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, 21.

imprecise term, not an objective one, a term to use carefully but not to take too seriously in itself” that happens to be “an extremely convenient shorthand term?”³⁷

Christopher Hill opined that the term and its cognates are “an admirable refuge from clarity of thought.”³⁸ Leonard J. Trinterud observed that “there was something odd about the English Puritans” but that “there has not been any agreement about who were Puritans or what was Puritanism.”³⁹ In other words, has “Puritan” and “Puritanism” shared the same fate as “evangelical” and “evangelicalism?”⁴⁰ J. C. Davies, Basil Hill, C. H. George, Paul Christianson, Michael Finlayson, Conrad Russell, and, at times, Patrick Collinson have rejected it (thus, reiterating Thomas Fuller’s 1655 wish to banish the term from the historical record),⁴¹ while John Coffey, Susan Doran, Christopher Durston, Jacqueline Eales, Kenneth Fincham, Crawford Gribben, Ann Hughes, Jeffrey K. Jue, Neil Keeble, Mark Kishlansky, Peter Lake, William Lamont, Paul C. H. Lim, Anthony Milton, John Morrill, John Spurr, David C. Steinmetz, Margo Todd, Nicholas Tyacke, David Underdown, Tom Webster, Blair Worden, and Keith Wrightson continue to employ its use.⁴² “Puritan” and

³⁷ Michael Winship, “Were there any Puritans in New England?,” *New England Quarterly*, 74 (2001), 137-8. Giles Widdowes reflected this same attitude in his 1631 treatise, *The Schysmatical Puritan* (London, 1631), sig. A4r. Five years earlier, John Yates found the term “offensive” in his *Ibis ad Caesarem* (London, 1626), sig. Eeee4v.

³⁸ Hill, *Society and Puritanism*, 1.

³⁹ Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, 3.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of the problems related to defining “evangelical” or “evangelicalism,” see Mark A. Noll, “Science, Theology, and Society: From Cotton Mather to William Jennings Bryan,” in *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, ed. David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 120-41; John R. Stone, *On the Boundaries of American Evangelicalism: The Postwar Evangelical Coalition* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), 1-21; and George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991), 1-8. More general questions arise as to how terms are used and how such use affects the readers’ understanding. Cf. Tim Thornton, *Wittgenstein on Language and Thought: The Philosophy of Content* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), 30-68.

⁴¹ Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, ed. J. S. Brewer (Oxford, 1845), 6:86-87; J. C. Davies, “Puritanism and Revolution: Themes, Categories, Methods and Conclusions,” *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), 704; Basil Hill, “Puritanism: The Problem of Definition,” in *Studies in Church History*, vol. 2, ed. G. J. Cuming (London: Nelson, 1965), 283-96; C. H. George, “Puritanism as History and Historiography,” *Past and Present* 41 (1968), 77-104; Paul Christianson, “Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1970): 463-84; Michael Finlayson, “Puritanism and Puritans: Labels or Libels?,” *Canadian Journal of History* 8 (1973): 201-33; Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621-1629* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 26-28. Both Hill and Christianson defined their terms so narrowly as to exclude separatists and Baptists from classifications of “Puritanism.” Russell argues that the term “Puritan” came into positive use with the rise of English Arminianism, and that so many diverse people are called “Puritans” in the seventeenth century to render it useless. Cf. Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642* (New York: Continuum Publishing, 1990), ix-xxx. For a critique of George, see Ian Breward, “The Abolition of Puritanism,” *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (1974): 20-34.

⁴² John Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560-1700,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 1-31; Jacqueline Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Eales, *Community and Disunity: Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640-1649* (Faversham: Keith Dickson Books, 2001); Kenneth Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (London: Boydell & Brewer, 1998); Crawford Gribben, *God’s Irishman: Theological Debates in Cromwellian Ireland* (New York: Oxford University Press,

“Puritanism” may be slippery but they are indispensable.⁴³ Few historians have produced as promising studies on Puritanism as Peter Lake, who has broadened our understanding of Puritanism’s complex identities and social contexts;⁴⁴ yet, even in Lake’s work, a sense of pessimism shrouds his conclusions.⁴⁵

Can this discipline be moved forward, at least to the extent that historians can employ the use of “Puritan” and “Puritanism” more confidently and unequivocally? Can historians make sense of this complex, varied intellectual culture and retain their use in writing history? Can one successfully trace Puritan “identities” and bloodlines across its several strains and arrive at a core distinctive?⁴⁶ Or, more likely, can one discern a set or

2007); Ann Hughes, “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” *Journal of British Studies*, 39 (2000): 1-7; Jeffrey K. Jue, *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (New York: Springer, 2006); N. H. Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 2001), ch. 8; Mark A. Kishlansky, *A Monarch Transformed: Britain, 1603-1714* (New York: Penguin, 1997); William M. Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s, 1996); Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Puritan Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); John S. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1994); John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998); David C. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayersberg to Theodore Beza*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 100-105, 168; Margo Todd, *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001); Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*; Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c. 1620-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (New York: Penguin, 2002); Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525-1700* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

⁴³ For representative positions on either side of the question, see Basil Hill, “Puritanism: The Problem of Definitions,” *Studies in Church History* 2 (1965), 283-96; Peter Lake, “Puritan identities,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1984), 112-23; Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*, 1-14; and Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge: “Orthodoxy,” “Heterodoxy,” and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001), 11-16. Both Alan Ford and Crawford Gribben have looked at this issue within an Irish context: Alan Ford, “Church of Ireland, 1558-1641: A Puritan Church?,” in *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*, ed. Alan Ford, J. I. McGuire, and Kenneth Milne (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), ch. 4; and Crawford Gribben, “Puritanism in Ireland and Wales.” For a helpful survey of positions, see Saseck, *Images of English Puritanism*, 1-27.

⁴⁴ Lake’s voluminous writings include *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988); *The Boxmaker’s Revenge; The Anti-Christ’s Lewd Hat*; and “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” in *Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993), 3-29.

⁴⁵ Lake writes, “The difficulties involved in defining ‘puritanism’ are easier to identify than solve and I really have nothing original to say on that subject.” Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 10-11. Elsewhere, Lake proposes his own definition as “a set of positions on [the English religious] spectrum.” See Lake’s “Introduction” to Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, 2nd ed. (1947; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), xx. Nuttall proposes a more dynamic and open-ended approach to definition, which Lake praises.

⁴⁶ The issue of “Protestant identities” has been the subject of several recent studies. Peter Lake has analyzed early modern Puritan identities in “Reading Clarke’s *Lives* in Political and Polemical Context,” in *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 293-318. See also Andrew Cambers, “Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, c. 1580-1720,” *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (October, 2007): 796-825; Christopher Haigh, *The Plain Man’s Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in*

cluster of ideas, attitudes, and expressions that, when woven or fashioned within a particular sixteenth- and seventeenth-century context, form something that we can identify as “Puritan,” and “Puritanism?” If so, what are its contents, and what makes it *distinctively* Puritan?⁴⁷ Can historians simply refer to Puritans as “the hotter sort of Protestants,” as Percival Wilburn did, or is this an insufficient rendering of English memory?⁴⁸ Further, as more historians begin to refer to *Puritanisms*, and offer competing definitions focused on single doctrines or practices, is something lost? As the wind continues to blow towards multiple religious identities, or irreducible pluralisms, which existed both at any one time, and across time, how long can one maintain Puritanism’s collective identity?⁴⁹ Winship pointed this out when he said, “It has recently been suggested, somewhat hyperbolically, that it is more useful to talk of ‘puritanisms’ rather than ‘puritanism,’ for there were almost as many puritanisms as there were puritans.”⁵⁰ Admittedly this is an overstatement, but historian Ann Hughes has popularized its reference within the literature, and though “Puritanisms” has more often been associated with studies of American Puritanism, it has broad implications for English Puritanism more generally, if for no other reason than by the fact that in the seventeenth century English Puritanism was thought of as “British Puritanism,” a collective identity of ministers and laypeople on both sides of the Atlantic (“the godly”) who lived and expressed their ideas in communion with each other, and had equal, though sometimes competing, visions of for a Puritan Reformation, whether to build a “city on a hill” or a “Puritan Commonwealth.”⁵¹ The idea of *Puritanisms* has thus been proposed as a possible solution to the definitions problem, in that it attempts to understand the fragmenting caused by multifarious proposals on how to define Puritanism.

Historians Theodore D. Bozeman, Janice Knight, and Stephen Foster have all written about “Puritanisms” and early modern “orthodoxies.”⁵² Some historians have

Post-Reformation England, 1570-1640 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Ethan H. Shagan, *Catholics and the “Protestant Nation:” Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005); and Muriel C. McClendon, Joseph Ward, and Michael MacDonald, eds., *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1999).

⁴⁷ Numerous historians have attempted to find the one defining feature of Puritanism. While this practice is not necessarily wrong, it is (at best) misguided. Rather than to see one prominent feature above (or to the exclusion) of all, historians should see a core set of identities (or cluster of ideas), that, considered together and expressed as a whole, form what we understand by “Puritan” and “Puritanism.” This is, perhaps, similar to Wittgenstein’s theory of *Familienähnlichkeit*, according to which concepts are like members of a family that share specific physical or character traits without everyone sharing the same traits. The varieties of Puritanism relate to one another in rather complex relations or family resemblances.

⁴⁸ Percival Wilburn, *A Checke or Reproofoe of M. Howlet’s Untimely Screeching* (1581), 15v. Quoted in Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (1967; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 27.

⁴⁹ Ronald Wells, *History and the Christian Historian* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 143.

⁵⁰ Michael Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 3.

⁵¹ See Hughes, “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” 1-7. On congregational communion across the Atlantic, see Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Community, 1610-1692* (Northeastern University Press, 1994), 17-40, where Bremer discusses in depth the “Cambridge connection” which fostered shared beliefs and experiences among the Puritans.

⁵² Richard Pointer notes that Foster “is the least inclined towards this tendency but even his final chapter offers some hints.” Pointer, “Selves and Others in Early New England: Refashioning American

traced this tendency to anti-Perry Miller tendencies in the 1960s. In their attempt to revise Miller's monolithic "New England mind," which saw a dominant mainstream Puritanism centered around notions of the covenant, revisionists have pointed out, at times convincingly, that Puritanism was much more diverse than what Miller had envisioned.⁵³ Thus, most present studies of American Puritanism now focus on its diversity, and contrast similarities and differences between the "puritanisms" of old and New England.⁵⁴ Moreover, it is possible, even probable, that this deconstructionism within the literature owe its origins not only to anti-Perry Miller tendencies, but also to resurgence of interest in studying the multi-fractured "radical" sectaries of the English Revolution. But this raises an important historical question: Did these religious radicals emerge *de novo*, without standing in relation to an earlier tradition or contemporary consensus; or, as the evidence suggests, were they reacting to perceived abuses and insufficiencies within the so-called "mainstream," especially in matters of obtaining assurance of faith and peace of mind?" Thus reflecting on this phenomenon, Glenn Burgess observed that historians are far more apt to be caught up with "origins" and "causes," than with "consequences," "effects," and "aftermath."⁵⁵

Puritan Studies," in *History and the Christian Historian*, ed. Ronald Wells (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 144 (n. 16). See Foster, *Long Argument*, 286-314; Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 344-55; Knight *Orthodoxies*, 198-213; and Andrew Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 224-43.

⁵³ Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestants and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (Princeton: University Press, 2002), 248 (n. 13); Pointer, "Selves and Others in Early New England," 143. Cp. Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 48-98; and Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*, 1-12. Perry Miller is known as "the father of American Puritan studies," and was largely responsible for revitalizing the study of Puritanism in the early-mid twentieth century. Miller's thesis was that of a unified Puritan theology or mainstream orthodoxy embodied by such Puritans as Thomas Hooker, Thomas Shepard, Peter Bulkeley, John Winthrop, William Perkins, and William Ames. Revisionists, such as Janice Knight, have challenged Miller's thesis and insist instead on a plurality of orthodoxies. Cf. David D. Hall, "Narrating Puritanism," in *New Directions in American Religious History*, ed. Harry S. Stout and D. G. Hart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 51-83.

⁵⁴ See Philip E. Gura, *A Glimpse of Zion's Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620-1660* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1984), 136-43, 222-24; David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 191-205; Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610-1692* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994), 120-1, 145-6, 150-1, 179-80; Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal*, 184-214; Stephen Fender, *Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 141-47; Susan Hardman Moore, *New World Settlers: Pilgrims and the Call Home* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 16-35, 123-271; and David D. Hall, *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 21-47. For an appraisal of English culture in early modern England and New England, including cross-fertilizations, see Francis J. Bremer and Lynn A. Botelho, eds., *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England, 1588-1649* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005).

⁵⁵ Glenn Burgess, "Radicalism and the English Revolution," in *English Radicalism, 1550-1850*, ed. Glenn Burgess and Matthew Festenstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 62. David Loewenstein, in his seminal work on John Milton, writes of "orthodox" and "radical" Puritan clergy. *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3, 14, 94, 175, 186, 323. David R. Como differentiates between "mainstream" and "antinomian" Puritanism, but states that Nuttall was correct in seeing continuities in style that bridged the gap between the radicals and their mainstream counterparts.

These questions and issues illustrate the difficulty involved in this task. That historians continue to debate the precise meaning of these terms shows how important this discussion is; further, the plethora of unqualified or non-nuanced usage within scholarship contributes to this quagmire. Further, the numerous definitions circulating current academic literature naturally tends toward deconstructionism because it gives the impression that all those “distinguishing” characteristics are somehow unique or independent from a greater consensus. Thus, some historians have offered *precise* definitions by identifying a particular characteristic of Puritanism; as David R. Como noted, “Through the centuries, puritans have been made to wear many historical masks.”⁵⁶ Michael Walzer emphasized the revolutionary spirit of the English Puritans and suggested that radicalism was a core feature of the movement (thus, Puritans were political revolutionaries wanting to overthrow the state); William Lamont saw similarities in the “godly rule” of the Puritans; Geoffrey F. Nuttall mused upon the experience of the Holy Spirit as the most vital element within Puritan thought and experience; J. Sears McGee distinguished Puritans by their emphasis on first table duties toward God, “such as avoiding idolatry and the profanation of the Sabbath, more than on second table duties, such as charity;”⁵⁷ Bernard Bailyn referred broadly to the “spirit of Puritanism;” Lake has defined Puritanism as “a set of priorities centered on religious experience,” creating something of a “puritan style;” Peter Ivan Kaufman sees Puritanism chiefly within the rubric of self-despair; the great patriarch of Puritan studies, Patrick Collinson, portrays Puritans as evangelical protestants who reacted to the profane society which surrounded them, and as part of a greater network to reform church and state; Austin Woolrych defined it as broadly as possible, as “a strain of piety within the established church;” and Bernard S. Capp sees Puritanism as a culture war in the reform of “morals and manners,” which centered on swearing, Sabbath observance, parish life, sex, alcohol, dress, music, dancing, art, plays, shows, and sports.⁵⁸

Como further sees radical Puritanism as a natural evolution of inherent tendencies within the godly. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergency of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2004), 13-24. Sarah Apetrei states, “Both antinomian and Behemist currents represent a ‘spiritist,’ or spiritualizing, tendency in English puritanism towards transcending structures in religion.” Apetrei, *Women, Feminism, and Religion in Early Enlightenment England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 190. Thus, Radical Puritanism emerges out of mainstream Puritanism and comes into its own identity, but nonetheless had the same goal of Puritan Reformation. See Chapter 7.3.

⁵⁶ Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 10.

⁵⁷ Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, “‘Good Works’ and Social Ties: Helping the Migrant Poor in Early Modern England,” in *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-fashioning in Post-Reformation England*, ed. Muriel C. McClendon, Joseph P. Ward, and Michael MacDonald (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 134. Margo Todd has challenged this view, stating, “Countless puritan preachers exhorted their congregations to give generously to their unfortunate brethren.” Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order*, 158.

⁵⁸ See Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1982); William Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-1660* (New York: Macmillan, 1969); Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*; McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England*, 93-94; Bernard Bailyn, *New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1979); Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” 3-29; Peter Ivan Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 5-7; Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of the Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1982); Collinson, *The*

Another popular method in recent scholarship has been the attempt to define Puritanism by discussing particular Puritans, such as Richard Baxter, Thomas Shepard, William Prynne, Nehemiah Wallington, TheaurauJohn Tany, Lodowick Muggleton, doomsday poet Michael Wigglesworth, the Harleys, and the Mathers.⁵⁹ Still others have emphasized the role of “experiential piety” in their approach to Puritanism.⁶⁰

As one can see, several abstract concepts have been proposed as a rationale for understanding Puritanism. Yet, as critics of the term point out, such concepts can equally be applied to other religious groups and often they are too narrow and exclude other groups, such as Separatists or Baptists;⁶¹ how then can one apply them to Puritanism as defining characteristics? And if one loses the term altogether, as some historians would wish, would not a complex, vibrant religious culture be abandoned along with the term? Others argue that the terms cannot be defined and any attempt to do so would prove unfruitful. Ann Hughes opined, “We have learnt from Collinson, Lake, and Tyacke that Puritans cannot be neatly separated from the mass of English Protestants and counted.”⁶² Further, Hughes questions any method that would define Puritans “by a number of simple,

Elizabethan Puritan Movement (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967); and Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 76; Capp, *England's Culture Wars*:

⁵⁹ Spurr, *English Puritanism*, 3. See Paul C. H. Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge*, rev. and exp. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994); Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-1660* (New York: Macmillan, 1969); Paul S. Seaver, *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1988); Ariel Hessayon, “Gold Tried in the Fire.” *The Prophet TheaurauJohn Tany and the English Revolution* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007); T. L. Underwood, ed., *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653-1657: The Conscience of a Puritan* (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1970); Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads*; Robert Middlekauf, *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999)

⁶⁰ See Pieter de Vries, “Die Mij Heft Liefgehad.” *De Betekenis van de Gemeenschap Met Christus in de Theologie van John Owen, 1616-1683* (Heerenveen: Groen, 1999), 63. Trueman questions this last approach to Puritanism in *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 5. While the Puritans had a strong experiential element to their theology and church life, so too did other early modern Protestants; further, limiting one's definition primary to expressions of piety does not adequately address the relation of Puritanism to Reformed orthodoxy.

⁶¹ It is nearly universally accepted that John Bunyan was a Puritan. However, by many historians' definitions, such as Paul Christianson's, Bunyan would be excluded being a Puritan. Timothy George suggests, alongside Collinson, that Separatists “advocated a totally alien, select Christian society,” which is only partially true. There was, in fact, great harmony between so-called “Separatists” and their “Anglican-Puritan” counterparts both in their divinity and respect for biblical interpretation. Cf. George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2005), 242 (fn 7); and cp. Christopher Hill, “Bunyan's Contemporary Reputation,” in *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88*, ed. Anne Laurence, W. R. Owens, and Stuart Sim (London: Hambledon & London, 2003), 3-16; and Paul Christianson, “Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1970), 463-84. Christianson attempts to solve the problem of definitions by narrowly delimiting “Puritan” to those nonconformist Presbyterians who chose not to obey conforming bishops but refused to separate from the Church of England and accepted royal supremacy. The problem with this solution, however, is that it is too narrow to account for separating nonconformists reputed as Puritans, such as William Ames and Henry Ainsworth.

⁶² Ann Hughes, *Politics, Society, and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 66.

formal tests” since the historical facts are too complicated for that.⁶³ Still, such attempts have been made and are so numerous that John H. Primus has suggested, “Some day, no doubt, an entire dissertation will be devoted to the history of the efforts to define Puritanism.”⁶⁴ Indeed, Collinson commented that a “secondary academic industry has arisen, devoted to the search for an acceptable definition.”⁶⁵ Michael Finlayson has observed that while many opinions have been postulated as to the defining feature of Puritanism, there still lacks a consensus.⁶⁶ Lawrence A. Sasek wrote, “Nearly everyone agrees that there were puritans and that there was a puritan movement in England between 1560 and at least 1640, but just who were puritans and who were not, or what tenets or practices were central to the movement, seems impossible to determine with any precision;”⁶⁷ and, finally, as Kenneth L. Campbell astutely pointed out, “[understanding Puritanism] brings us right back to the thorny problem of religious identity.”⁶⁸ In other words, what *distinguishes* a Puritan from the rest of the early modern Post-Reformation world?

This industry of defining Puritans will continue to produce mixed results as long as it focuses on one element as preeminent or superior to another. What is needed is a holistic, as opposed to an atomistic, approach that incorporates insights from multiple fields and arrives at core sets of values or expressions or clusters of concepts, that, when woven together within an early modern English religious context, form what we call “English Puritanism;” in other words, one needs to consider the whole *in relation to* its parts. This proposal is similar in concept to both Wittgenstein’s theory of *Familienähnlichkeit*, and Norbert Elias’s concept of “configuration.” For Wittgenstein, there was what may be called *synchronic* family resemblance in similar and overlapping concepts, but where one defining feature does not exist; as members of a particular family share resemblance to one another, and have common features identical to them all (*unitas*), they are nonetheless distinct persons (*diversitas*). For Elias, the concept of “configuration” emphasizes that individuals must not be seen as existing in isolation from the society to which they belong; nor, conversely, as a society to which there was no individuality (*unitas in diversitate*).⁶⁹

Further, one must consider the changing nature of early modern English Puritanism; that is, that the Puritanism of the 1560s was not exactly that of the 1640s, since Puritanism was a protean, evolving movement, that adapted to the times in which it flourished. Nonetheless, the evidence is highly suggestive of a normative tradition which

⁶³ Hughes, *Politics, Society, and Civil War in Warwickshire*, 65-66.

⁶⁴ John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 12.

⁶⁵ Patrick Collinson, *English Puritanism*, rev. ed. (London: Historical Association, 1987), 6.

⁶⁶ Michael G. Finlayson, *Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution: The Religious Factor in English Politics Before and After the Interregnum* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), 165.

⁶⁷ Sasek, *Images of Puritanism*, 1.

⁶⁸ Campbell, *Windows into Men’s Souls*, 13.

⁶⁹ See Michael Forster, “Wittgenstein on Family Resemblance Concepts,” in *Wittgenstein’s Philosophical Investigations: A Critical Guide*, ed. Arif Ahmed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 66-87. For Elias’s concept of “configuration,” see Elias, *The Society of Individuals* (New York: Continuum, 1991). While it is beyond the scope of this work to engage in ongoing debates within sociology, it is, perhaps, sufficient to note that Elias’s work is important in that it emphasizes human relationships in the construction of a society with its own distinctiveness.

can be traced to the mid-sixteenth century, if not earlier, and which came to maturation in the middle of the seventeenth. Therefore, my working hypothesis is that what is needed is a metanarrative for understanding this sixteenth and seventeenth-century English religious phenomena. Moreover, due consideration has to be given to the fact that the terms “Puritan” and “Puritanism” changed over its long history; so, while “Puritan” initially arose within an Anglican context by the time of the English Revolution, “Puritan” had a much more eclectic meaning and was broadened to incorporate many of the more radical sects of the period, such as the Muggletonians, whose architect had strong ties to Puritanism, but nonetheless moved beyond it.⁷⁰ Yet, even within this increasing *diversitas*, arguably there was a main line, or “mainstream,” Puritanism, as expressed in the meetings of “the godly” who sat at Westminster Abbey, from 1643-1652, and which was preached and published since its earliest origins.⁷¹ While Parliament admonished the assembly to consider theology as a tertiary consideration, their chief concern being ecclesiastical government, it is telling that majority of their time was caught up with producing a doctrinal consensus, thus confirming the urgency of establishing and codifying a theological identity within Puritanism.⁷² These meetings at Westminster produced several confessional documents and catechisms, which set forth a highly unified system of theoretical and practical divinity, and which became the basis for assessing the bounds of English-Puritan Reformed orthodoxy.⁷³ Sydney E. Ahlstrom observed this point when he said, “Though looking back with thanksgiving to the great confessions of the Reformation era, the Puritans also entered into the making of new confessions with thoroughness and

⁷⁰ William M. Lamont, *Last Witness: The Muggletonian History, 1652-1979* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 19; Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*, 27-40.

⁷¹ The “Westminster Assembly,” which derives its name from the historic church where these meetings were held, consisted of 121 Puritan divines, lay assessors, and Scottish delegates, who were charged by the Long Parliament, who was then in open conflict with Charles I, to come up with proposals for the reform of the English Church. The divines at Westminster sought to codify what was seen as the mainline tradition within Puritanism, but also allowing for variance on matters of church order and polity. The theological harmony among its members, between Presbyterians and Independents, and those dissenting Baptists within London is attested to by Laurence Clarkson, the alleged founder of the Ranters, who, in his own religious journey, went from the zealous Presbyterians, being “tormented [in] soul, [by reading a book by Thomas Hooker] that I thought it impossible to be saved,” to the Independents, whose, “greatest difference betwixt them, was about baptizing of infants,” to the doctrine of “one Doctor Crisp...[who] held forth against all the aforesaid Churches, That let his people be in society or no, though walked all alone, yet if he believed that Christ Jesus died for him, God beheld no iniquity in him.” From here he moved onto the more radical “higher and clearer” teachings of Giles Randall and John Simpson, “which was then called *Antinomians*,” and then onward from there. Clarkson, *The Lost Sheep Found; Or, The Prodigal Returned to His Fathers House, after Many a Sad and Weary Journey Through Many Religious Countreys* (London, 1660), 8-10. In his *Radical Religion in Cromwell’s England*, Andrew Bradstock remarks on the fluidity of the radical sects of the English Revolution, which is seen in “the ease with which people moved from one to another.” This itself is suggestive of some degree of *unitas* with the normative tradition, as, presumably, radical departures or conversions would be less “fluid.” Bradstock, *Radical Religion in Cromwell’s England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2011), xix.

⁷² John Coffey, “A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution,” in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 114.

⁷³ Indeed, as Chad van Dixhoorn has stated of the period in which the divines sat at Westminster: “It was an hour of glory for the puritan experiment.” Van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652, Vol. 1: Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 81.

vigor. In Britain, as it happened, their thinking seemed to lead almost inexorably to the doctrinal views so carefully articulated in the Westminster standards and their derivative symbols...Puritanism, in short, is generally marked by careful thought; it is an intellectual tradition of great profundity.”⁷⁴ Seeing Puritans as generally “Reformed” is not new; A. G. Dickens posited this idea in his *The English Reformation*.⁷⁵ Confusion as to the terms has arisen, in part, because English sectaries were often accustomed to use “Puritan” to describe themselves, though they had sometimes self-consciously departed significantly from its orthodox consensus.⁷⁶

Before we turn to the methodology and structure of this book, let us first look at the origins of the words “Puritan” and “Puritanism,” since they are suggestive not only of something that was perceived as a distinct strain within the English Church, as far back as the 1560s, but also of a growing theological identity and consensus that came to be associated with their use.

Jacqueline Eales stated that part of the difficulty in defining Puritanism stems from the fact that when contemporaries used the term they did not always agree on what they meant by it, which is further complicated in that as often as the term had any static presence for a short time, it soon evolved with new meaning and nuance.⁷⁷ Nonetheless, historians have found artful, if not brilliant, ways to qualify its use or present alternatives. Margo Todd, for instance, opines, “The historian who talks about the likes of Laurence Humphrey and John Rainolds as ‘advanced protestants’ need not disturb us. We know what he means by the term because we know of whom he speaks: a puritan by any other name is still a puritan.” Todd makes this observation because, when assessing the beginnings of the terms of abuse, “The people who called themselves ‘the godly,’ ‘professors,’ and even ‘saints’ and were called ‘puritans’ by their foes, were a sufficiently self-conscious and popularly identifiable group in their own day to deserve a name, and the traditional ‘puritan’ seems as good as any.”⁷⁸ Before Todd, Leonard J. Trinterud made

⁷⁴ Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 130.

⁷⁵ A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 367-77.

⁷⁶ This self-conscious moving away from orthodox Puritanism can be seen throughout Lodowick Muggleton’s (1609-1698) posthumous autobiography, *The Acts of the Witnesses* (1699). In the text, Muggleton recounts his youthful embrace of the zealous “Puritan religion and practice,” which had such a great impression on him that he chose only to hear the preaching of the “*Puritan* ministers.” However, over time, many of his Puritan acquaintances, having “no Comfort nor Peace of Mind, as to a Life to Come,” became disenfranchised with the Puritan way, and “left that Zeal, and turned Ranters” (possible reference to his cousin John Reeve, who began as a Puritan but turned Ranter). Sometime later, after himself becoming dissatisfied with Puritanism, Muggleton moved beyond its confessional mores and chose “not to mind any Religion more...and if there were anything, either of Happiness or Misery after Death, I left it to God, which I knew not, to do what he would with me.” But at times, however, his fears of hell and damnation would resurface, “as it did formerly, when [I was] a *Puritan*.” T. L. Underwood, *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 35, 38, 43; cf. William Lamont, “Muggleton, Lodowicke,” *ODNB*; Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*, 27-40.

⁷⁷ Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads*, 12.

⁷⁸ Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 9.

this astute observation: “There was something odd about the Puritans. On that, everyone seems to have been in agreement for the last four hundred years.”⁷⁹

As just stated, the terms “Puritan” and “Puritanism” first arose as pejorative terms sometime during the 1560s.⁸⁰ Their first printed use dates to the 1572 publication of the anonymous *Admonition to Parliament*, a text Patrick Collinson describes as “public polemic in the guise of an address to Parliament.”⁸¹ The *Admonition* appeared at a time “when those English ministers hoping for further reform, especially in the matters of the Prayer Book and ceremonies, were frustrated by the queen’s suppression of parliamentary appeals that dealt with the topics of religion.”⁸² Those who sought further reform were styled “Puritanes, worse than Donatistes,” and were considered too radical in their reforms; thus ensued a conflict over Puritanism and its ramifications for the English church.⁸³ The authors of the *Admonition* were soon discovered and sentenced to prison in order to suppress their voices; however, as Marcy L. North observes, they defended their publication by stating that in Parliament there “should be a time of speaking and writing freely,” presumably so that various ideas could be expressed without fear of reprisal.⁸⁴ Further, their anonymity, says North, suggest that political and religious freedom was not yet possible for these early Puritans, and that attempts for further reform would be suppressed and censored.⁸⁵ Thus, the *Admonition* initiated an early modern academic warfare over Puritanism that spawned numerous anonymous texts.⁸⁶ This is known as the first “Puritan” controversy and moved historians initially to define Puritanism in its negative relation to the more ceremonial Anglicanism in that it was a clash of motives, interests, and desires.⁸⁷ Responding to personal charges of favoritism to “Puritans,” Gabriel Harvey, “the noted Puritan man of letters,” wrote of “Puritanism” or “Precisianism” in one of his letters, dated 1573; it appears to be the first recorded use of the term.⁸⁸ By the end of Elizabeth’s reign in 1603, the name “Precisians” and “Puritans” was a common choice of slander to describe overly zealous Protestants who were thought to be too precise in their beliefs or in the way they lived.⁸⁹ Thus, even from its inception, there was an irrevocable

⁷⁹ Leonard J. Trinterud, ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 1. Trinterud goes on to distinguish between various phases within Elizabethan Puritanism: the “original, anti-vestment party;” the “passive-resistance party;” and the “Presbyterian party.”

⁸⁰ For a history of the pejorative use of “Puritan,” see Holden, *Anti-Puritan Satire*.

⁸¹ Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 118. Cited in Marcy L. North, *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2003), 134.

⁸² North, *The Anonymous Renaissance*, 134.

⁸³ John Field and Thomas Wilcox, *Admonition to Parliament* (1572), 2. The texts of their *Admonition* can be found in W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes* (London, 1954), 8-19; and Hans J. Hillerbrand, ed., *The Protestant Reformation* (New York: Harper, 1968), 257-66.

⁸⁴ North, *The Anonymous Renaissance*, 134.

⁸⁵ North, *The Anonymous Renaissance*, 134.

⁸⁶ For the historical circumstances surrounding the *Admonition*, see North, *Anonymous Renaissance*, 134-158.

⁸⁷ For appraisals of Puritanism as anti-Anglican, see Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*; and J. F. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640* (London: A. and C. Black, 1964). See also Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 60-82.

⁸⁸ Victor Houlston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Person’s Jesuit Polemic, 1580-1610* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 44; Gabriel Harvey, *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573-1580*, ed. Edward John Long Scott (London: Printed for the Camden Society, 1884), 30.

⁸⁹ Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, 20.

tie between *dogma* and *praxis*. Based on certain doctrinal formulations and understandings, these “Puritans” deduced or inferred that the mainstay of the English Church was sorely wanting, not only in how its members chose to live and conduct their business, but in the way they thought about God and his majesty, and the broad implications this reverence had for perceiving doctrine, conducting worship services, observing the Sabbath, guarding one’s mouth, giving to the poor, dying well, cultivating a robust devotional life in public and private society, and many other “planks in the puritan platform.”⁹⁰

By the dawn of the seventeenth century, the terms “Puritan,” “Puritanism,” and “Precisianism” were nearly synonymous terms of reproach. Thus, in a bit of irony, the “theological father” of English Puritanism,⁹¹ William Perkins, reputed as the most influential Cambridge theologian, moralist, and casuist of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, disregard “Puritan” as a contemptuous term.⁹² Those who were styled as “Puritans” generally despised its use because, as with Perkins, they often associated with the medieval Cathari.⁹³ They preferred more neutral and apropos terms, such as “the godly” or “saints.” It was not until the early to mid-seventeenth century that “Puritan” would be “owned and acknowledged...as an honorable flag under which to sail—the good old English Puritans.”⁹⁴ John Gere’s depiction of the Puritan in his oft-printed tract, *The Character of an Old English Puritan, or Nonconformist* (1646) was indeed one of the first positive portrayals in early modern England, though there were those even before Gere who struggled over its representation.⁹⁵ In 1626, the word was still disparaged, evidenced

⁹⁰ This latter phrase, which pervades current literature, and popularized by Collinson, seems to have its origins in the nineteenth century. Cp. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 44; Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft*, 136; with *Eighty-Fifth Anniversary Celebration of the New England Society in the City of New York* (1890), 39.

⁹¹ Martin, *Milton among the Puritans*, 107. Current literature has made elaborate, albeit justifiable, claims about Perkins: “puritan father of British practical divinity;” “a major English Puritan spokesman;” “the father of Pietism” (which competes, perhaps, with William Teellinck’s designation “father of Continental Pietism”); “father of British reformed casuistry;” “archetypal puritan;” among many, many others. James F. Keenan, S. J., “Jesuit Casuistry or Jesuit Spirituality? The Roots of Seventeenth-Century British Practical Divinity,” in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540-1773, Vol. 1* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 627; Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 186 (fn. 29); Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany*, 110; Christopher P. Vogt, *Patience, Compassion, Hope, and the Christian Art of Dying Well* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 25; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 13.

⁹² William Perkins, *The Workes of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the University of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins* (Cambridge: Printed by Cantrell Legge, 1616-1618), 1:342, 3:15.

⁹³ Joel R. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 106; James Calvin Davis, *The Moral Theology of Roger Williams: Christian Conviction and Public Ethics* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 72. On sixteenth-century attempts to equate “Puritan” to the medieval “Cathari,” see Richard L. Greaves, *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981), 7-8; and on James Ussher’s use of “Cathari,” see Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 75.

⁹⁴ Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays* (New York: Continuum Publishing, 1994), 236.

⁹⁵ Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 172. Michael R. Watts, referring to Gere’s tract, has simplistically stated, “Historians have agonized over the meaning of the term ‘Puritan’ but there is really little need. A brief but comprehensive description was given in the seventeenth century by the Presbyterian minister John Gere.” Watts, *The*

in Francis Rous's comment that "In the Devil's language, a Saint is a Puritan."⁹⁶ What happened between Perkins and Geree to account for this shift? This question is not easily answered, but undoubtedly it has something to do with changing perceptions within early Stuart religion and culture, which indicates that the times were changing.⁹⁷ One possible explanation is implied in Rous's complaint before the Short Parliament that "The word Puritan is an essential engine...For this word in the mouth of a drunkard doth mean a sober man, in the mouth of an Arminian, an orthodox man, in the mouth of a Papist, a Protestant. And so it is spoke to shame a man out of all religion." Thus J. P. Kenyon states: "The most serious complaint in 1640 was that the word 'Puritan' was being used by the enemies of Protestants to libel its defenders—the effect being to enhance the prestige of 'Puritanism' and enlist on its side a great deal of bi-partisan support which was not basically 'Puritan' at all."⁹⁸ It is possible, perhaps probable, that the association of "Puritan" with "anti-Catholic" in the 1630s-1640s was partially responsible for its switch from derision to banderole. Whatever the cause for this change, it is certain that the religion of the "Puritans" was a clearly identifiable strain within English Protestantism, which gave rise to the slander in the first place; and while their religion changed and evolved with the times, it did not lose its characteristics or identifiably. This perception is attested not only in Neal and Brook's histories, but also in the continued use, even if only reluctant, by the majority of scholars currently working in this field.

The early use and changing perceptions of "Puritan" and "Puritanism" only provide hints as to the full nature of its complexity. Sir Matthew Hale, a prominent seventeenth-century jurist, shared definite Puritan sympathies, seeing "religious feeling where others saw 'enthusiasts' and knaves, their cloak of irrationalist folly concealing seditious intent."⁹⁹

Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 15. Before Geree, John Downame published the anonymous *A New Anatomie; Or, Character of a Christian, or Round-head* (1645), which depicts the Puritan "in his most noble right temper," against the "unjust censures" of "this blind World," as one who journeys through this worldly wilderness towards heaven, being "Heavens Darling, Earths Paragon, the Worlds onely wonder...[and who is] is justly said to be the wonder of God himself."

⁹⁶ Francis Rous, *The Onely Remedy* (London, 1627), 162.

⁹⁷ See David Scott Kastan, "Performances and Playbooks: the Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama," in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 167-184; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 132-175; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 10-30; David Cressy, *Agnes Bowker's Cat: Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 234-250; and Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, "Introducing the 1630s: Questions of Parliaments, Peace and Pressure Points," in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 1-27.

⁹⁸ J. P. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 177.

⁹⁹ Alan Cromartie, *Sir Matthew Hale, 1609-1676: Law, Religion, and Natural Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 139. Charles M. Gray calls Hale a "psychological" Puritan but not a "programmatic" one. Holly Brewer, however, calls Hale a Puritan throughout his life, if for no other reason than that he dressed like one and refused to enforce laws against them. Cp. Sir Matthew Hale, *The History of the Common Law of England*, ed. Charles M. Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), xvi; with Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 176-77. It is noteworthy to add that Gisbertus Voetius, one of the leading Dutch theologians of the *Nadere Reformatie*, opposed both luxury in dress and long hair on men; he also fought against dancing and "the new habit" of smoking tobacco, thus echoing general Puritan disdain

The seeming “obfuscating nature” of Puritanism since the seventeenth century has contributed to the problem of its definition.¹⁰⁰

What is suggested as a possible solution to the definitions problem is a metanarrative that perceives its constitutive parts in relation to its whole: to what degree were Puritans *united* together in a common motif, even amid their plurality of expressions? Is the motive of further reform (or, of a “hotter-sort” of temperament) adequate as a predominant unifying theme to signify something of a *Puritan* style? To what degree do these unities express a common bond or brotherhood? What were its theological continuities with Reformed Protestantism? What was unique about its particular expression of spirituality?

Numerous historians have recognized Puritanism’s appeal throughout early modern England, spreading like wildfire among English towns and localities, but what was it about *Puritanism* that made it so appealing in the first place?¹⁰¹ Further, can one devise a definition that is both nuanced and expansive, allowing for such diverse Puritans as John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp (and Baxter and John Goodwin), to co-exist on a continuum of English Puritan “identity?” Moreover, what did it mean for English Puritans to be English *and* Reformed?¹⁰²

1.2 Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure

This study seeks to shed insight into what unites and defines orthodox Stuart Puritans, but more work will need to be done to explore facets of Elizabethan Puritanism (c.1558-1603), and the later decline of Puritanism after the close of the Stuart age (c.1714-1758). Thus, this study is broadly confined to Stuart Puritanism (c. 1603-1689), but its working hypothesis may have broad implications for the other eras of Puritanism.

for public and social vices. Kaspar von Greyerz, *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 82.

¹⁰⁰ Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty*, 7.

¹⁰¹ For the urban popularity of English Puritanism, see Robert Tittler, *English Urban Experience, 1540-1640* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001), 1-38; Peter Lake, “Puritans, Popularity and Petitions: Local Politics in National Context, Cheshire, 1641,” in *Politics, Religion and Popularity: Essays in Honor of Conrad Russell*, ed. Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 259-289; Patrick Collinson, “Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture,” in *Culture of English Puritanism*, 32-57; Vanessa Harding, “Reformation and culture, 1540-1700,” in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840*, ed. Peter Clark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 263-288.

¹⁰² Tom Webster allows for a “recast Arminianism,” epitomized in John Goodwin, to coincide with Puritan orthodoxy. See Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 147. Both John Spurr and John Coffey affirm Webster’s thesis. For Coffey, John Goodwin helps scholars to understand the evolution of English Puritanism in the seventeenth century; for Spurr, men like John Milton and John Goodwin reaffirm the existence of Arminians who were “undoubtedly puritan.” Ellen More is more cautious and states that Goodwin’s “theology is more difficult to locate...[it] looked back to the Puritanism of the 1620s and forward to the rational theology of the post-Restoration era.” Cf. Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 10; Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*, 68; Ellen More, “John Goodwin and the Origins of the New Arminianism,” *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Autumn, 1982), 70. Alan Cromartie devotes a whole chapter to Sir Matthew Hale’s “puritanism” in *Sir Matthew Hale*, 139-155.

While Puritan origins precede the year 1558, are closely tied to the Marian exiles and their networking in Geneva, and could possibly be traced to Lollardy, for the purposes of our study it is best to assess Puritanism in its mature expression and age of codification.¹⁰³ Thus, the dates are broadly confined to 1603/4-1689/90 or from the coronation of James I to the English throne (1604 being the year in which the first edition of Downname's *Christian Warfare* was issued) to the Glorious Revolution (1690 being the year Crisp's *Christ Alone Exalted* was reissued in its definitive and controversial edition).

Seventeenth-century Puritanism in its mainline consensus and context of debate from the time of the calling of the Westminster Assembly to the Great Ejection obligates certain theological issues and boundaries, and that, arguably, in its mainstream expression can be identified as one form of a broadly defined Reformed orthodoxy. It is also necessary to limit this discussion to theological identity, since during this time "Puritanism" as a non-Anglican or ceremonial religious phenomenon was the dominant religious movement, albeit diverse, within England. Further, it is the time in which Downname, Rous, and Crisp published and engaged in advancing the Puritan Reformation. Although none of these authors wrote systematic works of theology, they nonetheless were acquainted with orthodox structure and boundaries, which itself contributed to "the specter of heresy." Changing perceptions and perceived threats to the consensus were taken seriously, even if handled in oft-contradictory ways.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Coffey and Lim, among others, trace the beginnings of Puritanism to 1564 or thereabouts. As muddled as its origins are so with its ending. The Stuart monarchy ended in 1714, and Thomas Kidd places the decline of Puritanism from 1689, tying it to the "Glorious Revolution" which instigated more "Protestant identities." These dates are somewhat arbitrary in that they do not account for the strong Puritan dynasties within New England (e.g. the Mathers), nor Jonathan Edwards's own affinity with it. In *The Idea of Progress in the Eighteenth Century* (1990), David Spadafora credits Puritanism's demise to changing perceptions in religion and its perceived excesses. There were, of course, many factors that led to the disenfranchising of Puritanism and are beyond the scope of this study. Coffey and Lim, "Introduction," 1; Thomas S. Kidd, *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 2; Robert C. Neville, *The Puritan Smile: A Look Toward Moral Reflection* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987), 17; David Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 98-99.

¹⁰⁴ Early modern English heresy culture was as complex and varied as its orthodoxy, and one cannot minimize the impact of rhetoric and misrepresentation on how heresy was often portrayed and classified. See, for instance, the work of David D. Loewenstein, and specifically his *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Loewenstein and John Marshall, eds., *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). It should be noted that "heretics" and "heresies" are classifications made by opposing parties; those who were branded as such did not see themselves espousing heresy, and undoubtedly believed themselves to be "orthodox" in some sense of the term. Indeed, Loewenstein has stated that "in the climate of extreme religious divisiveness, such accusatory terms as 'error' and 'heresy' had...enormous rhetorical power" in that they could induce fears of all kinds, thus "fueling ferocious opposition to religious toleration in any kind or degree" (Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith*, 224). Finally, a distinction could be made between "heresy" and "blasphemy" in that the latter was seen as a more willful and vile attack on the object of Christian religion, and often resulted in severe punishment, and even, at times, public execution. See John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration, and Early Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 212ff; and Michael Hunter, "'Aikenhead the Atheist': The Context and Consequences of Articulate Irreligion in the Late Seventeenth Century," in *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 221-54.

The method of this study is to examine three carefully chosen case studies to inquire whether there were common theological interests and confessional sensibilities that may be found within Stuart Puritanism, and especially within writers who did not write a system of divinity akin to that of William Ames's *Medulla* or Edward Leigh's *A Systeme or Body of Divinity*, which may justify use of the term "English Puritanism" in the singular; that is, to see whether a greater movement or narrative united these English Reformed Protestants during this central period and core country of development. I have focused chiefly on theological identity, in order to assess whether there is a *sensus unitatis* across a diverse spectrum of confessionally minded Puritans.¹⁰⁵ The themes examined in these case studies are representative of a theological focus, are characteristic of Puritans understood as "Reformed," and appear within writers who wrote within different genres of literature. It is suggested that there is significant theological harmony across a wide spectrum of beliefs and "strains" within Puritanism, which will, in turn, warrant further studies and more investigation.¹⁰⁶ The presence of these themes within pietistic writings of Puritans is further suggestive of a *unitas in diversitate*.

This study will draw from the published sources of Puritans John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp.¹⁰⁷ Much of this corpus consists of sermons revised for

¹⁰⁵ Wim Janse has observed that "The late sixteenth and seventeenth century European churches were confessional churches: they stuck to a creed or confession as an internal and external norm and 'party statute,' and monopolized their world view." Janse, "Church Unity, Territorialism, and State Formation in the Era of Confessionalization," in *Unity of the Church: A Theological State of Art and Beyond*, ed. Eduardus Van der Borgh (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 33. The same is true of the Reformed and Puritan parishes within Britain, evidenced not only in the doctrinal statements of their divines, and their confessional mores, but also in the precise way in which Puritans developed a distinctively experiential divinity which instructed Puritans how to live and worship.

¹⁰⁶ On picking which themes within Puritanism to study, Patrick Collinson advised, "If we share with contemporaries a sense of Puritanism which is at once polemical and nominalistic, then far from circumscribing its meaning we should regard the incidence of the term in contemporary discourse as indicative of theological, moral, and social tensions which should be the prime object of our investigations, especially if we wish to understand what followed, in the 1640s and beyond." Collinson, "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (October, 1980): 488. Further, Perry Miller was correct that "ideas and purposes shaped the course of events. Human beings could not move without a thought in their heads...and those men and women that moved others did so with well articulated thoughts." Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the Truth about History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994), 143. This work is an attempt to study the theological identity of three diverse Puritans, from which their moral and social understandings flowed; indeed, as Thomas Shepard wrote, "the knowledge of Divinity" was necessary to clear the way for a genuine conversion and life of piety. Shepard, *The Sincere Convert* (London, 1640), sig. A7r.

¹⁰⁷ In this book I do not attempt to prove that Downname, Rous, and Crisp were Puritans. That they are "common consent" Puritans is well established in current academic literature. While seventeenth-century classifications are sparse, major influences on current scholarly consensus stems from their association with the Westminster Assembly, some comments in Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (1691-1692), Daniel Neal's *The History of the Puritans* (1732-1738), and Brook's *Lives of the Puritans* (1813), the two latter classifying Downname and Crisp as Puritan divines, but nowhere mentioning Rous (possibly because Rous was never ordained). However, Edmund Calamy lists Rous among the Puritans in his *Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of His Life and Times* (London, 1702), 83. It is interesting that in response to criticisms of his *History of the Puritans*, Neal published a response in which he clarified, "My Design in writing the *History of the Puritans*, was not to defend *their* Doctrine or Discipline, but to set their Principles in a fair Light, with their own Arguments in defence of them...Have not the Papists published the History of their Sufferings by the *English* Reformers? And Dr. Heylin, Fuller, Bishop Burnet, Collier, Strype...all Clergymen of the Church of

print. It will also draw, in part, from other Protestant and Reformed writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, John Calvin, William Perkins, Richard Greenham, Edward Dering, James Ussher, William Ames, Stephen Charnock, William Gouge, Andrew Willet, Thomas Edwards, John Howe, Edward Leigh, John Preston, Samuel Rutherford, John Eaton, John Saltmarsh, Henry Vane, Samuel Willard, and Thomas Hooker. By ascertaining what sources were read and disseminated, and which ones were censored and suppressed one can possibly discern the major influences in one's thought, however with some hesitations.¹⁰⁸ It will also consider, to a limited extent, various political, social, cultural, economic, literary and religious spheres pertaining to English Puritanism. It will map Downname, Rous, and Crisp into their unique historical and religious contexts and suggest ways in which they influenced the forming of an English Puritan identity.

The English Puritans did not exist in a vacuum; they inherited a varied and complex religious culture, were receptive of a codified system of ideas that was shaped by countless heresies and heterodoxies dating to the early Christian church. As with Calvin, the Puritans received, used, and transmitted theological ideas, which, in turn they accepted, modified, or rejected. Their heritage was distinct enough to be their own, but it was never *only* their own; it was a *shared* expression of ideas that formed a unique cluster and style of divinity and piety, such as "plain style" preaching, experimental predestinarianism, Sabbath observance, and heavy stress on family worship.¹⁰⁹ This study, therefore, does not envision Puritanism as an isolated phenomenon but as a contextual movement that received and expressed attitudes and ideas that united Puritans, even

England...Why then should it be criminal for the Puritans...to tell their Story?" Neal, A Review of the Principal Facts Objected to the First Volume of The History of the Puritans (London, 1734), 1, 4.

Further, on Downname, it is telling that in 1645 he published an anonymous "character tract" called *A New Anatomie, or Character of a Christian, or Round-head*. Typical of positive "Puritan" character literature, this short work sets out to defend the Christian-Round-head-Puritan as one who is a pilgrim travelling through this world onto his heavenly home, depicted much in the same way "Christian" is in John Bunyan's later *Pilgrim's Progress*. The tract concludes: "Thus a right Puritan or Round-head is in his most noble right temper...and let my Round-head be thus beautified, and let mee live his life, whatsoever his death may be, and I dare venture my Eternity with his."

¹⁰⁸ For a detailed study of the reading habits of early modern England, see Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 259-97; Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000). On press censorship, see Debora Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), ch. 1; and David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 281-309. The phenomenal cross-fertilization that occurred between England and the Continent can be seen in the libraries of early modern English readers. See, for instance, Peter Clark, "The Ownership of Books in England, 1560-1640: The Example of Some Kentish Townsfolk," in *Schooling and Society*, ed. Lawrence Stone (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 95-111.

¹⁰⁹ Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 33. Historians have often referred to Puritan "plain-style" preaching or "naked" church architecture that elevated the role of the minister and the centrality of the preached Word. While the culture of "plain style" (as Puritans termed it) was not exclusive to the Puritan tradition, it did stand in contrast to other more florid forms of rhetorical expression, and did not suggest simplicity in content but "a simple, direct regard for the truth of their beliefs." Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty*, 41; Bruce C. Daniels, *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995), 32-34; and Stephanie Sleeper, "Plain Style," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 2:479-480.

amid significant diversity. This unity is suggested in their common ancestry with early Reformed Protestantism and their identities as Reformed Catholic Christians. Bound by a rather robust and diverse covenant theology, these Protestants engaged in sober worship that emphasized “hot-tempered” spirituality and the Bible’s centrality. As such, these unities will be explored in the life and writings of John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp.

The precise ways in which these ideas were disseminated are equally complex, and involve the selective use of fiction, church architecture (including the use of the hour glass, which often was turned two or three times during the course of a sermon), propaganda, and education, as well as the more traditional venues of the sacraments, the preaching of the Word, and the codification of Protestant scholasticism; the imaginative world of the Reformation thus carried over to the post-Reformation era. What emerges is a remarkably diverse and complicated English religious culture that was formed by trans-Atlantic, trans-insular, and trans-continental influences encompassed in a variety of social networks and cross-fertilizations. This complex network is seen not only in the rich diversity of writings published in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but in the communion of saints and academic pursuits that the divines shared, even in their pursuits to be educated abroad, often traveling great distances to the Netherlands or to other parts of the Continent, to be fully trained in proper method.

Some divines, such as John Bunyan and Richard Baxter, were largely self-taught, something that would not have been possible without a robust English printing system that made books readily available and affordable. What used to be the sole prerogative of an English medieval clergy (i.e. ownership of books) became a prominent characteristic of the Puritan thinking class; further, arguably, the most prominent diversities within English Puritanism were at its highest during times of no censure, when presses overflowed with orthodox and heterodox, even heretical, drift during the apex of the English Revolution. By ascertaining what sources of literature were available to whom and when, the picture just mentioned moves from the suggestive to the more definitive; that is, the *British* or multi-ethnic quality of Puritanism’s bloodlines become evident. This study is, therefore, has arisen in response to tendencies towards deconstruction, suggests a more nuanced approach to revisionism of Perry Miller’s influential monolithicism, and hypothesizes that historians have much to gain not only by looking at individual Puritans (narrative), but at the Further Reformation or Puritan Reformation (metanarrative) to which they belonged. Thus, it is hypothesized that *sensus unitatis* and *unitatis in diversitate* will prove to be important concepts in our understanding of Puritanism.

Thus, this study seeks to understand better some fundamental questions that have arisen within Puritan historiography: What are prominent themes within Stuart Puritanism? How should historians make sense of its diversity? What were its unities? Were Puritans united in a quest for further Reformation? Was there a “mainstream” orthodoxy? Is it better to write of “Puritanisms” or “Puritanism?”

While diversity among Puritans has gained recent academic attention, few studies have devoted significant length to their underlying unities. The aim of this study, therefore, is to investigate whether Puritanism can be better understood by using narrative and metanarrative, in which Puritans are assessed not only as individuals, but also as members of a religious society.

Finally, in terms of taxonomy, I use “Reformed,” “Reformed orthodox,” and “Puritan,” throughout this book. These terms are often overlapping among various thinkers, but are not identical categories that can be equally applied to all Puritans. For instance, there are numerous English Reformed thinkers who can be identified as “Puritan” but who did not disapprove of episcopacy (e.g. William Perkins), and there were those “Puritans” who were neither strictly Reformed nor orthodox (e.g. John Goodwin). Moreover, there were fairly numerous Anglican “Calvinists” following the Great Ejection in 1662 (e.g. John Edwards). While I will revisit this issue in Chapter 7, suffice it to say that I distinguish between mainline Puritanism, as represented by those who were both “Reformed” and “orthodox,” and those outside that consensus, but who nonetheless stood in relation to it,¹¹⁰ and were, in many cases, reacting to what was seen as a hyper-sensitivity to orthodox structures.¹¹¹ The question of how Puritans relate to a Reformed confessionality is a significant one, because, as said before, there was always a strong confessional impetus within Puritanism since its beginnings, and, as we will see, Puritanism was much more than a reform of morals and manners, and had to do with theological and religious identity, or, put another way, both *doctrine* and *discipline*. While these doctrines were contested, especially in how far one could go and still be considered “orthodox,” the far majority of Puritans agreed that there should be some sort of normative belief and practice, if, for no other reason, than to have an orderly society.¹¹²

1.2.1 Narrative and Metanarrative

Franklin H. Littell observed that in the periodization of history, “The Ocean of facts is infinite. Every writer reveals his presuppositions in several ways but never more clearly than by selecting certain persons to feature, certain reports to highlight, certain events to emphasize in telling the story.”¹¹³ This is equally true for studies in English Puritanism. The initial decision to examine one person to the exclusion of another, one facet of their thought or activities independent of another, or to address the evidence of one academic discipline rather than another invariably affects the outcome. To adequately approach history one must be cognizant of one’s own fallibility and must work with utmost fairness and care to relate things as they were and not merely as we think they may have been.

¹¹⁰ Thus Richard L. Greaves and Murray Tolmie challenge the contention that “radical” Puritans were as different from mainline Puritanism as vinegar is from wine. Greaves, *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Mercer: Macon University Press, 1983), 2-3; Tolmie, *The Triumph of the Saints: The Separate Churches of London, 1616-1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

¹¹¹ Thus John Milton defined heresy not as deviation from an objective standard, but as “a *subjective* attitude of blind submission to tradition rather than to scripture.” Coffey, “A Ticklish Business,” 130.

¹¹² There remains the question, of course, as to whether some of the more “radical” Puritans should be considered as “anarchists.” Cases could be made that the Ranters, Diggers, and other extremists envisioned a utopian society centered on “a primitivist Millennium in which private property, class distinctions and human authority would have no place.” Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*, rev. and exp. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 288.

¹¹³ Franklin H. Littell, “The Periodization of History,” in *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams*, ed. F. Forrester Church and Timothy George (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 18.

Further, as Fernand Braudel wrote, “All thought draws life from contacts and exchanges.”¹¹⁴ Thus, this present study attempts to take into account the proliferation of books and articles from various social and intellectual disciplines. Its limitations of scope have naturally been determined to the extent these studies have been utilized. Further, the lives of the Puritans here discussed span across the seventeenth-century religious scene.

I hypothesize that by looking at three diverse Puritans, who promoted vying streams within a normative orthodox tradition, that the concept of unity in diversity will play an integral role in understanding Puritanism. In order to test my hypothesis regarding unity in diversity, this book will assess the similarities and disparities of three Puritans who are broadly representative of specific aspects of what has been identified as Puritanism. By ascertaining what binds and unites them, it will surface common religious motifs of Puritan identity, thus placing its unities and diversities within their social and intellectual contexts. Due to size restraints, I have only chosen Downname, Rous, and Crisp as case studies. To further confirm this work’s thesis, consideration should be given to Richard Baxter, John Goodwin, John Pym, Peter Sterry, and others.¹¹⁵

The first of these three-divines, the “harshly anti-Catholic” John Downname (1571-1652)¹¹⁶ made himself a place in the history of the English Bible largely for having produced a succession of concordances. He considered the success of the English Reformation as a miracle, given the “weake instruments (a childe and a woman [i.e. Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth I])” that succeeded in defeating the “mightie Engines” of the papacy.¹¹⁷ As representative of the precisianist strain, his theology and spirituality will serve as a litmus test to assess whether Francis Rous and Tobias Crisp belonged to the normative tradition. A prolific author, Downname published nineteen treatises, most famous of which is his two-part, *The Christian Warfare* (1608-1611). Downname, like contemporary Reformed theologian, Richard Sibbes, was well known for his educated practical divinity; as such, he

¹¹⁴ Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century, Vol. 1: The Structures of Everyday Life: the Limits of the Possible* (1981; repr. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 401. Cited in Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*, 1.

¹¹⁵ Baxter’s importance derives from the fact that he was a leading Puritan minister and author of the “longest, most ambitious and influential guide,” *A Christian Directory* (1673) which sets forth the Puritan paradigm for social behavior, and that he was the spokesman for the “protestant ethic.” A nineteenth-century edition of Baxter’s “practical” works, edited by William Orme, swell to twenty-three volumes. Goodwin’s significance rests in that his intellectual milieu contributes to ongoing debates over the parameters of Puritanism and intellectual change in the seventeenth century. Lamont, “R. H. Tawney, ‘Who Did Not Write a Single Work Which Can Be Trusted?’” in *Historical Controversies and Historians*, ed. William Lamont (New York: Routledge, 1998), 114; Hill, *World Turned Upside Down*, 330; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, vii, 1-12, 291-97.

¹¹⁶ Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 177.

¹¹⁷ John Downname, *Annotations Upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament* (London, 1645), sig. B2; David S. Katz, *God’s Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 77.

was a popular theologian of experience.¹¹⁸ Downname's service as parliamentarian censor sheds further insight into the acceptable religious parameters of Stuart England.¹¹⁹

The second Puritan, pro-Scottish, anti-Arminian, anti-Catholic, parliamentarian, Sir Francis Rous (1580/81-1659), represents the mystical strain within Puritanism, even being styled "the first Puritan mystic."¹²⁰ Rous was renowned as a writer of godly prose that sought to unite English Reformed in a cosmic vision against the hordes of Antichrist and their various manifestations, which include vices and Catholic cultures. His vehement opposition to Arminianism (or, Anti-Calvinism) throughout the 1620s-30s, along with his stepbrother John Pym (reportedly the most powerful man in England),¹²¹ was closely connected to his fear of Catholicism.¹²² Rous was unique in early modern England because of his close ties to mainstream divines and his parleying with various late-medieval streams of mysticism, which would not have been as popularized (or accepted) without Rous.¹²³ Rous held close affectionate friendships with several powerful personas, including

¹¹⁸ John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 59-60. For Sibbes' spirituality in its historical context, see Mark E. Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000).

¹¹⁹ Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 344-345.

¹²⁰ Jerald C. Brauer, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic, 1579-1659: An Introduction to the Study of the Mystical Element in Puritanism" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1948); Brauer, "Types of Puritan Piety," 53-6. Brauer distinguishes between two types of mystics within Puritanism: "classical mystics" like Rous who were deeply entrenched in medievalism, and "Spirit mystics" like John Saltmarsh and William Dell who were at the most extreme ends of the "radical spectrum." See also Tom Schwanda, *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative-Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2012), 12-13. For a discussion of Rous's relation to Reformed orthodoxy, see John Barber, *The Road from Eden: Studies in Christianity and Culture* (Palo Alto: Academica Press, 2006), 330-332. For Rous's strong political and family connections, see Anne Duffin, *Faction and Faith: Politics and Religion of the Cornish Gentry Before the Civil War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996), 52.

¹²¹ As a testament of Pym's greatness, John S. Morrill remarks that Pym's funeral "was the grandest...ever given to a commoner in the early modern period, and if the procession did not match the formal splendors of the funeral arrangements for the 3rd early of Essex, his resting place within [Westminster] Abbey was the more striking." Morrill, "The Unweariability of Mr. Pym: Influence and Eloquence in the Long Parliament," in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 19. Cf. Vanessa Harding, *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1670* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 257.

¹²² Nicholas Tyacke places Rous at the center of English parliamentary debates on Arminianism. See Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1987). See also, L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 74; C. A. Patrides, "The Experience of Otherness: Theology as a Means of Life," in *The Age of Milton: Backgrounds to Seventeenth-Century Literature*, ed. C. A. Patrides and Raymond B. Waddington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), 189; Peter White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 308; Duffin, *Faction and Faith*, 42-43. For a portrayal of Arminius within the context of the medieval scholastic tradition, see Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991), 31-51.

¹²³ Johannes van den Berg writes, "More clearly than with many others, various seemingly disparate aspects of the Puritan movement [the extraverted and introverted] are reflected in [Rous] as we know him from his activities and his publications." Van den Berg, "The English Puritan Francis Rous and the Influence of His Works in the Netherlands," in *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents: Essays on Early Modern*

James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh, and Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector.¹²⁴ Though Rous typifies the pressing of early modern English religious bounds, he has recently been dubbed “a broadly tolerant puritan” for his ecumenicism.¹²⁵ Johannes van den Berg has further observed Rous’s influence in the Netherlands.¹²⁶ That Rous was a lay educator, provost, and politician, shows that Puritanism was not confined to conservative clergy but spread across social classes and boundaries.

The third Puritan, Tobias Crisp (1600-1642/3), a former Arminian from wealthy nobility and one of the few Puritans to earn a Doctor of Divinity degree, represents the antinomian strain within Puritanism, along with William Dell, Paul Hobson, John Eaton, and John Saltmarsh, though these latter “Puritans” were not “mainstream” or “Reformed orthodox.” Crisp was called “a controversial divine” and “the great champion of antinomianism” because many believed that he transgressed the bounds of the orthodox tradition.¹²⁷ Like Baxter, Crisp was revered for his godly conduct even though many Reformed theologians did not tolerate his theological deviancies from the precisianists. The tension in his life, between orthodoxy and orthopraxy, illustrates the complex interrelatedness of English Puritanism, and its complex formulations of such common Reformed motifs as law and gospel and testifies that there were many variants to common doctrinal themes.¹²⁸ Crisp’s unique place in early modern English religion is seen in the numerous subscriptions to the republication of his work in the 1690s. Twelve ministers, including John Howe, Vincent Alsop, Increase Mather, and Hanserd Knollys, signed a certificate, which was placed in the volume, stating that the work had “been faithfully transcribed from [Crisp’s] own notes.”¹²⁹ Richard Baxter, who despised Antinomism, responded to this republication and accused the ministers of “hanging up a sign to show where Jezebel dwelt.”¹³⁰ Seven of the twelve responded that they were attesting only to the work’s authenticity, not its content. The times were rife with accusations.¹³¹ When Crisp’s

Protestantism and the Protestant Enlightenment, ed. Jan de Bruijn, Pieter Holtrop, and Ernestine van der Wall (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 25.

¹²⁴ Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and the Politics of Early-Modern Ireland and England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 100; Patrick Little, ed., *Oliver Cromwell: New Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 33; Blair Worden, “Oliver Cromwell and the Council,” in *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, ed. Patrick Little (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 85.

¹²⁵ Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, 543.

¹²⁶ See Van den Berg, “The English Puritan Francis Rous,” 25-42. For a broader discussion of Rous’s relation to Jacob Boehme, see B. J. Gibbons, *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought: Behmenism and its Development in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 60-88.

¹²⁷ See the entry on Crisp in Stephen Jones, *A New Biographical Dictionary: Containing a Brief Account of the Lives and Writings of the Most Eminent Persons and Remarkable Characters in Every Age and Nation, Third Edition, Corrected* (London, 1799).

¹²⁸ Robert Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 30-33.

¹²⁹ Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 102.

¹³⁰ Cited in Peter Toon, *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity, 1689-1765* (London: The Olive Press, 1967), 49-50. More generally on Richard Baxter and antinomism, see Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001).

¹³¹ See Barry H. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: The Question of Orthodoxy Regarding the Theology of Hanserd Knollys, c. 1599-1691* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 79-132; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 183-332; and Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 33-137.

works were reissued in 1755 (and reprinted in 1791), John Gill, the editor, clearly anticipated a negative response to its publication, and insisted that Crisp's "life was innocent and harmless of all evil...zealous and fervent of all goodness."¹³² Yet, in 1773, Crisp's sermon "Free Grace the Teacher of Good Works" was reissued with the name *Doctor Crisp's Ghost; or, A Check Upon Checks, Being a Bridle for Antinomians and a Whip for Pelagian and Arminian-Methodists*. The issuance of this short sermon was to correct eighteenth-century Antinomian abuses as well as free-will religion. It is clear that whoever printed the pamphlet held Crisp's legacy to be free grace and pious religion, and innocent of actual doctrinal antinomism.¹³³

It is theorized that these three Puritans, when considered together, will give the terms "Puritan" and "Puritanism" more stability as they seem to elucidate the unities and diversities within Stuart Puritanism. Further, due to size-restrictions it will not be possible to add a fourth "representative" to the mix, Richard Baxter, who depicts both the "Protestant ethic" and the oft-blurred lines between seventeenth-century notions of religious orthodoxy and heterodoxy.¹³⁴ Nor do we have time to assess John Goodwin who is an interesting test case since he had close affinities with Puritanism and Reformed orthodoxy but who converted to Arminianism.¹³⁵ However, to offset possible deficits by only examining three Puritans, comparisons and contrasts with other Puritan thinkers of the era will be interspersed throughout. This will alleviate concerns that the three thinkers chosen are either too narrow or limited to resolve the greater question of unity in diversity. It should be reiterated that the three Puritans examined here appear to represent varieties within Puritanism's mainstream or normative expression, and are suggestive of a broader definition and confessional plasticity than has sometimes been allowed. Further, some recent studies of "Radical Puritanism" have also suggested a degree of *unitas* with the mainstream, and have challenged the period's heresiographies as consisting of overly-charged rhetoric that had as often political aims as it did a concern for the parishioner.¹³⁶

¹³² Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted: Being the Compleat Works of Tobias Crisp*, ed. John Gill (London: R. Noble, 1791), 1:lxvii. For a negative reading of Crisp, see Edward Wells, *An Help for the Right Understanding of the Several Divine Laws and Covenants* (London, 1729), 140.

¹³³ Tobias Crisp, *Doctor Crisp's Ghost; or, A Check Upon Checks, Being a Bridle for Antinomians and a Whip for Pelagian and Arminian-Methodists* (London, 1773), 2.

¹³⁴ See Tim Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 55-86; 137-68; Paul C. H. Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); William Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 41-54.

¹³⁵ For Goodwin's relation to mainstream Puritanism, see Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 131-67.

¹³⁶ Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith*, 197-213. The mainstream divine Jeremiah Burroughes, who favored toleration of dissidents and conciliation among the godly, criticized Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena* (1646) for its numerous factual errors and "abusive" nature. See Burroughes, *A Vindication of Mr. Burroughes, Against Mr. Edwards His Foule Apersions, in His Spreading Gangraena, and His Angry Antiapologia* (1646). For studies of *Gangraena* as a political artifice, see Ann Hughes, *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 318-415; and Hughes, "Print, Persecution, and Polemic: Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena* (1646) and Civil War Sectarianism," in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*, ed. Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 255-74.

Edwards's seeming skewed perspective on the radical sects of the English Revolution has moved some historians, such as J. C. Davis, to question its historical use: "Relying on Thomas Edwards for evidence

This book's overarching thesis is that Puritanism, as a construct and term, should not be abandoned in historical conversations; nor should one minimize the differences between Puritans and their various manifestations in the English-speaking world. It is hypothesized that narrative and metanarrative can help advance this proposition.¹³⁷ Bound by a common language and heritage, English Puritans (narrative) seemed to form a cohesive historical movement, the Puritan Reformation (metanarrative), that expressed itself in diverse ways, but which had as its goal a further Reformation of the religion and society to which they belonged. *American Puritanism* is distinct from its *British* counterpart in that it faced and adapted to new challenges in a wilderness frontier, but nonetheless is irrevocably tied to it culturally and theologically. This is seen not only in American Puritanism's British flavor, but also in cross-fertilizations between American-born and British Puritans ministering abroad.¹³⁸ Further, the *international* aspect of this cross-fertilization between Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, Ireland, and other European societies¹³⁹ shows the need of building a cohesive metanarrative in order to see a Puritan Reformation, not only in the way Puritans behaved outwardly, but as forming a certain style and expression that combined divinity with piety.¹⁴⁰

In *Prospero's America*, a recent examination of John Winthrop, Jr., one of America's most well-connected Puritans, Walter A. Woodward observed: "The larger Atlantic world connections of colonization are now transforming Puritan studies. Colonial historians are rediscovering, although in new ways, something that Perry Miller noted more than two generations ago: New England's Puritans were continuing participants in a complex culture whose intellectual roots extended throughout Protestant Europe."¹⁴¹ As John Donne, dean of Saint Paul's, once put it, "No man is an island, entire of itself; every

of the reality of sectarian development in his time, is like relying on Horatio Bottomley or Joseph McCarthy for sound, objective depictions of the social and political realities of their day." Davis, *Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 126. Before Davis, Christopher Hill opined that *Gangraena* had historical value and "that what was needed was a critical edition to test Edwards's accounts." Hill, "Irreligion in the 'Puritan' Revolution," in *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*, ed. J. F. McGregor and Barry Reay (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 206. Both sources are cited in Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), 137.

¹³⁷ It should be noted that all modern definitions are constructs because they take "Puritan" and "Puritanism" beyond its original negative application. Narrative and Metanarrative are also constructs but have the advantage of identifying doctrinal foci uniting major writers who have consistently been identified as "Puritan."

¹³⁸ See Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, 17-40.

¹³⁹ For recent studies on international Calvinism, see Alastair Duke, "Perspectives on International Calvinism," in *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620*, ed. Andrew Pettegree, Alastair Duke, and Gillian Lewis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1-20; Graeme Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier, 1600-1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1-9; and Murdock, *Beyond Calvin: The Intellectual, Political, and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches, c.1540-1620* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 1-5, 118-24.

¹⁴⁰ This is not to deny the significance of seeing a "Reformation of morals and manners," nor to belittle its usefulness in assessing Puritans. Rather, that since Puritanism has often been portrayed merely by its piety, to suggest that in addition to social and pietistic concerns that the question of theological *unitas* should have some scholarly attention.

¹⁴¹ Walter W. Woodward, *Prospero's America: John Winthrop, Jr., Alchemy, and the Creation of New England Culture, 1606-1676* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 1.

man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main...The *Church* is *Catholike, universall*, so are all her *Actions*; All that she does, belongs to *all*;¹⁴² and so, no manifestation of Puritanism is truly independent, having borrowed its view on biblical authority, vocabulary, culture, ideology, theology, social norms, from not only a common “normative” heritage, but from a broad and robust interaction between the saints across time and continents. Thus, I hypothesize that there is a coherent theological tradition within Puritanism that crosses its vying strains, is expressed in its “family resemblances,” and binds Puritans together within their diversity.

As Reformed orthodoxy must be regarded as a rather diverse phenomenon within identifiable but flexible confessional boundaries, it is postulated that operating within Puritanism is a tradition centered around certain theological themes or topics, which bound Puritans of various emphases together.

In short, the method proposed in this book is identifying theological foci within Stuart Puritanism, as seen through the eyes of Downname, Rous, and Crisp. Since I have, due to size restraints, focused chiefly on theological identity, more work will need to be done on social and cultural material. Indeed, it is difficult to assess how social issues may have impacted or altered theological concerns, but the connection seems inevitable, and raises questions of the interplay between *dogma* and *praxis*. What appears to be distinctive in these authors, however, is this very thing; that is, in the precise way in which doctrine and practice are interwoven. This *praxis pietatis* is suggestive of a certain “ethos” within Puritanism, and will be looked at more fully in Chapter 7.

1.2.2 Structure

The structure is as follows: Chapter 2 presents an overview of seventeenth-century background, presents a synopsis of the major political epochs in which Puritanism first arose, flourished, and declined, and introduces four strains in Puritanism: precisianism, mysticism, antinomism, and neonomianism.

Part I (Chapters 3-5) introduces the three representative Puritans—their life, theology, culture, major works, and influence, followed by Part II (Chapters 6-8), which investigates the *unitas in diversitate* and metanarrative question, and then concludes the work.

In Chapter 3, John Downname will be introduced as a progeny of precisianist Puritanism. His chief works of edited theology and piety, *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (c.1620), *A Guide to Godlynesse* (1622), and the giant and peerless summa of English affectionate divinity, the four-part *Christian Warfare* (1604-1618), will be presented and discussed. Due consideration will also be given to the influence Downname’s corpus (nineteen treatises, including biblical concordances, and collections of sermons) had on codifying the Puritan practical divinity within the early seventeenth century. Downname’s role as public censor and editor of James Ussher’s *A Body of Divinity* (1648) will also be examined.

¹⁴² John Donne, *The Works of John Donne, D.D., Dean of Saint Paul’s 1621-1641* (London: John W. Parker, 1839), 3:575.

Chapter 4 will introduce Sir Francis Rous, one of the longest standing members of Parliament and the “first Puritan mystic.” His major work *The Mystical Marriage* (1635) illustrates the mystical union of all souls with Christ, and reflects the atmosphere of mid-century mystical piety, and more radical notions of the believer’s subjective experience of the divine.

Chapter 5 will place Tobias Crisp among the many mid-seventeenth-century antinomian controversies. He was known as a leading antinomian among his contemporaries and yet equally revered as a godly saint. Perry Miller states that though Crisp began his ministry “as an orthodox federalist...he came to the conclusion, as did Anne Hutchinson, that the Covenant of Grace had nothing to do with moral behavior, and that therefore no ethical duty could be imposed upon or any response expected from mankind;” and thus, “in New England eyes, Crisp figured as an arrant Antinomian.”¹⁴³ However, it is suggested that Crisp is not strictly antinomian in a “rigid” sense. Within the seventeenth century, he is counted among orthodox Puritans, and had wide influence into the eighteenth century.¹⁴⁴ While other prominent English antinomians shared some of Crisp’s beliefs, none were as revered or defended by the precisianists as Crisp. This vindication, though contested in the 1640s and again in the 1690s, is suggestive of a distinct antinomian strain within the mainstream normative tradition.

Part II will consider the unities and diversities among these three Puritans. Chapter 6 will coalesce the three prior chapters and discuss unity in diversity. It will compare and contrast identifiable theological foci within their writings, and assess possible ways in which this continuity exists. Chapter 7 will attempt to define Puritanism, and investigate more fully my hypothesis regarding narrative and metanarrative as useful, even necessary, constructs in understanding Puritanism. I will briefly look at how Puritans might better be identified, using John Goodwin, John Milton, Lodowick Muggleton, Gerrard Winstanley, and others as grounds for exploration. Chapter 8 will summarize the book’s contents and conclude the work.

1.3 Summary

Since the sixteenth century, there have been widely diversified beliefs about the Puritans, and common mis-caricatures and satires that have made jest of the seriousness with which they viewed the godly life. Though the study of English Puritanism has gained serious academic credence within the past sixty-five years, there have been few significant advances or consensus in how Puritanism should be defined and understood. This lacuna within the literature is due to historical preference for neat and easy classifications, often based on single defining themes, which can be applied across the spectrum of belief and practice. However, this preference for easy taxonomy does not coincide with the massive

¹⁴³ Miller, *New England Mind: From Colony to Province*, 219. See also the entry on Tobias Crisp in *A Biographical History of England, from Egbert the Great to the Revolution*, ed. James Granger, 2nd ed. (London: T. Davies, et al, 1775), 2:179-80.

¹⁴⁴ Notable among Crisp’s critics were Richard Baxter and Robert Traill. See Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 83-84; and Richard L. Greaves, *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985), 95-96.

body of evidence on the subject, or, for that matter, with the complex nature of human beings who interact and interrelate within a society. As such, there is a need for revisiting this “thorny problem” of English Puritan religious identity to assess whether *unitas* or *diversitas* are appropriate concepts to employ when referring to Puritans, and whether these concepts can, in the end, help illuminate the very meaning and definition of Puritanism. Further, it is suggested that narrative and metanarrative concepts further attenuate the definitions problem by seeing English Puritans not only in their own contexts, but as part of a greater reform movement, which can be called the Puritan Reformation, a distinct attitude and cluster of attitudes and priorities that sought to advance their vision for the Christian life, both on a personal and a more national level.

Therefore, it is proposed that current winds within the literature towards deconstruction or irreducible pluralisms result in an insufficient rendering of Puritanism, and leads to useless terminology. As such, the subject of English Puritan theological identity, especially as it relates to a Reformed confessionality, is an important one because it attests to a *sensus unitatis* within the movement, which is seen not only in its overall theological harmony, but also in its affinity and longing for its past.

This work is an attempt, however limited, to incorporate insights from both social and intellectual historians, to come up with a more holistic approach to the subject, and to pave the way for a revision of revisionism. It does not suggest that Puritans were coined from the same stamp, in which case there would be no *diversitas*, but that the stamps were made, and originated, from the same or similar metals, and which relates to a Reformed confessionality.

Finally, this work is based, for the most part, on printed sources. The inaccessibility, and paucity, of archives pertaining to Downname, Rous, and Crisp have limited extensive archival research.

Chapter 2

Seventeenth-Century Background

2.1 Introduction

The seventeenth century was a time of dramatic change for British society. Political and religious upheavals effectively “turned the world upside down,” as Christopher Hill once put it.¹ In fact, Hill considers the time between 1603 and 1714 “perhaps the most decisive in English history;” it a time when all the major political, cultural, and religious forces served as a catalyst for an explosive combination which resulted in massive political and social change.² Politics changed from rule by King to rule by Parliament—and even after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660, Parliament still maintained unprecedented power; acts of conformity and suppression of dissident voices by the Church of England were replaced with a near-total collapse of censorship and toleration for dissenting voices; worldviews changed from belief in the supernatural to belief in science; philosophy moved from being a handmaiden to theology to its own *au courant*; economics went from being governed to more “*laissez-faire*,” culture changed from a more hierarchical ordering to a more democratized one; literature moved from the more flamboyant style of Richard Hooker to the more plain style of such wits as John Bunyan and Daniel Defoe. This century also produced the first great English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, whose ideas and *Leviathan* (1651) are still influential today, and all this upheaval thrived within an apocalyptic or millenarian atmosphere.³

Of these changes, the most important for this study involve political and religious developments. Further, the seventeenth century, as any other century, did not exist in a vacuum; the major political movements and religious controversies were deeply rooted in the earlier English and Continental Reformations. We will thus give a brief survey of the political, religious, and theological events of the sixteenth century which pertain to

¹ See Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (New York: Penguin, 1975). For more on the history of this period, see Jenny Wormald, ed., *The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Christopher Hill, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, Volume 2: Religion and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986); J. S. Morrill, *Seventeenth-Century Britain, 1603-1714* (Connecticut: The Archon Press, 1980); S. R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603-1642*, 10 vols. (London: Longman, Greens, and Co., 1883-84).

² Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1982), 1.

³ Barry H. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: The Question of Orthodoxy Regarding Hanswerd Knollys, c. 1599-1691* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 17; Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 89-159, 186-219; Jeffrey K. Jue, *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (New York: Springer, 2006), 1-6, 141-174; and Austin Woolrych, *England without a King, 1649-1660* (New York: Routledge, 1983), 16. Cf. S. A. Lloyd, ed., *Hobbes Today: Insights for the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Puritanism and which serve as a precursor to the later events of the seventeenth century, as well as of the relevant events of the seventeenth century which John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp would have been familiar with. We will also introduce the major religious currents dealt with in their works (precisianism, mysticism, and antinomism). This survey will be divided into six distinct time periods: the Early English Reformation (1534-53); Marian England (1553-58); the Elizabethan period (1558-1603); the Early Stuart period (1603-42); the English Revolution (1640-60); and the later Stuart Restoration (1660-88).

2.2 The Political, Religious, Social, and Theological Contexts

While the timeline for the seventeenth century – the “short seventeenth century” (1603-89) – is firmly established, the century remains historically and historiographically a mess.⁴ Even after nearly a century of solid scholarship, questions still linger as to the precise nature of radical religion during this period, its inner cohesiveness, orthodoxies and heresies, and the relationship between the English Reformation and other Continental Reformations.⁵ Radical religion arose chiefly as an alternative to established mores and often as perceived correctives to conventional wisdom, as is the case with both first-wave and second-wave Antinomism.⁶ The complex interworking of politics and religion during the English Revolution shows how fractured established religion had become by the mid-1650s. In many ways the Protestantism of the mid-seventeenth century, as with that of the sixteenth century, “was a novel, defiant and infectious phenomenon,” one that allured those of religious sensitivity and captivated even the higher classes and thus produced a wide spectrum of revolutionary Puritans.⁷ That such radical writers as John Saltmarsh, William Dell, and William Erbery could not only be tolerated but also flourished further reveals the laxity of Cromwell’s government towards radical thought. There was an established network of godly correspondence and theological dissemination; students of established schools, such as Oxford or

⁴ Jenny Wormald, *The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 1. On current issues in the philosophy of history and historiography, see Aviezer Tucker, ed., *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).

⁵ Recent trends are shifting towards a more holistic approach to the English Reformation. In September 2007, essays were presented for the British Academy symposium, “The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain and Ireland.” Published as Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, eds., *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010). The stated goal of the essays is to “break through the lingering insularity of British reformation studies” and explore various ways in which Britain and the Continent interacted during the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Reformations.

⁶ Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 123, 183-210; Andrew Bradstock, *Radical Religion in Cromwell’s England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2011), xviii-xix.

⁷ Alexandra Walsham, “Afterword,” in *Pieties in Transition: Religious Practices and Experiences, c. 1400-1640*, edited by Robert Lutton and Elisabeth Salter (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 181. For instance, Oliver Cromwell’s daughter was said to have joined the Seekers by the preaching of the radical William Erbery. See Richard L. Greaves, *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985), 1-8.

Cambridge—and in particular Christ’s Church and Emmanuel College, Cambridge—fostered tutor-student relationships, which forged strong bonds that would follow individuals throughout their life and career.⁸ These bonds helped to curve (but in some cases foster) religious heterodoxy; it has been noted, for instance, that by 1660 Christ’s Church, Cambridge, once the citadel of Puritan dons, had become the center stage of Cambridge Platonism and by century’s end had given way to the new philosophy.⁹ Regardless how one perceives the seventeenth century, its political or religious contexts, the massive academic attention on the religious experience and piety of this world is the “result of a thriving scholarly industry that shows little sign of declining in vitality or losing momentum or steam.”¹⁰ This book will thus shed light on the great diversity as well as solidarity of Puritanism.

2.2.1 *The Early English Reformation (1534-53)*

While Elizabeth I (1558-1603) is often credited with being the monarch most closely associated with the rise of English Puritanism, more recent historians have traced its origins to the early English Reformation and the disputes between Henry VIII and his religious program with the more conservative evangelicals.¹¹ Some historians see this early reformist wing within the English church to represent the earliest threads of Puritanism.¹² Accepted historical wisdom has traditionally held that the last decade of Henry VIII’s reign

⁸ See Ole Peter Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610-1692* (Lebanon: Northeastern University Press, 1993), 17-40; and Sarah Bendall, Christopher Brooke, and Patrick Collinson, *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999), 177-226; see also, for example, the lasting impact of George Gifford’s Christ’s College, Cambridge, education in Timothy Scott McGinnis, *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort: Puritan Priorities in Elizabethan Religious Life* (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2004), 26-29. For a detailed analysis of Latitudinarianism in the seventeenth-century see Lila Freedman, ed., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden: Brill, 1992). In 1594 Trinity College Dublin was founded and modeled on Emmanuel College, Cambridge, with a particular “puritan” ethos. See John McCafferty, *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633-1641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 61.

⁹ Arthur Quinn, *The Confidence of British Philosophers: An Essay in Historical Narrative* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 11; G. R. Evans, *The University of Cambridge: A New History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010), 185-254. For Cambridge Platonist ideas, see C. A. Patrides, *The Cambridge Platonists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), and Charles Taliaferro and Alison J. Tepy, eds., *Cambridge Platonist Spirituality* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2004), 5-54.

¹⁰ Walsham, “Afterword,” 181.

¹¹ D. G. Newcombe, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 52-75. For early English evangelical identities, see Peter Marshall, *Religious Identities in Henry VIII’s England* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 19-102. There seems to be some confusion as to how to refer to evangelicals in the early English Reformation. Strictly speaking, “conservatives” would refer to those wishing to retain the older order of strict Roman Catholicism (from *conservare*, “to save”). However, current convention seems to dictate a newer definition of religiously Protestant evangelicals. In keeping with current academic usage, I have followed the latter usage.

¹² Thus Karl Gunther, “The Intellectual Origins of English Puritanism, ca. 1525-1572” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2007), 9-30; Gunther, “The Origins of English Puritanism,” *History Compass* 4/2 (2006), 235-40.

was the most conducive to the budding conservative evangelical cause, so much so that by the time Edward VI succeeded his father as King in 1547 the evangelical movement pervaded the whole of English society.¹³ A. G. Dickens, one of the most revered historians of the English Reformation, proposed this thesis in his 1964 book *The English Reformation*; since the 1960s, however, more recent scholarship has disputed this claim.¹⁴ Christopher Haigh, for instance, responded to Dickens in his “Introduction” and “The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation” in his edited work *The English Reformation Revised*, and argued, among other things, that the early English Reformation was more of a disaster or an unpredictable and deeply-contested process than an actual success, one with chiefly political motivations and little success among parishioners.¹⁵ J. J. Scarisbrick, Eamon Duffy, and Alec Ryrie followed suit.¹⁶ But, as Tyacke argues, “The concept of a Reformation from below, which we are asked to reject, is something of a revisionist straw man.”¹⁷ Scarisbrick, Duffy, and Ryrie, have all pointed out that there were pockets resistant to the Reformation, and in some cases outright hostility. But their revisionism does not explain why, if there was such a massive cultural and social resistance, that there was not a “lay” revolution, or why those who tried to garner support for such a revolution, as those who were involved in the Gun Powder Plot of 1605, failed in their attempts to authenticate a national-recusant English Catholicism.¹⁸

¹³ Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals and the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 7.

¹⁴ A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1964). Cf. Dickens, *Reformation Studies* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1982).

¹⁵ Christopher Haigh, “Introduction” and “The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation,” in *The English Reformation Revised*, ed. Christopher Haigh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1-18, 19-33.

¹⁶ See J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984); Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 1-8; 377-523; Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, eds., *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1-13; Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII*, 5-12.

¹⁷ Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 39. I concur with Tyacke that at the popular level the English Reformation was largely a success, and though Haigh and Duffy have continued to present compelling evidence in support of their claims, they have not adequately accounted for the strong English disdain for “popery,” which was much more than a clerical or political ideology. Cf. and cp. Peter Marshall, *The Catholic Priesthood and the English Reformation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Marshall, *The Impact of the English Reformation, 1500-1640* (London: Hodder Arnold, 1997). Cf. Ian Hazlett, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (London: T&T Clark,), 29-36.

¹⁸ I agree with Michael Questier’s statement that, “Movement between the Churches [of Rome or Reformation] cannot be understood just as the function of an academic debate.” Indeed, there were a lot more factors involved in who converted to the Reformation (or vice-versa) than simply who had the better argument. There was a convergence of multifarious interests, such as political preferment, family and social pressures, and the very real, but subjective, experience of “conversion.” Michael C. Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 41. Cp. Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993), who sees the presence of a strong Catholic recusancy, especially among English women, which she believes questions the idea of a “Protestant” England. But contrast this with Diarmaid MacCulloch, “The Impact of the English Reformation,” *Historical Journal* 38 (1995); 15; MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 105-119.

This revisionism further suffers in that it cannot account for how the English Reformation came to be a “howling success” in making England into a Protestant nation.¹⁹ That the England of the Stuarts (1603-1707) was thoroughly Protestantized is evident in the popularity of Protestant print in the seventeenth century and especially the burgeoning of an anti-popery genre. This fact alone brings into question some of the revisionist rendering of early English evangelical history. What is essential for the purposes of our study, however, is the evangelical dissent from the *status quo* of Henrican reform, or, put another way, the strict conservatism of such early English evangelicals as Nicholas Partridge, a man with strong connections on the Continent.²⁰ The man perhaps most important in the advance and progress of English reform, especially towards more conservatism, was Thomas Cranmer, whose Continental allies have been well noted.²¹ The major feats of the early English Reformation were greater than just turning the English tides away from Rome and towards Zurich or Geneva. Their greatest endeavor, perhaps, was in establishing a system of networking and communication with the reformers on the Continent and making great strides in pastoring the English toward more Protestant virtues.²² Another neglected but important aspect of the success of English Protestantism, even as early as the 1520s, was the entrance of Lutheranism into England. Henry VIII’s bishops, devout followers of Rome, mimicked Roman Catholic practices across Europe in 1521 and publicly burned Luther’s works in Oxford, Cambridge, and at St. Paul’s Cross, London, all places that would later become bastions of Reformed theology. Yet, even amid flaming rhetorical attacks by the clergy towards Luther’s theology, Luther’s Latin works and Tyndale’s English New Testament, among other Protestant tracts, continued to be smuggled into the country by foreign and English traders.²³ In fact, David Daniell questions the claims of revisionism based chiefly on the popularity of Tyndale’s New Testament.²⁴

While tracing the origins of Puritanism to the early English Reformation continues to bear fruit, some historians have entertained the possibility of finding embryonic Puritanism in the English Lollardy of the early fifteenth century: David Zaret, for instance, notes that “Lollardy had anticipated many crucial doctrinal tenets of Puritanism, and

¹⁹ Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, “Introduction: Protestantisms and Their Beginnings,” in *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 3; Diarmaid MacCulloch, “The Impact of the English Reformation,” *Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 152; Jeremy Gregory, “The Making of a Protestant Nation: ‘Success’ and ‘Failure’ in England’s Long Reformation,” in *England’s Long Reformation, 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), 307.

²⁰ Partridge, for instance, kept up correspondence with Heinrich Bullinger, the chief minister of Zurich and Europe’s most energetic Protestant networker. Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII*, 21.

²¹ See Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 351-516.

²² See Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 37-60.

²³ Susan Doran and Christopher Durston, *Princes, Pastors and People: The Church and Religion in England, 1500-1700*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2003), 115-16.

²⁴ David Daniell, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 123-25.

much of its lay initiative;²⁵ Patrick Collinson calls Lollardy a “tributary stream of English Protestant development;”²⁶ Christopher Hill credits Lollardy with making Puritanism “a Trojan horse with a bellyful of sects;”²⁷ Stephen Foster believes that the Lollards deserve a place in the prehistory of Puritanism because of their persistence and popularity for generations after authoritative suppression and for the simple fact that most former southeast English Lollard centers became Puritan strongholds;²⁸ and Amanda Porterfield traces female Puritan spirituality to that of Lollardy.²⁹ Whatever merits there are in probing Lollardy as a prehistory to Puritanism, and so to date the beginnings of Puritanism to the fourteenth century, historians have generally mentioned this possibility only in passing and no systematic comparison has been published to date.³⁰ My own sense is that Lollardy can be a prehistory to Puritanism in the sense that it drew on the early English Reformation, which in itself owes a profound debt to the Lollards.³¹ Christopher Marsh, however, in his “pioneering study” *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630* (1994), saw no ties to Lollardy; thus, while Lollardy can be traced throughout English Protestant history, one needs to be cautious.³²

²⁵ David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), 47; Patrick Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft* (New York: Continuum Publishing Group, 2006), 133-35.

²⁶ See Patrick Collinson, “Night Schools, Conventicles and Churches: Continuities and Discontinuities in Early Protestant Ecclesiology,” in *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, ed. Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 9, 209-35.

²⁷ Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft*, 132; Hill, *Religion and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*, 89-116.

²⁸ Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 7; see also Durston and Doran, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, 112-15.

²⁹ Amanda Porterfield, *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 33-35. Cf. Johanna Harris and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, eds., *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558-1680* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

³⁰ While Lollardy in relation to Puritanism is still under-explored, the study of Lollardy itself has been an active and productive academic industry. See, for instance, Richard Rex, *The Lollards* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens, and Derrick G. Pitard, eds., *Lollards and Their Influence in late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003); and Anne Hudson, *Lollards and Their Books* (London: Bloomsbury, 2003); Robert Lutton, *Lollardy and Orthodox Religion in Pre-Reformation England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006); and J. Patrick Hornbeck II’s excellent analysis of Lollard theological motifs in *What Is A Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

³¹ Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (New York: Continuum Publishing Group, 1984), 219-20. Aston here comments on the influence of Lollardy in the English Reformation by stating that the Lollards “careers and achievements [were] commemorated and immortalized in that great valhalla of the English Reformation [i.e. Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*],” thus suggesting, perhaps, that Lollardy had more rhetorical if not overtly intellectual influences.

³² David R. Como, “The Kingdom of Christ, the Kingdom of England, and the Kingdom of Traske: John Traske and the Persistence of Radical Puritanism in Early Stuart England,” in *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England*, ed. Muriel C. McClendon, Joseph P. Ward, and Michael MacDonald (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 64; Christopher W. Marsh, *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 29-31. On the question of Lollardy influence on the Early English Reformation and especially on Tyndale, see Donald D. Smeaton, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale* (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 1986), 75-7, 251-5; and Carl R. Trueman, *Luther’s Legacy: Salvation and the English Reformers, 1525-1556* (New

When Henry VIII died on January 28, 1547, the throne fell to the then nine-year-old boy-king Edward VI.³³ The new king was too young to rule on his own and as his father had appointed advisors to the boy, the future of English politics and religion lay chiefly in their counsels. Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset, one of Edward's chief counselors, guardian and lord protector was a zealous Protestant and promoted such clergy as Hugh Latimer, Bishop John Hooper, and Nicholas Ridley. He worked with Thomas Cranmer, bishop of Canterbury, reader in Jesus College and a Doctor of Divinity, to move England beyond the Henrican "half-Reformation." Cranmer made significant progress during Edward's reign to advance the Reformation. He wrote the first two editions of the Book of Common Prayer and developed doctrinal clarity in the Eucharist, clerical celibacy, the role of images in public worship, and the veneration of saints. Along with John Dudley, William Parr, William Padget, Nicholas Ridley, and Thomas Goodrich, among others, the early evangelical movement was more solidified and its proponents were determined to banish the English world of Catholic devotion.³⁴

During Edward's reign there was more freedom for the expression of Reformed ideas and confluence with the Reformed religion of the continent. Cranmer not only embraced many of the latest ideas coming out of Germany and Switzerland, evident in his theology of the Eucharist, but also invited many of the reformers to visit England, such as Peter Martyr Vermigli and Martin Bucer, in order to realize his dream of domesticating continental Reformed religion and appropriating "Luther's legacy."³⁵

During Edward VI's final illness in 1553, Edward's advisors feared for the fragile state of the English Reformation and sought to secure a Protestant heir. Their efforts were cut short, however, when Henry VIII's devout Catholic daughter, Mary, was recognized as the only legitimate successor. Thus, the English Reformation that began under Henry VIII and flourished under Edward VI would soon suffer from some of the most notorious religious persecutions in modern memory. Ironically, however, the religion, which Mary sought to eradicate, would only grow.

York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 41-2. Trueman cautions against Smeaton's assertion that Tyndale was influenced by Lollardy by noting that Smeaton's arguments are based on similarities rather than documented connections.

³³ For definitive biographies of Edward VI and the progress of Protestantism during his reign, see Jennifer Loach, *Edward VI* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). Both Loach and MacCulloch challenge the common belief that Edward VI was a sickly king; rather, they present compelling evidence that the boy-king was robust in health and only succumbed to illness in his last few weeks.

³⁴ MacCulloch, *The Boy King*, 8; Ian Hazlett, "Calvin and the British Isles," in *The Calvin Handbook*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 118-25; John A. Taylor, *British Monarchy, English Church Establishment, and Civil Liberty* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996), 68-9.

³⁵ Thus Carl R. Trueman writes, "While England never produced an organized Lutheran movement of any significance, it is simply impossible to understand the nature of English Reformation thought without reference to the theology of Martin Luther." Trueman, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and the English Reformers, 1525-1556* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 54. Cf. Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, eds., *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

2.2.2 Marian England (1553-58)

Mary was proclaimed Queen of England in London on July 19, 1553, and in most of the north by St. Mary Magdalene's Day, July 22, 1553. As soon as it was clear that Catholicism would be restored some communities moved toward Counter-Reformation. Two of Mary I's first acts as queen was to re-legitimize Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order to undo the annulment which could provide legal grounds for opposition to her reign, and to rescind Edward VI's "Protestant" reforms. Mary further began to banish Protestants and burn them at the stake which earned her the epithet "Bloody Mary," and which were immortalized in John Foxe's "valhalla." It is estimated that almost 800 Protestants were exiled and emigrated to the continent.³⁶ Those who remained went into hiding or were executed in often-sensational displays of royal supremacy. Thomas Cranmer, as we saw before, an early pioneer of the English Reformation, was charged with heresy, tried, and executed on March 21, 1566, the scene of which was preserved in John Day's 1563 edition of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*.³⁷ In addition to exiling close to 1,000 Protestants, Mary ordered English-language Bibles removed from the churches and outlawed the works of English Bible translators.³⁸ Hundreds of Protestants were burned alive at London's famed execution site at Smithfield, including Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley six months before Cranmer.³⁹

There have been 472 exiles that have been identified by name: 116 were gentry; 67 were clergy; 119 were theological students; and 40 were merchants. Noted among them were Sir Francis Knollys, Sir Francis Walsingham, Edmund Grindal, Edwin Sandys, Thomas Young, Lawrence Humphrey, and "leader of the Elizabethan Puritan classical

³⁶ Andrew Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996), 3-4; Dale Walden Johnson, "Marginal at Best: John Knox's Contribution to the Geneva Bible, 1560," in *Adaptations of Calvinism in Reformation Europe: Essays in Honor of Brian G. Armstrong*, ed. Mack P. Holt (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 242; Leo F. Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 63-66.

³⁷ John N. King, ed. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs: Select Narratives* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 182-97. Cranmer had recanted of his Protestantism two times but the day of his execution "recanted his recantations" and was said to have plunged his "offending" hand into the flames first. MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 603; Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft*, 23-4. For John Foxe, the quintessential English Reformation chronicler, see D. M. Loades, *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1997); D. M. Loades, ed., *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), xii-xx; and V. Norskov Olsen, *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

³⁸ Dorothy Auchter, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001), 248. The foundational study on the Marian exiles is Christina Hallowell Garrett's *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (1938; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). For more recent discussion of Protestantism during the reign of Mary I, see Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism*, 1-7, 86-117, 129-50. For a more recent study that examines the impact of exile on English Puritanism, see Dan G. Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1555-1560* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999).

³⁹ Janette Dillon, *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 133; George Fisher, *The Reformation* (New York: Scribner & Armstrong, 1873), 324; *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. Frank Leslie Cross (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 752-53; 1051.

movement, Thomas Wood.”⁴⁰ Leo F. Solt writes, “The Marian exiles emigrated to those Calvinist and Zwinglian centers in western Germany and Switzerland controlled by Reformed Church leaders. Bullinger was at Zurich; Calvin was at Geneva; martyr was at Strassburg; Poullain was at Frankfort; and some of a Lasco’s London congregation were at Emden.”⁴¹ Whereas England had once been home for the Protestant exiles from France and Holland, it was now among persecuted lands for disbanded Protestants. Consequently, these English reformers were welcomed into the major Reformed centers within Europe, such as Geneva, Switzerland, which became an “incubator” for the Reformed theology which later flourished during the Elizabethan Settlement, and is attested in the popularity of the Geneva Bible with its copious annotations which incidentally criticized the “divine right” of monarchs.⁴²

In his 2000 monograph *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, Dan G. Danner argues that most of the English in Geneva from 1555-1560 had already solidified their theology indigenously and only borrowed Genevan polity and ecclesiology. Danner goes so far as to suggest that these early English Puritans were not Calvinists *per se* and only a later generation of Puritans would enthrone Calvin within English Protestantism.⁴³ While Danner’s thesis should be assessed sympathetically, being the first major attempt to disentangle the theology of the exiled English in Geneva, there are noticeable gaps in his argumentation and his theological analysis. For instance, as Michael Stephen Springer has pointed out, the life work of John a Lasco, who spent time both in England and in exile and who exerted a profound influence over London Protestantism and the Marian exiles, is absent.⁴⁴ It is perhaps better to designate the exiles as “Reformed” over “Calvinist.”⁴⁵ Further, Bucer and Vermigli had spent prolonged periods in England and Bullinger’s *Decades* had been in use by the English Reformed since the time of Edward VI. Calvin was known to have corresponded with the English-Protestant communities at Frankfurt am Main, and the more “progressive community” of John Knox were desirous to know whether they were to have “an English Church or Christ’s Church?”⁴⁶ However significant Calvin’s direct influence on English theology may have been, it is certain that the

⁴⁰ Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England*, 63. Solt mistakenly counts the named-exiles to 427. Cf. Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, 32, 41. On the Cambridge exiles in particular, see H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 74-100.

⁴¹ Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England*, 63

⁴² Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England*, 63-4; Avihu Zakai, *Exile and Kingdom: History and the Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 38; Crawford Gribben, “Introduction,” in *Literature and the Scottish Reformation*, ed. Crawford Gribben and David George Mullan (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 12.

⁴³ Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*.

⁴⁴ Michael S. Springer, *Restoring Christ’s Church: John a Lasco and the Forma Ac Ratio* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 132.

⁴⁵ Dirk W. Rodgers, *John a Lasco in England* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994). Though Polish, a Lasco not only ministered at an English church in London but he also influenced the Reformed churches in the Netherlands. Guido de Bres attended Lasco’s London church in the 1550s.

⁴⁶ Hazlett, “Calvin and the British Isles,” 122; Diarmaid MacCulloch, “The Latitude of the Church of England,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 53-59.

Continental Reformation had a lasting impact on its course and development.⁴⁷ Further, it is impossible to fully discern what impact Calvin's Academy in Geneva had on British religion and society.⁴⁸

In sum, while in Geneva the English reformers were exposed to Calvin's teachings and that of other continental reformers. What Mary I had attempted to debar had the opposite effect. Seventeenth-century English Reformed theology and its Protestant scholasticism can be credited to some extent to the greater networking of Reformed thinkers came about during English Reformed exile in Geneva. Mary had thus solidified the religion she so much despised.⁴⁹ Or, as Solt put it, "It is an ironic twist that the English sovereign who achieved the reputation of being the greatest enemy to Protestantism should have inadvertently caused Englishmen to carry out religious experiments in continental laboratories that would inspire succeeding Puritan generations."⁵⁰

When Queen Mary died in 1558, her half-sister, Elizabeth, succeeded her and restored Protestantism in England. Through the so-called Elizabethan Settlement, Elizabeth I paved the way for the rise of English Puritanism and religious dissent.

2.2.3 *The Elizabethan Period (1558-1603)*

Soon after Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, the Marian exiles were allowed to return. Those involved in the earlier reforms under Edward VI had hopes of continuing their evangelical cause. Though Elizabeth appointed some of the exiles to positions of influence such as that of bishop, many felt that her Acts of Uniformity (1559-1562), which sought to unify English Protestantism, left the English church only "half-reformed;" further, for many, the Acts were believed to be a compromise between the more moderate Protestants and the still strong Roman Catholic liturgy in a *via media* or "middle way."⁵¹ Initially, the first Puritans were to find nothing more intolerable than the demand to array themselves in garments to which they objected on grounds of conscience. As time went on, however, Puritan preachers who had not been found guilty of any specific offence were nevertheless being convicted and ejected from their pulpits on rather vague charges under the Act of

⁴⁷ Ian P. Hazlett, "Calvin and the British Isles," in *The Calvin Handbook*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 122-23.

⁴⁸ Karin Maag, *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560-1620* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1995), 30.

⁴⁹ For an alternative and more sympathetic assessment of Mary Tudor's religious reforms, see Eamon Duffy and D. M. Loades, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor: Catholic Christendom, 1300-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), xi-xxv, 1-32, 227-57.

⁵⁰ Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England*, 65.

⁵¹ Solt, *Church and State*, 208. See also Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*; Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*; and John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 55-76. For analyses of moderate Puritanism, see Jonathan M. Atkins, "Calvinist Bishops, Church Unity and the Rise of Arminianism," *Albion* 18 (1986): 411-27; Margo Todd, "An Act of Discretion': Evangelical Conformity and the Puritan Dons," *Albion* 18 (1986): 581-99; Peter Lake, "Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson," *Journal of British Studies* 27 (1988): 81-116; and Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

Uniformity; by the mid-to-late 1550s, the emerging Puritan faction was more polarized and targeted by the establishment in what was called the Vestiarian or Vestments controversy, though few Puritans were actually deprived of their living.⁵² Within scholarship, some have questioned how influential or formative these Elizabethan Puritans were, or of Puritanism more generally; in answer to this, Bernard S. Capp states, “If puritan teaching attracted only a minority, it was a substantial and influential minority. Puritan scholars secured a powerful presence in the universities, especially Cambridge, shaping the values of successive generations of undergraduates.”⁵³

The Elizabethan Puritans’ chief concerns centered on the establishment’s endorsement of an essentially Catholic liturgy, an insurmountable barrier to the budding Puritan movement.⁵⁴ This seeming compromise was evident to the Elizabethan Puritan in the clergy’s white linen surplice, the “standard attire for all Elizabethan ministers; the sign of the cross in baptism; and the giving of the ring in marriage,” among other modest concerns. Thus Elizabethan Puritans often chose to be deprived of their livings than to conform to Settlement. These English Puritans objected to wearing “Catholic dress” on the grounds that it was associated with the elaborate attire of priestly hierarchy in Romish churches. Consequently, they sought support from such continental reformers as Peter Martyr Vermigli, Heinrich Bullinger, and Martin Bucer, and asked their advice on the controversies then plaguing the English Church. Laurence Humphrey, president of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Thomas Sampson, dean of Christ Church, sought counsel from Bullinger. However, unfortunate for their cause, Bullinger supported clerical dress and other Settlement positions because he believed them to be *adiaphorous* or not worth fighting over.⁵⁵ So while there was much borrowing from the continental reformers, the

⁵² Solt, *Church and State*, 83-85; Michael Zell, “The Establishment of a Protestant Church,” in *Early Modern Kent, 1540-1640*, ed. Michael Zell (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 239.

⁵³ Bernard S. Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 4.

⁵⁴ Related to the Vestiarian controversy are the “iconoclast” controversies, which seem to coincide with more radical attempts at Reformation from the late sixteenth through to the seventeenth centuries, which ebbed and flowed according to whoever had power. David Cressy has also observed that Puritan opposition to the Establishment was focused on the Book of Common Prayer than other ceremonial aspects such as burial of the dead. Cressy, *Birth, Marriage and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 403-09; See, more generally, Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c. 1700* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); and Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003).

⁵⁵ Collinson, *Elizabethans*, 238-39; R. Tudor Jones, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds., *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Volume 1: 1550-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 20-21; David Englander, Diana Norman, Rosemary O’Day, and W. R. Owens, eds., *Culture and Belief in Europe, 1450-1600: An Anthology of Sources* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 1990), 448-50; and Judith H. Anderson, *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England* (Bronx: Fordham University Press, 2005), 90-97. Anderson states “Bucer wrote that he would prefer to see vestments abolished, since they are a source of superstitious belief, but that he does not ‘believe...there is anything about them which in itself is wicked’ and ‘that unless and until the people are properly taught, ‘the use and remove of vestments will do equal damage’” (95). Calvin also weighed in on the controversy when he wrote to John Hooper that “his opposition to vestments was not worth it.” Cited in E. W. Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c. 1500-1555): Bishop of Gloucester* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 136. Within the literature, Hooper has been called a “proto-Puritan,” who struggled over the implications of the doctrine of predestination. Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003),

English Reformed often belittled their continental contemporaries' advice if it did not serve their political or religious purposes.⁵⁶

Puritan ministers “conformed” and preached moderation, as did Richard Greenham, or were deprived of the living, as was Thomas Cartwright.⁵⁷ Some Puritans wanted more than a further cleansing of the church and insisted on a systematic and thorough rebuilding of it. This motif is clear in Edward Dering’s sermon before Queen Elizabeth in 1569. Dering, a young Cambridge scholar, was invited by the Queen to preach at court.⁵⁸ He began his sermon by expressing his own gratitude that God’s people in England had been freed from the spiritual bondage of the previous reign and that the preaching of God’s word was more free and available to the people. This change was the result of God’s Spirit at work in the Queen’s life, who had herself lived in great danger but now enjoyed safety. Dering likened England’s deliverance to the liberation of Israel from their Egyptian captivity. It was now the Queen’s duty to feed God’s people and the magistrate’s to “maintain Religion and to supresse superstition.”⁵⁹ If she failed, however, the Lord would bring judgment on the nation. For Dering, there were matters that needed urgent attention; now that the word of God could be proclaimed widely and freely, greater numbers of well-trained ministers were needed. Dering addressed the Queen directly with unprecedented boldness (possibly being inspired by Cartwright): “you at whose hands God will require it, you sit stil, and are careless, and let men do as they list. It toucheth not belike your commonwealth, and therefore you are wel contented to let it alone.”⁶⁰ When Dering dedicated his *Works* (1597) to Queen Elizabeth, years later, he said that he had so angered the Queen in his sermon that she forbade him to preach “more openly within your Maiesties dominions.”⁶¹ Remarkably, Dering’s sermon was quite popular with the presses and went through sixteen editions by 1603, being “the most frequently reprinted sermon published in the Queen’s reign.”⁶²

The Elizabethan period is associated with the rise of such influential divines as William Perkins, Richard Greenham, John Udall, Thomas Cartwright, William Whitaker, William Bradshaw, George Gifford, Arthur Golding, John Field, Laurence Chaderton, Walter Travers, and Arthur Dent. Elizabethan Puritan theologians stood within the earlier

331-2; Peter Marshall, “England,” in *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*, ed. David M. Whitford (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 2008), 257.

⁵⁶ R. Tudor Jones, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds., *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Volume 1: 1550-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 20-21; David Englander, Diana Norman, Rosemary O’Day, and W. R. Owens, eds., *Culture and Belief in Europe, 1450-1600: An Anthology of Sources* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 1990), 448-50; and Judith H. Anderson, *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England* (Bronx: Fordham University Press, 2005), 90-97.

⁵⁷ Greenham criticized those ministers who were deprived of their office over “trivial” matters since it left their flocks without a shepherd and compromised the Puritan cause. John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: The Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 58-9.

⁵⁸ W. Brown Patterson, “Elizabethan Theological Polemics,” in *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 99-100.

⁵⁹ Edward Dering, *A Sermon Preached Before the Queens Maiestie* (Awdely, 1569), sig. C.iv. verso.

⁶⁰ Dering, *A Sermon Preached Before the Queens Maiestie*, sig. E.iv. verso.

⁶¹ Patterson, “Elizabethan Theological Polemics,” 100.

⁶² Patterson, “Elizabethan Theological Polemics,” 100; Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 36-37; Collinson, *Godly People*, 302-4.

Reformed evangelical tradition, were part of Tudor Puritanism, and promoted a distinct experiential theology that became known as “Elizabethan Puritanism.”⁶³ In many ways, Elizabethan Puritanism stood at the center of a Reformed synthesis of older, late medieval Catholicism and the later theology of the post-Reformation; as M. M. Knappen argues, “Puritanism was a transitional movement linking the medieval with the modern. Only recently have students begun to notice the strength and importance of its medieval ties.”⁶⁴ Such ties as asceticism, the use of scholastic and humanist method, and use of patristics are but three examples. Another central feature of Elizabethan Puritanism and its later manifestations was a preference for the spoken word over the printed word of Scripture. Though Puritan ministers urged their congregants to be conversant in the Bible, private devotional exercise was never to supplant hearing the word preached; in fact, Arnold Hunt argues that this preference was a distinctive feature of puritan culture, much, perhaps, in the way the *viva vox Evangelii* was to the Lutheran.⁶⁵ The hallmark characteristic of the movement, however, was its formative piety and casuistry, which consisted of a well-pitched effort to address the whole spectrum of human need and correct the oversense of unworthiness;⁶⁶ such works as Perkins’s *Whole Treatises of Cases of Conscience* (1606) or Ames’s *De Conscientia* (1603) embodied the Puritan model for precise living.⁶⁷ Whatever the Puritans were, they were pitched as “the Godly” or as reformers for the pursuit of

⁶³ Within the literature, it is possible to distinguish between Tudor and Elizabethan Puritanism as phases of development. See M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*; Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*; Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays; A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of “Godly Master Dering”*; and Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 169-261. On the authority of Scripture within Elizabethan Puritanism-Reformed orthodoxy as it relates to William Whitaker, see Henk van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 125-33.

⁶⁴ Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, ix.

⁶⁵ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 30-59; Paul S. Chung, *The Spirit of God Transforming Life: The Reformation and Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 113. For a detailed analysis of Puritan devotional practices, see Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Raleigh: University of North Carolina Press, 1986).

⁶⁶ Margaret Sampson, “Laxity and Liberty in Seventeenth-Century English Political Thought,” in *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Edmund Leites (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99. Sampson correctly observes that Puritan preachers lamented the lack of practical treatises and urged their fellow ministers to preach and publish, but makes too much of “that...proneness to despair at the heart of Calvinism.” Cf. Benjamin T. G. Mayes, *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning after the Reformation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 18-21. Cf. and cp. Nam Kyu Lee, *Die Prædestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen, 1593-1622* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11-16.

⁶⁷ Puritan casuistry was distinct from Jesuit casuistry and had more ties to early modern Jesuit devotional texts. See James F. Keenan, “Jesuit Casuistry or Jesuit Spirituality? The Roots of Seventeenth-Century British Practical Divinity,” in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts: 1540-1773*, ed. John W. O’Malley, et al (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 627-40. For more general discussions of casuistry, see James F. Keenan and Thomas A. Shannon, eds., *The Context of Casuistry* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1995); Leites, *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*; Albert R. Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); and Elliot Rose, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans Under Elizabeth I and James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

godliness.⁶⁸ Though Elizabethan Puritan theologians generally thrived, even under more strict acts of conformity, the movement itself suffered a tremendous setback when some of the more radical authors penned, published, and distributed the controversial and satirical *Martin Marprelate Tracts* in 1588-89 which mocked prelaty; prominent Puritans were accused and so more strict measures were taken to suppress the presses.⁶⁹

2.2.4 The Early Stuart Period (1603-42)

When Queen Elizabeth died in 1603, James VI of Scotland became James I of England and ruled over both nations.⁷⁰ Though raised under Presbyterianism, and professing to be a Calvinist, James “quickly embraced the Church of England hierarchical church government because he believed it accorded best with the monarchy.”⁷¹ Over one thousand ministers signed what was known as *The Millenary Petition* (1603), a tract that requested changes in the administration of baptism and the use of vestments as well as several other liturgical adjustments.⁷² In 1604, at the Hampton Court Conference, James considered these requests but ultimately sided with his bishops.⁷³ While some concessions were made (such as a new translation of the Bible), the more radical wing in the English church feared persecution and their fears would turn out to be wholly justified.

In these early years the House of Commons and the king clashed over various issues chiefly because of James’s high view of royal authority; he fully believed in the “divine right of kings,” and sought to control both church and state. Some have seen this monopolizing in his commissioning of a new English translation of the Bible, which became known as the *Authorized Version* (1611), and in his specific request that it contain no annotations in its margins.⁷⁴ The Hampton Court Conference in 1604, in which Puritans

⁶⁸ See Collinson, *Godly People*, 1-18.

⁶⁹ See Joseph L. Black, ed., *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), xv-cxii; Jones, *Protestant Nonconformist Texts*, 87-90; and Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 27-52.

⁷⁰ On revisionism and various historiographical issues in the Stuart era, see Ronald Hutton, *Debates in Stuart History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

⁷¹ Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 18. For an overview of the seventeenth century in its religious, political, social, and economic contexts, see John S. Morrill, *Seventeenth-Century Britain, 1603-1714* (Kent: Dawson and Archon, 1980).

⁷² Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritan Politicians and King James VI and I, 1587-1604,” in *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 41.

⁷³ Jones, *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Vol. 1: 1550-1700*, 103.

⁷⁴ This is actually a misunderstanding of what happened. While the English Puritans favored the Geneva Bible and used it widely, they appealed to James I for a new translation to supplant the Bishop’s Bible because of advances in textual scholarship. James’s request for no marginal annotations was either to safeguard the work from being a platform for any one party, and possibly to present to the learned world an up-to-date “ecumenical” text that could be used in the pulpit. Paul C. Gutjahr, *An American Bible: A History of the Good Book in the United States, 1777-1880* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 92; Naomi Tadmor, *The Social Universe of the English Bible*, 8. Cf. Femke Molekamp, “‘Of the Incomparable Treasure of the Holy Scriptures’: The Geneva Bible in the Early Modern Household,” in *Literature and Popular Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Matthew Dimmock and Andrew Hadfield (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 121-36.

had great hopes for a reformed liturgy, “was clearly a defeat for puritanism.”⁷⁵ Thus Puritan hopes were continually dashed. Throughout the early Stuart church there were generally four types of Christians: “radical Puritans, moderate Puritans, conformist Calvinists, and anti-Calvinists;” James I tended to favor those conforming Calvinists but made concessions to so-called “anti-Calvinists.”⁷⁶

Jacobean or “Caroline Puritan” fears escalated when Charles I, James’s second son, took the throne in 1625.⁷⁷ Charles’s marriage to Henrietta Maria, a devout French Catholic, sparked fears among Puritan ministers and “the godly” in Parliament that the new king intended to restore Catholicism in England.⁷⁸ Intense fears of the bloody persecutions during Mary I’s reign were still of recent memory, being enshrined by numerous Stuart reprints of Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* (1570). These worries escalated when Charles appointed his trusted advisor and “anti-Puritan,” William Laud, as the bishop of London in 1628. Laud restored elements of the Catholic liturgy and promoted the Arminianism that the Synod of Dort had invalidated a decade earlier.⁷⁹ In fact, much historical controversy centers on the beginnings of English Arminianism.⁸⁰ For historian Nicholas Tyacke, Arminianism was an innovation in the English church that upset the “Calvinist consensus” that had existed prior to the 1590s, and, ultimately, contributed to the civil war. For Peter White, Arminianism had deeper roots in earlier English theology, being representative of a wider spectrum of ideas within the Established Church, and was not so much a disruption

⁷⁵ Alan Cromartie, “King James and the Hampton Court Conference,” in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 61.

⁷⁶ This distinction between the various types of Christians is based on and confirmed in a reading of the following sources: Kenneth Fincham, “Introduction,” in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 6-10; John S. Morrill, *Stuart Britain: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 77-87; Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 1-8. Fincham provides a helpful introduction to the historiography of the field, especially as it relates to the “Anglican-Puritan” question. In some ways “Anti-Calvinist” is a misnomer because opposition to the Reformed doctrines associated with Calvin, such a strict predestinarianism, were not always associated with Calvin himself. See also Borden W. Painter, “Anglican Terminology in Recent Tudor and Stuart historiography,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 56:3 (1987): 237-49.

⁷⁷ On the Caroline Puritan movement as a whole, see Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, 1620-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

⁷⁸ Michelle Anne White has recently explored Henrietta Maria’s role in causing or contributing to the English Civil Wars in *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Ashgate, 2006). Here she recounts the story of an Edward Bilton who so despised the prospect of Maria’s return to England after the Restoration in 1660 by stating “she was a traytour and had been the cause of all his mischief (meaning the late wars in England).” White, *ibid*, 1.

⁷⁹ An interesting and little explored “focal point” of the debates between Arminianism and Puritanism centers on the use of illustrations in seventeenth-century print. See Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 160. For Arminius’s deviation from mainstream Reformed theology, see William den Boer, “Defense or Deviation: A Re-examination of Arminius’s Motives to Deviate from the ‘Mainstream’ Reformed Theology,” in *Revisiting the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Brill: Leiden, 2011), 23-48.

⁸⁰ See Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c.1560-1643* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), 1-36; Margo Todd, “‘All One with Tom Thumb’: Arminianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge,” *Church History*, Vol. 64, No. 4 (1995): 563-65, 575-79.

as it was a natural progression of the *via media*.⁸¹ More recently, Gregory D. Dodds has argued in his book *Exploiting Erasmus* (2009) that Jacobean Arminianism should be seen as a progression and legacy of Erasmianism which dated from the mid-sixteenth century, which is evidenced, in part, by the “Englishing” of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases on the New Testament* (1517-1524) and the popularity of his humanist ideas.⁸² However one chooses to disentangle the emergence of English Arminianism, it is certain that mainstream Puritanism was always, even in its earliest beginnings, anti-Catholic and thus (possibly) anti-Arminian, though such English preachers as John Goodwin remain anomalous.⁸³ Indeed, much of Stuart anti-Arminianism was little more than a cloaked fear of international Roman Catholicism.⁸⁴ Popular rhetoric against Arminianism would increasingly become laced with anti-popish sentiments. Thomas Hobbes, one of the foremost English philosophers of the seventeenth century, wrote that Arminian tenets, “acting as a stalking horse,” prepared the way for popery.⁸⁵ Hobbes was not alone in his suspicions.

The late-1620s also witnessed the great Puritan migration to the New World, when Puritans *en masse* left Britain for safe haven from persecution and freedom to worship, a movement that arose out of continuing tensions between Puritans and the Established

⁸¹ Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 172. Cp. Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), with Peter White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). Their debate predates their respective books. See Nicholas Tyacke, “The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered,” and Peter White, “Rejoinder,” both in *Past and Present*, No. 115 (May 1987): 201-29. See also the effort to sort out the issues in Peter Lake, “Calvinism and the English Church, 1570-1635,” *Past and Present*, No. 114 (Feb. 1987): 32-76. On Peter Baro’s understanding of the predestinarian question, see Keith D. Stanglin, “Arminius Avant la Lettre’: Peter Baro, Jacob Arminius, and the Bond of Predestinarian Polemic,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 67:1 (2005): 51-74. Baro recognizes three schools of predestinarian thought within the English church: the first was that held by Calvin and Beza, which Baro depicts in “supralapsarian” terms; the second was held by Augustine, George Sohn of Heidelberg, Zanchi, and Bellarmine, depicted in “infralapsarian” terms; and a proposed third way in which God is neither seen as the author of sin nor of condemnation; here Baro claims support from Melancthon, Hemmingius, and Snecanus. William den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius, 1559-1609* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 319-20.

⁸² Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus*, 3-4; cf. 159-200. Dodds also makes the acute observation that “prior to the rise of English Arminianism, [Andrew] Willet and other Puritan divines chose to defend predestination by addressing and refuting Erasmian readings of Romans” (147-8).

⁸³ In a book published in 1628, *An Appeal to the Parliament, or Sion’s Plea against the Prelacy*, Alexander Leighton had made the point that “Arminianism was merely old Popery in new guise.” In 1629, William Prynne fumed “This infernal monster...is but an old condemned heresy, raised up from hell of late.” Cited in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 162; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 3.

⁸⁴ Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 1-30, 35-41, 426-34; and Milton, “The Church of England, Rome, and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus,” in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1993), 187-210; John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (New York: Palgrave, 1999), 168-9.

⁸⁵ Nicholas D. Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall, and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity: A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 93.

Church. While there were numerous reasons for this “Puritan exodus,” both secular and religious, the chief reason for “the godly” centered on religious themes.⁸⁶

The 1630s were equally a time of growing frustration for Parliament and Puritans. In 1633 when the King introduced his “Book of Sports,” which legalized “cultural relaxation” on the Sabbath after church services, the Puritans were furious. It was seen as a direct affront on the Sabbatarians, and an insult to “the godly.”⁸⁷ Thus, Stuart Puritanism was concerned with continuing to fashion its own identity within a theologically divided country, and promoting its own brand of pietism in contrast to what was seen as freer or more libertarian approaches to the Christian life.

While the causes for the English Revolution are too multifarious to discuss here, it is perhaps sufficient to say that there was a strong confluence of competing political, cultural, social, and religious ideals, which elicited war between King and Parliament.⁸⁸

2.2.5 *The English Revolution (1640-60)*

Perhaps the most important change politically was the change from rule by King to rule by Parliament; then, to the removal of the King by execution and the establishment of the Protectorate; and then to the fall of the Protectorate and the reestablishment of the monarchy, to religious persecution and then to religious toleration.⁸⁹ These major political crises had a direct affect on the religious culture of the period; the power play between King and Parliament, between Royalist and Roundhead, would not only cement the fate of the nation as a political power and entity but the fate of religion in the land. That Puritanism was at the forefront of English political and religious crisis in the mid-seventeenth century is undisputed; the precise ways in which Puritanism fostered the Revolution, however, continue to be assessed as well as Oliver Cromwell’s role in fostering

⁸⁶ David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication Between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 74-106; Susan Hardman Moore, *Pilgrims: New World Settlers and the Call Home* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 16-34.

⁸⁷ See Alistair Dougall’s *The Devil’s Book: Charles I, the Book of Sports and Puritanism in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011), for a thorough exposition of all the sports allowed in the King’s edict, such as bear-baiting, bowling, bull-baiting, carding, coursing, loggats, and throwing at cocks.

⁸⁸ Scholarship on the causes of the English Revolution is as immense as those on Puritanism more generally. This is not surprising since the Revolution has often been heralded as a portent of current forms of English government. For entry into this debate, see: Lawrence Stone, *Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642* (1972; repr. New York: Routledge, 2002); R. C. Richardson, ed., *The Debate on the English Revolution*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1988); and Ann Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998).

⁸⁹ Major William Rainsborough, an alleged Ranter and Leveller of the New Model Army, had a “flag device” which depicted the bloody execution of the King, with the phrase “*salus populi suprema lex*,” The image is to be found in Dr. Williams’s Library MS 12.7, fo. 115, and is graphically depicted on the cover of Nicholas Tyacke’s *The English Revolution, c.1590-1720: Politics, Religion, and Communities* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007). Depictions such as these expressed popular sentiment that the dead King was no more than a traitor to the English people for his failure to protect them from popery, and other “nuisances” of the public conscience.

the more radical sects and millenarian fervor in his readmission of the Jews.⁹⁰ While a few historians continue to refer to a “Puritan Revolution,” most have discarded this taxonomy as a product of older, Whiggish, historiography.⁹¹ In any case, Carla Pestana notes that in the two decades before 1661, Britain witnessed “civil wars, invasions, regicide, religious radicalism, experiments in non-monarchical forms of government, and, in the end, the restoration of the Stuart monarchy.”⁹² The English Revolution, while successful in contributing to modern notions of religious toleration, was ill fated in that it was unable to sustain itself.⁹³ By the time Oliver Cromwell’s son, Richard, succeeded as Lord Protector in 1658, the realm was anxious for a restoration of the monarchy.⁹⁴

During this time of revolution, when Parliament was in open conflict with Charles I, the former, consisting chiefly of elite members of Puritan society, such as John Pym, Sir Francis Rous, William Prynne, and others, officially abolished episcopacy in January 1643, and ordered the meeting of an assembly of “the godly” to be held at Westminster Abby, to advise on a national church settlement. The king had refused an earlier measure for this Assembly in 1642, because of the overwhelming “Puritan” bias within Long Parliament, which sought to discredit episcopacy. The published 1643 parliamentary statute stated that there was “no blessing...more dear than the purity of religion,” and admonished the Assembly to a threefold revision of the English Church: ceremonial and liturgical reform; proposals for a new church government; and vindication of its doctrine from

⁹⁰ Christopher Hill, “Till the Conversion of the Jews,” in *Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650-1800*, ed. Richard H. Popkin (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 30-31. The literature on Cromwell is enormous. For entry into this subject of Cromwell and the English Revolution, see Christopher Durston, *Cromwell’s Major-Generals: Godly Government During the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001); John S. Morrill, ed., *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (New York: Longman, 1990); Christopher Hill, *God’s Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (New York: Penguin, 1990); and William Lamont, “Pamphleteering, the Protestant Consensus and the English Revolution,” in *Freedom and the English Revolution: Essays in History and Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), 72-92.

For Cromwell and the Jews, see David S. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England, 1485-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 107-144; and Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603-1655* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 158-189. For Cromwell’s general biography, see J. C. Davis, *Oliver Cromwell* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁹¹ The rejection of this classification should not belittle the centrality of religion in the English Revolution. As J. T. Cliffe’s monumental *Puritans in Conflict* shows, religion was at the forefront of English revolutionary thought. See J. T. Cliffe, *Puritans in Conflict: The Puritan Gentry During and After the Civil Wars* (London: Routledge, 1988). John Coffey has further stated that “The English Revolution was a religious event. It was much more than that, of course, but hardly less.” Coffey, “Religion,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 98.

⁹² Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 1.

⁹³ Thomas Festa, *The End of Learning: Milton and Education* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 102.

⁹⁴ On Richard Cromwell and his failed protectorship, see John A. Butler, *A Biography of Richard Cromwell, 1626-1712: The Second Protector* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1994); Jane Ross Hammer, *Protector: A Life History of Richard Cromwell* (New York: Vantage, 1997); and David L. Smith and Patrick Little, *Parliaments and Politics During the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 148-70.

misconstructions.⁹⁵ Parliament's goal was to promote a "further and more perfect reformation" of the English Church based chiefly on God's word, and to solidify its *sensus unitatis* with the Scottish churches and other Reformed churches abroad. Thus, members were chosen and invited from the "godly and learned divines" then ministering in England and New England, as well as Members of Parliament, and invites were given to potential delegates in other parts of the Kingdom, in what could be seen as a distinctively English way of solidifying a British Reformed and Puritan establishment and divinity. The "consensus" of "the godly" at Westminster was within the trajectories of earlier Reformed and Puritan exigencies operating within Tudor and Elizabethan Puritanism, as, for instance, in its anticlericalism, but which finally came into their own confessional status in the documents produced at Westminster.⁹⁶

In recent years much has been written about the religion of the English Revolution, its diversity, and fostering of various sects and heresies;⁹⁷ one of the greater threats to "orthodox" Puritanism of the 1640s-50s was the challenge of Socinianism.⁹⁸ While Socinian writing proved a serious threat to orthodoxy, it was not the only challenge to Trinitarian faith in these years; there were plenteous homegrown heterodoxies: John Everard, Roger Brearley, and Peter Shaw wanted to "minimize the significance of the historical Christ" and wished to "emphasize that all believers could be human and divine in the way that Christ had been;"⁹⁹ John Eaton, author of the influential *Honey-combe of Free Justification by Faith Alone* (1646) taught that Christ's true followers were without sin or that God saw no sin in his elect; and William Erbery denied the divinity of Christ altogether.¹⁰⁰ As John Coffey acutely pointed out, "the godly were often at odds with each other in matters theological and such doctrinal consensus as existed did not come easily;"¹⁰¹ the English Revolution brought all these tensions to the fore.¹⁰² In the early years

⁹⁵ Chad van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652, Volume 1: Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 7-9.

⁹⁶ While not all members of the assembly could be identified as "Puritan," such as the royalist Daniel Featley, the far majority could be, and the inclusion of the limited "non-Puritans" may have been strategically motivated to give the assembly "credibility and some sense of fairness," which could draw in support from parties who would have otherwise opposed its measures. Van Dixhoorn, *Minutes and Papers, Volume 1*, 13.

⁹⁷ For a brief, though pointed, survey of recent trends in the study of religious diversity during the revolution, see R. C. Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 184-202. Cf. Michael Hunter, *Robert Boyle, 1627-1691: Scrupulosity and Science* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 51-57.

⁹⁸ See Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 1-12, 39-62, 88-118, 177-204.

⁹⁹ Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, 59.

¹⁰⁰ David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 236-8, 293-5; and David Como and Peter Lake, "Puritans, Antinomians and Laudians in Caroline London: The Strange Case of Peter Shaw and Its Contexts," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (1999): 684-715.

¹⁰¹ John Coffey, "A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution," in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 108; Christopher Hill, "Freethinking and Libertinism: The Legacy of the English Revolution," in *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750*, ed. Roger D. Lund (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 56. On radical religion in the English Revolution, see Nicholas McDowell, *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and*

of the revolution, 1640-42, English printing presses were overwhelmed with dissident voices which Cressy phrases “the press overpressed.”¹⁰³ In 1646, John Benbrigge complained of the many religious sectaries: “Such was their hypocrosie in all they did...[that] their *Reformation* was but a greater *Deformation*, and that opened yet wider the Floud-gates of their *Desolation*.”¹⁰⁴ As Kristen Poole points out, “Benbrigge was far from alone in his assertion that religious radicalism had perverted the English Reformation.”¹⁰⁵

For the purposes of our study, this period is significant because it is an era of confessionalization, which resulted in the meeting of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652, which produced the “Westminster Standards,” and which has long been identified as the codification of a main line (or “mainstream”) Puritanism.

In his sermon before Parliament, the mainstream Puritan Stephen Marshall admonished parliament to so conduct their lives that future generations would remember their age as one of godliness.¹⁰⁶

2.2.6 *The Later Stuart Restoration (1660-89)*

Richard Cromwell’s failed attempt to succeed his father as Lord Protector created a complex political crisis that led to the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660. While Charles II promised “a liberty to tender consciences,” Anglican royalists pressured the king to restore religious conformity through a series of acts known as the Clarendon Code; thus began a period of dissent that resulted in the persecution and imprisonment of many Puritan pastors, including John Bunyan and Richard Baxter.¹⁰⁷ The *Act of Uniformity* (1662) required Puritan ministers to renounce their ordinations and subscription to the *Solemn League and Covenant*; furthermore, bishops required them to be re-ordained in what appears to have been a political repudiation of their ministerial credentials given during the Revolution. Nearly 2,000 ministers refused to concede to these new stipulations and

Revolution, 1630-1660 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and J. F. McGregor and B. Reay, eds., *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

¹⁰² On the perception of “orthodoxy” in the English church, see Peter Lake and Michael Questier, “Introduction,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), ix-xx. The religious orthodoxy of the period was a process that was defined and refined by debate among its theologians, and often initiated by the specter of heresy. Cf. David Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1-22.

¹⁰³ Cressy, *England on Edge*, 281-309.

¹⁰⁴ John Benbrigge, *Gods Fury, Englands Fire. Or A Plain Discovery of Those Spiritual Incendaries, which Have Set Church and State on Fire* (London, 1646), sig. A2. Quoted in Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton*, 1.

¹⁰⁵ Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton*, 1.

¹⁰⁶ Stephen Marshall, *A Sermon Preached to the Honorable House of Commons*, 26 January 1648 (published 1647/8), 15-16. Cited in D. R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 23.

¹⁰⁷ Blair Worden, *God’s Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 324; Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke’s Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 22.

were ejected from their pulpits on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1662, in one of the greatest acts of religious persecution since the days of Mary Tudor.¹⁰⁸ Two more acts of conformity were issued: The *Conventicle Act* (1664) which banned nonconformists from preaching in the fields or conducting services in homes; and the *Five Mile Act* (1665) which prohibited ejected ministers from coming within five miles of their former parishes or any city or town.¹⁰⁹ Though oppressed, many Puritans produced some of the more memorable pieces of devotional literature during this period, such as *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678-9). When William and Mary ascended to the English throne in 1689, an Act of Toleration was passed that granted freedom for all dissenters.¹¹⁰ It was the "first statutory grant of toleration in English history," and "inaugurated a decisive change in the intellectual and cultural life of English-speaking peoples."¹¹¹ From here, English dissent moves beyond "classic dissent" and becomes so diverse that it cannot be contained in an "ism."¹¹²

2.2.7 Summary

When the Reformation made its way to England, it effectively, to use Hill's phrase, "Turned the world upside down." But, as Tyacke, Collinson, and other have demonstrated, the process of English Protestantization was a "Long Reformation" in that did not occur overnight, but through many decades of progress, regress, and solidification.¹¹³ Notable for the purposes of our study is the Calvinist networking that began during the English Reformation, and solidified over the course of its existence. This international gathering formed and disseminated a "canon" of "prestigious" works, and built reputations that lasted well into the seventeenth century. It became the basis of the "rise of Puritanism," its intense interdependences, and contributed to a sense of nostalgia within Stuart Puritanism. Catholic persecutions during Mary Tudor's reign, as depicted in the "valhalla" of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, left an impression on English national and social identity, and contributed to the hot-tempered Anti-Catholicism, which characterized the seventeenth century. Conflicts between Puritans and their Reformation, and the King and his vision for England, erupted into a protracted conflict in the English Revolution, and,

¹⁰⁸ See David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008); Barrie White, "John Bunyan and the Context of Persecution, 1660-1688," in *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88*, ed. Anne Laurence, W. R. Owens, and Stuart Sim (London: The Hambledon Press, 1990), 51-62.

¹⁰⁹ Newton E. Key, "Clarendon Code," in *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689*, ed. Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996), 98-99.

¹¹⁰ Andrew R. Murphy, *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 2001), 158; Dale Hoak, "The Anglo-Dutch Revolution of 1688-89" in *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution, 1688-89*, edited by Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1996), 11.

¹¹¹ Erik Routley, *English Religious Dissent* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 133-4. Cf. James E. Bradley, *Religion, Revolution and English Radicals: Non-conformity in Eighteenth-Century Politics and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

¹¹² Patrick Collinson, "Comment on Eamon Duffy's Neale Lecture and the Colloquium," in *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 71.

ultimately, in the King's own execution. Cromwell's Commonwealth, which ushered in a new time of prosperity and general toleration, ultimately failed and led to the reintroduction of the monarchy into England in the Later Stuart Restoration.

We will now look at some themes within Stuart Puritanism.

2.3 The English Puritanism of the Seventeenth Century: Thematic Elements

Historians have often used the term "mainstream Puritanism" to denote those Puritans who were Reformed orthodox and "precisianist" as distinct from those who presumably were not.¹⁴ Mainstream Puritanism, however, would seem to be as varied and complex as Reformed orthodoxy; while most Puritans were Reformed orthodox (as in the case of Baxter, Downname, Rous, and Crisp) there is some question whether such figures as John Goodwin were, given his conversion to Arminianism. This relates, of course, to an ongoing debate whether Arminius and Arminianism should be classified as "Reformed" or "anti-Reformed" and to what degree confessional boundaries should be considered when classifying thinkers.¹⁵ John Milton was undoubtedly "Puritan" but was not Reformed orthodox; and in the case of Milton he was not "mainstream" given his adherence to ideas that breached confessional boundaries.¹⁶ Mainstream Puritanism, as with Reformed orthodoxy, was an eclectic range of ideas that were woven together by common

¹⁴ See, for instance, Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 352, where Como distinguishes between "antinomians" and precisianist "mainstream puritanism." In contrast, Bozeman never uses the term "mainstream Puritanism" and instead refers to a "precisianist strain" within Puritanism. See Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 63-182. Bozeman's approach is more nuanced than Como's, but even Bozeman tends to separate the antinomian strain from the mainstream. Cf. Bozeman, "The Glory of the 'Third Time': John Eaton as Contra-Puritan," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 47, No. 4 (October 1996): 643, 646. This is not to suggest that Eaton was "mainstream" or "Reformed orthodox," but rather to note that Eaton could be classified as "Puritan."

Christopher Hill equates "mainstream Puritanism" with the diverse life and work of William Perkins, John Preston, Thomas Taylor, William Gouge, Thomas Goodwin, Richard Baxter, and Richard Sibbes. Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980), 62; and *Society and Puritanism*, 15. Numerous historians employ the phrase without qualifying or defining it. See, for instance, David Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 99; and David Parnham, *Sir Henry Vane, Theologian: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Religious and Political Discourse* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1997), 74.

¹⁵ On the "Arminian" question, see Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 242-44. For Arminius's discussion of doctrines characteristic of Reformed theology, see Den Boer, *God's Twofold Love*, 197-210; Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacobus Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic-Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1991); and Aza Goudriaan, "Justification by Faith and the Early Arminian Controversy," in *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt*, ed. Maartin Wisse, et al (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 155-78. On the issue of diversity within Reformed orthodoxy, see Richard A. Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 11-30.

¹⁶ Barbara K. Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003), 425; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 5.

agreement on most confessional topics and consisted of a variety of emphases and strains. What is remarkable is the unity in diversity among such Puritans; that is, that though they were diverse theologically and, at times, contradicted each other and presented competing ideas, they nonetheless shared a common confessional consensus and expressed agreement within their diversity. We will later see how Downname, Rous, and Crisp coalesced on the doctrines of God and humanity, predestination and assurance, covenant of works and grace, justification and sanctification, and the Christian life and piety. Suffice it to say here that though there were many nuanced emphases or tendencies within mainstream Puritanism, such as strains that may be classified as *precisianist*, *mystical*, *antinomian*, and *neonomian*, there was still a *sensus unitatis* and experiential emphasis that bound Puritans together.¹⁷ Thus, it is possible to see an intellectual and pietistic continuity. Those thinkers who moved beyond confessional boundaries but who nonetheless had an affinity towards Puritanism, as is the case with John Milton, may be seen as a hybrid of Puritanism with its distinctive experientialism and competing theological themes such as Socinianism and Arianism.¹⁸ By defining mainstream Puritanism more broadly as consisting of various strains rather than confining it to precisianism only allows for a deeper understanding of the elasticity inherent within the confessional boundaries of the seventeenth century. It also resolves, to some extent, the problem that Trueman posed in applying the word “Puritan” to John Owen in that it affirms the close affinity between Reformed orthodoxy and mainstream Puritan thought.¹⁹

Though Puritanism is more complex than the four streams just mentioned, this study will examine in some depth the first three of the four major variants: precisianism, which is embodied in the earlier theologies of Richard Greenham and William Perkins and which was carried into the seventeenth century by William Ames, John Downname, Isaac Ambrose, and others; mysticism, which variegated in degree or complexity was always

¹⁷ On the content of Puritan theology and its main themes, see Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012); J. I. Packer, *The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter* (1954; Vancouver: Regent Publishing, 2003), 15-102; Geoffrey W. Bromiley, *Historical Theology: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1978), 305-16; and Edward Hindson, ed., *Introduction to Puritan Theology: A Reader* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1976), esp. 17-27. Beeke and Jones cover an eclectic range of theological themes, such as the covenant, predestination, salvation, and eschatology. Packer identifies as distinctively “Puritan” a “thoroughgoing Calvinist piety...pastoral concern which distinguished clerical Puritan leaders...spiritual kinship with Edwardian Reformers...repudiation of Commonwealth novelties...[and] conscientious nonconformity” (27-8) as well as a pensiveness for practical divinity and Ramist logic (33-43). Bromiley focuses on the covenant. Hindson’s collection of primary sources covers such topics as Natural Theology, Scripture, God, Man and Sin, Christ, Salvation, Atonement, Regeneration and Conversion, Justification, Sanctification, Church, and Eschatology.

¹⁸ For recent assessments of Milton as “Puritan,” see Jeffrey Alan Miller, “Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young,” in *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620-1642*, ed. Edward Jones (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 72-106; Catherine Gimelli Martin, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 65-104; and N. H. Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2001), 124-40.

¹⁹ See Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 5-12. Trueman does not deny that Owen was a “Puritan theologian” but he finds the term unhelpful given the broad sweep of “Puritan” in current scholarship. However, identifying Owen as “mainstream precisianist” alleviates this concern to some degree since it identifies both elements of experimental piety and Reformed orthodoxy.

incumbent in Reformed theology since Calvin's emphasis on mystical union in the Lord's Supper. Indeed, the word-centered mysticism of Richard Sibbes is not exactly the same as the spirit-centered mysticism of Rous or Saltmarsh; antinomism, which emerged as a response to precisianism but which also grew into its own self-fashioned intensity in the 1650s and had its own set of trajectories, some of which may be seen in Crisp; and neonomianism, which was a counter-response to antinomism and theologically high Calvinism with its emphasis on the moral conduct of the believer. Though precisianism was the majority opinion within Puritanism and though historians have equated precisianism with mainstream Puritanism, for the purposes of this study and for more nuances, it is better to see precisianism as a majority variant among the Puritans rather than identifying it as mainstream Puritanism. This is because thinkers such as Crisp who criticized the precisianist strain could and should be classified as "mainstream" given their theological affinity to Reformed orthodoxy and adherence to the confessions, as is the case with John Cotton.¹²⁰

We will now look at these themes more closely and then conclude the chapter. It should be noted that these four themes or strains within Puritanism often overlapped as Puritans generally used the various strains as best served their purposes; thus, for instance, one could see both precisianist and neonomian strains in Baxter.¹²¹

2.3.1 *The Precisianist Strain*¹²²

The core beliefs of precisianism, the central strand within Puritanism and out of which the other strains grew, centered on six major themes: (1) God and man, (2) predestination, (3) covenant theology, (4) practical divinity, (5) providence and the devil, and (6) biblical exegesis.¹²³ Most historians recognize at least two "founders" of precisianism within English Puritanism: Richard Greenham and the Cambridge theologian and "father of

¹²⁰ For Cotton, the only complete assessment of his life and ideas is Larzer Ziff's dated *Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962). Ziff stresses the need to understand Cotton in his historical context since Cotton was "medieval." For a collection of Cotton's letters and an introduction to his thought, see Sargent Bush, Jr., ed., *The Correspondence of John Cotton* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), esp. 1-67.

¹²¹ Bremer, *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction*. Given that the precisianists were in the majority, it is not surprising that those who could be classified as "precisianist" wrote most of the divinity manuals that outlined basic Puritan theological categories that can be classified as "Reformed orthodox." Those mainstream Puritans who diverged from precisianism either in the degree of mysticism or in challenging some of its basic assumptions on law and gospel, for instance, should not be seen as entirely different theologies but rather as competing strains within the mainstream.

¹²² As far as I have been able to discern, Theodore D. Bozeman is the first to use the phrase "the precisianist strain" within mainstream Puritanism to denote its majority opinion. Prior to Bozeman, "precisianist movement" or "precisianism," especially in its Dutch contexts seems to have been more prevalent, though the words "Puritan" and "Precisianist" have always been employed since the late sixteenth century to refer to diverse streams within radical English Protestantism.

¹²³ The word "precisianism" to denote Puritanism dates to the mid-sixteenth century as a term of derision. Soon after its introduction, however, it was often employed by Puritans to describe their way of life. One person was said to have commented to Richard Rogers (1550-1618), "I like you and your company very well, but you are so precise." Rogers replied, "O Sir, I serve a precise God." Quoted in Bendall, *A History of Emmanuel College*, 186.

European pietism” William Perkins.¹²⁴ Both Greenham and Perkins endorsed what can be called Reformed “experiential predestinarianism,”¹²⁵ which placed a high emphasis on living an exemplary life, intense self-examination, and one’s ability to know their standing before God.¹²⁶ Contrary to certain historians, experiential predestinarianism (or experimental Puritanism) stood firmly within earlier Reformed trajectories and therefore should not be seen as a departure from it.¹²⁷

First, the Puritans embraced classic Christian theism that conceded to the limits of human understanding in comprehending God; thus, “As the English clergyman Richard Sibbes wrote, it was possible to apprehend God but not to comprehend him.”¹²⁸ In this sense the precisianists mirrored the scholastic metaphysical thought of Thomas Aquinas and others who via the patristics, such as Anselm’s *Cur deus homo* and Athanasius’s *Oratio de incarnatione Verbi*, upheld the belief that God was both grasped in the sense that one could *know* him and *love* him and *be loved* by him in the Incarnation, but that it was impossible given the limits of finitude and reason to comprehend him in his essence. Precisianists also believed in the Augustinian doctrine of Original Sin and in keeping with the Reformation the “bondage” or inability of the human will to of its own volition turn toward God. Though more radical sects would push the bounds with what the will was able to do, there was an early consensus and codification of this doctrine in the Reformed creeds and catechisms.

Second, following Beza, Perkins developed a strong double-predestinarian doctrine that emphasized God’s absolute sovereignty in the *ordo salutis*: election, justification, conversion, sanctification, and final glorification of sinners; though believers cooperated with grace in sanctification, God was the efficient cause of all.¹²⁹ Greenham

¹²⁴ Heiko A. Oberman argues that “in the larger European perspective William Perkins...may well hold the best claim to the title ‘Father of Pietism.’” Heiko A. Oberman, preface to Johann Arndt, *True Christianity*, trans. Peter Erb (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1979), xiii, n. 6. See August Lang, *Puritanismus und Pietismus. Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung von M. Butzer bis zum Methodismus* (Neukirchen, 1941), 101-31.

¹²⁵ It was Kendall who coined this term to be used in distinction to mere “creedal predestinarianism” (Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 8, 80). Lake and Hughes endorse this distinction. However, Tyacke, Schaefer, and Anthony Milton reject it as too rigid (Peter G. Lake, “Calvinism and the English Church, 1570-1635,” *P&P* 114 [1987]: 39, 58; Sean F. Hughes, “The Problem of ‘Calvinism’: English Theologies of Predestination, c. 1580-1630,” in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, ed. Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger [Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998], 229-49, 235, 247; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, ix; Schaefer, “The Spiritual Brotherhood,” 247).

¹²⁶ Francis J. Bremer, *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 34-47, 49-54; Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison, eds., *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996), 483; R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 1-13.

¹²⁷ See, for example, Richard A. Muller’s *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 63-104, which corrects many aspects of Kendall’s *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*.

¹²⁸ Peter J. Thuesen, *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 34-37; Bremer, *Puritanism*, 34.

¹²⁹ William Perkins, *A Golden Chaine; or, The Description of Theologie Containing the Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, According to Gods Word: A View of the Order Whereof, Is to Be Seene in the Table Annexed* (London, 1591), originally published in Latin as *Armillæ Aureæ* (1590). On Perkins’s table and its relationship to Beza’s, see Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (1986; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008); Muller, “Perkins’ *A Golden Chaine*: Predestinarian System or Schematized *Ordo Salutis*?” *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 9 (1978):

likewise emphasized the supremacy of grace in predestination and the Christian life, though Perkins's influence over later English Puritanism seems to have surpassed that of his contemporary, thus giving Perkins the reputation of being the most important Elizabethan writer of technical and practical works.¹³⁰ Perkins is often credited as the premier Elizabethan scholastic theologian (an epithet Greenham seems to have avoided);¹³¹ indeed, of the 210 books printed in Cambridge between 1590 and 1618, more than fifty were by Perkins.¹³²

Third, both Greenham and Perkins developed a strong Reformed experiential theology, which emphasized the *covenant* and covenantal duties; Perkins often spoke of a "Covenant of Works" and a "Covenant of Grace" to make sense of the relationship between God and man.¹³³ Though it would not mature until the mid-seventeenth century, historians

68-81; and Muller, "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula Praedestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 33-61.

Brannon Ellis states that Johannes Maccovius, a Polish Reformed professor at the University of Franeker, had approved of Perkins's "pithy encapsulation" in his debates with Arminius, thus reaffirming the inter-continental dialogue of the time. Ellis, *Calvin, Classical Trinitarianism and the Aseity of the Son* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 190.

¹³⁰ Thuesen, *Predestination*, 34; Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 126-27. On the practical and technical aspects of Perkins's work, see Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 55-61. Regarding Perkins's wide influence, Haller has claimed that no author was more often found on the shelves of later generations of Puritans. See William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism; or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643* (1938; repr., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), 65. Though sometimes technical, Greenham's major contribution was in the development of pastoral theology. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 126; Kenneth L. Parker and Eric J. Carlson, eds., *"Practical Divinity": The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998), 116-17.

¹³¹ Muller, *After Calvin*, 75. Cp. Paul R. Schaefer, "Protestant 'Scholasticism' at Elizabethan Cambridge: William Perkins and a Reformed Theology of the Heart," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 147-164, with Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 88-89. See also Muller, *After Calvin*, 75. For an introduction to scholasticism, see Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 1-9, 103-93.

¹³² Michael H. Black, *Cambridge University Press, 1584-1984* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 55.

¹³³ Primus states that Greenham would not be a good example to show Miller's thesis that Puritans were obsessed with the "covenant" because he scarcely discusses it at all. Instead, Greenham's primary contributions to Elizabethan Puritanism centered on building what could be called a Puritan and Reformed world and life view which emphasized experience and godly conduct. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 126. Cf. Kenneth L. Parker and Eric J. Carlson, *"Practical Divinity": The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998).

Current literature suggests that there is little difference between "covenant" and "federal" theology and that "scholars sometime use them interchangeably." Indeed, "The root of the word 'federal' comes from the Latin *foedus*, which was often translated from the Hebrew *berith* or Greek *diatheke* (testament)." Based on this observation, Glenn A. Moots suggests that a "precise understanding would use the term 'federal theology' to refer to the later theological innovation of the 'covenant of works,' for federal theology argues that there were two covenants in Scripture." Thus in this schema, there is a "Covenant of Works" which refers to the pre-lapsarian covenant made with Adam in the Garden of Eden, and the "Covenant of Grace," in which Jesus Christ, the "second Adam," agrees to perfectly keep the covenant of works in Adam's stead and "take upon himself the penalty associated with it." Moots, *Politics Reformed: The Anglo-American Legacy of Covenant Theology* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2010), 178 (n. 66).

have credited Perkins with the rise of “federal theology” because he emphasized Adam’s legal role as head of all humanity and Christ’s sacrificial role in serving as the “second Adam.”¹³⁴ Late-Elizabethan federal theology had strong organic ties to Calvin, Beza, and Bullinger, even though these magisterial reformers did not develop such a theology. John Morgan stated that English Puritan covenant theology and “its emphasis on the pastoral side...were...not innovations after 1590, but rather continuing adjustments to the requirements of a modified context;” as times changed, so too did mainstream theological expressions and pastoral requirements; they were, however, continuous with the earlier, even though there were noted departures.¹³⁵

Fourth, Puritanism’s emphasis on practical divinity has been well noted.¹³⁶ It was common to see manuals of divinity issue from the English presses and there seems to have been a whole and perhaps distinct Puritan culture of reading which “cultivated a distinct style of piety;”¹³⁷ in fact, the three most popular practical treatises, Arthur Dent’s *A Plain Man’s Pathway to Heaven* (1601), Lewis Bayly’s *The Practice of Pietie* (1613), and Henry Scudder’s *The Christian’s Daily Walke* (1627), were commonly read well into the eighteenth century,¹³⁸ and fifth, what has been less commonly observed is how this whole applied theology was enveloped within a strong millenarian rubric which emphasized God’s

While this is a characteristic portrayal of “federal theology,” it should be stated that there were various opinions in the seventeenth century as to how many covenants there were and often these covenants were understood to have occurred in various stages or dispensations. See Edmund Calamy, *Two Soleme Covenants Made Between God and Man* (1647) and cf. Richard A. Muller, “Divine Covenants, Absolute and Conditional: John Cameron and the Early Orthodox Development of Reformed Covenant Theology,” in *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 17 (2006): 11-56; Darren Staloff, *The Making of an American Thinking Class: Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in Puritan Massachusetts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 56-7; Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), 28-48; and Peter A. Lillback, “The Early Reformed Covenant Paradigm: Vermigli in the Context of Bullinger, Luther and Calvin,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, ed. Frank A. James III (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 70-96, esp. 91, where Lillback suggests the possible influence of Martyr on Puritan covenantal formulations.

¹³⁴ Michael Mullett, *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2010), 121. Cf. David A. Weir, *The Origins of Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Andrew A. Woolsey, *Unity and Continuity in Covenant Thought: A Study in the Reformed Tradition to the Westminster Assembly* (1988; Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 461-98.

¹³⁵ John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 20.

¹³⁶ Such divinity often centered around the issue of assurance for “those who believed but could not feel Christ’s love.” Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, “Practical Divinity and Spirituality,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 194. More generally, see Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe’s *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); and

¹³⁷ Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 111. On the reading culture of Protestants more generally, see Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 259-97.

¹³⁸ Matthew P. Brown, *The Pilgrim and the Bee: Reading Rituals and Book Culture in Early New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 34.

absolute providence in ordering all events to the final consummation: the true church was constantly waged in a cosmic battle against the devil.¹³⁹

Sixth, while it is less common among historians to see a distinct biblical exegetical tradition within Puritanism, nonetheless the historical evidence warrants such investigation of what Perkins aptly called “the *Opening* of the words and sentences of the Scripture.”¹⁴⁰ This possible avenue is confirmed in the distinct ways and style in which and with which Puritan commentaries were composed and published.

2.3.2 *The Mystical Strain*

While much has been written about the mystical element in Protestant spirituality, little attention has been given to mysticism within English Puritanism.¹⁴¹ While “mysticism” is a relatively loose term and historians are divided as to its precise meaning, it is possible to identify the main tenet of mysticism within Puritanism as union with Christ. This union consists of two aspects: actual mystical union (*unio Christi*) and the saint’s communion with God (*communio Deo*). Reformed theologians of the more mystical bent are known as “affectionate” theologians because of their emphasis on affective piety, a devotion that encompassed the whole gamut of feelings and attitudes to move “Christian piety inward.”¹⁴² In this sense Richard Sibbes and Samuel Rutherford have been called “affectionate” theologians. Some theologians and religious writers went deeper than

¹³⁹ Literature on Puritan millenarianism has seen a recent resurgence of interest. This is perhaps because seventeenth-century notions of the millennium and the last days have impacted subsequent generations of Christians, even to our own time. Indeed, David Spadafora credits millenarianism, in part, with British conceptions of “progress.” Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 108-9. See also Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550-1682*, 2nd ed. (London: Paternoster, 2008); Jeffrey K. Jue, “Puritan Millenarianism in Old and New England,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 259-76; *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (New York: Springer, 2006); Howard Hotson, *Paradise Postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2000); Avihu Zakai, *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 12-55; and Peter Toon, ed., *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660* (London: James Clarke, 1970). On “Puritan providentialism,” see Michael P. Winship, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), esp. 111-123; on the devil and demonism, see Nathan Johnstone, *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1-26; 107-41.

¹⁴⁰ Quoted in Lisa M. Gordis, *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 2.

¹⁴¹ Four noted exceptions are G. F. Nuttall’s somewhat dated *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, 2nd ed. (1947; repr., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), his *The Puritan Spirit: Essays and Addresses* (London: Epworth Press, 1967); Gordon S. Wakefield’s *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety* (London: Epworth Press, 1957); and Tom Schwanda’s *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative-Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2012). While I here employ the phrase “the mystical strain,” by it I mean the deeper mysticism espoused by many “affective” Puritans. Schwanda has called this “contemplative-mystical piety,” which is suggestive of the world-centered mysticism espoused in Puritanism and which waxed and waned over the course of its history.

¹⁴² Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000), 157; Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 209.

others in a move that spawned various mystical “homegrown heterodoxies,” such as Behmenism, in England; others came close.¹⁴³ Mysticism within Reformed theology represents one of several trajectories since the late Middle Ages, and much has been said about its continuity.¹⁴⁴ The study of mysticism is further complicated in that medieval mysticism and its later manifestations were more eclectic and expansive than one might expect; thus, as Denys Turner has argued, there is more than one mystical tradition within Western Christianity which contained both apophatic and cataphatic strains but which are difficult to trace because of anachronism and modern readings into medieval texts.¹⁴⁵ One of the major characteristics of English mysticism was its ability to cross social barriers and, as with Puritanism, influence all classes and ranks, from the illiterate to the highest ranks in society, some of the more noted English mystics being John Everard, Sir Henry Vane, Sir Francis Rous, George Fox, and Jane Leade.¹⁴⁶

While emphasizing mystical union with Christ, mystics disagreed on how far one could experience the divine in this life; one thing they agreed on ubiquitously was Christ’s intrinsic beauty and power to transform believers into his own likeness.¹⁴⁷ Thus while most mystics pushed for a further, spiritual reformation, they disagreed about the ways in which their inner faith should take external form; the rise of the Quakers and of George Fox in particular is indicative of the culture of spiritualities then present. Linda Woodhead states that by the time of Fox there was “such an international confluence of mystical ideas that it was possible for a writer such as John Everard to translate and make accessible the ideas of a whole range of Christian mystics, ranging from Christian appropriations of Plato to Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite to Tauler to Hans Denk.”¹⁴⁸ Such popularity, including the works and ideas of Jacob Boehme, illustrates the popularity of such notions as the desire for a more intimate and personal awareness of the divine. Indeed, that Henry More, the noted Cambridge Platonist generally critical of Boehme, would spend much of his time refuting the latter’s notion of a direct contact with “the God within” is suggestive of Bohme’s influence.¹⁴⁹ By the latter half of the seventeenth century, religious enthusiasm

¹⁴³ See B. J. Gibbons, *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought: Behmenism and Its Development in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 103-19.

¹⁴⁴ See Arie de Reuver, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 15-26; and Simon Chan, “The Puritan Meditative Tradition, 1599-1691: A Study in Ascetical Piety” (PhD. diss., Cambridge University, 1986).

¹⁴⁵ Denys Turner, *The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 7-8, 19-22.

¹⁴⁶ While Turner corrects cautions against seeing too much influence between medieval and more modern notions of mysticism, for the seventeenth century mystics noted here there was a strong direct influence which is seen their reading and imitation of medieval and continental sources. Turner, *The Darkness of God*, 7. For Leade, perhaps the most influential woman-mystic in seventeenth-century England, see Julie Hirst, *Jane Leade: Biography of a Seventeenth-Century Mystic* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005); for Vane, see David Parnham, *Sir Henry Vane, Theologian: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Religious and Political Discourse* (Cranbury: Associated University Press, 1997); and for Rous, see J. C. Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic: 1579-1659” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1948).

¹⁴⁷ Sibbes, *The Saints Cordials* (London, 1658), 364. Quoted in Stephen C. Barton, *Holiness: Past and Present* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 295.

¹⁴⁸ Linda Woodhead, *An Introduction to Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 225-6.

¹⁴⁹ Richard H. Popkin, *The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 97; Robert Crocker, *Henry More, 1614-1687: A Biography of the Cambridge Platonist* (New York: Springer, 2003), 9-

was both popular and feared and as often as it was embraced it was attacked, especially when it crossed confessional parameters or threatened the established social order.¹⁵⁰

2.3.3 *The Antinomian Strain*

While English Antinomianism¹⁵¹ has strong affinities to the earlier controversies on the continent, it became its own entity with its own champions.¹⁵² “Antinomism,” literally means “against the law” (anti-nomos), Howson broadly defines it within the Christian context as “teaching that the moral law is not relevant to the believer’s life [since] the believer is under grace and not law; she is not bound by the law as a rule of life,” instead having the inner witness of the Spirit guiding their actions.¹⁵³ In this schema, living in accordance with the law is thus meaningless for New Testament believers and serves no purpose, contrary to the Reformed belief of the third use of the law (as a moral compass or educationally), a use borrowed from Melancthon’s 1535/6 *Loci communes*.¹⁵⁴ Mainstream Reformed theology has always sought to balance Christian liberty with responsibility for moral conduct; in fact, much of Calvin’s rhetoric when writing on the law was constructed to avoid the extremes of the Anabaptists.¹⁵⁵ The Reformed church feared the Antinomian position because it was believed to allow or encourage professing Christians to lead

10. Cf. Sarah Hutton, “Henry More and Jacob Boehme,” in *Henry More (1614-1687): Tercentenary Studies*, edited by Sarah Hutton (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990), 157-168.

¹⁵⁰ For the theological critique of enthusiasm from the Reformation to the mid-seventeenth century, see Michael Heyd, *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 11-43. Of course, religious enthusiasm had much more than theological criticisms from the mainstream; virulent attacks were as often political in nature with overt suspicions of anarchy.

¹⁵¹ In certain linguistic spheres (e.g. Germany, Holland), current scholarship prefers “antinomism” to “antinomianism” to denote those who disparaged the place of the law in the Christian life. According to Theodor Mahlmann, Luther minted the German noun “Antinomer” in 1537 to describe John Agricola’s rejection of the law. Both terms have English historical precedent: in 1643, John Milton, in his *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, referred to the “fanatick dreams” of “antinomianism;” and in 1658, Thomas Manton wrote that “antinomism is but sin licensed and privileged.” Further, within seventeenth-century literature, Antinomians were often called “Antinomists” and “Libertines.” While the preponderance of current English scholarship prefers “antinomianism” I have, at times, used both terms. Mahlmann, “Antinomism,” *Religion Past and Present*, Vol. 1 (2006); *OED*, s.v; David Como, “Antinomianism,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 305-7.

¹⁵² See Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 79-132; Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 33-72; Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 11-62.

¹⁵³ Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 79 (fn 1); cf. Ernest F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law: A Study in Puritan Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976), 17-45.

¹⁵⁴ See John Witte, Jr., *The Reformation of Rights: Law, Religion, and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 59-62; Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 129. The earlier German “Antinomian Controversies” involved disputes between John Agricola and “orthodox” Lutherans in the first controversy, and between the Philippists and the Gnesio-Lutherans in the second. Ernest Koch, “Antinomian Controversy.” *Religion Past and Present*, Vol. 1 (2006); Timothy J. Wengert, “Antinomianism,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 51-3.

¹⁵⁵ Witte, *The Reformation of Rights*, 4-6, 43, 62.

immoral or careless lives. English Antinomianism first arose in the wake of perceived abuses within precisionism and provided a critique of what was seen as a revival of “Catholic legalism.”¹⁵⁶ In response to this criticism, the precisionists reduced Antinomian views to its implications for moral conduct and complained that doctrinal Antinomianism taught immorality, even if none of the alleged Antinomians and their congregations were living as such.¹⁵⁷ This is evident in two of the most popular seventeenth-century Protestant heresiographies, Thomas Edwards’s *Gangraena* (1646) and Ephraim Pagitt’s *Heresiography* (1645).¹⁵⁸ Though the chief complaint against the English Antinomians proved dubious practically, the common caricature of the English Antinomian was as one who broke the Ten Commandments with a chisel and hammer.¹⁵⁹ Crisp was known as a godly minister.¹⁶⁰ Thus, the precisionist’s main critique lay on theoretical grounds. The clash between precisionism and Antinomianism in England was often a battle of the press more than the pulpit; and as Ann Hughes points out, there were strong political connotations and often misrepresentations in mid-century heresiographies.¹⁶¹

Curt Daniel suggests that Reformed antinomianism first arose “in Geneva with the tensions between those who agreed with John Calvin...and those who agreed with the Anabaptist radicals who are sometimes referred to as the Libertines of Geneva;” only when the Libertines were either expelled or executed was there a resolution to this crisis.¹⁶² The

¹⁵⁶ Indeed, antinomian criticisms of precisionism centered on the claim that the precisionists were merely re-introducing salvation by works back into English theology. On the rise of English antinomism, see Como, *Blown by the Spirit*; Bozeman, *The Precisionist Strain*; Huehns, *Antinomianism*; and cf. and cp. the Dutch theologian Herman Witsius’s attempt to ameliorate this conflict in G. A. van den Brink, “Herman Witsius (1636-1708) and the English Antinomian Conflict,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 229-40.

¹⁵⁷ For a detailed analysis of the first Lutheran Antinomian controversy, see Klaus Ganzer and Brunto Steimer, eds., *Dictionary of the Reformation* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2002), 10-12; Timothy J. Wengert, “Antinomianism,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 51-3; Timothy J. Wengert, *Law and Gospel: Philip Melancthon’s Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben Over Poenitentia* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997); and Mark U. Edwards, *Luther and the False Brethren* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press 1975), 156-179.

¹⁵⁸ Thomas Edwards, *The First and Second Part of Gangraena: Or, A Catalogue and Discovery of Many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of This Time, Vented and Acted in England in These Four Last Yeers* (London, 1646); Ephraim Pagitt, *Heresiography: Or, A Description of the Heretickes and Sectaries of These Latter Times* (London, 1645), 88-89.

¹⁵⁹ Thus the portrait of the “Libertin” as shown on the cover of Como’s *Blown by the Spirit*.

¹⁶⁰ See, for example, the sympathetic portraits of Crisp in Thomas Beverley, *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp’s Sermons* (London, 1690); Hananiel Philalethes, *Christ Exalted and Dr. Crisp Vindicated in Several Points called Antinomian* (London, 1698), sig. Alv; and John Gill, *Truth Defended in Sermons and Tracts, by the late Reverend and Learned John Gill, D.D. A New Edition* (1814; repr., Streamwood: Primitive Baptist Library, 1981), 3:427.

¹⁶¹ Ann Hughes, “Print, Persecution and Polemic: Thomas Edwards’ *Gangraena* (1646) and Civil War Sectarianism,” in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*, ed. Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 255-274.

¹⁶² Curt Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” in *The Life and Thought of John Gill, 1697-1771: A Tercentennial Appreciation*, edited by Michael A. G. Haykin (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 171; Selderhuis, *The Calvin Handbook*, 67-68. Henk van den Belt clarifies that, for Calvin, there is a distinction between Anabaptists who acknowledged the Bible’s authority, and the “Spiritual Libertines” who did not. Thus, while some in current scholarship equate the two, there is need for finer distinction. Van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 29-30.

next rupture, between mainstream-precisianist divines and Antinomians, was in the Massachusetts Bay Colony of New England in the mid-to-late 1630s, which consisted of conflicts between mainstream clergy and Anne Hutchinson.¹⁶³ The third major antinomian controversy that broke out during England's time of crisis during the English Revolution, when the "Puritan underground" emerged from the shadows to wreak havoc on precisianist codifiers.¹⁶⁴

Thus, the rise of English Antinomianism is unique in that it had direct ties with the earlier Continental controversies in Germany; in fact, the London minister John Eaton (often cited as "the first antinomian among us") was known to have cited or quoted Luther over one hundred times in his treatise *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Faith Alone* (1642), a book of some influence and which seems to have circulated in manuscript form since the early 1620s.¹⁶⁵

Both Luther and Calvin were used by English Antinomians to enlist support for their cause; as often as they were used they were also altered to support positions contrary to the overall work of the reformers. Thus, "even as Eaton used Luther, he changed him...the Luther who saw the Decalogue as an indispensable guide to Christian conduct, who required severe self-discipline, denounced libertine misconstructions of sola fides, and warned congregations that they must obey the law or go to hell, he knew, grasped, or regarded little." Eaton's Luther was no more than an espouser of "free justification, or pardon."¹⁶⁶ Tobias Crisp also appealed to the continental reformers and earned the reputation of being the greatest Antinomian of the seventeenth century. His sermons, collected in *Christ Alone Exalted*, were widely read and influential well into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and are still popular among Particular Baptists.¹⁶⁷ Unlike Eaton

¹⁶³ Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," 171. Stephen Strehle calls this "The most important controversy concerning antinomianism and the doctrine of assurance..." Strehle, *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounter Between the Middle Ages and the Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 47. For an elaborate discussion of this second controversy, see David D. Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 3-22; Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 188-210; Winship, *Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson: Puritans Divided* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005); and William K. B. Stoever, "A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven": *Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1988).

¹⁶⁴ Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," 171-72; Hill, *Religion and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*, 163-64.

¹⁶⁵ Pagitt, *Heresiography*, 89. Eaton's main source of inspiration is John Foxe's English edition of Luther's commentary upon Galatians (1535). Norman B. Graebner finds no less than 106 citations of Luther in Eaton's work. Graebner, "Protestants and Dissenters: An Examination of the Seventeenth-Century Eatonist and New England Controversies in Reformation Perspective" (PhD diss., Duke University, 1984), vi, 154, 167, 182, which is confirmed by Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 190. See also, Bozeman, "John Eaton as Contra-Puritan," 638-54.

Daniel claims that neither the first nor second "Antinomian controversy" had much influence on the English controversy of the 1640s. I disagree with this assertion because the English antinomians had direct access to the writings of continental reformers and used their texts to support their positions. In fact, John Agricola's controversy in Germany arose out of misreading Luther. Samuel Rutherford claimed the same infelicities in John Eaton, John Saltmarsh, and others. Daniel, "John Gill and Hyper Calvinism," 171-72.

¹⁶⁶ Pagitt, *Heresiography*, 90; Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 190-91.

¹⁶⁷ One of the more influential editions of Crisp's sermons was that annotated and printed by the London Particular Baptist John Gill in 1755. See Curt Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," in

and other radical reformers, Crisp had a wide and eclectic following, ranging from extreme radicals (such as Jane Leade) to mainstream elite (such as Vincent Alsop); while many were critical of him (Isaac Ambrose, Samuel Rutherford, Robert Traill, John Flavel, Thomas Gataker, Richard Baxter), there were also those who defended him to various degrees from the former's aspersions (Increase Mather, Nathaniel Mather, John Howe, Hanswerd Knollys).¹⁶⁸

Other noted Antinomians were John Traske, Roger Brearley, Robert Towne, John Everard, William Dell, Henry Denne, Paul Hobson, Walter Cradock, and John Saltmarsh. Often historians refer to a first and second wave of English Antinomianism, which may be marked as pre- and post-Civil War Antinomianism, the former consisting of an "underground" network of pastors and unlicensed printers.¹⁶⁹ The construction is somewhat artificial since English Antinomianism should be seen as an organic entity, which flourished or diminished according to various factors, such as freedom of the press, and which even affected such high-standing luminaries as John Milton.¹⁷⁰ Theodore Bozeman, David Como, and Peter Lake have "shown that Puritanism was not a monolithic 'homogeneous ideology,' [and] that in the pre-Civil-War period a radical Puritan 'underground' was at odds with the conservative orthodox mainstream." Aschah Guibbory adds to this that "we see something of the tensions and contradictions between radical and conservative elements, however, even within the 'orthodox' Puritans who preached the fast sermons to Parliament during the Civil War."¹⁷¹ More recent scholarship has taken a more sympathetic stance towards the Antinomians of the seventeenth century and has attempted to weave through precisianist rhetoric when assessing their contributions to theology and society.¹⁷²

2.3.4 *The Neonomian Strain*

So-called neonomianism or "new law" (sometimes referred to as "Baxterianism" post-1690s) emerged as a response to theologically high Calvinism and was pitched as a corrective to English antinomianism.¹⁷³ While there were several proponents of "neonomian" theology, the most famous are the Puritan casuist Richard Baxter and his

The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697-1771): A Tercentennial Appreciation, ed. Michael A.G. Haykin (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 171-90.

¹⁶⁸ Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 102-3.

¹⁶⁹ See, for instance, Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 3-9.

¹⁷⁰ Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 447; Hill, *Religion and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*, 153-4.

¹⁷¹ Aschah Guibbory, "Israel and English Protestant Nationalism: 'Fast Sermons' During the English Revolution," *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton's England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 128. Cf. See Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 10-32; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 3-10; and Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001), 389-413.

¹⁷² See Tim Cooper, "The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the 'Radical' from Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Religion," *Journal of Religious History* 24/3 (2000): 247-62. Cf. Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001).

¹⁷³ Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, 250-51.

disciple Daniel Williams.¹⁷⁴ Baxter had reasserted the necessity of good works and obedience in the justification of the sinner. He believed that by the Holy Spirit's enabling, the elect are able to fulfill the new law inaugurated by Christ or that the gospel itself is a "new law," in that its requirements for salvation are fulfilled through faith and repentance. In other words, it is the belief that the gospel of Christ is a "new law" that supplanted the "old" or Mosaic Law. This teaching had specific implications for the Protestant doctrine of justification and was challenged in the court of orthodoxy by Robert Traill, Thomas Edwards, John Owen, and William Eyre, who believed that the neonomian strain tended to promote a salvation by works and legalism. The Presbyterian Daniel Williams, "a moderate Calvinist who carried the torch after Baxter's [death]," more explicitly developed a "neonomian" scheme in his *Gospel-Truth Stated and Vindicated* (1692), which, in turn, provoked numerous precisianist responses.¹⁷⁵ Later that year Isaac Chauncy published the first major response to Williams with his *Neonomianism Unmasked* (1692). Chauncy's treatise was not only the first to retort to the newly minted *Gospel Truth*, but was the first to give this "legal strain" a new name: "neonomianism."¹⁷⁶ In fact, Chauncy referred to Baxter as "a certain zealous Neonomian" and opined that "after...[he] had taken his leave of us, there was a great deal of Probability this Controversie would have fell to the ground," if Williams had not tried to "make [himself] the Head of a Party."¹⁷⁷ In 1693, Williams responded with a much-shorter pamphlet called *A Defense of Gospel Truth*, in which he sought to garrison neonomian theology.¹⁷⁸ Isaac Chauncy, Robert Traill, and others, alleged that neonomianism jeopardized *sola fide* and *sola gratia* and that it came dangerously close to, if not being wholly infected with, Catholicism. Thus, while neonomianism was an attempt to correct the antinomianism of the English Revolution, to many precisianists the pendulum swung in the opposite direction and jeopardized free grace. It was thus believed to have come too close to the moralism pitched by Henry Hammond and other like-minded Anglicans in viewing justification as a process which "only begins at the moment of conversion but is concluded at the final judgment."¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ For recent studies on "neonomianism," its contexts of controversy, and the varieties of hypothetical universalism among the Reformed orthodox, see Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in His Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993), 166-94; Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 15-45; J. I. Packer, "The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter" (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1954), 212-308; Albert Gootjes, "Calvin and Saumur: The Case of Claude Pajon (1626-1685)," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 203-14; Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 27-229; David P. Field, *Rigide Calvinisme in a Softer Dresse: The Moderate Presbyterianism of John Howe, 1630-1705* (Edinburgh: Rutherford House Books, 2004); and Curt Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," in *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697-1771): A Tercentennial Appreciation* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 171-90.

¹⁷⁵ Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 158-59.

¹⁷⁶ *Oxford English Dictionary, Vol X: Moul-Ovum*, 320.

¹⁷⁷ Chauncy, *Neonomianism Unmasked*, 10.

¹⁷⁸ Williams criticizes Crisp's supports by appealing to the teachings of the Westminster Assembly and "all *our* Orthodox" [italics mine]. Williams, *A Defense of Gospel Truth* (London, 1693), 42-3.

¹⁷⁹ Fesko, *Beyond Calvin*, 311. For Baxter's ties to Arminianism, see William Lamont, "Arminianism: The Controversy that Never Was," in *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 45-66. Cf. C. Fitzsimons Allison, *The Rise of*

Baxter's "neonomian" views were published in his *Aphorisms of Justification* (1649), *Confession of His Faith* (1655), and *Catholick Theologie* (1675). Because of striking similarities with the teachings of Moises Amyraut, Baxter was called Amyraut's "only proselyte in England," though this epithet was not entirely accurate.¹⁸⁰ Baxter did believe that the true believer participated in his justification by obedience to the new law of grace as expressed in the gospel, but such participation was so miniscule that it could be likened to "a hot pepper corn." Further, Baxter upheld forensic notions of justification likened it to "the acquitting of us from the charge of breaking the Law."¹⁸¹ Of course, even the smallest of human contributions to justification contradict most Reformed orthodox notions of the process of salvation.

Trueman states that Baxter's "polemical and dogmatic works demonstrate extensive appropriation and interaction with all manner of theological streams and philosophical trajectories;"¹⁸² and yet Baxter's eclecticism with what were perceived to be suspect sources brought his theological works into disfavor with the orthodox Reformed. As critical of extreme Antinomianism as mainstream Puritans generally were, some of their sharpest assaults were reserved for Baxter's softening of the doctrine of justification; intransigent Presbyterians feared the course English Reformed theology was taking and believed that neonomianism reflected the growth of a certain legal strain within the church. Given how important the doctrine of justification was for the English Protestantism of the seventeenth century, the overcharged rhetoric in response to neonomianism seems warranted; however, that Baxter retained an admirable reputation as a Puritan casuist in spite of some of his dogmatic expressions reveals the often perplexing and flexible bounds of the Reformed orthodox among the Puritans and, in particular, its chief interest in the *praxis pietatis*.

Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter (1966; rpr. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003), 96-106.

¹⁸⁰ Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 47 (fn 154). On Amyraut's influence on Richard Baxter, see William M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), 129, 138, 146-47; 152-53; N. H. Keeble, "Richard Baxter," *Oxford DNB*, and Matthew Kadane, "Les bibliothèques de deux théologiens réformés . du XVIIe siècle, l'un puritan anglais, l'autre pasteur Huguenot," *Bulletin Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 147 (2001): 67-100. Anne Dunan-Page notes that Baxter kept six of Amyraut's books in his library, and often recommended them in his *Christian Directory* for healing divisions among Protestants. Anne Dunan-Page, "Introduction," in *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots, 1660-1750*, edited by Anne Dunan-Page (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 11; Dunan-Page, *Grace Overwhelming: John Bunyan, The Pilgrim's Progress, and the Extremes of the Baptist Mind* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 21 (fn 13).

¹⁸¹ Michael Bryson, *The Tyranny of Heaven: Milton's Rejection of God as King* (Cranbury: University of Delaware Press, 2004), 120. On Baxter's doctrine of justification in its historical and theological context, see Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum 1993). On Baxter's eclectic use of scholastic sources in this doctrine ("[which] even here he betrays a Scotist influence"), see Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic*, 339-40.

¹⁸² Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 32. Cf. Trueman, "A Small Step Towards Rationalism: The Impact of the Metaphysics of Tommaso Campanella on the Theology of Richard Baxter," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark (Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999), 181-95.

2.4 Conclusion

The seventeenth century was a time of dramatic change for British society, and witnessed change from a royal monarchy to an English Commonwealth, in a move that “turned the world upside down.”

Any study of the seventeenth century and of particular theologians or religious writers of this era must necessarily take into consideration the major religious, cultural, social, and political forces affecting the period as well as standard works of literature (of received and disputed ideas) which they would have likely dealt with. While these texts will be looked at later, it is sufficient to note that all three Puritans examined in this book were well acquainted with the major continental writers (Luther, Calvin, Bullinger), and used them as they best served their purposes. As Eaton used Luther and changed him, so too did Rutherford in refuting Eaton. While it is not necessary to note every book or idea they may have come across it is nonetheless expedient to examine the major theological currents that affected the received theological tradition of the period. This is especially the case with those figures that stood on the fringes of orthodox belief; how they used sources and why they took alternative interpretations of major sources is essential in understanding the radical religion of the English Revolution.

The Reformed orthodox theology of seventeenth-century Puritans was fluid in the sense that there was room for variance, flexibility, or “varieties,” but they stood in relation to what can be understood as a normative, mainstream tradition that was codified at the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652. While possible reasons for such diversity will be explored later, among Puritans there were variations on such topics as hypothetical universalism, covenant, justification, and predestination. Puritanism should be seen as broadly Reformed orthodox, which, at times, allowed for significant deviation, as Baxter’s doctrine of justification, so long as one’s overall theology was seen to be in confluence with Puritan doctrine and practice. This understanding of Reformed orthodoxy concedes to the fact that Baxter was well respected and accepted by most mainline Puritans, even though they generally disputed his doctrine of justification. The “social” Reformation which occurred in the sixteenth century, and which affected the popular mindset and behavior of “the godly” continued into the seventeenth century.

The seventeenth century was a “short century” in the sense that the major political moments occurred between 1603-89. This chapter has shown that seventeenth-century Puritanism has a greater prehistory than the century in which it existed. We can successfully trace the origins of Puritanism to the early English Reformation, thus predating the rise of Puritanism in the Elizabethan period, and it is possible to date it earlier to Lollardy. While historians continue to debate the origins of Puritanism, the evangelical elements within early English Protestantism gave rise to the “the Puritan spirit.”

While Protestantism gained massive impetus during the reign of the boy-king Edward VI, it was not until the Elizabethan period that Puritanism became a formal element in English religious life. This establishment was in no small part due to the return of hundreds of exiles to England, many of whom made important theological connections on the continent; it is estimated that of the almost 800 exiles about one quarter to one

fifth of the exiles eventually made their way to Geneva. This explains the strong Genevan flavor of early Elizabethan Protestantism and the rise of English Presbyterianism.

Rather than remaining static, Puritanism adapted to the political and religious conditions of the later sixteenth and early seventeenth century; many of these adaptations were theological modifications of such doctrines as the assurance of faith. Thus, there is the variation through time, and the many shifts in emphasis from the antivistarian position of the 1560s through the great pietist turn of the 1590s to the era of eschatological furor of the early-mid seventeenth century when radical Puritanism emerged as a viable contender to the moralism of the established church through to the rather sudden demise of its ideals in the mid-eighteenth century. First and Second-Wave English Antinomianism emerged during the English Revolution, borrowing facets of established religion and modifying it as deemed necessary; aberrant forms of spirituality also surfaced, keeping various degrees of continuity with its medieval past and sometimes transgressing the bounds of mainstream opinion; precisianism became more solidified in the wake of radical challenges as did exaggerated reactions. English religious culture sought to hammer out its own identity, spawned various Protestant identities, and concluded with a readiness for toleration and religious freedom.

Chapter 3

John Downname (1571-1652)

3.1 Introduction

John Downname (or Downham) was one of the greatest exponents of the precisianist strain within Puritanism during the pre-revolutionary years of the seventeenth century, a prominent member of London Puritanism, and renowned casuist.¹ His fame rests chiefly in his nineteen published works, most of which were works of practical divinity, such as his four-part *magnum opus*, *The Christian Warfare* (1604-18), and his *A Guide to Godlynesse* (1622), a shorter, though still copious, manual for Christian living. Downname was also known for his role in publishing two of the most popular theological manuals: Sir Henry Finch's *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (1620), which consisted of a much more expanded version of Finch's earlier *Sacred Doctrine* (1613), and Archbishop James Ussher's *A Body of Divinitie* (1645), which was published from rough manuscripts and without Ussher's consent, having been intended for private use.² Downname also had a role in codifying the Westminster annotations on the Bible, being one of a few city ministers to work on the project, though he never sat at the Westminster Assembly.³ Downname's older brother,

¹Various historians from the seventeenth century to the present have spelled Downname's name differently (either Downname or Downham). The majority of seventeenth century printed works, however, use "Downname." I here follow that practice. For Downname's place in Reformed casuistry, see Benjamin T. G. Mayes, *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning After the Reformation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 19-20.

²There is some debate between historians over the authorship of *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (c. 1620). Ian Green, Michael McGiffert, and Wilfred Prest credit authorship to Sir Henry Finch, a Puritan lawyer and author of the shorter *The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie* (1599), whereas Richard A. Muller cites authorship to Downname. In recent private correspondence, however, Muller has conceded to Finchian authorship. See Randall J. Pederson, "Who Wrote *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (1620)?" (forthcoming in *Reformation and Renaissance Review*); Ian Green, "For Children in Yeeres and Children in Understanding': The Emergence of the English Catechism under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986): 398; Michael McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 88, No. 5 (Dec., 1983): 1158; Wilfred R. Prest, "The Art of Law and the Law of God: Sir Henry Finch (1558-1625)," in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*, ed. Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 106; Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 97; and Richard A. Muller, "Covenant and Conscience in English Reformed Theology: Three Variations on a Seventeenth-Century Theme," *Westminster Theological Journal* 42 (1980): 312-20. On Ussher's reluctance to see *A Body of Divinitie* in print, see Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 81-3; Crawford Gribben, "Rhetoric, Fiction and Theology: James Ussher and the Death of Jesus Christ," *The Seventeenth Century* 20:1 (2005): 64.

³Helen Thornton incorrectly calls Downname a "member of the Westminster Assembly." Rather, Downname's role with the Assembly seems confined to preparing the 1645 Annotations in association with various ministers of the Assembly and serving in an adjunctive capacity in the ordination of ministers; cf. and cp. Helen Thornton, *State of Nature or Eden? Thomas Hobbes and His Contemporaries on the Natural Condition of Human Beings* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005), 35; William Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1843), 182; Chad van Dixhoorn,

George, had the reputation of being the most famous Ramist in Christ's College, Cambridge, for engaging in public controversy, and publishing various famed treatises, all in which Downname followed suit.⁴ Given John Downname's extensive influence within Stuart Puritanism and his enduring legacy as a popular devotional writer and biblical exegete, it is surprising so little work has been done on him.⁵ To date, no extensive analysis of his life and work exists; shorter analyses tend to focus on single aspects of his thought (such as "covenant") or themes within his published work as opposed to a broader analysis of his divinity within its historical and social context.⁶

Downname's practical divinity represents an English synthesis of Reformed continental thought. Thus, by examining Downname's social and intellectual contexts, we will come to a better understanding of Stuart Puritanism, its beliefs and practices; in short, we will see how a mainstream "precisianist" Puritan contributed to the advance of the Puritan Reformation through the preached and published word.⁷

William K. B. Stoeber has stated that as there was a "canon" of literature for continental systematic theology works, so, among the Puritans, there was a corpus or "standard theological literature" which consisted of published sermons, treatises, divinity books, prayers, and "spiritual" biographies and were of varied "practical" or "controversial importance."⁸ At least three of Downname's works, *Christian Warfare*, *Annotations*, and

ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652, Vol. 5: Assembly Papers, Supplementary Material, and Indexes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 5:80.

⁴ Donald Lemen Clark, "John Milton and William Chappell," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (1955): 337. George Downname, professor of logic at Cambridge, was chiefly responsible for urging John to attend university and to pursue the ministry under his tutorship. John Downname, *The Christian Warfare* (1634), sig. A3. George Downname's handwritten manuscript *Expositionis Georgii Dounami: in Petri Rami Dialecticam Catechismus* was found in Jonathan Edwards's library, being handed down through the generations. Peter J. Thuesen, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards, Vol. 26: Catalogues of Books* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 424. For George Downname's "wedding" of Ramism and Puritanism, see Robert Letham, "The Foedus Operum: Some Factors Accounting for Its Development," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (1983): 457-467.

⁵ This may partly be due to the immensity of his work. The combined page count of *Christian Warfare* and *Guide to Godlynesse*, just two of his works, is over 2,000.

⁶ Three notable exceptions are R. W. de Koeijer, "Geestelijke strijd bij de puriteinen. Een spiritualiteit-historisch onderzoek naar Engelse puriteinse geschriften in de periode 1587-1654" (PhD thesis, Utrecht University, 2010), 101-19; McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," 1151-1174; and Muller, "Covenant and Conscience." De Koeijer's work deals chiefly with Downname's view of *Christian Warfare*, and the latter two articles are now dated, with the last presuming Downnamean authorship of the *Summe*.

⁷ John Morgan writes that John Downname described "the good Puritan life" as "walking before [God] in the duties of piety, righteousness and sobriety, with faith, a pure heart, and good conscience all the dayes of our lives." Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 18.

⁸ William K. B. Stoeber, *"A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven: Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts"* (Middleton: Wesleyan University Press, 1978), 15-16; Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 1-38, 246-47, 258. While Cambers work is monumental in assessing early modern English Puritan "book culture," his work is more of a social or cultural history rather than a textual or intellectual one; he does not, for instance, clearly identify the "canon of devotional literature" (246-47) and only mentions its existence. For a more clearly defined "canon," see Matthew P. Brown, *The Pilgrim and the Bee: Reading Rituals and Book Culture in Early New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 68-105. Cf. Hugh Amory,

Guide to Godlynesse, were part of this greater devotional corpus, and have appeared in such widely diverse libraries as that of Richard Baxter, Lady Anne Clifford and Samuel Jeake of Rye.⁹ It is not known to what extent Downname's work was translated into other languages. Willem op't Hof found at least one edition of Downname's *Spiritual Physicke* (1600) in Dutch translation.¹⁰

Within Puritanism there was not only a "religion of the word" which consisted of the centrality of preaching and the spoken word but also a "religion of the book" which centered on the Bible and its interpretation with various devotional or theological helps to understand and put it into practice.¹¹ This experiential book-centeredness is important in understanding Puritanism because of the emphasis Puritans placed upon reading as a spiritual discipline; and though Puritans often favored the spoken to the written word (e.g. Thomas Watson refused to read recorded prayers), there was nonetheless a vibrant and flourishing culture of godly reading and learning.¹²

"Printing and Bookselling in New England, 1638-1713," in *A History of the Book in America, Volume 1: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World*, ed. Hugh Amory and David D. Hall (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 83-116.

Further, I here include printed "prayers" as an important contribution for Puritan practical divinity, which, to some, may seem surprising given the Puritans general disdain for such forms as the Book of Common Prayer, which nonconformists were reputed to refuse to read from the pulpit because they stymied extemporaneous prayer. But in the course of my research I have found such books as Robert Bolton's *Certaine Devout Prayers of Mr. Bolton* (1631), which should temper this common but mistaken assumption about Puritan devotion. Indeed, William Gouge, who wrote the preface to Bolton's collection and likely published it posthumously from manuscripts in his possession, wrote, "Sundry forms of prayers were by the Ancient Fathers composed for the Churches in their daies. In like manner have all Christian Churches in succeeding ages, had their particular forms. Never had any age, or country more pious, pithy forms then ours, some for publick, others for private use, among which the forme here tendered unto thee hath its excellency." Prior to this comment, Gouge expressed his desire that this "pithy" collection would "enflame" and "quicken" the spirits of readers. Bolton, *Certaine Devout Prayers of Mr. Bolton* (London, 1631), sig. A8v, Agr-10v.

While, as Lauren F. Winner states, "Puritan advocates of extemporaneous prayer" may have generally despised more ceremonial or liturgical forms, believing these form prayers to be "merely performative, artificial, boring, repetitious," and that "free-form prayer was authentic and bespoke the heart's true desire," there needs to be greater nuance in scholarship to account for Bolton's and Gouge's work (Gouge was, after all, a noted minister who sat at Westminster). Winner *A Cheerful and Comfortable Faith: Anglican Religious Practice in the Elite Households of Eighteenth-Century Virginia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 96.

⁹ Richard Baxter, *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter, Volume 5*, ed. William Orne (London: James Duncan, 1830), 587; Julie Crawford, "Lady Anne Clifford and the Uses of Christian Warfare," in *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*, ed. Micheline White (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 104-5; Michael Hunter, et al, *A Radical's Books: The Library of Samuel Jeake of Rye, 1623-90* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999), 9.

¹⁰ Willem op't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1598-1622* (Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987), 254.

¹¹ Cambers, *Godly Readings*, 259. See also Lisa M. Gordis, *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 73-96; and John R. Knott, Jr., *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), 13-41.

¹² Thus Downname writes that though there are some who are so taken up by the Fathers, Schoolmen, and late Writers that they have little time for the Bible, Christians are not to neglect or want

Given Downname's extensive role as a codifier of the precisianist strain within mainstream Reformed spirituality, his life and work ably demonstrate the major motifs and doctrinal unities associated with the Puritan Reformation and serve as an excellent comparison to Rous and Crisp, who, being reflective of other strains within Puritanism, testify to mainstream Puritanism's unity within diversity.¹³ This unity in diversity is seen in not only shared social experiences, such as Sabbath observance, disdain for the theater and plays, and more theological concerns in combating Arminianism and Socinianism, and in being members of an international Calvinist network, but in common concerns for the devotional welfare of laity and their instruction in godly living.¹⁴

In this chapter will focus on Downname as a representative of the precisianist strain in Puritanism with a view to establishing his doctrinal stance, but also work to place him into the broader stream of Puritan and Reformed thought. To do this, we will consider first Downname's social contexts and see how he was involved in various controversies in the Stuart period, how he served as licenser of the press, and how he became a prominent minister in London. We will then look at Downname's major writings; namely, his *Christian Warfare*, *Lectures on Hosea*, *Guide to Godlynesse*, *Concordance*, and *Annotations*; and his two edited works, *Summe of Sacred Divinitie* and *Body of Divinitie*. Finally, we will look at Downname's theology in its historical context and conclude with some observatory remarks. By looking at Downname's life and thought within context, we will be able to see the "ethos" of the precisianist strain, and note the importance that precisianist Puritans placed upon biblical exegesis, the experiential weaving of doctrine with practice, and adherence to Reformed orthodoxy.¹⁵

3.2 Social Contexts

We will now appraise Downname's social contexts to the extent in which they shaped his theology, contributed to his reputation as an English casuist, and reflect the concerns of the Puritan Reformation. While various social and political forces converged to influence the precise ways in which Downname expressed his divinity, he was, above all, preoccupied with the social and spiritual welfare of his parishioners; indeed, his greatest work, *Christian Warfare*, devotes more time to assurance of faith and self-examination than any

time to peruse the writings of "learned and godly men;" indeed, care must be taken when selecting the "most profitable for our edification." Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 631-52. On Puritan reading culture, see Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 30; Cambers, *Godly Reading*, 1-38; Brown, *The Pilgrim and the Bee*, 68-106; Hugh Amory and David D. Hall, *A History of the Book in America, Volume 1: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); David D. Hall, *Cultures of Print: Essays in the History of the Book* (Boston: University of Massachusetts, 1996), 79-96; cf. Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 142, where John Downname is said to have illustrated the proposition that the family was the bedrock of instruction.

¹³ See Chapter 6.

¹⁴ Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 1-4.

¹⁵ Indeed, Charles Cohen has identified a distinct "Puritan" religious experience centered on conversion. Cohen, *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 14-16.

other topic.¹⁶ The work itself was intended for those who were burdened by the “sight and sense” of their sin in their combat with the flesh, world, and devil.¹⁷

John Downname was born in Chester, the younger son of William Downname, bishop of Chester.¹⁸ He matriculated from Christ’s College, Cambridge, in 1589, graduated BA in 1593, and proceeded MA in 1596 and BD in 1603, all when Christ’s College was a “hotbed of Elizabethan Puritanism;” in fact, Puritanism would characterize Christ’s College well into the seventeenth century and impact such luminaries as John Milton.¹⁹ As far back as the 1560s and 1570s, Christ’s had its reputation as “a puritan seminary in all but name.”²⁰ Though Trinity and Emmanuel colleges became the most notable Puritan strongholds, the latter under Chaderton in the 1580s, it was Christ’s College that had a reputation for churning out “the godly” ministers who characterized the Puritan Reformation.²¹ Downname’s education at Cambridge set the course of his life and exposed him to the method of Peter Ramus, which marked his entire ministry and is clearly seen in his published works. Connections made throughout his career helped him to become an elite member of London Puritanism and lecturer at Allhallows the Great.²²

Downname was ordained a deacon and priest in London in 1598 at the age of twenty-seven, was the vicar of St. Olave Jewry, London, from 1599 to 1602, and from 1602 to 1618 was, in succession to his brother George, rector of St. Margaret’s, Lothbury, where he was indicted in 1607 for preaching without a license.²³ It is not clear whether Downname “conformed” afterwards or whether his eminent patrons and extensive publications shadowed his nonconformity.²⁴

Downname’s prominence as a London minister and controversialist is seen in his active roles to resolve disagreements between fellow clergy, as when, about 1614,

¹⁶ See, for instance, Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 85-96, 106-38, 236-62; cf. Michael P. Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s,” *Church History*, Vol. 70, No. 3 (2001): 462-81; C. Scott Dixon, *Contesting the Reformation* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 190-91.

¹⁷ Downname, *Christian’s Warfare*, sig. A1r-a1v.

¹⁸ Biographical details are brief and fragmentary. See *Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. “Downham, John.” Details of Downname’s London career and connections are brought to light in Paul S. Seaver, *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970), 158, 175, 199; esp. 273-74, 325-6, 362.

¹⁹ Much of Christ’s College fame came from Laurence Chaderton, the “pope of Cambridge Puritanism,” who, more than any other professor “made Christ’s College a virtual Puritan seminary.” J. David Hoeveler, *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002), 7; Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 25-54; Catherine Gimelli Martin, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case of Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 108.

²⁰ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 122.

²¹ Hoeveler, *Creating the American Mind*, 7.

²² Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London’s Overseas Traders, 1550-1653* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 296; Tai Liu, *Puritan London: A Study of Religion and Society in the City Parishes* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1986), esp. 51-102, 149-71; and Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge: “Orthodoxy,” “Heterodoxy,” and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 170-261.

²³ Paul S. Seaver, “Downham, John (1571-1652),” *ODNB*.

²⁴ Downname had such eminent patrons as Henry Andrews and Hugh Perry, a Levant Company and East India Company director. Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, 296-97.

Downname joined with Richard Stock and William Gouge in supporting George Walker in Walker's longstanding controversy with Anthony Wotton, a seasoned Puritan preacher who was charged with advancing Arminian, even Socinian, opinions in his lecture at Barking.²⁵ Walker, a proponent of strict Reformed orthodoxy and a fledgling minister, denounced Wotton in a sermon at Blackfriars in London, and the two eventually agreed to a dispute in a conference before eight other ministers, each side choosing four, in a controversy that ignited a long and protracted pamphlet war.²⁶ Those supporting Walker were Richard Stock, John Downname, Thomas Westfield, and William Gouge; those defending Wotton were Thomas Gataker, James Balmford, William Hickes, and John Randall.²⁷ Walker had accused Wotton of a "damned and damnable heresy," and sought to prove that Wotton was promoting doctrines that subverted the religious and moral order.²⁸ The first conference proved fruitless, however, and so a second was convened some time later, upon Gataker's insistence, with the stipulation that Walker outline and compare the errors of Socinus to Wotton's.²⁹

The second conference was held and the points again debated. Wotton was largely exonerated of the charges (the ministers declaring "we do not hold the difference to be so great and weighty as that they are to be justly condemned of heresy and blasphemy"), but his reputation suffered within European Protestant circles.³⁰ Walker thus gained a

²⁵ Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 232-34.

²⁶ For pamphleteering in the seventeenth century in general, see Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), 132-62; and Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 4-26.

²⁷ Samuel Wotton, *Mr. Anthony Wotton's Defence Against Mr. George Walker's Charge, Accusing Him of Socinian Heresie and Blasphemie* (Cambridge, 1641), 8; John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 55.

For an overview of the Walker-Wotton affair, see Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge*, 221-42; Lake, "Puritanism, Familism, and Heresy in Early Stuart England: The Case of John Ethington Revisited," in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 95; Peter Lake and David Como, "'Orthodoxy' and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of 'Consensus' in the London (Puritan) 'Underground,'" *The Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000): 34-70; and Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, 1620-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 56-57.

Webster's account of the Wotton affair in his *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England* (1997) is inaccurate in two ways: (1) He refers to an Anthony "Wooton" (whereas it should be "Wotton"); and (2) he notes that the Downname referred to in *Mr. Anthony Wotton's Defence* was George Downham (d. 1634), which is impossible because according to Gataker's preface only Richard Stock of Walker's supporters had died as of 1641.

The whole affair is suggestive of the budding nature of doctrinal consensus in the Stuart parish as it sought to come to terms with emerging Arminianism.

²⁸ Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge*, 215; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 109.

²⁹ Gataker had a reputation for attempting to ameliorate intra-Puritan debates. Diane Willen, "Thomas Gataker and the Use of Print in the English Godly Community," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70 (2007): 343-64.

³⁰ Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 55; David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2004), 23 (n. 25).

reputation as a “doctrinal attack dog of quite outstanding tenacity and viciousness” and continued to campaign on the issue for years to come.³¹ As Lake shows, the Walker-Wotton affair provides remarkable insight into “doctrinal disputes” and “damage litigation” within London Puritanism, the role of affecting clergy, and the somewhat flexible bounds mainstream ministers were willing to go to keep the peace.³² What Walker disliked about Wotton was the latter’s insistence, akin to Johannes Piscator, that Christ’s righteousness was not imputed to believers but rather that justification concerned chiefly the forgiveness of sins.³³ Wotton’s “subtle revisions” to the doctrine of justification reemerged during later controversies surrounding John Goodwin and Richard Baxter. Gataker, who came to Wotton’s defense in this protracted affair, would also come to Goodwin’s aid sometime later and would even express sympathy for Baxter.³⁴

Downname’s role in the Walker-Wotton affair shows not only his interest in what became a “*cause célèbre*” within London Puritanism, but hints as to his own theological leanings and articulations.³⁵ Further, Lake observes how the whole affair reflects the wanton polemics of the period and desire for clerical advancement; Walker was an inexperienced minister and wanted to establish his reputation within London Puritanism.³⁶ Though Downname never sat at the Westminster Assembly, he was nonetheless aware of and endorsed its theological consensus. By the time the meetings were held at Westminster, Downname had established himself as an influential member of “the godly” in London.³⁷

On February 1, 1615, the Haberdashers’ Company appointed Downname, already a popular preacher in the city, the first William Jones lecturer at St. Bartholomew Exchange.³⁸ His inaugural lecture, published as *The Plea of the Poore; Or, A Treatise of*

³¹ Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*, 200.

³² See Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*, ch. 9.

³³ See Anthony Burgess, *The True Doctrine of Justification Asserted and Vindicated* (London, 1644), 214, where Piscator and Wotton are mentioned together. It is possible that Wotton had read Piscator’s book on justification, which was published in English in 1599. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 104.

³⁴ David Como, “Wotton, Anthony (1561?-1626),” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, ed. by Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 2:288; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 55.

³⁵ There was significant diversity over the doctrine of justification and the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the believer, and Downname, as we shall see, took the Reformed orthodox position of justification within time at the moment of faith and the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the believer (see Section 3.4.5 below).

³⁶ Lake, *Boxmaker’s Revenge*, 215, 221-41.

³⁷ Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 315-16; O. C. Edwards, Jr., “Varieties of Sermon: A Survey of Preaching in the Long Eighteenth Century,” in *Preaching, Sermon and Cultural Change in the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Joris van Eijnatten (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 37.

³⁸ The William Jones lectureship was but one example of prominent English merchants funding Puritan lectureships. Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), 70-74; William Meyler Warlow, *A History of the Charities of William Jones at Monmouth and Newland* (Bristol: Printed by William Bennett, 1899), 319-23; Paul S. Seaver, “Laud and the Livery Companies,” in *State, Sovereigns and Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honor of A. J. Slavin*, ed. Charles Carlton (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998), 227; and Dorothy Williams Whitney, “London Puritanism: The Haberdashers’ Company,” *Church History*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (1963): 298-321.

Beneficence and Alms-Deeds (1616), praised Jones's lavish bequest, which included almshouses, schools, and endowed lectureships, and which was held as a model of charity. Downname admonished that Christians should strive to increase their estate so that they may be more plentiful in good works towards others.³⁹ Downname continued to teach at the "Golden Lectureship" after he retired in 1650 and was followed in the lectureship by George Griffiths.⁴⁰ Within two years of his initial appointment Downname became an adviser of the Haberdashers' Company, and was consulted in its ecclesiastical patronage.⁴¹

Little is known about Downname's family other than that he seems to have been married twice, his second wife being the widow of Thomas Sutton, a close friend and fellow Puritan minister, known as the "scourge of the Jesuits" and a well-known foe of the theatre.⁴² Sutton had been lecturer at St. Savior's, Southwark, from 1615 to 1623, and his *Lectures Vpon The Eleventh Chapter To The Romanes* Downname subsequently edited and published in 1632. While Sutton seems to have benefited from the lectureship, he was not hesitant to criticize the politics surrounding it. He complained, for instance, that too much was demanded of the preacher by the hearers in that some were only pleased with long lectures, or speaking loudly, or zealous and vehement expressions, or expounding the patristics, or criticizing a Latin phrase, among others. Were the preacher to not perform to expectation he would find "[their] love...burning...as cold as snow water."⁴³ Downname's tenure as a frequent lecturer suggests that he was able to appease a crowd that had come accustomed to expect the "cream" of English Protestant ministers.

Downname became rector of All Hallows the Great in Thames Street, London, on November 3, 1630, a living he held until his death. From 1623 he was a member of a steering committee of London ministers set up to oversee the English contribution to John Dury's project for the preparation of an ecumenical "Body of Divinity," outlined in *The Earnest Breathing of Forreign Protestants* (1658).⁴⁴ Remarkable, the ecumenical divinity

³⁹ John Downname, *The Plea of the Poore; Or, A Treatise of Beneficence and Alms-Deeds* (London: Printed by Edward Griffin, 1616), 23.

⁴⁰ Richard L. Greaves, "Griffith, George," *ODNB*. It was called "The Golden Lectureship" because of its immense endowment, though there may be some hinting at the quality of the lectureships (e.g. Χρυσόστομος or "golden-mouthed"). Warlow, *Charities of William Jones*, 27, 240, 321; Warlow, *History of the Charities of William Jones*, 322; Collinson, "What's in a Name? Dudley Fenner and the Peculiarities of Puritan Nomenclature," in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 133.

⁴¹ Seaver, *Puritan Lectureships*, 158. Upon his retirement, the Haberdasher's Company paid Downname a pension of £80 for the first year of his retirement and £70 yearly thereafter, which allowed him to live in comfort and solitude.

⁴² Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999), 116-18; Michael C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 518.

⁴³ Quoted in Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 225-26.

⁴⁴ John Dury, a member of the Westminster Assembly, aimed at what he called the "ecclesiastical pacification" of the Protestant churches, which, he thought, could be united in "the life of God set awake by the rules of Practicall divinity." For more than fifty years, he pursued Protestant unity in travels across Europe until his death in 1680. He had strong connections in England and in the continent and worked with multifarious Puritans to bring it about. Not everyone was as enthusiastic about Dury's vision as Simeon Ashe, Edmund Calamy, Joseph Caryl, William Spurstowe, William Gouge, George Walker, Daniel Rogers, and John Downname, however. William Twisse criticized the project since differences between bishops and

manual was pitched to James Ussher in the 1620s or 1630s in a letter signed by numerous London Puritans: William Gouge, John Stoughton, John Downname, Henry Burton, George Walker, Nicolas Morton, Sidrach Simpson, Adoniram Byfield, Richard Culverwell, Obadiah Sedgwick, George Hughes, and Joseph Symonds.⁴⁵ These London ministers sought not only Ussher's approval for producing the "Body of Divinity," giving deference to his status and learning, but also entreated his labor to produce it: "And the rather are we emboldened to desire the engagement of your Grace herein since we are credibly informed, that your Grace formerly hath much desired such a Work to be undertaken and effected."⁴⁶ While the letter is undated, Ussher notes (in 1653) that it was received "when I was in Ireland many years ago" (pre-1640 and likely pre-1634) when "I was very glad of the motion, and laid it very seriously to heart."⁴⁷ Thus, the letter provides evidence that in the years prior to Downname's editing and publishing of Ussher's *Body of Divinitie* in 1645, the plans for a like "Body of Divinity" were pitched to Ussher who himself was desirous of it.⁴⁸ Dury's vision for an ecumenical divinity text, which Downname fully endorsed and sought to materialize, is more evidence for the *sensus unitatis* among English Puritans as they sought to find common ground among their contemporaries.

There are other curious circumstances surrounding the publishing of Ussher's *Body of Divinitie*, and it is not entirely known how Downname came across the manuscript to begin with. It seems plausible that Downname gathered the fragments for the 1645 work either from Ussher himself, through his brother, George, who, as the Bishop of Derry, was (according to Ussher) going to take the brunt of the work for the ecumenical divinity book but was cut short by his death in 1634, or, as Ussher hints at in 1645, from gathering fragments "being lent abroad to divers in scattered sheets."⁴⁹ Ussher had no knowledge of his text being published until after the fact, and immediately expressed his disapproval, though, as Nicholas Bernard notes in his 1656 elegy of Ussher, the latter softened his disapproval upon hearing of its usefulness.⁵⁰

puritans were "wholly irreconcilable." Anthony Milton, "The Unchanged Peacemaker? John Dury and the Politics of Irenicism in England, 1628-1643," in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, ed. Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 113; Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 258-60.

⁴⁵ John Dury, *The Earnest Breathings of Foreign Protestants, Divines and Others to the Ministers and Other Able Christians of These Three Nations for a Compleat Body of Practicall Divinity* (London: Printed for T. Underhill, 1658), 47-48.

⁴⁶ Dury, *Earnest Breathings*, 47-48.

⁴⁷ Dury, *Earnest Breathings*, 48-49.

⁴⁸ Ussher, "a product of Protestant Ascendancy culture" in Ireland, was one of the most learned men of his time, being fluent in English and Irish antiquities and Eastern culture. G. J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 78-84; Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 143.

⁴⁹ Dury, *Earnest Breathings*, 48-49; Charles Richard Elrington, ed., *The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, with a Life of the Author and An Account of His Writings* (Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1897), 1:248-49.

⁵⁰ Nicholas Bernard, *The Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Learned Father of Our Church, Dr. James Usher, Late Arch-Bishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland* (London: Printed by E. Tyler, 1656), 41-42.

Whether John Downname conceived Ussher's *Body of Divinitie* as the realization of Dury's efforts is unknown; however, in 1653, Ussher wrote to Dury commending him for still being willing to produce the envisioned ecumenical work. Thus, for Ussher at least, and likely for Dury, the 1645 *Body of Divinitie* was not the realization of their dream, even though it was immensely popular and was in itself a demonstration of Reformed ecumenical theology.⁵¹ Alan Ford has cautioned, however, that though *Body of Divinitie* was popular and went through many editions, it cannot be described as Ussher's work since it consists mainly of extracts from the work of other divines that Ussher had compiled in his youth.⁵² Indeed, Ussher wrote to Downname and disclaimed authorship of *Body of Divinitie* by stating that it had been transcribed from Thomas Cartwright's *A Shorte Catechisme*, among others, and composed into a commonplace book.⁵³

In 1640 Downname seems to have joined other London Puritans in petitioning the Privy Council against Archbishop Laud's innovations and the infamous "et cetera oath," which required all clergy to swear that they will never strive or give consent to an altercation of the established church government. This, of course, infuriated the Puritans who had opposing ideas on how church hierarchy should be structured.⁵⁴ These actions eventually led to Laud's impeachment by the Long Parliament for high treason; he was confined to the Tower in 1641 and eventually executed in 1644.⁵⁵

In June 1643, more than a dozen men were appointed to replace the remains of Laud's licensers for the press. While Thomas White continued to serve as occasional licenser, the bulk of licensing divinity books was undertaken by well-connected and eminent divines: Thomas Gataker, John Downname, Calybutte Downing, Thomas Temple, Joseph Caryl, Edmund Calamy, John Carter, Charles Herle, James Cranford, Obadiah Sedgwick, John Bachelor, and John Ellis.⁵⁶ Downname was appointed one of the licensers of the press, and seems to have used his influence to promote mainstream tracts and treatises, and even to license *Eikon Basilike*, "the touchstone for disgruntled Englishmen"

⁵¹ For instance, Andrew Marvell writes, "Had you been well catechized in Bishop Usher's *Body of Divinity*..." Martin Dzelzaninis and Annabel Patterson, eds., *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell, Volume 1: 1672-1673* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 384; and Samuel Pepys sat for several hours in 1663 reading "Dr. Usher's body of Divinity, his discourse of the Scripture." *The Diary of Samuel Pepys* (New York: Croscup and Sterling Company, 1893), 107.

⁵² Alan Ford, "Making Dead Men Speak': Manipulating the Memory of James Ussher," in *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History, 1600-1800* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010), 51; Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 81f.

⁵³ James Ussher, *The Whole Works of the Most. Rev. James Ussher, D.D.*, ed. Charles Richard Elrington (Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1847), 1:248-49.

⁵⁴ *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical* (London, 1640); Charles W. A. Prior, *A Confusion of Tongues: Britain's Wars of Reformation, 1625-1642* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); 167-8; Dagmar Freist, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1997), 138-39; Barry Coward and Julian Swann, eds., *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern England: From the Waldensians to the French Revolution* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), 117; Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 231.

⁵⁵ Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison, eds., *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996), 284-85.

⁵⁶ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 144-45.

opposing Cromwell's regime.⁵⁷ The "Image of the King" was published ten days after Charles I's execution and went through more than 35 editions the first year alone, which so worried the new regime that John Milton was asked to pen a rejoinder, the *Eikonoklastes* or "Image Breaker."⁵⁸ John Peacey states that the licensing of *Eikon Basilike* was no accident and is attested in that several months later Downname licensed *Apophthegmata Aurea*, which consisted of numerous extracts from the *Eikon*. He further cites the words of John Price, an Independent minister that complained of the "bountiful" and "liberal imprimatur" that was given to "scurrilous and scandalous pamphlets against the Parliament and army." In consequence, moves were taken to more closely fence the press of such tracts and treatises.⁵⁹

Downname's sometimes "lax" licensing would get him, at times, into trouble, as when he licensed John Milton's *Bucer* tract (1644), Thomas Tany's *Theauraujohn His Aurora in Tranlagorum in Salem Gloria* (1651), the anonymous *Apophthegmata Aurea, Regina, Carolina* (1649), and Thomas Lushington's anonymous *The Expiation of a Sinner, in a Commentary Vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes*, a sizeable text promoting Socinianism and likely a free English translation of a Latin text by Johann Crell and Jonas Schlictingius.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 156-57. Downname was able, for instance, to get his late brother's *Godly and Learned Treatise of Prayer* into print, even amidst Archbishop Laud's vigorous policy of censorship in London. See David McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press: Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge, 1534-1698* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 257. Recent advances in the subject of early modern press censorship are reflected in Cyndia S. Clegg's works: *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); and *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), especially 123-86 on censorship and the Puritan press. Other informative studies include: Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print, and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (London: The Boydell Press, 1997); S. Mutchow Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (London: The Boydell Press, 2003); Friest, *Governed by Opinion*; Sheila Lambert, "State Control of the Press in Theory and Practice: The Role of the Stationers' Company Before 1640," in *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France, 1600-1900*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1992), 1-32; Anthony Milton, "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England," *Historical Journal* 41 (1998), 625-51; and Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961), 96-100. While church and state powers wished to curtail a clandestine book trade and to limit their influence, their efforts were often foiled due to active overseas presses. See Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), esp. Chapter 2, "The Open Doors of Dutch Printing" (28-45).

⁵⁸ Laura Blair McKnight, "Crucifixion or Apocalypse? Refiguring the *Eikon Basilike*," in *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*, ed. Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 138-60.

⁵⁹ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 157.

⁶⁰ Randy Robertson, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 210; John Rogers, "Milton and the Heretical Priesthood of Christ," in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 218; Peter G. Bietenholz, *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus: Erasmus' Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 175. Porter chides "G. M." for publishing the Latin work of Crellius as his own in a "crime of Plagiarism." Several sources cite Thomas Lushington, the tutor of Thomas Browne, as the anonymous author (or translator) of the Hebrews commentary: H. John McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), 108-17; Douglas Maclean, *A History of Pembroke College, Oxford* (Oxford, 1897), 134-36. Lushington has been called "a subtle divine and an eminent philosopher, an independent mind, with fits of unorthodoxy and irreverent speech."

Later Downname would blame the infirmities of age for his lapse in judgment.⁶¹ Less controversial books licensed by Downname include Thomas Sutton's *Lectures Vpon the Eleventh Chapter to the Romans* (1632), George Downname's *A Godly and Learned Treatise of Prayer* (1640), Thomas Heath's *Stenographie; Or, The Art of Short-Writing* (1644); John Cotton's *The Covenant of Gods Free Grace* (1645); James Ussher's *A Body of Divinitie* (1645), John Graunt's *Truths Victory Against Heresie* (1645);⁶² Sir Thomas Browne's *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (1646);⁶³ Immanuel Bourne's *A Light from Christ* (1647), Samuel Hartlib's *Londons Charitie* (1649); Joseph Hall's anti-millenarian tract, *Revelation Unrevealed* (1650)⁶⁴ and his *Resolutions and Decisions of Divers Practical Cases of Conscience* (1654), Edmund Porter's *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος* (1655), and John Hart's *The Everlasting Joys of Heaven* (1656).

In his preface to Porter's *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος*, Downname acknowledged that his sometimes hasty licensing had ill effects, even though his greater aim was to promote "the received Doctrine of Our and all other Reformed Churches" and to never knowingly condone heresy.⁶⁵ For Porter, the Hebrews commentary was the work of "Johannes Crellius or some other Socinian" and undermined Christian religion by "un-Godding Jesus Christ, and blasphemously denying his grand, and most gracious Work of Redemption."⁶⁶ Given the Arian fragments in the commentary, even after a first round of edits by Downname, it is difficult to see how the text passed his censorship. Downname himself noted the historical circumstances surrounding its publication: first, he was contacted by an intermediary who carried with him a "learned and judicious" work from an anonymous source; Downname read the work and was overall impressed with it, but questioned certain passages which seemed to contradict the received wisdom of the Reformed church in that they endorsed Arminianism and Socinianism. Downname wrote a letter to the author to rework those questionable portions, which the author did, and the work was subsequently published. However, smaller passages slipped through either because of old age or

Joan Bennet, *Sir Thomas Browne: "A Man of Achievement in Literature"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), 5. Downname's imprimatur, which he later partially retracts, reads: "I have perused this Comment or Exposition upon the Epistle to the Hebrewes, and finding it to be learned and judicious, plaine and very profitable, I allow it to be Printed and published."

⁶¹ Interestingly, already in 1640, in his sixty-ninth year, John Downname was saying, "I am now disabled by age and many infirmities to produce further works of divinity." George Downname, *A Godly and Learned Treatise of Prayer* (London, 1640), sig. A5r.

⁶² Graunt's short work contains a woodcut depicting ten heretics gathered around the table of truth: papists, familists, Arians, Arminians, Anabaptists, separatists, antinomians, monarchists, millenarians, and independents. The title-page further quotes from Romans 16:17, "Now I beseech you, Brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them."

⁶³ Downname approved this text as "much transcending vulgar conceipt, and adorned with great variety of matter, and multiplicity of reading."

⁶⁴ In approving Hall's anti-millenarian tract, Downname wrote, "I have perused this polemical discourse against the tenents of the millenarians and find it to be...learned and judicious...and very well worthy of printing and publishing." Joseph Hall, *Revelation Unrevealed: Concerning the Thousand Yeares Reign of the Saints with Christ upon Earth* (London, 1650), sig. A5.

⁶⁵ Edmund Porter, *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος; or, God Incarnate, Shewing that Jesus Christ is the Onely and the Most High God* (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, 1655), sig. A1. Porter reprints Downname's explanation of the licensing of the Hebrews commentary on 9-10.

⁶⁶ Porter, *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος*, sig. A4.

busyness. Thus Downname confesses: “The which Errors I the rather fell into because the Author was wholly unknown to me, who am naturally of this disposition, that I neither am, nor desire to be more scrupulous and curious in observing other mens errors and faults then I have evidence and truth for it; whereas otherwise if knowing the Persons with whom I have to deal, to be Heterodox and Erronious in their Doctrine, I should be more wary and observe in their words and works with a more vigilant eye.”⁶⁷ Thus Downname retracted his approval of the Hebrews commentary some four years after it was published in order to litigate damages arising from the mishap, to clarify his intentions in licensing it in the first place, and to save face among the godly, likely, in part, because Lushington was capitalizing on the imprimatur.⁶⁸ While I do not want to draw too many inferences from this historical oddity, it does suggest the often complicated historical, social, and cultural circumstances surrounding the press in the seventeenth century, especially that in getting something into print was as often a matter of who-knows-who as it was of the merits of the manuscript itself.

On September 18, 1644, the Westminster Assembly assigned Downname to a committee for the ordination of ministers but he does not seem to have engaged in its internal debates. Downname’s connections to the Fifth Monarchy movement are obscure and inferential, though a case could be made that he knew and gave its members a platform for the cause in his London parish.⁶⁹

When Downname drafted his will on February 26, 1652, he had two surviving sons, Francis and William, and three daughters, Sarah Ward, Joan Harrison, and Elizabeth Kempe. His wife lived for several years after, but a son, George, a curate at St. Stephen’s Walbrook, 1637-1639,⁷⁰ had died. In the will, Downname bequeathed a Greek New Testament, and a Latin and Greek Bible, to his stepson, Thomas Sutton, Jr. Downname died at his Bunhill house in 1652 as a “venerable and celebrated divine,” and was buried next to his pew door in his London parish.⁷¹

In sum, Downname’s social contexts show his prominence as an English divine during Stuart and Caroline Puritanism. He used his many connections to promote the Reformed experiential divinity that he had learned at Cambridge. He was an integral part of a vibrant Calvinist network and advanced the greater cause of the Puritan Reformation by licensing and promoting many of its “canonical” texts both from the pulpit and the

⁶⁷ Porter, *Θέος-Ανθρωποπόρος*, sig. A1. Often in the seventeenth century, the Reformed orthodox equated Arminianism with Socinianism, the latter being seen as the consistent outworking of the former. While some moderate Arminians did become Socinians, William Warburton argued that it was actually a defense against such tenets. Carl R. Trueman, *The Claims of Truth: John Owen’s Trinitarian Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 23; David Jan Sorkin, *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 55.

⁶⁸ The Hebrews commentary had a somewhat wide circulation; it was to be found among the major university libraries, such as Cambridge, and the private libraries of noted divines including Lazarus Seaman whose library was the first to be “sold in England by auction.” Herbert McLachlan, *Essays and Addresses* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1950), 329.

⁶⁹ For instance, Walter Cradock accepted a lectureship at All-Hallows the Great, London, in 1643, and whenever Welsh Independents visited London they worshipped in Downname’s church. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 286; Liu, *Puritan London*, 118-19, 190.

⁷⁰ St. Stephen’s Walbrook became famous when Thomas Watson became lecturer and rector there in 1646 and 1655-56.

⁷¹ Seaver, “Downham, John.”

press. His distaste for Arminianism and Socinianism reflect the era's "heresy culture" and the stigma associated with it. We will now turn to Downname's published corpus and examine the texts which Downname used to advance the Puritan Reformation.

3.3 Downname's Writings in Historical Context

That Downname's authored corpus consists of works of practical divinity or "helps to the Bible" is suggestive of the primary goals within Puritanism (*praxis pietatis*). Downname should thus be seen as a practical theologian who interacted with and promoted the Reformed orthodox "precisianist" consensus. This greater intent to instruct readers so that they may better pursue godliness is confirmed in the opening passages of the major divinity manuals of the seventeenth century: Finch's *Summe* opens with this definition, "Divinitie is a Doctrine of glorifying God;" Ames's *Medulla* has "*doctrina est Deo vivendi*;" and Edward Leigh's *Body of Divinity* says, "Logick is an art of disputing well, Rhetorick of speaking well, Divinity of living well."⁷² Joseph Hall also emphasized the practical aspects of divinity when he wrote that "Of all *Divinity* that part is most usefull, which determines cases of Conscience; and of all cases of Conscience the Practicall are most necessary; as action is of more concernment than speculation."⁷³

While Reformed theologians at times engaged in speculation, the two ends of theologizing were the integrity their theology and *praxis pietatis*.⁷⁴ Downname stands out as an active, successful, and effervescent promoter of experiential Reformed orthodoxy and piety. His writings, which reflect a rigorous affective theology, were reprinted numerous times in the seventeenth century, such as Downname's *Concordance*, which went through more than twenty-five printings and supplanted older concordances based on the Geneva Bible, and even outsold Clement Cotton's massive *A Complete Concordance to the Bible of the Last Translation* (OT, 1627; NT, 1631; combined, 1635).⁷⁵ Downname's works were equally popular in the Continent and likely influenced the Dutch precisianist movement.⁷⁶

We will now examine seven of Downname's works, two of which were edited and published by him. For classification, we can divide these works into three categories: (1) practical divinity (*Christian Warfare, Guide to Godlynesse*); (2) commentaries and

⁷² Cocceius's *Summa Theologia* also defines doctrine as piety.

⁷³ Hall, *Resolutions and Decisions*, sig. A3.

⁷⁴ Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety*, 286-7.

⁷⁵ Various editions of Downname's *Brief Concordance*, based on the King James Version, appeared in 1630-1633, 1635, 1639, 1642, 1646, 1652, 1654, 1659, 1663, 1671, 1688-1690, 1726, 1732, 1739, 1752, 1757, 1762, 1767, 1773-1774. While Downname's *Brief Concordance* was based on Cotton's work, it was quite condensed (the enlarged 1635 edition came to just over 120 pages), and made the immediate context much clearer than Cotton had done. William Gouge, a London Puritan minister, criticized Cotton's *Concordance* because it included too many "common words" (such as "God" and "Lord"); Gouge further said that Cotton was not skilled in "the three learned languages" of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin but was still "of great understanding" and "unwearied industry." Cotton was, after all, "the most prolific English translator of Calvin." I. M. Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*, 125-26; Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England*, 362.

⁷⁶ Ian Maclean, *Learning and the Market Place: Essays in the History of the Early Modern Book* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 355; cf. Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London: Maney Publishing, 2006), 63-70.

concordances (*Lectures on Hosea, Concordance, Annotations*);⁷⁷ and (3) theology manuals (*Summe, Body of Divinitie*). Taken as a whole, these writings reflect the theological and religious atmosphere of Stuart Puritanism, its motifs, ideas, and ethos; in short, we will see how theological instruction, piety, and the godly life were the chief motives of the Puritan Reformation.⁷⁸

3.3.1 *The Christian Warfare (1604-18, 1612, 1634)*

The *Christian Warfare*, “a manifesto of militant piety,” was Downname’s first published work and became his most famous.⁷⁹ In contrast to Richard Bernard’s *The Bible-Battells* (1629), a defense of “just war” theory, Downname’s book understands Christian warfare “in an entirely spiritual sense” as the struggle between the Christian and Satan.⁸⁰ The work epitomizes what William Haller saw as a major element within

⁷⁷ While common parlance attributes the 1645 *Annotations* to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which sat from 1643-1649, in truth, the Bible commentary, or as it was published, the *Annotations Upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament* (or simply, the *Assembly’s Annotations*) was commissioned by Parliament as an English counterpart to the Geneva Bible’s notes and to the annotations to the Dutch *Statenvertaling* (later translated into English by Theodore Haak and published in 1657). Though Downname did not attend the Westminster Assembly, at least six of the compilers did (William Gouge, Thomas Gataker, John Ley, Francis Taylor, Daniel Featly, and John Reading). Thus its common name. A second edition of the *Annotations* was published in 1651, 1657; and a third edition, with additional annotations, in 1658. See Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, Vol. 2: Holy Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 91; Dean George Lampros, “A New Set of Spectacles: The Assembly’s Annotations, 1645-1657,” in *Renaissance and Reformation* 19/4 (1995), 33-46; and George Watson, ed., *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, Vol. 1: 600-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 1884. For the practice of annotating books in early modern England, and Downname’s views on the subject, see William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 71-86; and John Downname, *A Guide to Godliness*, Book 5 (“Of the meanes whereby we may be inabled to leade a godly life”), chap. 30 (“Of the duties required in the action of reading, that we may profit by it”), sect. 8 (“That we must reade orderly with diligence and constancy”).

⁷⁸ On the atmosphere of Stuart Puritanism, see Tom Webster, “Early Stuart Puritanism,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 48-66; and John Spurr, “Later Stuart Puritanism,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 89-108.

⁷⁹ Michael McGiffert wrote that *Christian Warfare* had “won a position at the head of a distinguished line of spiritual enchiridia, and historians have recognized its role in the rise of Puritanism.” McGiffert, “God’s Controversy with Jacobean England,” 1151. Also, the front piece of William Haller’s influential *Rise of Puritanism* (1938) is a reproduction of the title page of the 1634 edition of *Christian Warfare*. See *ibid* 1151 (fn 2).

The popularity of *Christian Warfare* is further attested in the “commonplace book” of Robert Saxby, a Kentish clothier who moved to London in 1629, which exists in MS form, housed at the University of Cambridge. The volume consists of extracts and summaries of several sermons, chapters of the Bible, and prayers and meditations. Saxby copied by hand three chapters from the 3rd edition of *Christian Warfare* (1612), and it appears to have been compiled at various dates in 1627. Cambridge University Library, Department of Manuscripts and University Archives, Religious commonplace book, Additional MS 3117, Fos. 94v-105v. Cf. John Craig, “Sermon Reception,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, Emma Rhatigan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 189-93.

⁸⁰ In this sense Downname’s book is comparable to William Gouge’s *The Whole Armour of God* (1616) or John Bunyan’s *Holy War*. Andreas Pecar, “On the Path of the Maccabees? The Rhetoric of ‘Holy War’ in the

Puritanism: “The spiritual attitude...of active struggle on the part of the individual against his own weakness.”⁸¹ Published in four parts from 1604-1618, a complete and definitive edition was published in 1634, which spanned to over 1,200 pages folio. The separate earlier printings of Parts II-IV of *Christian Warfare* (1611, 1613, 1618) contained Ramist charts of the contents and flow of thought; these were removed for the third edition of 1612, which combined Parts I-III, and are absent from the fourth and definitive edition of 1634, though for this last edition Downname added a complete concordance of texts cited and an elaborate index of major points made in the book; in addition, there is an opening poem written by Downname, a graphic front piece ascribed to the engraver John Payne⁸² depicts the Christian in warfare, a new dedicatory epistle to his brother, a new preface to the Christian Reader, and several expansions to the main text.⁸³ Downname acknowledges his brother’s tutelage at Cambridge and is not shy in his praise.⁸⁴ In his “To the Christian Reader,” Downname defends himself against the immense cost of the book by saying that only by conference, observation, and experience was he able to produce the definitive edition, and not by merely reading and studying; further, that much labor was involved in perfecting it, yet, for those dismayed at the cost, the former editions were still useful.⁸⁵

Christian Warfare is the largest English exposition of the Christian’s warfare with the flesh, the world, and the devil. With William Gouge’s *The Saints Sacrifice* and John Preston’s *The Saints Daily Exercise* and Richard Sibbes’s *The Saints Cordials, Christian Warfare* reflects “the essentially personal nature of religious belief” in the Stuart era.⁸⁶ Though not as popular as John Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs* (1563), which went through nine editions by the end of the seventeenth century, Downname’s *Christian Warfare* still ranks as one of the most printed and read books of the Puritan Reformation.⁸⁷

Sermons and Pamphlets of ‘Puritans’ in the Run-up to the English Civil War, 1620-1642,” in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors, 1 and 2 Maccabees in Historical Perspective*, ed. Gabriela Signori (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 247; McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, 184-91; Beth Lynch, *John Bunyan and the Language of Conviction* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004), 137-64; Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 228 (n. 81).

⁸¹ William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), 150.

⁸² John Payne (1606-1648) was often commissioned to sketch title pages and portraits for London presses. His work includes likeness of Robert Bolton and Thomas Hobson, and the title page of *The Workes of John Boys* (1622). Anthony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689* (London: British Museum Press, 1998), 72.

⁸³ The title-page graphic depicts a Christian in armor at top center with the words *state, vigilate et orate* (“Stand, watch and pray”) above him. To his right is a woman who seduces and to his left a monster depicting the devil with the words *resiste diabolo et fugiet* (“Resist, and the devil will fee”) above. To his lower left is an old man with the instruction *deponite verten hominem* (“Put off the old man”). At the bottom of the page is a graphic portrayal of the believer’s warfare, and above all, top and center, are the Hebrew words “LORD GOD” and the words *omnia hac tibi dabo* (“All this I will give to you”).

⁸⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, sig. A1-4.

⁸⁵ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, sig. C1-2.

⁸⁶ Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 193.

⁸⁷ Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited*, 160. Cf. John N. King, *Foxe’s “Book of Martyrs” and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1-20, 157-161.

The warfare genre of devotional literature was quite prominent during the seventeenth century, producing such influential works as Thomas Brooks' *Precious Remedies Against Satan's Devices* (1652), William Gurnall's *The Christian in Compleat Armour* (1655), William Spurstowe's *Satana Noemata; or, The Wiles of Satan* (1666), and Richard Gilpin's *Daemonologia Sacra; Or, A Treatise of Satan's Temptations* (1677). However, *Christian Warfare* was the largest and most popular, and historians have long recognized its importance in the rise of Stuart Puritanism, though to date no extensive analysis of its contents exists.⁸⁸ It was frequently reprinted throughout the seventeenth century, became a classic text just a few years after publication, and was found in the libraries of noted intellectuals well into the eighteenth century.⁸⁹

Consisting of a massive exposition of Ephesians 6:11, Downname engages the major topics of the *ordo salutis* covered by William Perkins's *The Whole Treatise of Cases of Conscience* (1608) and William Ames's *De Conscientia* (1630). In short, he articulates a thorough body of practical divinity on such topics as spiritual conflict, temptations, election and assurance, redemption, justification and sanctification, repentance, perseverance, wisdom and learning, wealth and society, loving God and the joys of heaven.⁹⁰ What is unique about *Christian Warfare* is that through all four parts Downname presents each Reformed locus through the dual perspective of warfare and comfort for the burdened Christian. Thus it contrasts with the method of the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*, where the topics are discussed more dogmatically.

Downname provides three reasons for *Christian Warfare*: first, to comfort those who are afflicted with the "sight and sense of their sins" and to offer them assurance of forgiveness, election to eternal life, reconciliation to God in Christ, and of being received into his love and favor; second, to lead Christians to the haven of eternal happiness, that they may not run amiss and fall into presumption and desperation; and third, to give solid and substantial consolations that are grounded upon God's truth. Downname clarifies that his book was for those children of God who doubt their eternal safety, who have been humbled by their sins, and who seek remedies in the Bible.⁹¹

The four parts of *Christian Warfare* are divided into ten books and address different though complementary subjects; each part is pitched toward a different end. Thus, the First Part (1604) shows the malice, power, and stratagems of the spiritual enemies of salvation, being Satan and his assistants, the world and the flesh, and the means whereby Christians may withstand and defeat them.⁹² The Second Part (1611) or "Contempt of the World" seeks to strengthen weak Christians against temptations associated with prosperity and the immoderate love of earthly things by showing that the

⁸⁸ William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism; or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643* (New York, 1938), 92, 155-58; cf. Robert J. McKelvey, *Histories That Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan's Holy War* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 188-89.

⁸⁹ William Chase, *A Catalogue of a Very Valuable Collection of Books* (Norwich, 1753), 11.

⁹⁰ In the session of the Westminster Assembly on October 8, 1645, Downname's *Christian Warfare* was brought up and cited to its members to illustrate the that God does not "call us to any morose and superstitious selfe denyall—not to enjoy the things that God gives." Van Dixhoorn, *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, Vol. 3: Minutes, Sessions, 199-603 (1644-1646)*, 674.

⁹¹ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, sig. A1-4.

⁹² Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 1-356.

world and worldly vanities pale in comparison to God's spiritual graces and heavenly joys.⁹³ The Third Part (1613) or "Consolations for the Afflicted" shows how the Christian may be armed and strengthened under affliction and cultivate patience while being afflicted.⁹⁴ The Fourth Part (1618) details the combat between the flesh and the spirit in life of the Christian and provides numerous instructions on how to subdue the flesh.⁹⁵

Downname uses the warfare metaphor throughout *Christian Warfare* to depict the Christian's ongoing struggle against the world, the flesh, and the devil. Thus, the topics covered by Downname are consistent with the genre and portray the Christian in combat with his spiritual enemies. Similar to Baxter's *Christian Directory*, Downname addresses numerous specific points pertaining to the believer's walk in faith. For instance, he argues against using makeup and encourages believers to avoid the company of those who have backslidden and to mortify earthly sorrows.⁹⁶ He further cautions against "playing with religion" in the point of predestination, as though one could live in sin and believe they are elected to eternal life.⁹⁷

3.3.2 *A Guide to Godlynesse (1622, 1629)*

Downname's *A Guide to Godlynesse* was published in 1622 and 1629, and consists of a thorough and intricate treatise on the Christian life. Downname argues that speculative knowledge could not be compared to experiential knowledge or "that attained through experience."⁹⁸ Thus emphasis is placed on the experiential knowing of Christian doctrine. While Downname recognizes a place for more speculative knowledge, he states that it does not make men spiritually wise unto salvation; thus it is that the great "doctors of the world" are said to often be "poorest in grace and godlynesse, hauing no sense and feeling of those things, whereof in their learned discourses they make a grew shew."⁹⁹

The *Guide* consists of six books that are divided into major thematic headings: Book I (Preface); Book II (Main Parts and Principle Duties); Book III (Daily Exercises); Book IV (Properties); Book V (Helps and Means); Book VI (Impediments). In total, a *Guide* contains 147 chapters within 961 octavo pages. Similar to *Christian Warfare*, glosses throughout the text provide brief summaries and biblical citations.

The *Guide*'s title page contains a graphic portrayal of devout women who represent the four virtues "Charity," "Humility," "Faith" and "Repentance."¹⁰⁰ Other images depict receiving the crown of life and Abram's offering of Isaac. "Faith" is depicted as a woman in classic convent garb. "Repentance" is a woman looking away from the remnants

⁹³ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 357-750.

⁹⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 751-1014.

⁹⁵ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 1015-1167.

⁹⁶ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, II, 132-37; 167-75; cf. Jeremy Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 57-58.

⁹⁷ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 99-101.

⁹⁸ John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning, and Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 59; Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 624.

⁹⁹ Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 626.

¹⁰⁰ The engraving is also the work of John Payne.

of sin—discarded playing cards, a theatrical mask, and a mirror. These images are noteworthy because they show how “the godly were in subtle ways reshaping and re-deploying the Old Testament for seventeenth century ends re-deploying the Old Testament for seventeenth century ends,” which would, in turn, give grounds for “backlash” from the antinomians.¹⁰¹ It is indeed interesting that a Roman Catholic nun depicts “Faith,” especially given the *Guide’s* disregard of Roman Catholicism.

Though not as popular as his *Christian Warfare* or William Perkins’s *Salve for a Sick Man* (1595, six editions to 1635), Downname’s *Guide* was nonetheless an important contribution to the swelling body of mainstream Calvinist books of instruction. As an inspiring manual of the godly life, the *Guide* was intended to promote godliness and stir up devotion and was generally better received across party lines than the often-contentious bodies of divinity; thus “they did have the function of consolidating community among those on the Puritan wing of the Church.”¹⁰² Indeed, in his dedication to Archbishop George Abbot, Downname notes three reasons for writing the *Guide* as opposed to a more dogmatic or theoretical work. First, he writes the practical *Guide* because the world is already full of “such books as doe fully handle the Doctrine of Diuinity” and “learned controuersies wherein the truth is sufficiently defended.” Second, the *Guide* is necessary because national peace and security have “cooled and quenched” the church’s zeal and devotion. And third, those who have grown weary of the truth desire to return to the “fleshpots of Egypt,” which is “Popery and superstition.”¹⁰³

The *Guide* was thus pitched as a work to educate readers in the paths of godliness and establish them within English Protestantism and played a prominent part among the growing body of domestic literature; thus Downname invites his readers to consider that “the family is the Seminary of the Church and Common-wealth” wherein “children and servants are fitted for the public assemblies...to perform...all religious duties of Gods worship and service.”¹⁰⁴

The *Guide* contributed to what Ian Breward called “a common fund of ideas approaching the status of moral orthodoxy” by furnishing believers with advice on numerous topics, including recreation, meditation, reading the Bible, and cultivating a lively faith.¹⁰⁵ Of the many subjects fit for meditation, remarkably, Downname includes the

¹⁰¹ Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 130. The image is also discussed and reproduced in Hambrick-Stowe, *Practice of Piety*, 40-41, and as the cover of Michael Hunter’s *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010).

¹⁰² Graham Parry, “High-Church Devotion in the Church of England, 1620-42,” in *Writings and Religion in England, 1558-1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory*, ed. Roger D. Sell and Anthony W. Johnson (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 245.

¹⁰³ John Downname, *A Guide to Godlynesse: Or, A Treatise of a Christian Life* (London, 1622), sig. A3-4. Many Puritans studied practical divinity before more theoretical dogmas. Richard Baxter wrote, “I studied *Practical Divinity* first, in the most *Practical Books*, in a *Practical Order*; doing all purposely for the informing and reforming of my own Soul. So that I had read a multitude of our English *Practical Treatises*, before I had ever read any other *Bodies of Divinity*...” Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London, 1696), Book I, Part I, 5.

¹⁰⁴ Downname, *Guide*, 329-30.

¹⁰⁵ Downname, *Guide*, 262-72, 533-604, 631-52, 823-47; Ian Breward, ed., *The Work of William Perkins* (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1970), 75. Quoted in Patrick Collinson, “Puritanism and the Poor,” in *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities, 1200-1630*, ed. Rosemary Horrox and Sarah Rees Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 244.

decrees of election and reprobation, which “haue plentifull matter of meditation.”¹⁰⁶ The *Guide* also suggests reading many of the “canonic” books of the Puritan Reformation.¹⁰⁷

3.3.3 *Lectvres Vpon the Fovre First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea* (1608)

Less well known than either *Christian Warfare* or the *Guide*, though no less copious, Downname’s commentary on Hosea 1-4 was the first major Protestant commentary on the Minor Prophet, and, at the time, one of the largest works of Old Testament exegesis by an Englishman.¹⁰⁸ Though only on the first four chapters of Hosea, the quarto consists of 347 pages and “marked the coming of age in English biblical scholarship.”¹⁰⁹ The *Lectures* also addressed the need for English Bible commentaries, which, to date, had chiefly rested in the brief annotations of the Geneva Bible (1560, 1599), the translated commentaries of continental divines (Bullinger, Calvin, Beza, Junius) and the published lectures of a few English divines, such as John Udall’s *A Commentarie Vpon the Lamentations of Jeremie* (1593), William Perkins’s *A Commentarie or Exposition Vpon the Fiue First Chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians* (1604), and Thomas Cartwright’s posthumous *A Commentary Vpon the Epistle of Saint Paule Written to the Colossians* (1612). Indeed, one of Downname’s reasons for writing on Hosea was to fill a perceived gap in English bookstores, there being many works on the godly life, but few “sound expositions” of the English Bible.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ Downname, *Guide*, 565-68; cf. Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 97-133.

¹⁰⁷ Downname recommends Theodore Beza’s *Confession*; the catechisms of Joseph Hall, Cornelius Burgess, and John Ball; Zacharias Ursinus’s catechism; Jeremias Bastingius’s *Treatise of the Christian Religion*; John Calvin’s *Institutes*; and the works of William Perkins for grounding in theology; and Richard Rogers’s *Seven Treatises*, and the works of Arthur Dent, Daniel Dyke, and Bishop Hall (the English Seneca) for the godly life. Downname, *Guide*, 636-37.

¹⁰⁸ McGiffert, “God’s Controversy with Jacobean England,” 1151. Later English expositions of Hosea include those by Samuel Smith (1616); Samuel Torshell (1633); Richard Sibbes (1639); William Kiffin (1642); Jeremiah Burroughs (1643); Edward Reynolds (1649); and George Hutchinson (1654). Burroughs’s work was most popular in terms of reprints; however, he had died (1646) before completing the full commentary. The posthumously finished work was published in 1654, being completed by Thomas Goodwin, William Greenhill, Sidrach Simpson, William Bridge, John Yates and William Adderly.

¹⁰⁹ Downname had planned a sequel to cover Hosea 5-14 pending on its reception. Downname, *Lectures*, sig. A6r-Biv. See McGiffert, “God’s Controversy with Jacobean England,” 1151-74. On the Jeremiad, see Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), 3-30; Michael P. Winship, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 9-29, 74-92.

¹¹⁰ McGiffert, “God’s Controversy with Jacobean England,” 1158; John Downname, *Lectvres Vpon the Fovre First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea* (London, 1608), sig. A6-7. While English pastors lectured from the Bible since the English Reformation, the London presses did not overflow with Bible commentaries until after 1608 when such books were published as Thomas Taylor’s *A Commentarie Vpon the Epistle of S. Paul written to Titus* (1612); Richard Rogers’s *A Commentary Vpon the Whole Book of Iudges* (1615); Henry Airay’s *Lectures Upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians* (1618); Paul Baynes’s *A Commentarie Vpon the First Chapter of the Epistle of Saint Paul, Written to the Ephesians* (1618); Thomas Adams’s *A Commentary or Exposition Vpon the Diuine Second Epistle Generall, Written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter* (1633); William Greenhill’s *An Exposition of the Five First Chapters of the Prophet Ezekiel* (1645); William Jenkyn’s *An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude* (1652); and William Gouge’s *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews* (1655).

The book was dedicated to James Montague, newly bishop of Bath and Wells, a renowned moderate Calvinist who is credited with influencing King James I against the Arminians (being his favorite bishop), being the editor of James's published *Works*, being dean of the Chapel Royal, being head of Sidney Sussex College (a Puritan college), being a prominent member of a Puritan family, and for being patron of such eminent divines as William Perkins, Thomas Gataker and Arthur Hildersham, and who even, in 1601, preached Perkins's funeral sermon, choosing as his text, "Moses my servant is dead" (Joshua 1:2). It is little wonder, then, why Downname dedicated his *Lectures* to Montague, imploring the latter's patronage and protection.¹¹¹

In his dedication to Montague, Downname denounces "the Popish crew" which dissuade the common people from reading the Bible and recognizes the duties of ministers to not only learn the mysteries of the Bible but to convey that truth to the people. Downname thus says that his intent in publishing these lectures is to clear the text from obscurity and lay open its "hidden treasures" so that those who are "willing to receive them by...reading and meditation" may be enriched.¹¹²

Michael McGiffert notes several ways in which Downname's *Lectures* are unique: First, the *Lectures* are the first major English attempt to establish a paradigm shift which identifies a "divine anglophilia" for the nation of England through a "covenant of works." This McGiffert calls a "Hosead."¹¹³ Second, it paves the way to the English Revolution, though, of course, Downname had no intention of this; third, the "Hosead" presents a "national charter" for conducting morality in that just as God had favored Israel he could, at any moment, remove his favor from England if it did not heed his word and listen to his counsel.¹¹⁴ And, finally, more generally, the "Hosead" shows that there was a "seismic shift" in the early seventeenth century in which "Paul's Cross sermons were becoming more restricted in their scope as preachers turned their attention away from the covenant of works (between God and the whole city or nation) towards the covenant of grace (between God and the elect)." This position has been criticized, however, more recently, especially in Arnold Hunt's *The Art of Hearing* (2010). Hunt states assertively, "McGiffert was mistaken." In support, Hunt accents the fact that Paul's Cross sermons were often directed to the city rather than to "visible saints."¹¹⁵ Hunt's observation is affirmed in such published "jeremiads" as Thomas Vincent's *God's Terrible Voice in the City* (1667), which presents social reasons (e.g. drunkenness) for God's punitive judgment of London in the Great Fire of 1666.¹¹⁶

To date, there is no extensive analysis of Puritan commentaries as a genre. For overview of Puritan exegesis and interpretation, see Gorids, *Opening Scripture*, 13-36; cf. Donald K. McKim, "William Perkins," in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2007), 815-19; Glenn R. Kreider, *Jonathan Edwards's Interpretation of Revelation 4:1-8:1* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2004), 1-36. For background, see Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson, eds., *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1996).

¹¹¹ Downname, *Lectures*, sig. A2r-6v.

¹¹² Downname, *Lectures*, sig. A3r-4v.

¹¹³ McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," 1151-52.

¹¹⁴ McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," 1152-70.

¹¹⁵ Edwards, "Varieties of Sermon," 37; and Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 325.

¹¹⁶ Thomas Vincent, *God's Terrible Voice in the City* (London, 1667), 35.

The *Lectures* thus addressed the social and religious concerns of the age and helped to redefine a genre of literature that paralleled English nationalism with national Israel under the Old Testament. God had a “controversy with the inhabitants of the land,” as Hosea had put it, and if the English continued to disregard God’s laws they would also share Israel’s fate; however, should England renounce idols and superstition, God would yet show mercy.¹¹⁷ Downname’s *Lectures* bears resemblance to the many sermons before Parliament, where the England/Israel motif is commonly used as a motive for national obedience and blessings are tied to public and private obedience; in fact, this would become a common theme during the English Revolution and a prominent reason for further reform of church and state.¹¹⁸

3.3.4 *A Briefe Concordance of the Bible (1630, 1635)*

An early modern bestseller and arguably the bestselling concordance of the seventeenth century, Downname’s *A Briefe Concordance of the Bible of the Last Translation* went through no less than 24 printings from 1630-1690. Authorized to print with the Bible, the concordance was undertaken at Clement Cotton’s request, whose earlier concordance on the then standard King James Bible Downname drew on.¹¹⁹ Downname’s *Concordance* was relatively small, coming to just over 120 pages in an enlarged c. 1635 edition. It was printed in small roman type, which meant the work was inexpensive and portable. Ian Green states that Downname’s *Concordance* reflects the latter’s concerns in his other writings, such as the emphasis on assurance in *Christian Warfare*, and that its “brevity meant that its Calvinist tendencies were kept within bounds.” But not all were satisfied with Downname’s concordance and attempts were made to replace it.¹²⁰

Green further comments on the use of Bible concordances in the seventeenth century: first, he cites the Puritan William Gouge, who noted that such works were far superior to “indexes, tables, commonplaces, epitomes, allegories, and other such meaner helps for finding out the golden mines of the scripture;” and second, they were ubiquitous among Bible commentators, scholars, and theologians, and even popular among the laity;

¹¹⁷ Downname, *Lectures*, 342-47; Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions*, 231; McGiffert, “God’s Controversy with Jacobean England,” 1151-74; Clarke, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England*, 21-22; Patrick Collinson, “Biblical Rhetoric: The English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode,” in *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*, ed. Claire McEachern and Debora Shuger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 15-45; cf. Edwards, “Varieties of Sermon,” 36-37.

¹¹⁸ Barbara Shapiro, *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558-1688* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 167-70, 176-79, 183-84. See also Mary Morrissey, “Elect Nations and Prophetic Preaching: Types and Examples in the Paul’s Cross Jeremiad,” in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1600-1750*, ed. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 43-58; Arnold Hunt, “Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 366-86.

¹¹⁹ The concordance appeared in an edition of Barker’s elaborate “Wicked Bible,” which was regularly reprinted in Britain. David Daniell, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 599.

¹²⁰ Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 126.

though the greater concern had to do with “completeness, ease of use, and price.”¹²¹ Indeed, the cost of books was a common concern among Caroline Puritans, as is evident in Downname’s apology for the immenseness of *Christian Warfare*. While Puritans were generally frugal and avoided the extravagances of “cultured society,” one area where they were not was in their purchase of books. Both pastor and layperson were known to have acquired extensive libraries of “canonic” works. Thus, ministers, divinity students, and parishioners were all likewise encouraged to “search into the hidden treasures of the scriptures, for the increase in knowledge and confirmation in the faith.”¹²² By the mid-seventeenth century concordances had become entrenched in popular devotion, which is suggestive of how important the Bible and its study were perceived by English Protestants. While Puritans cultivated a society of reading more broadly, there were those Puritans who had only a Bible and concordance. John Bunyan said that “my Bible and my concordance [are] my only library in my writings.”¹²³

3-3-5 *Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament (1645, 1651, 1657-58)*

In 1611, the King James Bible (KJB) was introduced and its rival, the Geneva Bible, “had a strong base in popular preference and half a century of market dominance.”¹²⁴ Over time the KJB would supplant its heavily annotated competitor but there would always be a demand for the Geneva’s annotations, especially for domestic use.¹²⁵ This desire to have the Bible explained in plain words was strong among the laity and the KJB, as it was printed in 1611, did not meet this need;¹²⁶ thus, there was a demand for the Geneva Bible’s notes rather than its translation; and, in 1645, the *Annotations* was the first of many attempts to meet this growing demand and supplant the older annotated Geneva Bible.¹²⁷

¹²¹ Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 126.

¹²² R. Wickens, *A Compleat and Perfect Concordance* (Oxford, 1655), title page; Bennet, *Theological Concordance*, title page and sig. A4. Quoted in Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 126.

¹²³ Graham Midgley, ed., *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan VII: Solomon’s Temple Spiritualized, The House of the Forest of Lebanon, The Water of Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 9.

¹²⁴ David Norton, *The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 135. The Geneva Bible was often among the famous. Indeed, John Locke was “born to a Puritan family in a Puritan parish, [and] was reared on the Geneva Bible and its theological teachings.” Dale S. Kuehne, “Reinventing Paul: John Locke, the Geneva Bible, and Paul’s Epistle to the Romans,” in *Piety and Humanity: Essays on Religion and Early Modern Political Philosophy*, ed. Douglas Kries (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997), 214. Lori Anne Ferrell has called the Geneva Bible “the best-selling English Bible of the era and the primary textbook for English reformed Protestantism.” Ferrell, “The Preacher’s Bibles,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Aldington, and Emma Rhatigan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 31.

¹²⁵ The English Bibles of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were intended for private use, thus “most editions were printed in [small] roman type and published in small octavo editions that were easy to hold.” Gordon Campbell, *Bible: The Story of the King James Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 26.

¹²⁶ The new KJB very purposely had no annotations, not because of the extra cost but to avoid controversy. In this sense, the KJV could be seen as an ecumenically Protestant Bible. Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 22.

¹²⁷ Lampros, “A New Set of Spectacles,” 33-46.

Another attempt was the publication in Amsterdam of the KJB with the Geneva annotations and Junius's comments on the Book of Revelation.¹²⁸ The "roaring success" of the Westminster *Annotations* can be attributed, in part, to the earlier success of the Geneva Bible in that it primed the public to expect more than a barebones translation of the Bible. The success of early modern Protestant commentaries can be ascribed to the success of the Geneva Bible's glosses. Still, the *Annotations* are largely neglected within current scholarship, possibly because of a misunderstanding of the era's contribution to the field of exegesis.¹²⁹ Indeed, the authors of the *Annotations* recognized the preeminence of the Geneva notes in saying, "[they] have been best known, and most used amongst us..."¹³⁰ Thus, stationers and printers in London petitioned the House of Commons for the Geneva notes to be updated, corrected, and published as marginal notes for the KJB, which the House approved and commissioned as the first edition of the *Annotations*. The second edition, much enlarged, corrected, annotated, and printed in two volumes (1651) became more of a commentary on the whole Bible, offered elaborate explanations of difficult texts and alleviated continental disquietude over the first edition.¹³¹ The third and definitive edition was completed in 1657-58.

Though the *Annotations* were dubbed the "Westminster Annotations," the Assembly did not compile or commission them in an official capacity as it had done the Westminster Standards. The work was separate from the Assembly's formal deliberations and commissioned by Parliament to be carried out by various divines, a majority of which sat at Westminster.¹³² Downname's involvement seems to be confined to "general editing" and the indexing of a "concordance."¹³³ There seems to have been much contemporary confusion as to the source of the commissioning, so much so that Cornelius Burgess, a noted member of the Assembly, felt compelled to clarify in his *No Sacrilege Nor Sinne* (1659), "It is very true, that some Members of that *Assembly*, joyning with some others, did compile some *Annotations upon the Bible*; which many take to be the work of the *Assembly*. But take this for an undoubted truth, those *Annotations* were never made by the

¹²⁸ David Price and Charles C. Ryrie, *Let It Go among Our People: An Illustrated History of the English Bible from John Wyclif to the King James Version* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2004), 91.

¹²⁹ Carl R. Trueman has said, "the Westminster Annotations have been almost entirely neglected by scholars, who have been quick to dismiss the seventeenth century as an era of dogma, not exegesis; yet they represent one of the most significant and comprehensive analyses of the biblical text in the seventeenth century." Trueman, "Preachers and Medieval and Renaissance Commentary," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Aldington, and Emma Rhatigan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 62; Norton, *The King James Bible*, 135-37.

¹³⁰ Downname, ed., *Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament* (London: Printed by John Legatt and John Raworth, 1645), sig. B4v.

¹³¹ *Annotations Upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament: The Second Edition so Enlarged as They Make an Entire Commentary on the Sacred Scripture, the Like Never Before Published in English* (London, 1651), sig. A5-7.

¹³² Robert Baillie, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Printed for Robert Ogle, 1841), 2:188.

¹³³ Richard A. Muller, *Holy Scripture*. Vol. 2 of *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 91

Assembly, not by any Order from it; nor after they were made, ever had the *Approbation* of the Assembly; or were so much as offered to the Assembly at all."¹³⁴

Though the Assembly had no official part in the work, the *Annotations* were nonetheless done in the spirit of the Assembly, confirming explanations and interpretations generally settled at Westminster. Though the title "Westminster Annotations" had become a common expression by the latter half of the seventeenth century, contemporaries, especially those more acquainted with the work, more often referred to the text as the "English Annotations" or "Great Annotations" to distinguish them from Theodore Haak's *Dutch Annotations* (1657).¹³⁵ Those enlisted to compile the *Annotations* were: John Ley (Pentateuch and four Gospels); William Gouge (1 Kings through Esther); Meric Casaubon (Psalms); Francis Taylor (Proverbs); Edward Reynolds (Ecclesiastes); Smallwood (Song of Solomon); Thomas Gataker (Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations with John Richardson's additional annotations on Genesis in 1655); Pemberton (Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets in the first edition); John Richardson (author of the additional annotations of 1655; Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets in the second edition); Daniel Featley (the Pauline Epistles); James Ussher (additional annotations on Genesis, 1655); and John Downname and John Reading (general editing).¹³⁶ Ley, Gouge, Taylor, Reynolds, Gataker, and Featley were members of the Westminster Assembly, and Gataker later published *His Vindication of the Annotations* (1653) on Jeremiah 10:2 in response to "aspersions of that grand Imposter," William Lillie and his associate John Swan.¹³⁷ The commentators drew on the whole gamut of Reformed knowledge, including earlier works by Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, and other continental and English sources. It was a monumental achievement and the first English commentary of its kind.¹³⁸

The *Annotations* were reprinted several times, made their way into many Nonconformist libraries, even the radical library of Samuel Jeake, and gave rise, in part, to several academic books, including John Lightfoot's *The Harmony, Chronicle and Order, of the Old Testament* (1647), John Trapp's *A Commentary or Exposition upon all the Epistles, and the Revelation of John the Divine* (1647), and his *A Clavis to the Bible, or, A New Comment upon the Pentateuch* (1650), Edward Leigh's *Annotations upon all the New Testament* (1650) and *Annotations on Five Poetical Books of the Old Testament* (1657), Henry Hammond's *A Paraphrase, and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament* (1653), John

¹³⁴ Cornelius Burgess, *No Sacrilege Nor Sinne To Aliene or Purchase the Lands of Bishops or Others, Whose Offices are Abolished* (London, 1659), 87-88.

¹³⁵ George Watson, ed., *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, Volume 1: 600-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 1857.

¹³⁶ Muller, *Holy Scripture*, 91. If one were to allow Downamean authorship of the glosses in the *Summe*, it is plausible that Downame was at least partially responsible for the glosses in the *Annotations*. Richard Baxter suggests that Downame and Reading might have been responsible for writing the annotations on Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-2 Samuel, Job, Acts, Hebrews, James, 1-2 Peter, 1-3 John, Jude, and Revelation. Edmund Calamy, ed., *An Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of His Life and Times*, 2nd ed. (London, 1713), 1:86.

¹³⁷ Thomas Gataker, *His Vindication of the Annotations by Him Published* (London, 1653), title page.

¹³⁸ Lampros, "A New Set of Spectacles," 44; Richard A. Muller, "Biblical Interpretation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2012), 42; Muller, *Holy Scripture*, 91.

Richardson's *Choice Observations and Explanations upon the Old Testament* (a supplement), John White's posthumous *A Commentary upon the Three First Chapters of the First Book of Moses Called Genesis* (1656), and "many sermons and commentaries on particular scriptural texts," such as Matthew Poole's hybrid *Annotations upon the Holy Bible* (1683-85).¹³⁹

The popularity of the *Annotations* shows several things about religion in the seventeenth century: first, it shows the desire among English people for explanatory texts and commentaries; as has been said of Protestantism more generally is equally true of English Puritanism—it was first and foremost a "religion of the word;" second, it shows the dominance of Reformed theology at the time (e.g. the *Annotations* often defer to Beza);¹⁴⁰ and third, the *Annotations* mark something of a seismic shift within popular religion, from preference for oral to printed forms of speech, from corporate to personal worship; indeed, the *Annotations* were emblematic of the English Reformed commentative tradition and were part of a thriving London book trade: "The printers and the laboring divines had succeeded in producing an exceedingly marketable alternative to the annotated Bible, and many more would follow the path that they had boldly forged."¹⁴¹

3.3.6 *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (c. 1620)

One of the more popular summaries of Reformed divinity in the seventeenth century was the oft-printed and anonymous *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie, First Briefly & Methodically Propounded and Then More Largely & Cleerely Handled and Explained*.¹⁴² As noted before, Downname did not write the anonymous *Summe*.¹⁴³ There has been some confusion in recent literature concerning its authorship, some historians citing Downname as author and others citing Sir Henry Finch (there are even older references citing John Gordon, the author of the preface to the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie*). Since the authorship issue has been addressed before, only the main points bear repeating: (1) It is

¹³⁹ Joad Raymond, *Milton's Angels: The Early Modern Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 99-100. For more general information on seventeenth-century annotating, see Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*, 119-24.

¹⁴⁰ This is not altogether surprising since Beza's *Annotations* led to the drafting of the Geneva Bible.

¹⁴¹ John Barnard, "London Publishing, 1640-1660: Crisis, Continuity, and Innovation," in *Book History, Volume 4*, ed. Ezra Greenspan and Jonathan Rose (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 6-7; Lampros, "A New Set of Spectacles," 44.

¹⁴² In the preface to the *Summe*, Downname addresses the anonymity of the author: "...had he [i.e. the author] herein respected the prayes of men, hee might well haue graced his Name with his worke, euen as his Worke would haue beene graced by his Name, and not as one ashamed of so beautifull an off-spring, haue suffered it to come abroad into the World as an Orphan, the Father still liuing...it comes abroad without the Fathers name, yet will, I doubt not, in short time be famous in its owne name and excellencie." Henry Finch, *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (London, 1620), sig. A4. There is a curious reference in Downname's *Guide* to Jeremias Bastingius's *Summe of Sacred Divinity*, and I have been unable to ascertain whether Bastingius actually wrote a *Summe* of this kind or whether Downname confuses the title with Bastingius's commentary on Ursinus's English-translation *The Summe of Christian Religion* (1589, 1595). See Dowame, *Guide*, 636.

¹⁴³ At least two seventeenth-century sources mistakenly cite Downname as author: *Walwyns Just Defence Against the Cast upon Him* (London, 1649), 9; and *The Leveller Tracts, 1647-1653* (New York, 1944), 362.

unlikely that Downname would refer to the *Summe* as the production of an anonymous pen, to be commended to the reader as one “iustly to be ranked among the best, both for Method and Matter, sound handling of the chiefe points of Christian Religion,” if indeed he were the author; (2) Downname was not known to publish anonymously and there would have been no need for him to do so; (3) William Gouge, a close friend of Finch and publisher of many of his works, including Finch’s last work, *The Worlds Great Restauration* (1621), cites Finch as author of both the *Sacred Doctrine* and the *Summe*;¹⁴⁴ (4) Finchian authorship of the anonymous 1589-90 *Sacred Doctrine* is nearly universally accepted as its subsequent barebones republication in 1613; (5) The title-page of the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine* refers to two volumes of the work: the first being the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine* and the second which was not as yet written but “is to containe a larger explication of the former doctrines: with a discouerie of the most principall Heresies and errors contrary thereunto.” This is near the exact bifurcation on the title-page of the *Summe*: “...first briefly & methodically propounded: and then, more largely & cleerely handled and explained;” (7) Sir Henry Finch, a layman, prominent member of Gray’s Inn, and sergeant-at-law for James I, though educated at Cambridge, would have had reason to publish anonymously given his standing at court, especially works of a more theological or dogmatic flavor and particularly his millenarian tracts.¹⁴⁵ It is little wonder, then, that the only books published under Finch’s own name during his lifetime were those on law; all of his religious writings, including a commentary on the Song of Solomon, were published anonymously, Finch giving the manuscripts to his friends to do what they will.¹⁴⁶

Reasons for Downnamean authorship are more speculative: (1) Were one to grant authorship of the glosses in the 1589-90 *Sacred Doctrine* to the more theologically astute Josias Nichols,¹⁴⁷ it would seem plausible that the fuller, more dogmatically fleshed out *Summe* would be from a different pen than Finch’s summative text; (2) Assuming a later publication date for the *Summe* (c. 1630) would seem to exclude Finch as author since he died in 1625. These reasons, however, are easily countered: first, while Nichols may have written the glosses to the earlier *Sacred Doctrine* there is no compelling evidence to suggest that Finch was less theologically adroit than many of his contemporaries; both Gouge and Downname praise Finch for his ability to soundly handle doctrine; second, Gouge was aware of and references the *Summe* in his preface to Finch’s *Worlds Restauration*, which definitively places the publication of the *Summe* before 1621, which coincides with Downname’s comment that the author of the *Summe* was still alive at the time of publication.

¹⁴⁴ Henry Finch, *The Worlds Great Restauration; Or, The Calling of the Jewes, and (with them) of all the Nations and Kingdomes of the Earth, to the Faith of Christ* (London, 1621), sig. A4-5.

¹⁴⁵ Finch’s end-time predictions, based on his readings of Thomas Draxe and Joseph Mede would get him into trouble with the Jacobean court, though he was not censured as severely as others. Victoria Clark, *Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 27-38; J. C. Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1516-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 147.

¹⁴⁶ See Gouge’s preface to *An Exposition of the Song of Solomon* (1615).

¹⁴⁷ McGiffert thus argues that Josias Nichols (1553-1639) was author of both the preface to and the glosses in the 1589 *Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie*. See McGiffert, “Who Wrote the Preface and Notes for Henry Finch’s ‘The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie,’ 1590?,” *Albion*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (1986): 247-51.

Given Finchian authorship of the *Summe*, the book merits little discussion, perhaps, beyond some comments as to its organization, glosses, and general content. Were the work more intimately annotated by Downname (as presumably Josias Nichols did to the 1589-90 *Sacred Doctrine*), it would bear more weight in assessing Downname's own theology, he thus assuming the role of theological editor and *auctor intellectualis*. Though Downname did not write the main text of the *Summe*, he nonetheless purposefully endorsed its contents, prepared the text, and published it on his own initiative. Downname would have been more intimately acquainted with it than many of the other books under his *imprimatur* and it seems to have been well received throughout the seventeenth century, meriting numerous undated reprints. While it is tempting to see the anonymous nature of the work as intending a more universal or ecumenical reception (as in the absence of "predestination" in the Heidelberg Catechism), the real cause for anonymity seems to be confined to the political circumstances surrounding its author and the expectations of the royal court. Furthermore, Finch's reputation was marred by bankruptcy. Given the intense disdain "the godly" generally had for not repaying one's debts in the Stuart Period, it seems certain that had Finch published in his own name the text would not have been as popular as it had.¹⁴⁸

The *Summe* has its roots in the earlier *Sacred Doctrine* and consists of an elaborate expansion of it, swelling to 551 pages. Its contents reaffirm historic Reformed doctrine, including double-predestination and the covenant.¹⁴⁹ The *Summe* is organized into two main parts: the first consisting of a barebones reprint of the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine*, which appears without an expanded discussion of the Old Testament's promise, and the second a more thoroughly annotated and enlarged version, which often, but not always, follows the form and content of the first.¹⁵⁰ The marginalia consists of elaborate citation of biblical sources, explanatory notes, and references to errors and heresies contraindicated by the subject under discussion.¹⁵¹

Following sixteenth-century Reformed theology, the *Summe* emphasizes the centrality of Christ to Christian doctrine by the very structure of its system. The second part is divided into two books, "Of God the Creator," and "Of Immanuel, God and Man, Our Redeemer." In the first book, Finch addresses the major *loci* pertaining to theology proper or the doctrine of God (divinity, Trinity) as well as some *loci* of other categories, including creation, the kingdom of God, the commandments, the covenant of works, and the fall of humanity. It is noteworthy that the earlier 1589-90 *Sacred Doctrine* was one of the first English treatises to include a discussion of the then novel teaching of the covenant of works. The second book addresses God's covenant, Christ's office of mediation, predestination, salvation, and the sacraments. Discussions of predestination and the covenant of grace are subsumed under the mediating office of Christ and precede

¹⁴⁸ See Neal's comment in *The History of the Puritans, Vol. 1*, 206, where Neal notes the scarcity of bankruptcy, and "in such a case the bankrupt had a mark of infamy set upon him that he could never wipe off."

¹⁴⁹ Finch, *Summe*, 382-311, 339-418.

¹⁵⁰ See Finch, *Summe*, sig. '1r-A4v and 1-551.

¹⁵¹ Such marginalia was common among the period's divinity books. William W. E. Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 35.

discussions of the threefold office of Christ as priest, king, and prophet. The ordering of the *loci* is probably unique and does not seem to follow Perkins's *Golden Chain*, but does bear semblance to Beza's *Confessio christianae fidei* and Musculus's *Loci communes*, both of which were available in late-sixteenth century English editions.

3.3.7 *A Body of Divinitie* (1645)

As noted before, James Ussher's *A Body of Divinitie* was an early modern bestseller well into the eighteenth century and was often used as a catechetical text to teach the essentials of Reformed doctrine.¹⁵² Alan Ford has called it "that curious book" because of its strange pedigree.¹⁵³ Though the book was first published in 1645 with several impressions thereafter, its origins were much earlier. According to Downname's preface to the 1645 edition, the work was "written and finished about twenty years since" (a statement repeated in the 1658 and 1680 editions) which would place it sometime *circa* 1625; however, the 1647 edition makes this thirty years, implying 1617, a date confirmed in the most careful edition of 1677. According to Ussher's biographer, Nicholas Bernard, its origins were in public catechetical lectures given at Trinity College when Ussher was twenty years old (being chosen college catechist) and then in private comments for his family (whom he instructed twice a week); copies and notes were made and dispersed abroad; much of it being the work of others and being not as polished as his later work, Ussher was displeased when it was first published in 1645, though, in time, he would come to see its benefit.¹⁵⁴

The *Body of Divinitie* was published without Ussher's permission and runs, in the first edition, to some 470 pages, containing a comprehensive coverage both of the basics of Christian doctrine and of early seventeenth-century divinity. Ford criticizes those who cite the book as Ussher's work since the latter was not the author but the compiler of English sayings and comments, chiefly derived from Thomas Cartwright's *Catechisme*.¹⁵⁵

Soon after publication Ussher wrote to Downname disavowing the work. His comments provide insight into Downname's actual involvement with the *Body of Divinitie*. Ussher accuses Downname of tearing apart his work, expanding it ("supply[ing] its wants"), and "cast[ing] it into a new mould of his own framing."¹⁵⁶ From this we can ascertain that Downname did a more thorough editing, arranging, organizing, annotating, and expanding of presumably shorter, briefer, explanations than in the original manuscripts. It does seem certain that Downname was more intimately involved with the contents than he was with the earlier *Summe*. Thus, the *Body of Divinitie* may more properly (or at least equally) be

¹⁵² Green, *Print and Protestantism*, Appendix 1; Andrew Marvell, *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, Vol. 1: 1672-1673, ed. Martin Dzelzaninis and Annabel M. Patterson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 384.

¹⁵³ Ford, *James Ussher*, 81.

¹⁵⁴ Ford, *James Ussher*, 82; *Eighteen Sermons Preached in Oxford in 1640* (London, 1660), sig. A3; Nicholas Bernard, *The Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Learned Father of Our Church, Dr. James Usher* (London, 1656), 34, 41-42.

¹⁵⁵ Ford, *James Ussher*, 82-3.

¹⁵⁶ Ussher, *Works*, I, 249, 13 May 1645.

ascribed to Downname than to Ussher, though, interestingly, after many impressions of the work and its increased popularity Ussher reclaimed the work for himself.¹⁵⁷

Downname commends the work to readers “under a two-fold notion:” the first being the subject matter, which is “the summe and substance of Christian Religion, upon which as a most sure foundation we build our faith, ground all our hopes, and from which we reap, and retain all our joy and comfort in the assurance of our salvation;” and the second the “manner of the Authors handling it, which is done so soundly and solidly, so judiciously and exactly, so methodically and orderly...that it giveth place to no other in this kind either ancient or modern, either in our own, or another Language which ever yet came to my view...” For Downname, the *Body of Divinitie* was the *prima inter pares* of such systematic works.¹⁵⁸

As with the *Summe*, questions linger as to Downname’s editorial involvement. While it is certain that Ussher initially compiled the work as a sort of common book or collection of sayings, Downname could have more purposely annotated and organized the text, as hinted at in the new prefatory material to the 1677-78 edition. There the new prefacer notes four things concerning the text which he acquired from eye-witnesses: (1) That the method and “most of the Materials” belong to the “incomparable Bishop Ushers;” (2) That Bishop Ussher initially scorned the work (being published without his consent) but that later he praised it for doing much good; (3) That the catechetical method of the *Body of Divinitie* is the same that Ussher used in his own country and lectures, and that he orders ministers in his diocese to go through the *Body of Divinitie*; (4) That John Downname did more than commend the work but “helped to midwife it into the World,” which suggests that a portion of the work, however brief, belonged to Downname. It seems likely that Downname contributed the many glosses and Ramist charts throughout the book as well as the closing index. Less certain is to what extent Downname may have altered the wording of the actual text or amended it. The degree of editing, it would seem, depends on the maturity of the manuscript Downname worked from; according to Ussher the work was in puerile form when he left it.

3.4 Downname’s Theology in Historical Context

So far we have seen Downname’s social contexts and have looked at his major writings in historical context. We will now consider Downname’s theology as it reflects the beliefs and doctrines of the English and Reformed orthodox theologians that represent mainstream Puritanism. In short, we will consider these major themes, which will also serve in comparisons with Rous and Crisp: (a) Doctrine of God and Humanity; (b) Predestination and Assurance; (c) Covenant of Works and Grace; (d) Justification and Sanctification; and (e) Christian Life and Piety. As we have observed, theology for Downname results from reflection upon the results of exegesis; throughout his many writings and edited works the Bible takes a primary place in argumentation. This Bible-centeredness reaffirms what historians have long noted but also neglected: that Puritans revered the Bible above all

¹⁵⁷ Ford, *James Ussher*, 81-84.

¹⁵⁸ James Ussher, *A Body of Divinitie; Or, the Summe and Substance of Christian Religion*, ed. John Downname (London, 1645), sig. A3-4.

other authoritative forms because they believe it to be the self-attesting true and inerrant Word of God to humanity.¹⁵⁹

3.4.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

Downame stood firmly within the Reformed tradition in his understanding of the Triune God, humanity's *summum bonum*, who actively works among humanity.¹⁶⁰ Downame's writings reflect the more finely tuned theological categories of early seventeenth-century development which culminated in such well-known treatises of the later seventeenth century as Edward Leigh's *A Systeme or Body of Divinity* (1654), Stephen Charnock's posthumous and incomplete, *Discourses upon the Existence and Attributes of God* (1683), and of the early eighteenth century, such as Samuel Willard's *A Compleat Body of Divinity* (1726). Such late works represent the broad apex of the eclectic nature of the early English Reformed tradition.¹⁶¹

When examining Downame's understanding of who God is as well as his thoughts on other *loci*, one must not ignore the wider historical contexts with which his life and work were interwoven. One such context is the wider confessional heritage, which Downame would have been familiar with and which is reflected in the period's divinity manuals.¹⁶² Though Downame is best known for his more practical writings and is a pastoral theologian, his editorial work on the *Summe of Sacred Divinitie* and *Body of Divinitie* should not be ignored. Though it is uncertain to what extent Downame was involved with the glosses and texts of the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie* on the subject of

¹⁵⁹ Harry Stout noted the irony that though the "Puritan experiment depended on the Bible," most scholarship "skims over the Bible generally in accounting for the rise of Puritanism." Stout, "Word and Order in Colonial New England," in *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, ed. Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 19. This is also the cynosure of George Marsden's criticism of Perry Miller. See George M. Marsden, "Perry Miller's Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique," *Church History* 39/1 (1970), 93. Those few studies that do focus on Puritan exegesis include Gordis, *Opening Scripture*; Kenneth Casillas, "English Puritan Exegesis as Reflected in Thomas Gataker's Annotations on Isaiah: Toward an Equitable Assessment of Historic Biblical Interpretation" (PhD thesis, Bob Jones University, 2001); John R. Knott, Jr. *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980) and John S. Coolidge, *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (London: Clarendon Press, 1970). Adriaan C. Neele has also commented on the biblical emphasis underlying the Reformed orthodox doctrine of God. Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706): Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 21, 141-70. More generally, on *αυτοπιστος*, see Henk van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

¹⁶⁰ Downame, *Guide*, 30.

¹⁶¹ For more on the Reformed orthodox doctrine of God, see Carl R. Trueman, "Reason and Rhetoric: Stephen Charnock on the Existence of God," in *Reason, Faith, and History: Philosophical Essays for Paul Helm* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 29-46; and Simon J. G. Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's Modus Theologiae* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 201-324; Richard A. Muller, *The Triunity of God*. Vol. 4 of *Post Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 143-381; and Muller, *The Divine Essence and Attributes*. Vol. 3 of *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 153-590; and John Platt, *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575-1650* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 3-49.

¹⁶² Often, though not always, confessional descriptions were used as starting points for the doctrine of God in these texts and were given logical priority.

God (or any other *loci*), it is undeniable that he gave his positive assent to their contents; therefore, these texts provide another window into Downname's own theological assertions; at the very minimum the popularity of these texts attest to the theological astuteness of mainstream Reformed theology and the growing need for doctrinal clarity within British Puritanism.¹⁶³

Discussions of God in Downname's texts reflect centuries of theological development and continuity.¹⁶⁴ The *Summe* presents the doctrine in 61 glossed pages and the *Body of Divinitie* does so in Heads 2-3, which comes to 64 pages. The entire first chapter of the expanded *Summe* is devoted to the discussion of God's being, life, understanding, will, holiness, kindness, truth, justice, mercy, blessedness, kingdom, power, glory, wisdom, infiniteness, nature, eternity, and unchangeableness. Similarly, the *Body of Divinitie* deals with God's nature, essence, persons, perfection, all-sufficiency, will, goodness, justice, simplicity, infiniteness, power, and knowledge after a relatively short introduction on Scripture and how one comes to know God, an organization and method not uncommon in the seventeenth century.¹⁶⁵ Downname's *Guide* devotes a chapter to the "object of saving knowledge," which is "God himself and his attributes, his Word, and workes."¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ See, for instance, Richard A. Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 11-30.

¹⁶⁴ Various aspects of divine efficiency and sufficiency in the doctrine of God within seventeenth-century Reformed orthodoxy has been elucidated, in part, in the following works: Dolf te Velde, *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School: A Study in Method and Content* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 19-255; Sebastian Rehnman, "The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 353-401; Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 3: The Divine Essence and Attributes* and *Volume 4: The Trinity of God*; Muller, *Christ and the Decree*; Carl R. Trueman, "Reason and Rhetoric: Stephen Charnock on the Existence of God," in *Reason, Faith and history: Philosophical Essays for Paul Helm*, ed. M. W. F. Stone (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 29-46; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 35-66; Trueman, *The Claims of Truth*, 102-50; Dewey D. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); John Platt, *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575-1650* (Leiden: Brill, 1982); Harm Goris, "Thomism in Zanchi's Doctrine of God," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem van Asselt and Eef Decker (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001); Michael D. Bell, *Propter potestatem, scientiam, ac beneplacitum Dei: The Doctrine of the Object of Predestination in the Theology of Johannes Maccovius* (Th.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1986); J. V. Fesko, *Diversity within the Reformed Tradition: Supra- and Infralapsarianism in Calvin, Dort, and Westminster*; and Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht*, 18-21, 139-278.

More generally, those aspects explored about God include God-talk, his existence and will, nature and attributes, and persons. Numerous writers in the seventeenth century wrote about these aspects to varying degrees. The doctrine that emerged over the century was a comprehensive understanding of God the Father, Son, and Spirit that was self-limited and illuminative. It reaffirmed the earlier medieval cataphatic and apophatic notions and embraced both Thomist and Scotist strains in an eclectic use of the past. See Rehnman, "Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy," 353-401; Richard A. Muller, "The 'Reception of Calvin' in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 258-60 (cf. Chapter 5 below, n. 81). Cf. John F. Wippel, *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas: From Finite Being to Uncreated Being* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press of America, 2000); Richard Cross, *The Metaphysics of the Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

¹⁶⁵ For instance, Leigh prefaces his work with an introduction on prolegomena and then discusses the doctrine of Scripture prior to the doctrine of God, thus emphasizing the importance of epistemology. Leigh, *A Systeme*, 1-143.

¹⁶⁶ Downname, *Guide*, 30-35.

This addressing God first or prior to discussions of Christology and humanity are typical of early modern scholastic works, including Calvin's *Institutes*, Dudley Fenner's *Sacra Theologia*, Johannes Wollebius's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*, and William Ames's *Medulla*.¹⁶⁷ Unlike many other contested issues of the Reformation, the doctrine of God was more of a unifying theme within early modern Christianity; and though Reformed rhetoric would, at times, argue for more substantial differences, both the Reformed and Roman Catholics could equally subscribe to the many descriptions of God found within early modern confessions and catechisms on either side of the divide; both, it could be argued, embraced similar forms of Thomism; indeed, within the top universities of the seventeenth century both Lombard's *Sententiae* and Aquinas's *Summa Theologia* were used as pedagogical texts.¹⁶⁸

The doctrine was equally unifying within moderate and more radical forms of British Puritanism, though, over time, differences would emerge over how to understand the logical priority of God's decrees and the nature of the covenant; more broadly, divisions between the Reformed and Lutheran would surface over God's knowledge of future contingencies, the latter embracing the thought of Molinism or "middle knowledge" to combat the perceived determinism of the former, even though notions of a "conditional

¹⁶⁷ Calvin begins Book I of the *Institutes* with "Knowledge of God the Creator;" Fenner, "the closest that early Presbyterians came to a systematic theologian," begins Book I of his *Sacred Theologia* with discussions of God and his actions; Ames, though he first discusses in detail the doctrine of faith (similar to Ussher's *Body of Divinitie*), he quickly moves to the discussion of God. For the quote on Fenner, see Peter Iver Kaufman, "Reconstructing the Context for Confessionalization in Late Tudor England: Receptions of Reception, Then and Now," in *Confessionalization in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), 282.

¹⁶⁸ Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 86; Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 4. See Fergus Kerr, *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2002); Denis Janz, *Luther and Late Medieval Thomism: A Study in Theological Anthropology* (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1983); and *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 5-14. Stephen Hampton writes, "In the context of [the Reformed] doctrine of God...Reformed authorities all but disappear, and are replaced by Thomas Aquinas and the many Roman Catholics who expounded and developed his thinking during the early modern period." Hampton, *Anti-Arminians: The Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 221; see esp. 221-265.

The chief synthesizers of a "Reformed Thomism" or "Christian Aristotelianism" seem to be Peter Martyr Vermigli and his student Girolamo Zanchi. One need only compare Aquinas's *Summa Theologia* with Zanchi's *Opera Theologia* to see Zanchi's reliance on Aquinas. See Luca Baschera, "Aristotle and Scholasticism," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 133-60; Harm Goris "Thomism in Zanchi's Doctrine of God," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and F. Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 121-39; John Patrick Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden: Brill, 1976); and Otto Gründler's more dogmatic appraisal in his "Thomism and Calvinism in the Theology of Girolamo Zanchi (1516-1590)" (Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1961); and, more generally, for "Reformed Thomism" within Puritanism, Christopher Cleveland, *John Owen and Thomism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2013). On the subject of "Christian Aristotelianism," see Richard A. Muller, "Scholasticism, Reformation, Orthodoxy, and the Persistence of Christian Aristotelianism," *Trinity Journal* 19:1 (1998): 81-96.

decree” and “middle knowledge” did not suggest “the power of a human creature to undermine, change, or over power the electing will of God.”¹⁶⁹

Given the substantial agreements between the earlier Reformed tradition and seventeenth-century British Puritanism on the doctrine of God, it is not necessary to fully outline the intricate details of this doctrine within the *Summe* or the *Body of Divinitie* or the *Guide* other than to note a few of their distinct points:

First, all three texts are heavily influenced by Ramism. This is seen not only in the Ramist charts throughout the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie* but in the direct quoting of Ramus’s *Theologiae* on the impossibility of defining God: one must have “Gods own Logicke” to peer into the depths of his being.¹⁷⁰ Other influences of Ramus are seen in the pedagogical nature of theology that teaches people about piety and their relationship to God; or, as Ramus put it, “*doctrina bene vivendi*,” a theme picked up by Cocceius, Ames, and other Reformed theologians of the seventeenth century. Given Ramism’s popularity within Puritanism, it is almost certain that Finch and Ussher would have been familiar with Ramus’s *Theologiae*, though these references may be suggestive of Downname’s editing since the same quote appears in both tests and in similar places.¹⁷¹

Second, the *Summe* distinguishes, in keeping with earlier divinity manuals, two forms of knowledge about God: “knowledge of God the Creator” and “knowledge of Christ the Redeemer.” The *Summe* calls the former “theologie” and the latter “Christianitie,” noting the absence of more formal, settled, terms.¹⁷² The *Body of Divinitie* distinguishes between God’s nature and kingdom and subsumes Christology under the latter *locus* and specifically under the two-fold covenant. The *Guide* states that God is the “cause of all causes” and *primum ens* who breathed life into his creation.¹⁷³

Third, all three texts provide careful descriptions of divine simplicity and eternity as well as a more nuanced Trinitarianism.¹⁷⁴ They further distinguish between

¹⁶⁹ Katherine Sonderegger, “Election,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*, ed. John Webster, Kathryn Tanner, and Iain Torrance (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 112.

¹⁷⁰ Finch, *Summe*, 7; Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 31.

¹⁷¹ Both Finch and Ussher were immersed in Ramism. Finch had been a student of Laurence Chaderton, who was “England’s first and leading exponent of Ramist logic” and Ussher’s “weekdays [while at Trinity College, Dublin] were spent studying Ramus and rhetoric.” David J. Seipp, “The Structure of English Common Law in the Seventeenth Century,” in *Legal History in the Making: Proceedings of the Ninth British Legal History Conference, Glasgow 1989*, ed. W. M. Gordon and T. D. Fergus (London: The Hambledon Press, 1991), 76; H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 209; Ford, *James Ussher*, 39-40.

¹⁷² Finch, *Summe*, 6. “Theologie” was commonly used throughout the seventeenth century and dates to the fourteenth century; however, “Christology” did not become a formal term within systematic theologies until the late seventeenth century.

¹⁷³ Downname, *Guide*, 30.

¹⁷⁴ The *Guide* states that “The Eternity of God is an essential attribute, which signifieth that he is infinite and uncircumscribed by time, first and last, without beginning or ending, absolute without succession, wholly all, alwaies and at once.” Downname, *Guide*, 31. On divine eternity, see Paul Helm, *Eternal God: A Study of God Without Time*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Muller, *The Divine Essence and Attributes*, 325-64. See also, more generally, Carl R. Trueman, “Reason and Rhetoric: Stephen Charnock on the Existence of God,” in *Reason, Faith and History: Philosophical Essays for Paul Helm*, ed. M. W. F. Stone (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 29-46.

God's incommunicable and communicable attributes or between God's "primary" and "secondary" attributes.¹⁷⁵

Fourth, though the *Summe* contains a more elaborate discussion of the doctrine of God than the briefer, more catechetical *Body of Divinitie* or practical *Guide*, there are no substantial disagreements between the three texts, which is again suggestive of the overall doctrinal harmony among the Reformed orthodox on discussions of God, and Downname's involvement with the texts. Also in harmony are the teachings on humanity, the fall into sin and the covenant of grace and works. Humanity is thus unable to redeem itself, there being a need for a Mediator, which, in the *Guide*, is treated under the saving "knowledge of God" with respect to "his workes and actions."¹⁷⁶

3.4.2 Predestination and Assurance

Predestination was a hotly contested doctrine in the early modern period and one that made it into nearly every body of divinity of the time.¹⁷⁷ It is the doctrine that affirms that God from eternity has chosen some persons for salvation and others for damnation. Puritans held the doctrine in high esteem because it emphasized the sovereignty of God in salvation and contradicted the teachings of the papists who seemed to find grounds for merit within human beings themselves. Thus, it was a way to emphasize the divine causality in salvation and was further appealing because it accented the spiritual nature of the relationship between the divine and the human, thus undermining the authority of church hierarchy and of ritual efficacy. By the mid-seventeenth century it became a doctrine synonymous with Puritan spirituality, and nearly made its way into every discussion of assurance among the Reformed orthodox. English Puritan theologians sometimes disputed the *ordo decretorum* in God's mind and formulated positions that came to be known as either *supralapsarianism* or *infralapsarianism*.¹⁷⁸ The former taught

¹⁷⁵ Downname, *Guide*, 30-32.

¹⁷⁶ See Downname, *Guide*, 34-36.

¹⁷⁷ On the historical contexts surrounding predestination in the Reformed tradition, see Dewey D. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 29-157; Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 1-16, 79-128, 149-70; Frank A. James III, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (New York: Oxford, 1998), 91-188; Peter White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 13-59; Peter J. Thuesen, *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (New York: Oxford, 2009), 14-72; Jan W. Wojcik, *Robert Boyle and the Limits of Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 76-94; Matthew Levering, *Predestination: Biblical and Theological Paths* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 98-134; and Fesko, *Diversity within the Reformed Tradition*.

¹⁷⁸ Beza placed the doctrine of God's eternal decrees at the front of his *Summa totius Christianismi*; the later Synod of Dort made no binding declaration on the orthodoxy of either infralapsarianism or supralapsarianism and allowed for diversity of thought. See J. V. Fesko, "Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 99-123. See also Joel R. Beeke, "The Order of the Divine Decrees at the Genevan Academy: From Bezan Supralapsarianism to Turretinian Infralapsarianism," in *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564-1864*, ed. John B. Roney and Martin I. Klauber (London: Greenwood Press, 1998), 57-76; David Como, "Puritans, Predestination, and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England," in

that the decree to predestinate was logically prior to the decree to create humanity and permit the fall of Adam (and so human beings in the decree are said to be *creabilis et labilis*); the latter taught that the decree to create was logically prior to predestinate and thus the objects of predestination were fallen creatures (*creatus et lapsus*). Though seventeenth-century Reformed scholastics debated the order of the decrees on predestination, creation, and the Fall, this order was always understood in a logical rather than temporal sense, since all knowledge and willing were regarded as simultaneous actions within the divine mind. Both forms were seen as within the bounds of orthodoxy and no one made it a confessional issue, though some more vehement adherents on both sides took great pains to disprove the other, supralapsarianism being seen as compromising God's goodness and infralapsarianism God's sovereignty.¹⁷⁹ Historians sometimes refer to supralapsarianism as double predestination and infralapsarianism as single predestination, but historically, as the decrees were understood in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both supralapsarianism and infralapsarianism were seen as being double or of having two sides, the decree to elect and the decree to reprobate or pass over. Both sides acknowledge elements of mystery to the decrees. Rather interesting, early seventeenth-century debates on Arminianism centered more on the doctrine of predestination than on justification, and, as Muller has well noted, predestination should not be seen as the central dogma of the Reformed; rather, predestination, in conjunction with several other doctrines, formed a system of thought that placed emphasis on "what might be called soteriological determinism."¹⁸⁰

The *Summe* places predestination under "Christ the Redeemer," explains the decree within 23 pages, and defends a rather robust supralapsarianism, thus reaffirming the strong ties to Christology that the Reformed orthodox placed when discussing predestination.¹⁸¹ Predestination is here defined as "one principall branch of Gods purpose, or eternall Decree, concerning the final estate of the most excellent creatures, Angels and Men," which consists of two parts: *election*, which is the bringing of some to salvation; and *reprobation*, which is the bringing of some to damnation. Though the number of God's elect are but few in comparison to the reprobate, the cause of their difference is only God's

Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000).

¹⁷⁹ See, for example, William Twisse's extensive defense of supralapsarianism in *The Riches of Gods Love Unto the Vessells of Mercy, Consistent with His Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the Vessells of Wrath* (Oxford, 1653). Though other prominent theologians, such as Beza, Maccovius, Gomarus, Perkins, Voetius, and Ames were supralapsarian in their views of predestination, various seventeenth-century confessions, such as the Canons of Dort and the Westminster Confession, were more infralapsarian. For clarification of the double/single debates within historic supra/infra discussions, see Muller, *After Calvin*, 11-12. For a thoughtful analysis of predestination in the sixteenth century, see Muller, *Christ and the Decree*; for a challenge to the conventional view that the Westminster Confession condoned infralapsarianism, see Guy M. Richard, "Samuel Rutherford's Supralapsarianism Revealed: A Key to the Lapsarian Position of the Westminster Confession of Faith?," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59 (2008): 27-44.

¹⁸⁰ Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 177-79; cf. John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 66-96. See and compare with Weber's thesis in Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Stephen Kalberg (1920; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 113-38.

¹⁸¹ Finch, *Summe*, 283-309; cf. Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 129-74

free will and pleasure or *decretum beneplaciti*, without any external motive, being first in the nature and order of causes and before all things. Predestination thus manifests God's mercy to those who will be saved and God's justice to those who are condemned.¹⁸² The *Summe* spends much time refuting notions that election and reprobation are moved by any quality within human beings: no foreknowledge of faith or infidelity, no good or evil works (not even the works of Christ), were the *causam efficientem* of the decree but rather are consequences that follow upon it.¹⁸³ *Christian Warfare* notes that the *forma causa* of election is the purpose or counsel of God himself, whereby he determined to elect, though it is silent on the causes of reprobation.¹⁸⁴ In the *Summe*, both election and reprobation are parallel decrees, the former wholly of God's mercy and the latter wholly of God's justice, and both for the displaying of God's glory.¹⁸⁵ The *Summe's* teachings on predestination are harmonious with the earlier English developments of Beza and Perkins and continental formulations seen in Polanus, Junius, Maccovius, and Gomarus.¹⁸⁶ The *Guide* defines election as "God's eternall decree whereby of his free grace, he hath purposed in Christ, to bring some to euerlasting life, and to the vse of the meanes, whereby they may attaine vnto it, to the praise of the glory of his grace;" and, conversely, reprobation is defined as the "eternall decree, whereby he hath purposed in his election to passe by some men, and to leaue them in their sinnes, that they may iustly be contemned, to the praise of the glory of his iustice."¹⁸⁷ Thus, there are differences in nuance between the *Summe* and the *Guide*, and it seems entirely plausible that this is because of their intended audiences. Indeed, *Christian Warfare*, written specifically for those perplexed with doubts, accentuates God's grace in election in stating that "all other causes" such as one's own will, the foreseeing of works, the worthiness or faith, or even the merits of Christ were excluded as grounds for election; the motive being ascribed to God's free grace and mere good will.¹⁸⁸ Downname further distinguishes between the "efficient," "material," and "formal" causes of election, and notes two ends of God's election, the first being God's glory and the second the salvation of the elect.¹⁸⁹

Glosses in the *Summe* on predestination defend the supralapsarian position without naming it; indeed, it is remarkable that throughout the *Summe* few references are made to extra-biblical sources, the majority of the effort being spent on expounding Scripture, a method similar to Downname's *Christian Warfare* and *Guide for Godliness*. The *Summe* also targets the errors of the Arminians, Universalists, Roman Catholics, and those of the "softer-Reformed" variety.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸² Indeed, in the *Guide*, Downname states that reprobation provides material for meditation because it extols God's justice toward the reprobate and God's love for the elect, both of whom are taken from the same mass of humanity. Downname, *Guide*, 567-68.

¹⁸³ Finch, *Summe; Christian Warfare*, Book I, 174-76.

¹⁸⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 176.

¹⁸⁵ Finch, *Summe*, 291-93.

¹⁸⁶ See "Predestination," in *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, 332-38; esp. 336.

¹⁸⁷ Downname, *Guide*, 34.

¹⁸⁸ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 97.

¹⁸⁹ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 98.

¹⁹⁰ Circulating at this time were notions that God merely passed over the reprobate rather than actively willing or decreeing their destruction. The *Summe* rejects Prestonian notions that reprobation becomes active only in time and not from eternity. Cf. and cp. Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical*

The *Summe* ends its discussion on predestination with the inestimable comfort available for the elect because of this doctrine, a subject dealt extensively in *Christian Warfare* (Book I, Ch. 3) and the *Guide*. One can readily see the preoccupation with assurance in these two texts and the great pains that Downname took to address it.

The *Body of Divinitie* places predestination under the kingdom of Christ and contains only a short question and answer on predestination. Election is based only on God's good pleasure and is not caused by anything good within people or by the good works of Christ. Reprobation is likewise an eternal decree or fore-appointment of men and angels to everlasting dishonor and destruction; God "of his own Free-will determining to pass them by, refuse or cast them off, and for sin to condemn and punish them with eternal Death;" and yet sin is not the cause of reprobation, for then all would be reprobate when God foresaw that all would sin; sin is the cause of the *execution* of reprobation, the wicked being justly damned for their own sin and not because God delights to destroy his creation.¹⁹¹ The *Body of Divinitie* seems to use more infralapsarian overtones when it employs the language of God "passing over" the reprobate, but then seems to nullify it by stating that there is no cause in the reprobate for their reprobation other than God's free will and good pleasure.¹⁹²

Typical of Puritanism, the *Summe*, *Body of Divinitie*, *Christian Warfare*, and *Guide to Godliness* address the practical problems associated with the doctrine of predestination and the common abuses against it. Rather than being the chief cause of anxiety, the doctrine brings comfort for the elect (being immutable) but terror to the reprobate (the *decretum horribile*); rather than opening a door to licentiousness, it encourages godliness and gratitude; but one must not peer too deeply into its depths and mysteries or they will fall into error and desperation.¹⁹³ Thus the doctrine of predestination had pedagogical uses and was used by Downname to bring comfort and assurance to the afflicted in conscience, though, says Downname, the devil was active in troubling weak Christians to doubt their election and salvation.¹⁹⁴

In *Christian Warfare*, Downname addresses the assurance problem in an extended and elaborate discussion which may be summated in five ways: First, the child of God who has been converted, justified, and sanctified can be certain of their particular election without any special revelation (thus assurance is *possible*); second, the means and infallible signs to discern election is the possession and fruits of a godly and Christian life,

Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 71-94.

¹⁹¹ Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 80-83.

¹⁹² Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 81. It is difficult to determine whether the text endorses infra- or supralapsarianism as the "passing by" of the reprobate mentioned in the text could reference an eternal negative act in a supralapsarian sense since it does not indicate anything about a fallen mass of humanity. Noteworthy, the editor of Ussher's definitive works accused Downname of authoring the supralapsarianism of the *Body of Divinitie*. See Charles R. Elrington, ed., *The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D.* (Dublin, 1847), 1:249-50.

¹⁹³ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 136-37. Both *Christian Warfare* and *A Guide to Godliness* address the complexity of assurance as it relates to predestination.

¹⁹⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 101-2. That the doctrine of predestination brings comfort to the elect is the central thesis of Nam Kyu Lee's *Die Pradestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen, 1583-1622* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

such as a heart enflamed with love for God and zeal for his glory (thus election has *evidences*); third, the rejection that doubt is somehow virtuous; though faith and doubt are often mixed in the godly, by nature, they are opposed (the papists thus erroneously extol *doubt*); fourth, that the nature of faith is to *believe* (thus faith itself *assures*); and fifth, that testimony of God's Spirit brings assurance by moving believers to love God's Word and work.¹⁹⁵ In characteristic precisianist fashion, Downname clarifies that the Spirit's testimony is not divorced from the diligent and careful use of outward means, as the hearing and reading of the Bible, the receiving of sacraments, and other holy duties in God's service. Thus, the inward testimony of the Spirit is not severed from the outward testimony of the word; further, the assurance of God's love and one's election is not wrought by the Spirit immediately but accompanies the preaching of the word and administration of sacraments.¹⁹⁶

Whether or not this precisianist program for assurance was successful is suggested in the rise of alternatives to this way of discerning marks and inward signs. For many, assurance was elusive and did contribute to many crises of faith, as in the case of Joan Drake, whom Lake wistfully calls "that long-distance puritan melancholic."¹⁹⁷ Numerous Puritan *intelligentsias* tried to resolve her inner conflict in believing that she was among the reprobate, but they largely failed to quiet her conscience. Among those divines who tried were John Dod, Thomas Hooker, John Preston, and James Ussher. It is interesting to note that Drake was often in "several days and nights of visionary ecstasy," followed by deeply depressive episodes. Though Drake suffered for many years, she does seem to have had some relief from her condition with Hooker's counseling, which, in part, resulted in her "peaceful death" in 1625, and which, in turn, contributed to Hooker's fame and preferment as a casuist.¹⁹⁸

Drake's case, and those like hers, is suggestive of the aura of religious despair that many parishioners, and some ministers, went through in the early Stuart era. Given the length that precisianist divines devoted to assurance in their writings, the problem of assurance must have been a constant issue within the parish. However, melancholic cases

¹⁹⁵ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 103-39.

¹⁹⁶ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 118.

¹⁹⁷ Peter Lake, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 609.

¹⁹⁸ John H. Ball, *Chronicling the Soul's Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1992), 13. For more on the Drake affair, and John Hart's chronicle of her story some twenty years after her death, see Charles Whitney, *Early Responses to Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 215-23; Jeremy Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 64-77; Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 91; George H. Williams, "Called by Thy Name, Leave us Not: The Case of Mrs. Joan Drake," *Harvard Library Bulletin* (1968). Cf. Mary Ann Lund, *Melancholy, Medicine and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading "The Anatomy of Melancholy"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 62-76.

Other notable melancholic cases include Thomas Shepard and Michael Wigglesworth. See Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge, Revised and Expanded* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), and Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653-1657: The Conscience of a Puritan* (New York: Harper and Row, 1946).

and crises of assurance were seen as evidences of spiritual conflict, with the devil leading the assault; and by no means were the more extreme cases the most prominent.

3.4.3 *Covenant of Works and Grace*

Covenant theology was a development within late sixteenth and early-mid-seventeenth-century Reformed theology that centers on notions of the covenant (*foedus*) between God and human beings.¹⁹⁹ Though covenant or federal theology was not monolithic in terms of detail, being expressed with various degrees of clarity throughout its evolution, it nonetheless enjoyed significant confessional and ecclesiastical status, being a central teaching in both British and continental symbols.²⁰⁰

The first major articulation of the covenant as such was Zwingli's in the 1520s. Zwingli used the covenant to defend the practice of infant baptism against the Anabaptists. Bullinger, Tyndale, and Hooper would later use the covenant to distinguish between divine sovereignty and human responsibility, though it was Calvin who more clearly detailed the notion of a single covenant of grace between God and the elect.²⁰¹ Later Reformed theologians, such as Caspar Olevianus, Zecharias Ursinus, and Herman Witsius, started to argue for a second covenant, a covenant of creation, nature, or works, which referred to an arrangement between God and Adam in the Garden of Eden prior to the

¹⁹⁹ Scholarship on the covenant in Reformed theology is enormous and complex. For introductions, summaries, and recent contributions, see Jordan J. Ballor, *Covenant, Causality, and Law: A Study in the Theology of Wolfgang Musculus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 43-78; J. Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 19-77; Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 175-90; Willem J. van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603-1669* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1-17, 248-90; Peter A. Lillback, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 28-125; Lyle D. Bierma, *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996); David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 115-52; Jonathan Neil Gerstner, *The Thousand Generation Covenant: Dutch Reformed Covenant Theology and Group Identity in Colonial South Africa, 1652-1814* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 107-35; and the now dated but historically accurate PhD thesis by Andrew A. Woolsey, *Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study of the Reformed Tradition to the Westminster Assembly* (1988; Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 7-160.

For studies on the covenant within Puritanism, see Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 217-320; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 71-100; Won Taek Lim, "The Covenant Theology of Francis Roberts" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2000); David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 128-98; John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1986); and Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), 365-462, 502-6. George Marsden wrote that "The covenant doctrine was emphasized primarily because it was discovered to be a central biblical concept." Quoted in Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract*, 4.

²⁰⁰ See, for instance, the "Westminster Confession of Faith," in *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition: Volume 2, Reformation Era*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 615-16.

²⁰¹ Lillback, *The Binding of God*; Selderhuis, *The Calvin Handbook*, 237-40.

Fall; while details of this second covenant varied it was generally held that life was promised to Adam upon obedience and death upon disobedience; Adam, falling into sin, thus plunged the whole human race into death. Inquiries into the respective roles of God the Father and God the Son in the salvation of the elect produced a third covenant in the mid-1640s—the Covenant of Redemption or *pactum salutis*, which was seen as an eternal agreement within the Trinity to bring about the elect’s salvation and glorification. It is the foundation of the covenant of grace and makes possible the “agreement between God and his elect;” thus, among seventeenth Reformed theologians, the covenant of grace “presupposes” the covenant of redemption.²⁰²

During the seventeenth century, three of the most widely circulated expositions on the covenant were by Puritans: John Ball’s *The Covenant of Grace* (1645); Edward Fisher’s *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (1646); and Francis Roberts’s *Mysterium & Medulla Bibliorum* (1657). Shorter discussions of the covenant frequently made it into the varied bodies of divinity and even within numerous practical expositions of the godly and Christian life. The doctrine of the two covenants (Covenant of Works and Grace) was a popular theme within Stuart Puritanism, especially in discussions of Christology and redemption.²⁰³ In 1646, Downname gave his imprimatur to Edmund Calamy’s *Two Solemne Covenants made Between God and Man*, which attests to the diverse literature on the subject in that it briefly notes the variety of opinions on the Covenant of Works and Grace.²⁰⁴

The doctrine of the two covenants appears with varying degrees of precision throughout *Christian Warfare, Guide, Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*. As expected, discussions of the covenant in the two former works center on the Covenant of Grace and its pedagogical use for bringing comfort and assurance to believers (the Covenant of Works is only mentioned twice by name, and that in the *Guide*).²⁰⁵ The two latter works present the Covenant of Works and Grace with more dogmatic aims to instruct readers in sound doctrine.²⁰⁶

The *Summe* first discusses the covenant of works with the creatures, a covenant of life (or blessedness) to the doers of the Law but of death (or of a curse) to its transgressors, calling it the first covenant that God made with his creatures. This covenant has two parts: the Law of God from which all other laws are streams and shadows and Reward and Punishment, without which there would be neither care to observe nor fear to break it. The reward comes from God’s free and undeserved goodness and punishment from the

²⁰² Muller, *After Calvin*, 187.

²⁰³ McGiffert, “Federal Theology,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 1:395-6; Zaret, *Heavenly Contract*, 133-35.

²⁰⁴ Edmund Calamy, *Two Solemne Covenants made Between God and Man: That is, the Covenant of Workes and the Covenant of Grace* (London, 1647), sig. A2-3. Calamy remarks that Sidrach Simpson presented a case for four covenants (two of Works and two of Grace) before the Westminster Assembly, and that others held to three covenants and still others, such as he, to two. Mark Jones, “The ‘Old’ Covenant,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within British Puritanism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 187.

²⁰⁵ See Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 68-9, 83, 86, 89, 103, 110, 115, 119, 198-9, 209, 245, 276, 297, 305, 319-20, 323, 597, 855, 892; and Downname, *Guide*, 6, 9-10, 21, 28, 36-37, 48-51, 88-90, 94, 107, 170-71, 243, 396, 406, 452-4, 492, 495-9, 530, 565, 582, 602-3, 606, 680, 689-90, 718, 738, 809, 823, 886, 896-7, 904, 923-5, 958, 960.

²⁰⁶ Finch, *Summe*, sig. *2v-3r; 222-26; 282-3, 307-10, 361, 380, 391, 406-9; Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, Heads 8, 11.

sins committed. The covenant requires works done by the strength of nature, and according to the law of creation, the express image being the moral law; the covenant's grounds and foundation is the beautified state of primitive man, who was endowed with holiness and God's Law written on the heart.²⁰⁷ The other covenant in the *Summe* is the conditional covenant between God and the elect, mediated by Christ, for the salvation of elect souls, the condition being faith. The *Summe* does not call this a Covenant of Grace, though substantially that is what it is; all the essential elements of the Covenant of Grace as depicted in Ball's *Treatise* are in the *Summe* in rudiment form, with both treatises emphasizing God's goodness and kindness. Thus, the *Summe* does not contain the more mature expressions of covenant theology typical of mid-to-late seventeenth-century treatises, but it nonetheless contains the seeds to which this thought would develop into. Both *Christian Warfare* and the *Guide* refer to the Covenant of Grace and use this covenant to foster Christian assurance and godly living.²⁰⁸

The *Body of Divinitie* contains a much more elaborate discussion of the Covenant of Works, and reflects the development to 1645: the covenant of works (the first covenant) was given to Adam pre-fall. It was a conditional covenant in that life was promised to Adam upon obedience and death upon disobedience. Adam had the capacity to either obey or disobey (having free will), though the law was written on his heart. The trees of life and of the knowledge of good and evil were seals of the covenant and signified either eternal life or the misery humanity would know by experience. Adam is clearly presented as the federal head of mankind, thus representing all those who should descend from him through natural generation. In a similar way that Adam represented all humanity, in the second covenant, the Covenant of Grace, Christ represents the elect and they receive from him the righteousness of the second Adam; or, as *Christian Warfare* puts it: "Christ's righteousness is our righteousness, his obedience our obedience, his merits our merits, as certainly, perfectly and effectually, euen as if wee our selues had beene most innocent, fulfilled the Law, or made full satisfaction to Gods justice."²⁰⁹

Thus, in sum, both the Covenant of Works and Grace appear throughout Downname's work, whether in those texts which he directly authored or those he edited and published. The Covenant of Grace is more predominately featured than the Covenant of Works, but even in the earlier work of the *Summe* and in the *Guide*, the Covenant of Works is discussed and presented as the broken covenant between God and humanity. The Covenant of Grace, in contrast, is the immutable covenant that God has established with his elect through the mediation of Christ on the condition of faith.

3.4.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

The doctrine of justification (*iustificatio*), the "*articulus standis aut cadentis Ecclesiae*,"²¹⁰ was no less a controversial doctrine in the seventeenth century as it was in

²⁰⁷ Finch, *Summe*, 222-26.

²⁰⁸ See Downname, *Guide*, 9, 689-90. See also Von Rohr, *Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*, 155-92.

²⁰⁹ Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 123-43; Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 270.

²¹⁰ This aphorism on the doctrine of justification, often attributed to Luther by seventeenth-century authors, seems instead to have originated within the Lutheran and Reformed environs of the early

the sixteenth.²¹¹ In fact, the doctrine was enshrined in controversy in the early seventeenth century, in no small part because of debates between the Reformed orthodox and the Arminians, Antinomians, and Roman Catholics, and especially in the proposals by some of eternal justification, which seemed to some to compromise motives for sanctification among the elect.²¹² Given the importance of the doctrine within mainstream Reformed orthodoxy, it is not surprising how much effort was spent on confuting the claims of opponents. Thus, the early seventeenth-century press issued William Bradshaw's *A Treatise of Justification* (1615), Andrew Willet's *Hexapla* (1620), William Pemble's *Vindiciae Fidei* (1629), John Davenant's *Disputatio de Iustitia Habituali et Actuali* (1631), and George Downname's *A Treatise of Justification* (1633); mid-century gave rise to Thomas Goodwin's *Christ Set Forth* (1642), John Goodwin's *Imputatio Fidei* (1642), and Anthony Burgess's *The True Doctrine of Iustification Asserted and Vindicated* (1648); and the late seventeenth century produced John Owen's magisterial *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith through the Imputation of Christ* (1677) and Robert Traill's missive against unjust charges of antinomism, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification* (1692), which sought to discredit, among others, the teaching that justification occurred before faith. Casual glances at these texts confirm the heated environment in which they were written, the importance of the doctrine among the Reformed orthodox, and the inescapable connection between *dogma* and *praxis pietatis*.²¹³

seventeenth century. In 1615, the Lutheran Balthasar Meisner wrote, in what appears to be the phrase's first recorded use: "*Verissimum est illud Luther proverbium, quo saepius fuit usus: 'Justificatio est articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae.'*" Meisner, *Anthopologia sacra*, disputation 24 (Wittenberg: Johannes Gormannus, 1615). Whether Meisner merely paraphrased Luther (e.g. Schamlkald Articles) or had access to some hitherto unknown source is not currently known. What is known is that this "proverb" circulated among Lutheran and Reformed writers in the seventeenth century, and was cited by Johann Heinrich Alsted, William Eyre (who credits Luther), and others. Moreover, though Luther may not have used this exact wording, the concept had definite precursors within Luther, such as his phrase, "*qui isto articulo stante stat Ecclesia, ruente ruit Ecclesia*" (WA 40/3.252.3). Regardless of its origins, the phrase cannot be credited to Valentin Ernst Loscher in 1718. Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Theologia scholastica didacta* (Hanover, 1618), 711; William Eyre, *Vindiciae justificationis gratuita* (London, 1654), 17; Theodor Mahlmann, "Articulus stantis et (vel) cadentis ecclesiae," *Religion Past and Present*, Vol. 1 (2006); Mahlmann, "Zur Geschichte der Formel 'Articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,'" *Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 17 (1993): 197-94; Philip J. Secker, ed., *The Sacred Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions: Selected Writings of Arthur Carl Piepkorn, Volume 2* (Mansfield: CEC Press, 2007), 260; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), vii (fn. 1). Cf. Friedrech Loofs, "Der articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 90 (1917): 323-420.

²¹¹ Standard histories of the doctrine are: James Buchanan, *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of Its History in the Church and of Its Exposition from Scripture* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1867); Albrecht Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1900); and Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

²¹² See Robert J. McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism': Eternal Justification," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 223-62.

²¹³ On the historical contexts of seventeenth-century justification debates, see McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar," 223-262; Brian Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 135-204; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 208-307; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 101-23; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church*

The doctrine of justification occurs throughout the texts under discussion: *Christian Warfare* (Book II, Chaps. 50-53) contains a lengthy exposition of justification and the *Guide* devotes one chapter to justifying faith; both the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie* likewise devote considerable time to clearing the doctrine from fallacy. The extent to which the doctrine is handled is indicative of its importance within Stuart Puritanism.

Christian Warfare bifurcates justification into two aspects: the remission of sins and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. This justification has two ends: first, it is chiefly toward the glory of God; and second, for the assurance of faith, salvation thus being wholly in the hands of God and grounded in Christ's righteousness and obedience. Further, Christ's active and passive righteousness are both imputed to believers, wherein all the merits of Christ are accounted to believers as if they were their own. Eternal justification is rejected because believers are first justified in time, subsequent to faith, which is brought by the ministry of the Word. *Christian Warfare* then spends considerable time to address Satan's varied temptations concerning the doctrine, which chiefly center on matters of assurance.²¹⁴ The *Guide* discusses justification as the second main ground of a godly life, the first being saving knowledge. Without justifying faith one cannot perform any duty acceptable to God, it being required that one's "person" must first be accepted prior to one's works. This faith is a true, lively, and justifying faith, which is a sanctifying grace infused by God's Spirit into believers, and results in their effectual belief and assent to gospel promises.²¹⁵ Thus, whereas *Christian Warfare* provides more detail to the doctrine of justification in order to subvert the heresies "spawned by Satan," the *Guide* provides the experiential groundwork for understanding the doctrine as it manifests in parish life, though both texts have as their end the growth and maturity of Christians.

The *Summe* contains a brief, though fine-tuned, explanation of the doctrine of justification, and quotes Andreas Osiander on the "essential righteousness" of Christ that is imputed to believers. The parts of imputed righteousness are twofold: first the imputation of the perfect sanctification of Christ's human nature and second the imputation of the thorough and perfect obedience which he performed in the course of his life. Here parallels are drawn between Adam and Christ, both similarly imputing to those who belong to them. Following upon this imputation is justification or God's censure and judgment to accept the elect as holy and righteous and thus being able to stand before him. Flowing from justification are sanctification and redemption, which are given freely to the elect.²¹⁶

The *Body of Divinitie* also defends the doctrine against Roman Catholic notions, and allows for the justification of those who do not yet have assurance of faith, in keeping with the teachings of the Westminster standards. The *Body* distinguishes between justifying faith and the faith that assures; the former precedes the act of justification and

and Dogma, 1300-1700 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 138-54; and Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993), 25-87.

²¹⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 271-80.

²¹⁵ Downname, *Guide*, 40-47.

²¹⁶ Finch, *Summe*, 447-52.

the latter follows it. Those things that accompany justification are adoption and reconciliation.²¹⁷

Typical of the Reformed orthodox, these four books assess the doctrine of justification prior to sanctification and in distinction from it and see the latter as the fruit of the former. This emphasis is without doubt an attempt to impugn the papists and Arminians, who were circulating vying concepts of the doctrine in an increasingly theologically divided country²¹⁸ *Christian Warfare* contains the lengthiest exposition of sanctification, devoting a whole book to it (Part I, Book 3), and the *Guide* omits any formal discussion of the doctrine. Reasons for these choices are speculative. It is possible this method reflects the warfare literature genre, or it could simply be for more pragmatic reasons, such as the size of the book, and possible allusions to their intended audiences.

3.4.5 *Law and Gospel*

While Downname did not write a treatise on the dialectic of law and gospel, as his contemporary Samuel Bolton did,²¹⁹ among others, he nonetheless evidences the precisianist understanding of how the law relates to the gospel, especially when it comes to the matter of assurance and its use in the Christian life. As we will see in Chapter 5, antinomian challenges to the precisianist way centered chiefly on differences in how the law was to be used, both in the church's preaching, and in the private devotion of Christians. For Downname, the law had an important place in guiding the believer's moral conduct in this life, and was to be used as a rule for living. This ideal standard, and the actual experiences of believers, however, did not always seem congruent, but Downname answers, "the Gospell commandeth vs nothing, which it doth not also by the inward and ordinary co-operation of Gods Spirit enable vs to performe." Indeed, Downname distinguishes the law and gospel on this point: the "Law sheweth vs the duties which we should performe, but ministers vnto vs no power whereby we may be enabled to performe them." This powerlessness of the law is in contrast with the "Gospell being assisted with the operation of God's Spirit," which both commands and enables the commandment to be performed. This lively faith, then, becomes another grounds for believing in one's election to grace.²²⁰

3.4.6 *Christian Life and Piety*

Given Downname's status as a pastoral theologian, it is not surprising that the majority of Downname's work is devoted to the Christian life and piety. Indeed, *Christian Warfare* and the *Guide* are replete with advice and counsel on multifarious social issues

²¹⁷ Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 199-201.

²¹⁸ See McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 284-95.

²¹⁹ Samuel Bolton, *The Trve Bovnds of Christian Freedome; Or, A Treaise Wherein the Rights of the Law are Vindicated, the Liberties of Grace Maintained, and the Severall Late Opinions against the Law are Examined and Confuted* (London, 1656).

²²⁰ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 106.

that were common among seventeenth-century parishioners, such as how to know one's calling and election, how to obey the Ten Commandments, how to live the life of prayer and submission, how to love one's neighbors, how to progress towards heaven, how to observe the Sabbath, how to foster godly relationships, how to fast, and how to combat the world, the flesh, and the devil. For Downname, as for the Reformed orthodox, the interplay between *dogma* and *praxis* was of high importance and a common thread within their writings. Correct doctrine, with the Spirit's blessing, would lead to a rather robust godly life; erroneous doctrine, however, would open the door to all manner of lasciviousness and scandal. Further, the Christian in this life was a stranger and a pilgrim; as Bryan W. Ball has observed, the *Guide*, and other works like it, sought to "make the saints aware of [their] direct relationship with Christ, and to bring each one of them into the fullness of its eternal benefits...Religion can scarcely be personal without devotion, and the end of faith was the godly life."²²¹ This lively faith toward heaven is aptly depicted in a short anonymous tract approved by Downname, in which a Christian "knows that he is a pilgrim upon earth, and like one in a strange Countrey here."²²²

3.5 Conclusion

The English Puritan John Downname was a promoter of the precisianist strain within Puritanism, which emphasized rigorous and introspective piety, godly conduct, and theological astuteness in dealing with the practical issues arising from the Christian life. He made a name for himself in the place of the English Bible with his production of a widely used concordance, and had equal fame as a casuist in the tradition of William Perkins and William Ames through his two most popular expositions of the Christian life, *Christian Warfare* and *A Guide to Godlynesse*.

As theological editor, Downname was able to publish and promote Reformed orthodoxy with the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*, two of the most popular English divinity manuals of the period. Downname was a prominent Reformed pastor-theologian who showed preference for the doctrine of predestination, its implications for the Puritan conscience, and biblical exegesis. Downname's theology accents the unities within early seventeenth-century Puritanism: belief in the Triune God who transcends human existence but who became a human being to redeem fallen humanity; belief in the parallel predestination of the elect and the reprobate; belief in God's twofold covenant to bring about the salvation of the elect and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; belief in the unconditional justification of the sinner by grace and their progress in the Christian life. Downname presented and defended divine causality in a mainstream Reformed way, which emphasized God's activity in election and salvation, and recognized the believer's co-operation with the Spirit in their ongoing sanctification.

Downname's social contexts demonstrate the needs of the English Reformed tradition and Stuart Puritanism: the need for a thorough and sound exegesis of the Bible;

²²¹ Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Puritanism to 1660* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 193.

²²² [Anonymous], *A New Anatomie; Or, a Character of a Christian, or Round-head* (London, 1645), 7.

the need to properly apply biblical principles to the Christian life; the need to confute heresy and error; the need to educate and inform the laity, and so create a culture of reading and literacy, and the need to theologically and pastorally address the problem of assurance.

Downname ministered during a time of massive change, engaged in the theological controversies of the period, and contributed to the “ethos” of Puritanism as a style that wove *dogma* and *praxis* in a Reformed experiential predestinarianism that is interwoven within a greater framework of the covenant and the history of redemption. He secured his reputation as an avid and gifted devotional writer whose main source was the Bible. His writings, though wholly theological, had a more practical bent, stand firmly within the earlier casuist Puritan tradition that sought to present precisianist answers to the problems of daily living from the pulpit and press.

In sum, Downname’s social and theological contexts suggest that the continuing Puritan Reformation was “successful” because of its diverse and intricate social networks that furthered the spread and acceptance of a “hotter-sort” or “fiery” Protestantism. Downname’s use of the printing press, his censorship, as well as his many ties to prominent theologians reflect the intricate social networks then in place. Downname was an emblematic and effervescent promoter of the precisianist strain within the Puritan Reformation.

Chapter 4

Francis Rous (1580/81-1659)

4.1 Introduction

In the last chapter, we saw how John Downname promoted the precisianist strain within Puritanism. In this chapter, we will see how Francis Rous, who has been called “the first Puritan mystic,” articulated the more mystical side of Puritan spirituality. Rous’s life and work reflects how, among the Reformed of the period, the life of piety and communion with God was paramount and the chief concern of the Puritan Reformation. Rous is unique in that he pushed for a more mystical experience with the divine than many of his Reformed orthodox contemporaries would have done, while still retaining adherence to strict orthodoxy.¹ Thus, as a puritan mystic, Rous’s chief contributions lie in formulating mystical union and promoting contemplative-mystical piety that had both apophatic and cataphatic strands.² He also made contributions in addressing major social issues then

¹ F. Ernest Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 85. Stoeffler writes that among pietistic Puritans, Rous “was most unreservedly committed to mysticism.” Within the literature there is some confusion as to whether Rous should be classified as a “mainstream” or “radical” Puritan. Both Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Johannes van den Berg see Rous as a proponent of “radical” Puritanism, while Dewey D. Wallace identifies Rous as a “mainstream” Puritan. This confusion rests, in part, on the oft-times overlapping categories historians use to understand English Puritan religious phenomena. My own sense is that Rous exemplifies both aspects of “mainstream” and “radical” Puritanism, and so represents an incumbent trajectory concerning bridal mysticism within the confessional tradition that not only had the possibility to cross over confessional sensitivity, but would do so in the “prophets” of the English Revolution (e.g. TheaurauJohn Tany). Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (1947; repr. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992); Johannes van den Berg, “The English Puritan Francis Rous and the Influence of His Works in the Netherlands,” in his *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents: Essays on Early Modern Protestantism*, ed. Jan de Bruijn, Pieter Holtrop, and Ernestine van der Wall (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 26; Dewey D. Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 74. We will return again, briefly, to the issue of “orthodox” and “radical” Puritanism in Chapter 7.

² For historiographical questions on puritans as mystic, see Tom Schwanda, *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2012), 1-34; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714*, 51-86; Ariel Hessayon, “Gold Tried in the Fire”: *The Prophet TheaurauJohn Tany and the English Revolution* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 91-107; Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart Puritanism* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000), 135-60; Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, ix-xxv, 1-19; Jerald C. Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” *Church History* 56 (1987), 39-58; Brauer, “Puritan Mysticism and the Development of Liberalism,” *Church History* 19 (1950): 151-70; Charles Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 278-87; Gordon S. Wakefield, “The Puritans,” in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, SJ (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 437-444; Wakefield, “Mysticism and Its Puritan Types,” *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, Vol. XCXI, 6th series, XXXV (1966): 34ff; James F. Maclear, “‘The Heart of New England Rent’: The Mystical Element in Early Puritan History,” *The Mississippi Historical Review* 42 (1956): 621-52.

Hessayon remarks that puritan mysticism, in essence, “embodied the tensions between two diametrically opposed paths to God:” the first through “justification, sanctification, and glorification;” and the second, through “purgation, illumination, and union.” Still, there was consonance in that the “puritan mystic...sought as much as his Catholic mystic counterpart an immediate, intimate union with God”

troubling Stuart Puritanism and similar to Downname's *Guide* sought to promote the Puritan Reformation through the published word.

Francis Rous was an influential statesman and devotional writer. He was known for being a "Puritan pamphleteer and critic of Arminianism" with ties to John Pym and Oliver Cromwell, two of the most powerful men in England in the mid-seventeenth century.³ He established his reputation with his *Testis Veritatis* and his many speeches before Parliament and "sat in every Parliament from 1625-1657."⁴ Rous was an active critic

(Hessayon, "Gold Tried in the Fire," 91). Brauer distinguishes between five types of Puritan piety (nomism, evangelicalism, rationalism, mysticism, and Spirit mysticism). Though Brauer does this to clarify different strains within Puritan spirituality, he does not adequately address the overlap between members of each type and overall his argument is unconvincing.

For more general introductions to mysticism in the medieval and early Reformation periods, see the work of Bernard McGinn, especially his *A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, 5 vols. (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1991-2012), and Denys Turner, *The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), which assesses both cataphatic and apophatic strains within mysticism.

³J. H. M. Salmon, "Precept, Example, and Truth: Degory Where and the *Ars Historica*," in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 19; L. H. Roper and B. van Ruymbeke, eds., *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 195; Hughes Oliphant Old, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 47; Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), 51; Edward Watkin, *Poets & Mystics* (North Stratford: Ayer Publishing, 1953), 174.

To date, no full biography of Rous exists. Fragments can be found in the histories of Cornwall, Eton, and the House of Commons. See Colin Burrow, "Rous, Francis (1580/81-1659), Religious Writer and Politician," in *ODNB*; J. Sears McGee, "Rous, Francis (1579-1659)," in *Puritans and Puritanism in America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (New York: ABC-CLIO, 2005), 1:221-222; Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 25-42; Henry Charles Maxwell Lyte, *A History of Eton College, 1440-1884* (London, 1889), 227-229; Wasey Sterry, *Annals of the King's College of Our Lady of Eton Beside Windsor* (London: Methuen & Co., 1898), 126-136; James Alexander Manning, *The Lives of the Speakers of the House of Commons, from the Time of King Edward III to Queen Victoria, Comprising the Biographies of Upwards of One Hundred Distinguished Persons, and Copious Details of the Parliamentary History of England, from the Most Authentic Documents* (London: George Willis, 1851), 328-331; George Clement Boase and William Prideaux Courtney, *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis: A Catalogue of the Writings, Both Manuscript and Printed, of Cornishmen, and of Works Relating to the County of Cornwall, Volume III* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1882), 1329; Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford*, ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1817), 3:466-69. Little has been written about Rous's relationship with Pym and Cromwell. J. Sears McGee has recently argued that Rous was Pym's "politico-religious alter ego." J. Sears McGee, "A 'Carkass' of 'Mere Dead Paper': The Polemical Career of Francis Rous, Puritan MP," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (September 2009): 347.

Several portraits of Rous still exist: in the Provost's Lodge at Eaton College; a watercolor attributed to Thomas Athow at the National Portrait Gallery in London; a painting by an unknown artist housed at Pembroke College, University of Oxford; and Frederick Newenham's oil painting of Rous as Speaker of the House, which is in the Palace of Westminster.

⁴Salmon, "Precept, Example, and Truth," 19. For Rous, Arminianism was the "spawn of the papist," a perception that reflected the growing English consensus against Catholicism in the seventeenth century. Rous, *A Discovery of the Grounds both Natural and Politick of Arminianisme*. J. R. Jones commented, "Anti-popery was the strongest, most widespread and most persistent ideology in the life and thought of seventeenth-century Britain." Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (New York: WW Norton & Co., 1972), 75. On the clash between Roman and Protestant churches during the time of Rous and the politics of

of Charles I and questioned the latter's imposing of taxation.⁵ He was also a lay member of the Westminster Assembly, produced the widely used and Westminster-endorsed *Psalmes of David in English Meeter* (1643),⁶ and fought for toleration of dissident religious groups, except for Arminians and Roman Catholics.⁷ Though he served high positions within English society, shaped a generation of students, and wrote extensively on the hot topics of the day, he has more recently earned the reputation of being the first and greatest Puritan mystic.⁸ Indeed, Rous's most famous mystical work, *The Mystical Marriage* (1635), is a blend of both Reformed and medieval spirituality and has been the subject of several recent, though brief, studies.⁹ Yet, even with recent academic interest, Rous remains an obscure and little studied figure.¹⁰ What is especially lacking is Rous's ties to the earlier

Parliament, see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Conrad Russell, *King James I/VI and His English Parliaments* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 140-53; and Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621-1629* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979)

⁵ John Coffey, "England's Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance," in *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. Charles W.A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 258. Coffey cites Rous on the issue of "oppressive" taxation in the latter's speech before Parliament: "there hath not such a thing been done since Israell came from Egypt of Roome." For the political and cultural aura of 1630s-Stuart England, see Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, eds., *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).

⁶ David Mullan, "Westminster Catechisms," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 579; Jordon, *Development of Religious Toleration in England*, II, 125; Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*, 284; Sharon Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 218; Amy M. E. Morris, *Popular Measures: Poetry and Church Order in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts* (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing Corp, 2005), 81. See also John Coffey, "European Multiconfessionalism and the English Toleration Controversy, 1640-1660," in *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, ed. Thomas Max Safley (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 341-68.

⁷ It is in this sense that Sarah Barber calls Rous a "Parliamentary *de facto*ist," a term of those who fought for "liberty of conscience and an end to religious persecution." Barber, "Power in the English Caribbean: The Proprietorship of Lord Willoughby of Parham," in *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750*, ed. L. H. Roper and B. Van Ruymbeke (Leiden: Brill, 2007); 195; Peter Elmer, *The Miraculous Conformist: Valentine Greatrakes the Body Politic, and the Politics of Healing in Restoration Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 98.

⁸ Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., uses the term "Calvinist mystic" to describe this brand of Puritanism. See Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, 74-9. For Rous as mystic, see Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, 85, 87; Jerald C. Brauer, "Puritan Mysticism and the Development of Liberalism," *Church History*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (1950): 152. For Puritan mysticism more generally, see Schwanda, *Soul Recreation*, 1-34; Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*; W. K. Fleming, *Mysticism in Christianity* (London, 1913), 213-30; Rufus M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1919), 235-335; and Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1919), 428-500.

⁹ See, for example, Belden C. Lane, *Ravished by Beauty: The Surprising Legacy of Reformed Spirituality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 97-169; Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 18-58; Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 25-42.

¹⁰ Prior to my ThM thesis ("Francis Rous (1580/81-1659) and the Mystical Element in English Puritanism," Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, 2008), the last major assessment of "one of the most unjustly neglected of seventeenth-century English prose writers" was Jerald C. Brauer's unpublished PhD thesis, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic 1579-1659: An Introduction to the Study of the Mystical Element in Puritanism" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1948); and K. J. Harper, "An Introduction to the Life and Works of Francis Rous, Puritan Divine and Parliamentarian, 1581-1659" (MA thesis, University of Wales College of

medieval mystics and his reliance, in particular, upon Pseudo-Dionysius, a favorite of Aquinas and the Reformed mystics, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas à Kempis, and John Tauler.¹¹ More attention needs to be given to Rous's mystical theology in its historical and intellectual contexts, and specifically as it attests to the plasticity of the Reformed *praxis pietatis*.¹² That Rous was both a writer of more deep or radical mysticism and flourished within a Reformed orthodox context should neither be ignored nor minimized; indeed, Rous's mysticism reflects both the flexibility of orthodox bounds at the time and the popularity of medieval mysticism within early modern English spirituality.¹³ However, "tracing influences among subsequent generations" of mystics, from the pre-Reformation (Catholic) through to the post-Reformation (Protestant), is tenuous and wrought with difficulty. This is especially the case with the "mystical marriage traditions" and how such narratives as that of Christ and his Bride were understood.¹⁴ More facets include Rous's model for education and notions of a utopian society.¹⁵ Both were integral parts of his mysticism.

In this chapter I will look at how Rous foraged the medieval mystical tradition while retaining his Reformed orthodox convictions. While his venture into mysticism was more thorough or deeper than many others in the Reformed community, in that he sometimes employs language not found in the Bible, he nonetheless adhered to a strict belief in the Bible, and "drew on all the resources of biblical language" to describe the Christian's marriage with Christ.¹⁶ We shall also note how Rous could believe in toleration

Cardiff, 1960). Stanley Stewart, *The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), 26. In contrast, mystics John Saltmarsh and Peter Sterry have seen a resurgence of interest; see, for instance, Nicholas McDowell, "The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism: Richard Crashaw, John Saltmarsh, and the Language of Religious Radicalism in the 1640s," in *Varieties of Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*, ed. Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 31-50; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714*, 51-86.

¹¹ Jones, *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 267-71; See also Fran O'Rourke, *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992); Douglas J. Elwood, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), 145. Various aspects of Reformed spirituality can be traced to Bernard's mysticism. See Arie de Reuver, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 27-62. Overall, Aquinas's influence on English Protestant mysticism has been grossly neglected and deserves attention.

¹² That Rous was classically trained is suggestive of the texts that he was exposed to during his studies at Oxford and Leiden.

¹³ Of particular continuity is the "sensuous language" employed by Rous and other Puritan mystics. See Wallace, *Spirituality of the Later English Puritans*, xviii; William J. Wainwright, "Jonathan Edwards and His Puritan Predecessors" in *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity*, ed. Paul L. Gavrilyuk and Sarah Coakley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 224-40.

¹⁴ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 14-15.

¹⁵ Mordechai Feingold, *History of Universities*, XVII, 2001-2002 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 27-29; Charles Webster, ed., *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 61; James Holstun, *A Rational Millennium: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 147. Rous was a patron of the educator Samuel Hartlib. Hartlib's *The True and Readie Way to Learne the Latin Tongue* (1654) was dedicated to Rous.

¹⁶ Elizabeth Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 58; Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 84.

and yet vehemently oppose leniency for Arminians and Roman Catholics.¹⁷ That Rous was well received by his peers is evident not only in the favor he received in Parliament, and the formal approval of his devotional texts, but also in the reception of his Psalter by the Westminster Assembly.¹⁸ In order to assess Rous and discuss his contribution to Reformed spirituality, as well as place him in the greater narrative of the Puritan Reformation, we will first discuss, briefly, Rous's social contexts and then examine his writings within their historical context. Then we will turn to Rous's theology and pay close attention to his unities and diversities with the Reformed tradition. What will become evident is that even as Puritans differed in various emphases, such as the depths of mysticism, they nonetheless had a strong *sensus unitatis*, which shows a *unitas in diversitate* within Puritanism.

4.2 Social Contexts

Francis Rous was born into a Puritan family at Dittisham in Devon, Cornwall, in 1580/81. He studied at Broadgates Hall in Oxford (B.A., 1597), Leiden University (1599), and the Middle Temple in London (admitted 1601). He was the son of Sir Anthony Rous of Hilton, in the parish of St. Dominick, and his first wife, Elizabeth.¹⁹

While much has been written on the theological education at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge during this time, relatively little exists on Leiden University and its role in educating the sons of "disaffected Englishmen."²⁰ Indeed, such well-known

¹⁷ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 50-51; Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 127. Both Clarke and Worden quote Rous's utopian dreams. The former cites Rous in 1623 looking forward to the time "wherein every man shall bee seated in his right place, even according to true, reall, and inward excellence;" and the latter cites Rous in 1648, pleading, "let true Christians seriously consider that union in Christ their head is a stronger root of love and unity than lesser differences can be of division." Cf. Rous, *The Balm of Love* (London, 1648), 10.

¹⁸ Old, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*, 47; Hannibal Hamil, *Psalm Culture and Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 51; Miller Patrick, *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody* (London, 1949), 79-104.

¹⁹ Rous's father would later marry the widow of Alexander Pym; her son, John Pym, came to live with the Rous's at Hilton, and thus began a close relationship that would foster throughout dual Parliamentary careers. Conrad Russell suggests that John Pym should be known as "John Rous," because of his closeness to the Rous's. Conrad Russell, "Pym, John (1584-1643)," *ODNB*; J. H. M. Salmon, "Precept, Example, and Truth: Degory Wheare and the *Ars Historica*," in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 11-36; J. Sears McGee, "John Pym," in *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689*, ed. Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996), 440-41; Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, 149; Cressy, *England on Edge*, 285. For more information on the Rous household, see Anne Duffin, *Faction and Faith: Politics and Religion of the Cornish Gentry Before the Civil War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996), 47-53.

²⁰ Hill writes, "No one, I believe, has so far properly investigated the extent to which Englishmen dissatisfied with Oxford and Cambridge sent their sons to Leiden University, or what Leiden's influence on English thought was." Christopher Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 251-2. This neglect is somewhat ameliorated in Daniela Proglor, *English Students at Leiden University, 1575-1650: "Advancing Your Abilities in Learning and Bettering Your Understanding of the World and State Affairs"* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), which is a re-assessment of the 831 English students who studied at Leiden between 1575-1650; and Ole Peter Grell, "The Attraction of

theologians and writers as Thomas Cartwright, William Ames, Theodore Haak, John Dury, William Bridge, and Thomas Browne all attended Leiden, as did Arminius and Vorstius.²¹ During the seventeenth century, Leiden was a haven for those pursuing a wide variety of theological and other interests: 825 Englishmen matriculated between 1575 and 1659, and 300 of those were from 1642-1651.²² While the Netherlands was a “safe haven” for disgruntled Englishmen during times of censorship at home, ironically, it was equally open to the royalists during the English Revolution. While the subject of Rous’s studies at Leiden are not known, other than generally being the “liberal arts,” it would seem that while a student at Leiden, Rous was introduced to the continental mystics, which, possibly, explains the absence of the English mystics within his writings.²³ Further, in 1702, the publisher of his *Academia Coelestis* states, “the ancient Writers and Doctors...were not despised by him” but rather “advanced [him] into an Higher University.”²⁴

Leiden University for English Students of Medicine and Theology, 1590-1642,” in *The Great Emporium: The Lowe Countries as a Cultural Crossroads in the Renaissance and Eighteenth Century*, ed. C. C. Barfoot and Richard Todd (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1992), 83-104. Grell states that English students were drawn to Leiden because of its renowned international reputation in the field of theology, in particular, as well as its diversity and quality of education, though since foreign degrees could not easily be “incorporated either at Oxford or Cambridge...the number of English Theology students at Leiden remained fairly modest and constant throughout the period” (91).

Keith L. Sprunger states that English students travelling to the Netherlands for education “went as first choice to Leiden University,” and then “occasionally to Franeker University.” Springer, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 8; see also Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower*, 125-155, for the thriving, though sometime clandestine, “Puritan printing” book trade at Leiden. Indeed, Leiden had “gained a world reputation” for its production standards and multifarious bookshops (125). See also, more generally, Theodore H. Lunsingh Scheurleer and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes, eds., *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

Timothy George relates the story of how “Ralph Winwood, English Ambassador of King James I at the Hague...protested the action at [Leiden] in allowing the disaffected Englishmen to settle there.” George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2005), 88-9. Ironically, during the English Revolution, when Charles II was in exile, an edition of his father’s writings, *Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinae* (1651), were published in The Hague by the royalist printer Samuel Browne, suggesting tolerance at Leiden went both ways.

For religious controversy at Oxford, see Nicholas Tyacke, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1-24, 569-620; for Cambridge, see G. R. Evans, *The University of Cambridge: A New History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010), 185-254; James Heywood and Thomas Wright, eds., *Cambridge University Transaction During the Puritan Controversies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 2 vols. (1854; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

²¹ The Scottish delegate to the Westminster Assembly, Robert Baillie, records how he encouraged Rous and the House of Commons to encourage Haak in the work of translating the Dutch annotations of the Bible. The work was ultimately published in 1657. Hill, *Intellectual Origins*, 95, 251-2; David Laing, ed., *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie* (Edinburgh: Printed for Robert Ogle, 1842), 3:231.

²² Hill, *Intellectual Origins*, 252. Hill comments that Cartwright was offered the chair of divinity at Leiden University in 1580. Dorothy Gardiner comments on the radical mood at Leiden in *The Oxinden Letters, 1607-42*, edited by Dorothy Gardiner (London, 1933), 33. Cited in Hill, *Intellectual Origins*, 252. On the controversy between the orthodox Reformed and the Cartesians among Leiden’s faculty, see Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 25-34.

²³ F. Ernest Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 86-7.

²⁴ Francis Rous, *Academia Coelestis* (London, 1702), Sig. A3.

Rous had entered the Middle Temple in London to study for law, “until a storme from heaven chased mee away to the studie of Eternitie, wherein I have found so much comfort and assistance from above.”²⁵ The precise circumstances surrounding Rous’s conversion, likely in 1601,²⁶ are not known; presumably his religious experience came from reading the medieval mystics, which would explain his lifelong admiration for them. Jacobus Koelman, a Dutch theologian and translator of two of Rous’s more mystical writings, notes that Rous “in a specific way had been taught by God, though...according to our common usage he was not a theologian, as in his youth he had only studied Law...[he prepared himself] to have a heart above all [for] the work of the Soul.” Rous elsewhere describes “how the Lord had touched and driven him to these Studies.”²⁷ This deep mystical experience would characterize his work from then on.²⁸

In his *Athenae Oxonienses*, Anthony Wood (1632-95) wrote that some place Rous as a minister in Saltash; more recent scholarship, however, has brought this into question and it seems unlikely that Rous was ever ordained.²⁹ This is substantiated in that Rous was an MP at the Westminster Assembly, and had no role in the ordination of ministers.³⁰

Throughout the 1620s, Rous spent considerable time in solitude writing books that brought him fame as a devotional writer. During this time he also seems to have delved further into mystical theology and the writings of the scholastics. Two of his more popular works at this time were his *Diseases of the Time Attended by Their Remedies* (1622), a sharp attack on corrupt clergy, and an “antidote” for social malevolence, and his *Oyl of Scorpions* (1623), a Puritan-Jeremiad of “staunch providentialism,” in which he addresses such varied topics as drunkenness and the theater.³¹

Rous served in the early Caroline Parliaments, in 1626 for Truro and in 1628-29 for Tregon; his career in politics, which began in 1625, would last until his death in 1659 (in 1657 he was made a lord by Cromwell). He had an active career in politics and tried to fuse

²⁵ Francis Rous, “Epistle Dedicatory,” in *The Arte of Happiness* (1619), sig. A3. See also Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, 267; Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 26.

²⁶ Brauer infers this date, and I think correctly, in that this was when Rous left Middle Temple and “retired to his father’s estate in Cornwell.” Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic,” 51.

²⁷ Francis Rous, *Het Binnenste van Godts Koninkrijk* (Amsterdam, 1678), f. 2. Quoted in Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 26. The two books reprinted in Dutch in 1678 were *The Mystical Marriage* and *The Heavenly Academie*. See Martin Brecht, ed., *Geschichte Des Pietismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 77.

²⁸ Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic,” 50-51.

²⁹ Cp. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 466; with Old, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*, 47.

³⁰ McGee, “Rous, Francis (1579-1659),” 221; Chad van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 114.

³¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 215-80; Martin Wiggins, *Drama and the Transfer of Power in Renaissance England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 93-96, 100, 110-12; *Commons Debates 1628*, IV, 320-21; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 139; Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*, 284; Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, 205-31; Joseph A. Conforti, *Saints and Strangers: New England in British North America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 102-7. While Puritans generally criticized the theatre and plays, as Rous did, this was not true of all of them; thus characterizations of Puritans as “anti-theater” needs to be nuanced. Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 21-22; Martin Butler, *Theater and Crisis, 1632-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 84-5, 88. Cf. Colin Rise, *Ungodly Delights: Puritan Opposition to the Theatre, 1576-1633* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 1997); Peter Lake, *The Antichrist’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

governing the Commonwealth with his mystical religion, with varying degrees of success.³² Theologically he was a Puritan and ecclesiologically he began as a Presbyterian and ended up among the Independents, possibly due to an association made with Jeremiah Burroughs.³³ Rous was well connected throughout his career, being, as said, stepbrother to John Pym and a lay chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, and though he was generally a proponent of toleration, which was an essential component of his vision for mystical union, he loathed Arminianism for being “a Trojan horse” in the English Church, which, he thought, would usher in a new age of Roman Catholicism.³⁴ Thus Rous, along with Pym, spent much time combating Arminian clergy and dogmas then circulating the Church of England.³⁵ Like Pym, Rous believed that the restoration of the papacy in England would overthrow political liberty and religious truth. He spent considerable time fencing the press and engaging in public debate in Parliament.³⁶

While Rous was accepted among the Reformed orthodox, the Royalists derided him and called him “the illiterate Jew of Eton,” presumably because of his informal theological education, and “Proteus,” for his many diverse writings.³⁷

Throughout the 1620s, Rous believed that popery was gaining ground in England and, along with Pym and William Prynne, pressed the House of Commons to oppose the “Arminian assault” on the Church of England; he feared the reintroduction of ignorance among the laity, destruction of the public conscious, and rise of superstition.³⁸

When Rous wrote his *Testis Veritatis* on the topics of predestination, free will, justification and perseverance, he identified with “the godly” in their struggle to reform the English Church. He criticized those who stood with Arminius for political reasons and argued that no one can have friendship with God unless he believes as the godly do and is counted among their society.³⁹ Though Rous did not have an ecclesiastical living, he identified with those ministers who were troubled by the way certain clergy sought to

³² Longfellow calls Rous “a vocal politician and reformer.” Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*, 47.

³³ Most historians put Rous as an Independent in 1649 because of his *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government*. See, for instance, Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics, Vol. 3: Hobbes and Civil Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 271; and Salmon, “Precept, Example, and Truth,” 19.

³⁴ L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 74; Clarke, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England*, 51.

³⁵ Typical of Puritan providentialism, Rous saw plagues and harvest failures as divine punishments for sins, and even Arminianism. See, for instance, Rous’s speech before the House of Commons in *Debates 1628: Volume IV: 28 May-26 June 1628*, ed. Mary Keeler Frearer and Maija Jansson Cole and William B. Bidwell (Rochester: Yale University, 1978), 320-1; Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*, 284; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 139.

³⁶ Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 183.

³⁷ Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the Most Famous and Ancient University in Oxford* (London, 1692), 147. On defamation in the early modern period, see Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); and Jane Kamensky, *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

³⁸ Marc L. Schwartz, “Some Thoughts on the Development of a Lay Religious Consciousness in Pre-Civil-War England,” in *Popular Belief and Practice*, ed. G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 173-4.

³⁹ Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, 95-6.

advance themselves for political ends and ultimately challenge the “Calvinist line.” He thus used his wealth and influence to provide livings and protection for Puritan clergy.⁴⁰

In the Long Parliament, Rous helped lead the drive against the Laudian bishops. His fellow members of Parliament appointed him Provost of Eton College in 1643 and made him one of the lay members of the Westminster Assembly, doubtless in recognition of his talent as a religious writer and amateur theologian, which he had displayed in a series of published works that begun with his *Meditations of Instructions* in 1616.⁴¹ His *Testis Veritatis* (1626) defended the popular Reformed doctrine of double predestination against the accused Arminian Richard Montagu (a protégé of William Laud), and his *Catholick Charity* (1641) defended Protestants against the charge of uncharitableness made by the Catholic polemicist Edward Knott’s *Charity Mistaken*.⁴² Meshed between these two controversies was a debate in the House of Commons (led by Rous) on the sermons of Roger Manwaring. Manwaring was one of Charles I’s chaplains who had preached two controversial sermons in *Religion and Allegiance* in 1627.⁴³ Joshua Scodel comments, “In 1628 the parliamentary leader John Pym had reported to an alarmed Parliament that Manwaring had asserted that the king had absolute power and that subjects had to submit to illegal commands against their conscience.”⁴⁴ In essence, this was Manwaring’s attempt to secure favor and preferment before the King. Parliament, however, prompted by Rous, was furious and had Manwaring, who was branded an Arminian, imprisoned, suspended, and his books burned; in addition, he had to pay £1,000 for preaching “seditious” sermons;⁴⁵ Charles I initially upheld the sentence, but soon after restored Manwaring to the ministry, made him a royal chaplain, and granted him preferment.⁴⁶ Rous’s role in the other controversies mentioned can be highlighted as follows:

⁴⁰ Kevin P. Laam, “Borrowed Heaven: Early Modern Devotion and the Art of Happiness” (PhD thesis, University of Southern California, 2006), 83-4.

⁴¹ In 1660, another lay theologian, Robert Boyle, was offered the provostship of Eton College on the condition that he be ordained. Boyle denied the provostship believing his religious writings had more weight coming from a layperson. See “Robert Boyle,” in Herbert Jaumann, *Handbuch Gelehrtenkultur der Frühen Neuzeit: Band 1: Bio-bibliographisches Repertorium* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 125-26.

⁴² The full title reads *Charity Mistaken, with the Want Whereof Catholickes Are Vniustly Charged: for Affirming, as They Do with Grief, that Protestancy Vnrepented Destroys Salvation* (1630). “Edward Knott” was a pseudonym for “Matthew Wilson.” McGee cites the author as Sir Toby Matthew. See J. Sears McGee, “Francis Rous and the ‘Scabby or Itchy Children’: The Problem of Toleration in 1645,” *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (2004): 401-23.

⁴³ N. H. Keeble, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 42; Jürgen Overhoff, *Hobbes’s Theory of Will: Ideological Reasons and Historical Circumstances* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000), 105.

⁴⁴ Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Johnson to Wordsworth* (New York: Cornell University, 1991), 152. See also James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes, eds., *Stuart Royal Proclamations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973-1983), 2:198 (n. 2).

⁴⁵ Though Manwaring was not an Arminian in theology, he was branded as such because of his support for the royal court. For example, in 1628, Henry Burton accused the Arminians of arguing that kings are partakers of God’s omnipotence, thus reflecting the fact that “Arminianism” was a politically charged term in the 1620-30s. Burton, *Israel’s Fast* (1628), as cited in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 158.

⁴⁶ Michael B. Young, *Charles I* (New York: Palgrave, 1997), 62-65; Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1991), 151-2; W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 289-90; Louis Edward Ingelhart, ed., *Press and Speech Freedoms in the World, from Antiquity until*

(1) The Montagu affair began when an anti-Calvinist tract, *Appello Caesarem*, offended the Parliament. Few issues were as hotly contested in the late 1620s as that of theology, and by this time the House of Commons consisted mostly of Calvinists. A large number of its members were lawyers and country gentlemen, among the most conservative in England.⁴⁷ This growing “Calvinist consensus” drew fire from Arminian clergy and Roman Catholic recusants. The Catholic John Heigham wrote *The Gag of the Reformed Gospel* (1623), which had attacked the doctrines of the Church of England on the grounds that it was chiefly Reformed. Richard Montagu, bishop of Norwich, answered this accusation with his *A Gag for the New Gospel? No. A New Gag for an Old Goose* (1624). In this tract, Montagu tried to show that Catholic doctrine was closer to that of the Church of England than its detractors had depicted. Anthony Milton states that the work’s significance is seen in that it exposed “the theological weaknesses in the alliance between Calvinist conformists and Puritans,” which, to date, had solidified the church.⁴⁸

Though *A Gag for the New Gospel?* was written to refute Catholic charges and defend Protestantism, “the text was surprisingly sympathetic to Catholic doctrine.” It did not “condemn the Pope as a ‘man of sin’” (a near universal tenet within English Protestantism since Henry VIII), and seemed to support a more Catholic view of the Lord’s Supper. Further, Montagu argued that “holy pictures and images served a useful purpose in the church,” perhaps echoing Peter Martyr Vermigli, as did the signing of the cross, which was offensive to Calvinist iconoclasts.⁴⁹ What caused so much scandal and irritation was the fact that, according to Montagu, the difference between Rome and the Church of England was “*de minimis*.” Calvinists in Parliament, including Rous, had grown accustomed to distancing themselves from Roman Catholic theologians, and, as Muller points out, while the Reformed preferred medieval Catholics for their metaphysics, they were hesitant to quote contemporary apologists for Rome.⁵⁰ Montagu’s book not only roused the chagrin of Parliament, who saw the threats as “Catholic-inspired,” but also international Protestants who feared the work improperly “distinguishes the Church of England from other Reformed churches of Europe,” and in so doing compromised its *sensus unitatis*.⁵¹ In Parliament, Rous and other Calvinist MP’s were prepared to fight for the English Church, as it was then constituted, by showing that there was little in common with the Roman hierarchy, and that English Protestants had long distanced themselves from the papacy and its dogmas.

1998 (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1998), 47. For Rous’s speech against Manwaring, see Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, 585.

⁴⁷ J. W. Allen, *English Political Thought, 1603-1660, Vol. 1: 1603-1644* (London: Methuen, 1938), 161-5; Dorothy Auchter, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001), 28.

⁴⁸ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 49; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 353-76.

⁴⁹ Dorothy Auchter, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001), 31.

⁵⁰ Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991), 37.

⁵¹ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 49; Simon L. Adams, “The Protestant Cause: Religious Alliance in the West European Calvinist Communities as a Political Issue in England, 1585-1630,” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1973), 12.

Parliament accused Montagu of endorsing both Arminianism and Catholicism and thus publishing a seditious text.⁵² But Montagu had favor with King James I and was allowed to publicly defend himself. The king further appointed Francis White, dean of Carlisle and member of Durham House, a group of churchmen who were largely Arminian and anti-Calvinist, to preside over Montagu's defense. The king was also alleged to have said in reference to *A Gag for the New Gospel?*, "If that is to be a Papist, so am I a Papist," thus expressing his affinity towards more controversial doctrines and sending a clear message to the Calvinist consensus.⁵³

Montagu's defense was published as *Appello Caesarem* (1625). Throughout the book, Montagu claims the backing of King James and of the English Church for opposition to the Reformed doctrines of predestination and perseverance and supports the doctrine of free will. He denounced the deliberations of the Synod of Dort as being of no significance to the English.⁵⁴ This attitude was offensive to the godly, even though the Canons of Dort had never been officially ratified in England.⁵⁵ Thus a major controversy ensued with Arminianism being a focal point within Parliament until its dissolution in 1629.⁵⁶

In *Appello Caesarem*, Montagu wrote, "I am not, nor would be accounted willingly Arminian, Calvinist or Lutheran, names of division, but a Christian."⁵⁷ He then discusses the more contested points between Calvinists and Arminians, as the fall of man, the nature of sin, justification and predestination. He argues that it is better to rely on Bible study rather than on the counsel of theologians who seek political preferment. Montagu questions whether the Church of England ever had a clear doctrine of predestination and denies the absolute decree of predestination. Further, he argues that true faith may ultimately be lost in an attack on the Reformed doctrine of the perseverance of the saints.⁵⁸ Throughout Montagu claims that the English Church is a moderating force that has not rendered sweeping judgments about the mind of God. He thus rejects any speculative doctrine and claims to be in complete accord with the historic English Church.⁵⁹ He denies that Dortian theology has any place in the Church of England ("the Synod of Dort is not my Rule"), though he does reject condign merit (*meritum ex condigno*) as false and presumptuous.⁶⁰ Due to the Montagu affair, the 1625 Parliament saw an attempt to adopt the Canons of Dort into a Parliamentary statute and a committee that included John Pym was appointed to investigate the claims of *Appello Caesarem*. On July 7, 1625, this committee declared the book "a factious and seditious book," deploring the

⁵² Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1990), 223-4.

⁵³ Graham Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honor: The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 8; Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 49-50; J. W. Allen, *English Political Thought, 1603-1660, Vol. 1: 1603-1644* (London: Methuen & Co., 1938), 162-3.

⁵⁴ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 50.

⁵⁵ Anthony Milton, ed., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), xlix, 381.

⁵⁶ Richard Montagu, *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers* (London, 1625). See also Stella Lambert, "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship," *Past and Present* 124 (1989): 36-68.

⁵⁷ Montagu, *Appello Caesarem*, 10.

⁵⁸ Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 165-66.

⁵⁹ Montagu, *Appello Caesarem*, 55-74.

⁶⁰ Montagu, *Appello Caesarem*, 105-8, 200-05.

slighting of the Synod of Dort, and officially declared Arminianism to be a major threat to the English Church.⁶¹

In 1626, Rous, who had taken part in the debates in the House of Commons as MP for Truro, took it on himself to respond to Montagu with his *Testis Veritatis*, a short defense of the Calvinism or the “Reformedness” of King James I. By this time, Rous had already shown support for the Calvinist consensus and their social concerns with his “religiously-motivated” *Diseases of the Time Attended by Their Remedies* (1622), a book which, as Elizabeth Clarke observes, was “committed to godly Protestantism at home and the support of the international Protestant cause abroad.”⁶²

Testis Veritatis had two overt aims: first, to show how theologically erroneous Arminianism was; and second, to set forth the political dangers associated with such doctrines. He likened the entrance of Arminianism to that of “a flying fish.” Though Rous portrays King James as adhering to the Reformed doctrines of predestination, free will, and the certainty of salvation, he does so by associating the King with the historic doctrines of the Church of England and the Catholic Church. He quotes an array of sources to show the eclectic nature of the Reformed church, including King James’s declaration against Vorstius (1612), James’s *A Meditation Upon the Lord’s Prayer* (1619), the Irish Articles (no. 15), the Conference at Hampton Court, the Articles of the Church of England (no. 17), John Rogers, John Field, Vincentius Lirinensis, Augustine, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Athanasius, Hillary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Beza, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, George Cassander, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Bradwardine and Antonio del Corro, in an eclectic exposition on predestination.⁶³ Rous says that Beza double predestination, as outlined in his commentary on Romans 9, is nothing more than a reiteration of Augustine.⁶⁴ Whether or not this categorization of Augustine holds true has been debated among historians. Frank A. James III has cautioned against seeing a full double predestination in Augustine’s theology, though he admits that Augustine did not “lend himself” to easy classification.⁶⁵

By publishing *Testis Veritatis*, Rous sought to remove any doubt that Arminianism might be an acceptable alternative within the English Church or that it could be consistent with catholicity, which Arminius and his followers had argued, or that King James preferred the Remonstrants.⁶⁶ Consistent with Rous’s depictions before Parliament,

⁶¹ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 50; Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, 233.

⁶² Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 50.

⁶³ Francis Rous, *Testis Veritatis: The Doctrine of King James, Our Late Sovereign of Famous Memory, of the Church of England, of the Catholic Church, Plainly Showed to Be One in the Points of Predestination, Free Will, and Certainty of Salvation* (London, 1626); White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 232.

⁶⁴ Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, 15.

⁶⁵ Frank A. James III, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 102-3. Both Jaroslav Pelikan and Bernhard Lohse have suggested that Augustine believed in double predestination. See Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of Catholic Tradition, 100-600* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971), 297; and Bernhard Lohse, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*, trans. Ernest Stoeffler (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1966), 116.

⁶⁶ More recent academic attention has been given to the question of whether Arminius should be identified as “Reformed.” In short, was he a pioneer who enriched the Reformed tradition and infused it with new life, or was he a heretic who founded a new tradition that was a full-scale assault on Reformed theology? Stanglin provides a cautious approach to the subject and sees Arminius moving away from Reformed orthodoxy. See Keith D. Stanglin, “Arminius and Arminianism: An Overview of Current Research,”

Arminianism was portrayed as a move towards popery and had profound theological, political, social, and cultural ramifications.⁶⁷

While Rous prefers the use of “Catholic” to “Calvinist” throughout *Testis Veritatis*, Peter White mistakenly infers that Rous was moving more towards the Establishment and away from the Calvinist consensus. As Tyacke has clarified, for Rous, the two terms were synonymous.⁶⁸ Further, Rous showed, through direct quotation, that as late as 1619 King James had publicly supported the doctrines of election and absolute reprobation.⁶⁹

However persuasive *Testis Veritatis* might have been to contemporaries, it does seem that King James’s professed Calvinism was more a political balancing act than a genuine confession of faith, as political historians are apt to point out.⁷⁰ While it is uncertain to what extent King James had embraced the Reformed faith, James’s son, King Charles I, had little regard for Calvinism and appointed Montagu as one of his chaplains, much to the dismay of Reformed clergy. Parliament sought to prosecute Montagu for heresy and schism, but Charles I dismissed them and eventually dissolved Parliament over many religious and political disputes. However, when the King later reconvened Parliament, sensing the shifting times and seeking favor, he banned *Appello Caesarem* and said that it was the cause of sedition within the church. Copies of the book were to be handed over to authorities or individuals would be prosecuted.⁷¹

Rous’s involvement in the Montagu affair reveals several things about how Arminianism and Catholicism were perceived in the early Stuart era. First, it highlights the disparity between “the godly” as sustainers of the “old” Reformed religion, and Arminians as the true “innovators” of a new and seditious doctrine. Second, it depicts English fears of foreign oppression; Rous had conjectured that Montagu’s *Appello Caesarem* was the product of a Spanish plot to reintroduce Catholicism into England. Whether these fears were justified or not, for Rous, who epitomizes the political endeavors of many Puritans, the issue of doctrinal indifference or of placating royal whim was much more than keeping the peace; it was, in affect, an overturning of social order.

(2) Edward Knott’s short work, *Charity Mistaken*, appeared in 1630, arguing that men could not be saved outside the Roman Church, thus urging Protestants to be reconciled to the true faith. Rous wrote his long, heavily annotated rejoinder, *Catholick*

in *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius, 1559/60-1609*, ed. Theodoor Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3-24; and Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 189-210.

⁶⁷ Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus*, 341.

⁶⁸ Cp. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 232, with Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 166.

⁶⁹ Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 166; Ivo Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 160.

⁷⁰ Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, 260-92; Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, 174 (n. 15). There is sufficient textual evidence that King James played both sides of the political fence: to the more English Arminian bishops, he was sympathetic and compassionate; to the Calvinists he was the Reformed champion of Protestantism.

⁷¹ Auchter, *Literary and Dramatic Censorship*, 32; Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 51-2. See also Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution,” in *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*, ed. Margo Todd (New York: Routledge, 1995), 53-70; Kenneth Fincham, *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (New York: Macmillan, 1993); Leo F. Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 168-9.

Charitie, soon after, but was prevented from publishing it during the 1630s by Laudian authorities.⁷² His manuscript circulated in Puritan circles, however, and was read by Pym and others.⁷³ Finally, when Parliament intervened, the manuscript was published in 1641 and approved for the press by John Hansley.⁷⁴ Knott's tract, however, did not go unchallenged in the 1630s. The Puritan provost of Queen's College, Oxford, Christopher Potter, wrote *Want of Charity Justly Charged* (1633), contesting Knott's claim for Rome and yet followed Beza who had believed that Roman Catholics could still be saved. Potter was likely able to get his response into print in 1633 because of his standing at a major university, having earned a Doctorate of Divinity (D.D.), and because of his status as chaplain to Charles I.

Knott responded to Potter's work with *Mercy and Truth; Or, Charity Maintain'd by Catholiques* (1634) to show comprehensively that salvation could not be found within more than one church and that Protestants were in a dangerous state of damnation. Potter seems to have enlisted the renowned debater William Chillingworth to enter the dispute; thus Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants* (1638) became an epoch-making defense of English Protestantism and was reprinted well into the nineteenth century.⁷⁵ Rous's *Catholick Charitie* was one of the last of the Reformed tracts on the Knott-Potter debate. Knott wrote at least two more books, *Infidelity Unmasked* (1652) and *Protestancy Condemned* (1654), both published after both Potter's and Chillingworth's death. Jean Daillé, a noted French-Reformed theologian, responded to *Infidelity Unmasked* with his *An Apologie for the Reformed Churches* (1653).⁷⁶

In 1640, Rous told Parliament that the prerogative taxes of the 1630s were so oppressive that "there hath not such a thing been done since Israell came from the Egypt

⁷² One of Rous's main arguments in *Catholick Charity* is that the testimonies of the Fathers refute Roman Catholicism, much in the same vein as Andrew Willet's *Synopsis Papismi* (see his Chapter 6). See also Stefania Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 93-103; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 10-30.

⁷³ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 51-2. Rous begins his work with these words, "The Spouse of Christ Jesus, when she shines in Love, she is amiable in Beauty, precious in the eye of her Husband, powerful with God her Father, prosperous in her own spiritual health and vigour, and prepared for her consummate marriage in celestial glory."

⁷⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, sig. A4-5; Rous, *Catholick Charitie: Complaining and Maintaining That Rome is Uncharitable to Sundry Eminent parts of the Catholick Church, and Especially to Protestants, and is Therefore Uncatholick* (London, 1641), sig. A2.

⁷⁵ Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, 63-84, esp. 71-73. Chillingworth tried to balance religious toleration with political obedience, but he eventually chose to support obedience over toleration, especially in the case of Arminianism. Gary Remer, *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 145-48, 166-67. Patrick Collinson cites Chillingworth for holding the patent to the phrase, "Religion of Protestants," which the former used as the title of his *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625* (1982).

⁷⁶ For Daillé, see Jean Daillé (Son), *Abrege de la vie de Mr. Daillé*, which was printed with Jean Daillé (Father), *Les deux derniers sermons de Mr. Daillé* (Geneva, 1671); Eugene Haag, *La France Protestante* (Geneva: J. Cherbuliez, 1846-59), 4:180-86; Eugene Haag and Emile Haag, *La France Protestante* (Paris: Sandoz et Fichbacher, 1877-1888), 5:23-38; and Alexander Vinet, *Histoire de la Predication Parmi Les Reformes de France Au Dix-Septieme Siecle* (Paris: Chez les editeurs, rue de Rivoli, 1860). Cited in Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church, Volume 4: The Age of the Reformation* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2002), 414 (fn. 14).

of Roome.”⁷⁷ He implied that while the Reformation had been England’s Exodus, the Personal Rule (1629-40) had taken the nation back to Egyptian bondage. Parliamentarians worried about ecclesiastical and political slavery; and the Puritan clergy accused the Caroline bishops of binding consciences by enforcing conformity to their ceremonies. This climate fostered distrust of the monarchy, and paved the way to revolution.⁷⁸

In 1643, Rous’s fellow members of the Long Parliament made him Provost of Eton College in recognition of his many academic labors; he served there for the rest of his life and promoted a form of classical education infused with his mysticism, such as those he outlined in *The Heavnelie Academie*, which concedes to the importance of “natural lamps” but places highest importance on a divine and heavenly light.⁷⁹ As with other mainstream Puritans, such as Downname, Rous emphasized preference for experimental knowledge above speculative; the desire for knowledge, as John Morgan aptly noted, was “the necessity for a lively expression of one’s faith.”⁸⁰ Still, there was a place for learning; and human knowledge was a necessary step towards the higher, more heavenly academy.⁸¹ Kevin Sharpe wrote that for seventeenth-century religionists, “God’s act in creating the world was perceived as an act of love.” Rous wrote, “love itself is a likeness of him who is love.”⁸² Godly learning, education, and the spiritual life were thus interwoven within Rous’s notion of *praxis pietatis*, and served as yet another unifying factor among English Puritans.

In 1645 an anonymous treatise, *The Ancient Bounds, or Liberty of Conscience Tenderly Stated*, was published in favor of tolerating more “tender consciences” in the church settlement then being negotiated.⁸³ *The Ancient Bounds* was attributed to Rous, and there is little reason to dispute this, though it was probably a collaborative effort of the Independents, with some assistance from Joshua Sprigge, a preacher of “vigorous enthusiasm for the parliamentary cause.”⁸⁴ The Independents opposed the Presbyterian

⁷⁷ *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*, 148.

⁷⁸ See John Coffey, “England’s Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance,” in *England’s Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. Charles W. A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 253-80.

⁷⁹ William J. Wainwright, *Reason and the Heart: A Prolegomenon to a Critique of Passional Reason* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1995), 9; M. Greengrass, “Samuel Hartlib and the Commonwealth of Learning,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume 4: 1557-1695*, edited by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 304-22.

⁸⁰ Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 59.

⁸¹ On the importance of human learning among the Puritans, see Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 220-244; Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, 85-7.

⁸² Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 109; Rous, *Heavnelie Academie*, 115.

⁸³ For excellent explorations into Rous’s notions of freedom and obligation to government, see Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics, Volume III: Hobbes and Civil Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 271, 287-307; John M. Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 45-6, 51-6; and Perez Zagorin, *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution* (Humanities Press, 1966), 67ff.

⁸⁴ J. C. Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1516-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 254; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, 186. On the authorship of *The Ancient Bounds*, see J. Sears McGee, “Francis Rous and ‘Scabby or Itchy Children’: The Problem of Toleration in 1645,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67 (2002): 401-22. McGee argues convincingly that Rous was the main author but that Sprigge was also involved. In contrast, in 1953, based on stylistic

drive towards doctrinal and ecclesiastical uniformity, instead wishing for a freer “association between congregations of like-minded believers.” They could “embarrass the Presbyterians” by using the same arguments that Presbyterians had used in combatting the conformist edicts of the Established Church.⁸⁵

In *The Ancient Bounds*, Rous and Sprigge argue for a “limited liberty of conscience, guaranteed and policed by the magistrate.” Mortimer states that the authors “began from the assumption that every society has a basic knowledge of God and of the manner in which he ought to be worshipped. From the light of nature itself all peoples knew that polytheism and idolatry were wrong; even without a specific revelation they knew the duties contained in the first table of the Decalogue.” Thus, “the prohibition on images of the deity was seen as universally valid, just like the prohibitions on murder, theft and adultery in the first table of second table; the magistrate could therefore take action against the Catholics when they violated this commandment. For in every society, the magistrate’s duty is to ensure that its members keep every one of the Ten Commandments,” but, as Mortimer continues, “did not need to go any further in the government of the church; indeed, the he ought not to impose disputable opinions in worship or doctrine. All he needed to do was to ensure that the provisions of the Decalogue were kept by outlawing all blasphemous, idolatrous and scandalous opinions and this would, Rous [and Sprigge] assumed, mean that he protected all good Protestants.” The noted Independent Jeremiah Burroughes made similar points in his *Irenicum, to the Lovers of Truth and Peace* (1646).

Though certain remarks within Robert Baillie’s letters have moved scholars to place Rous among the Presbyterians,⁸⁶ in 1649, Baillie, a good friend of Rous, wrote that “Mr. Rous...hes complied with the Sectaries, and is a member of their republick.”⁸⁷ Further, the argument of the *Ancient Bounds*, with its advocacy of the toleration sought by the Dissenting Brethren, shows that he at least “leaned towards” Independency or had changed his views over the years.⁸⁸ Still, Blair Warden has called Rous one of the more tolerant Presbyterians who sought leniency for Christopher Love in 1651.⁸⁹ Whether Rous was a Presbyterian or an Independent, ultimately, for the purposes of our study, does not matter. What matters is his insistence on tolerating the more radical groups within the English Revolution, which were prime for persecution by rigidly minded Presbyterians like Thomas Edwards. Indeed, Rous’s sermon preached before the House of Commons in the 1620s on religious toleration had not only been well received but was in hot demand.⁹⁰

analysis, Barbara Kiefer argued that Sprigge was sole author. See Barbara Kiefer, “The Authorship of ‘Ancient Bounds,’” *Church History* 22 (1953): 192-6.

⁸⁵ Martin Dzelzainis, “Ideas in Conflict: Political and Religious Thought During the English Revolution,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 41-2.

⁸⁶ Blair Worden calls Rous a “religious Presbyterian,” but adds that “despite his Presbyterianism Rous...was of a tolerant disposition.” Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 127.

⁸⁷ King, *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, 97.

⁸⁸ Marchamont Nedham, *The Cases of the Commonwealth of England Stated*, ed. Philip A. Knachel (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969), xxvii.

⁸⁹ Blair Warden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-53* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 127.

⁹⁰ Chris R. Kyle, *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 105.

The anonymous pamphlet *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government* appeared on April 25, 1649, and sought to establish the Rump regime as the true governing body within England, and as such, its dictates should be heeded “so long as its commands were lawful.”⁹¹ Conal Condren calls the tract “an elegantly structured casuistic exercise, moving from theological axioms to the present situation, concluding with a resolution to the problem of renegeing on *The Solemn League*.”⁹² Rous’s goal in writing the tract was to solidify Parliament’s power to govern the Commonwealth in wake of the collapse of the monarchy; though some might think the change unlawful, it may nonetheless be “lawfully obeyed,” based on Romans 13.⁹³ Soon after the tract’s publication, Rous’s authorship became known. Though Rous had many critics who challenged his interpretation of Romans 13, chiefly on the grounds that the Pauline injunction commanded obedience to a “lawfully constituted” authority, echoing Charles I’s own dismissal of Parliament’s power during his trial, there were equally those who supported the new government and believed that a new era of prosperity had finally come.⁹⁴

Rous was active in the new regime. He was a member of Cromwell’s council of state, and was nominated as one of Cromwell’s Triers. His role as Speaker of the House in the Barebones Parliament (1653) has been well documented. Indeed, he was “remarkable for his learning and piety, as well as for being re-elected month by month.”⁹⁵ His close affinity to Cromwell suggests a possible leaning towards Independency.⁹⁶ Though part of Cromwell’s inner circle throughout the interregnum, Rous retired after Richard Cromwell took power in 1657, likely because of his age and declining health. Rous’s absence in the politics of the new regime is, according to Jason Peacey, one of the many factors that precipitated the end of the Protectorate.⁹⁷

⁹¹ Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 199 (fn. 201); Fritze, *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England*, 179-81, 199; McGee, “Rous, Francis,” 222.

⁹² Conal Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 300.

⁹³ Rous, *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government* (London, 1649). Cited in Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England*, 300.

⁹⁴ Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 300-05; Skinner, *Visions of Politics, Vol. 2: Hobbes and Civil Science*, 271, 291-6.

⁹⁵ Stephen K. Robert, “The House of Commons, 1640-1660,” in *A Short History of Parliament*, ed. Clive Jones (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 113; Leora Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions: Everyday Life and Politics in Britain, North America, and France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 72-79; Paul Seaward, ed., *Speakers and the Speakership* (Malden: Wiley, 2010), 76-77; James Holstun, *Ehud’s Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution* (New York: Verso, 2000), 274.

⁹⁶ Skinner, *Visions of Politics, Vol. 2: Hobbes and Civil Science*, 271; J. H. M. Salmon, *Ideas and Contexts in France and England from the Renaissance to the Romantics* (Variorum, 2000); N. H. Keeble, *The Cambridge Companion to the Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 42.

⁹⁷ John Peacey, “The Protector Humbled: Richard Cromwell and the Constitution,” in *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, ed. Patrick Little (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), 35. There is some debate on Rous’s influence on Cromwell and the events of the interregnum. Though Peacey mentions Rous as one of lesser influence, the council met several times a week, and Rous was no doubt among those who were “prodigiously energetic.” Nancy L. Matthews, *William Sheppard, Cromwell’s Law Reformer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 35-6.

Joseph Glanvill was chaplain to Rous from 1658 until his death.⁹⁸ Rous had a younger brother, Arthur, a clergyman sent to the New World.⁹⁹ Rous died at Acton in 1659 and was buried in the college chapel at Eton. He outlived his wife, Philippa, who had died on December 20, 1657,¹⁰⁰ but left behind two sons, one being disinherited due to an illicit marriage, and the other, a Francis Rous, Jr., author of the oft-printed *Archaeologiae Atticae* (1637).¹⁰¹ A contemporary newspaper, “Mercurius Politicus,” printed on January 27, 1658/9, recounts in vivid detail Rous’s funeral procession:

Monday the 24th being the day appointed for the interment of the corpse of the Right Hon. Francis Lord Rouse, it was performed in this manner. The lords of his Highness privy council met at his house at Acton, as also divers of the commissioners of the admiralty, and of the officers of the army, with many other persons of honor and quality. His Highness was also pleased to send several of his gentlemen in coaches with six horses to be present at the solemnity; three heralds likewise or officers at arms gave their attendance. The corpse was placed in a carriage covered with a pall of black velvet, adorned with escutcheons, and drawn with six horses in mourning furniture. The lords of the council followed it, and the rest in their order, towards Eaton college by Windsor, where the deceased lord, having been provost, desired he might be interred. The corpse being arrived there, it was received by the learned society of that college with much sorrow for the loss of so excellent a governor, and the young scholars had prepared copies of verses to express their duty and bear their part of sorrow upon this sad occasion. The body being taken off the carriage, was born towards the college chapel, four lords and gentlemen holding up each corner of the pall, and the whole company following it to the grave.

Following the interment, a sermon was preached by John Oxenbridge, a fellow of Eton College, Puritan preacher, and missionary to Bermuda, but it does not seem to have been printed.¹⁰² The paper concludes that Rous “needs no monument besides his own

⁹⁸ Glanvill would later become chaplain-in-ordinary to Charles II after the Restoration. See Rhodri Lewis, “Of ‘Origenian Platonisme’: Joseph Glanvill on the Pre-Existence of Souls,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 69 (2006): 277; Martin I. J. Griffin, Jr., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 25.

⁹⁹ Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, 101.

¹⁰⁰ A marble memorial was affixed to the Parish Church of St. Mary in Acton in 1657, in memory of Philippa Rous, which bore the family crest and a short inscription.

¹⁰¹ Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 304; George Clement Boase and William Prideaux Courtney, eds., *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis: A Catalogue of the Writings, both Manuscript and Printed of Cornishmen, and of Works Relating to the County of Cornwall with Biographical Memoranda and Copious Literary References* (London, 1878), 2:601; Francis Rous’s will, dated March 18, 1657.

¹⁰² Oxenbridge was a nonconformist divine who, upon being ejected, made several visits to Bermuda to advance the Puritan Reformation. He also seems to have been the source of inspiration for some of Andrew Marvell’s poems. Christopher Hill, *Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England*, 162; Myra Jehlen and Michael Warner, ed., *The English Literatures of America, 1500-1800* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 544; Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 158-9.

printed works to convey his name to posterity.” Rous was active in charity, frequently gave to the poor, which many “with tears will tell you,” and appointed three fellowships at Pembroke College, Oxford, for his posterity or others deemed worthy. In 1661, the provost of Eton Nicholas Monck removed “the standard and escutcheons from his grave,” in an apparent Royalist act of defiance.¹⁰³

Rous’s social contexts show his close affinity with Stuart politics and active career in Parliament. They reveal his mystical vision for the Commonwealth and his hatred of doctrinal indifference. Rous was a hero of the Calvinist cause and a foe to anything Arminian. With Pym and Prynne, he became associated with the more conservative wing in Parliament and was a prominent voice in Stuart Puritanism. While Peter White has suggested that the Church of England in the pre-Civil War era was highly fractured and consisted of an eclectic group of Remonstrants, the life of Rous and his belief in the historicity of his Reformed convictions within the English Church confirm Tyacke’s contention that there was indeed an earlier “broad consensus” of Calvinism in the Tudor/Stuart Church.¹⁰⁴ Further evidence of this lies in Rous’s many speeches before Parliament where he was a vocal advocate for prosecuting and responding to the rising tide of Arminianism within the Commonwealth, and especially within the church hierarchy. In 1626, Rous cautioned Parliament that Arminianism was nothing more than “popery in a new dress;” and then, by the 1640s, Rous had worsened his outlook by stating that Arminianism was “worse than popery.” That Rous, a known advocate for religious toleration among Protestants, was so derisive of Remonstrants further shows how religion and politics were so interwoven during this time. Stuart Puritans saw doctrinal indifference as the chief danger facing the realm, and fought to oppose it wherever possible.¹⁰⁵

4.3 Rous’s Writings in Historical Context

Though Rous was not a trained theologian (his academic studies were for a career in law), he had a profound religious experience, which, as with Luther and Calvin before him, put him on the path to study theology and become a writer of devotional texts. Following his religious conversion, Rous did not pursue formal theological studies but chose rather to read as widely as he could the writings of the mystics, church fathers, and to some extent the scholastics. Thus, like Baxter and Bunyan, he was mostly self-taught in matters of theology and biblical exposition. While we do not have record of Rous’s library, the numerous quotations in his writings provide a window into the types of books he had become acquainted with, and consistent with Puritan attitudes towards learning, Rous shows remarkable awareness of Roman Catholic writers and theologians, such as Thomas

¹⁰³ Daniel Lysons, *The Environs of London, Volume 2*, 2nd ed. (London, 1830), 3-5. Upon Monck’s appointment as provost in 1660/61, most Puritan fellows resigned from the college or were deprived of their living.

¹⁰⁴ Gary W. Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 236-41.

¹⁰⁵ Francis Rous in *Commons Debates for 1629*, ed. Wallace Notestein and Francis Relf (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1921), 12-13, 24.

Bradwardine and Thomas Aquinas. He was also familiar with the Spanish mystics and other continental thinkers that expanded on the *mystica theologia*.

So far, we have seen how Rous had a prominent career in Parliament and was engaged in several religious controversies surrounding the monarchy and the threat of Arminianism. Throughout his career, Rous, who expressed a “profound conviction” before his peers in Parliament and monopolized on past Romish plots, became a much-admired author of theological works.¹⁰⁶ These writings were not only popular in the Netherlands and in English-speaking British colonies but they made their way into numerous Norwegian collections.¹⁰⁷ Both Jacobus Koelman and Gottfried Arnold recommended the *Interiora Regni Dei*, though in Koelman’s Dutch edition *The Great Oracle* was left out, being deemed unnecessary to the greater work.¹⁰⁸ Throughout his writings, Rous communicates the dangers of corrupt religion, the need for theological education, and the urgency of mystical union and fellowship with the Holy Spirit. It is his preoccupation with union and the Holy Spirit that has earned him the name of “Puritan mystic” and brought him to the attention of mystics both in England and in the Continent.¹⁰⁹ Ian Green has associated Rous with a variant stream within early modern devotion, alongside some of the New Model Army chaplains, Seekers, Ranters, and early Quakers.¹¹⁰

For convenience, Rous’s religious writings may be divided into his major and minor works: his major works include *Testis Veritatis* (1626), *The Mystical Marriage* (1631), *The Heavenly Academie* (1638), *Catholick Charitie* (1641), *The Psalmes of David in English Meeter* (1643), *The Ancient Bounds* (1645), and *Mella Patrum* (1650); his minor works include his *Meditations of Instrvction* (1616), *The Arte of Happiness* (1619), *Diseases of the Time* (1622), *The Oyl of Scorpions* (1623), *The Only Remedy* (1627), *The Balme of Love* (1648), and *The Great Oracle* (1655).¹¹¹ His other published prose, such as his many speeches before

¹⁰⁶ Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 134; Nicholas D. Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity: A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 93 (fn. 116).

¹⁰⁷ Gina Dahl, *Book Collections of Clerics in Norway, 1650-1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 109, 132, 161, 176, 187, 214. Several of Rous’s works are also found in the Countess of Bridgewater’s London Library. Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 79, 269, 271-2, 279. While Van den Berg affirms that Rous had a strong following in the Netherlands, Willem op’t Hof points out that the writings of William Perkins were most popular with twenty-nine titles eclipsing all others taken together. Further, both Rous and Perkins seem to have had some influence on Witsius. Op’t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1589-1622* (Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987), 634, 636-37, 640, 645; Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 174.

¹⁰⁸ Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 38, esp. 35-42; Volker Keding, *Theologia Experimentalis: Die Erfahrungstheologie Beim Späten Gottfried Arnold* (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2000), 57-8. See also Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2006), 59-70.

¹⁰⁹ Mystics on the Continent, such as Pierre Poiret, recommended many of Rous’s works; cf. Poiret’s endorsement of Rous’s *Interiora Regni Dei* in Pierre Poiret, *Theologiae Pacificae itemque Mysticae ac hujus Auctorum Idea Brevior* (Amsterdam, 1702), 286.

¹¹⁰ Ian Green, “Varieties of Domestic Devotion in Early Modern English Protestantism,” in *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), 24-25.

¹¹¹ *Testis Veritatis* was reprinted without Rous’s “To the Reader” in 1633 as *The Trvth of Three Things*.

Parliament, his first composed work (a sonnet), and his essays on obeying the government, may be classified as either miscellaneous or political.¹¹²

Two collected editions of Rous's work were published in the seventeenth century: first, in 1655 and 1674, a Latin compilation of Rous's three most mystical works (*The Heavenly Academy*, *The Great Oracle*, and *The Mystical Marriage*) was issued as *Interiora Regni Dei* (as the title suggests, this edition contains the core of Rous's mystical teachings and focuses on the interior life of believers). Second, in 1657, *Treatises and Meditations* was printed, reprinting the English equivalent of the Latin collection and adding six of Rous's major and minor works.¹¹³

In order to assess Rous's contributions to Reformed spirituality and his relation to Reformed orthodoxy, we will examine, in some detail, Rous's teachings in *Interiora Regni Dei*.¹¹⁴ Before we assess Rous's *Interiora Regni Dei*, we will first briefly survey his early work and minor writings.

(1) Rous's first appearance in print was a "Spenserian" sonnet, *Thvle, or Vertues Historie* (1596-8), which was prefaced to Charles FitzGeffry's laudation of Sir Francis Drake, *Sir Francis Drake, His Honorable Lifes Commendation, and His Tragicall Deathes Lamentation* (1596). Both FitzGeffry and Drake were close friends of the Rous family.¹¹⁵ However, the main corpus of Rous's written work seems to have been composed throughout his fifties (c. 1620-1630s) when England was cast into political, religious, and cultural unrest. Thus, an eighteen-year gap separated Rous's first poetic work and his subsequent religious writings; presumably, during this time he was occupied with his theological studies and preparing for a long career in Parliament. It is likely that Rous influenced his younger stepbrother's path to a Parliamentary career. Threats of Arminianism and Roman Catholicism likely prompted Rous to pick up the pen in the 1610s; indeed, England was then caught up in a whirlstorm of competing ideologies, all vying for the formation of an English religious national identity. While there were significant threads of Calvinism within the English Church of the early-mid seventeenth century, among whom Rous would count himself, there were dissidents throughout the Commonwealth and domestic and foreign political threats preoccupied the public Protestant conscious.¹¹⁶ It is little wonder that Arminianism and Roman Catholicism dominated Rous's earlier polemics.¹¹⁷

¹¹² For a full account of Rous's writings, see Bibliography.

¹¹³ A German translation of *Treatises and Meditations* (*Das Innerliche des Reiches Gottes*) appeared in 1682. Keding, *Theologia Experimentalis*, 57.

¹¹⁴ I concur with Rufus Jones that the three texts contained in the Latin collection are representative of Rous's mysticism. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, 268.

¹¹⁵ The Puritan FitzGeffry preached the funeral sermon of Rous's father, Anthony. FitzGeffry praised Rous' father "for the fair and just execution of his public duties" and faithful attendance to worship services. Duffin, *Faction & Faith*, 48; Martin Dzelzainis, "Ideas in Conflict: Political and Religious Thought During the English Revolution," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Writing of the English Revolution*, ed. N. H. Keeble (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 42.

¹¹⁶ See Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 7-76; and Michael C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 389-98.

¹¹⁷ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 51-2.

(2) Rous spent much time in solitude prior to his first religious publication, *Meditations of Instrvction, Of Exhortation, Of Reprofe* (1616). Even in this early work there is evidence of patristic and medieval reliance. In the dedicatory to the “Sonnes of the most High,” Rous writes of the many divers “sparks of holy fire” which the Holy Spirit has “baptized with fire” and which Rous has “gathered together by their united heate.” His goal, other than the glory of God, is to spark “a flame where there is none” and to increase it in those who have grown cold in their devotion. Only God’s blessing can grant it.¹¹⁸ Throughout Rous’s 87 *Meditations* we see such diverse topics as the new birth, ambition, inward baptism, Christian progress, covetousness, divisions and schism, true friends, heaven, spiritual idolatry and images, kingdom of Satan, true knowledge of self, loving God, presumption, providence, the pope, the name “Puritan,” resurrection, and meddling with worldly things. The book closes with the quote, “The Spirit and the Bride say, Come, euen so, come Lord Jesus” (Rev. 22:17), and an alphabetical index. Of particular interest to this study are Rous’s thoughts on “Puritan” and the pope. For Rous, “Puritan” and “Puritanism” are English terms denoting scrupulosity and are used to deride honest men for their Christian religion; thus, the term still retains a derogatory nature in 1616; and for the pope and his supremacy, Rous marvels that any in “this broad day light” of Protestantism should stumble as to the pope’s true status and fallibility as a usurper.¹¹⁹

Rous’s *Meditations* reflect his concerns with the state of the English church and the many corruptions facing it. Though Rous does address a wide variety of churchly issues, one the more predominant themes throughout his *Meditations* is an avid anti-popery; in fact, Rous later laments that so much time was spent on this: “It is a pittie we haue so wholly taken vp our minds with the controuersies, betweene vs & the Pope, that wee haue much neglected the more immediate controuersie between vs & the diuell,”¹²⁰ and yet the text is ordered in such a way as to present itself as a kind of casuistic manual. Though less exhaustive and not as well organized as Perkins’s *Whole Treatise of the Cases of Conscience* (1606) or some of the other more popular casuistry manuals, as Gouge’s later *Domestic Duties* (1634), Rous’s *Meditations* are no less part of the growing early seventeenth-century instructional genre. The *Meditations* were expanded into 113 meditations for the 1657 collection *Treatises and Meditations* and added were topical headings.¹²¹

Rous was aware of the need for instructive treatises and concludes his *Meditations* with a plea for educated ministers to do the same: “Be it therefore the precious worthy labour of some *Bezaleel* or *Aholiab*, some one whose heart God hath touched and inlightened, to lighten and kindle manhy of the yet-dim-shining lamps which are in the house of God...Let them breake abroad the commandments of God into their seuerall branches of things forbidden, and commanded...”¹²² Rous concludes the Meditation with a warning: “But if the spirituall lawyers shall not be so diligent to search, and set forth Cases of Conscience, as the secular Lawyers are to publish Cases of transitorie and temporall right, let them expect to haue a chiefe part in that curse of Christ: Woe be to you Lawyers,

¹¹⁸ Rous, *Meditations of Instrvction*, sig. A2.

¹¹⁹ Rous, *Meditations of Instrvction*, 259-74, 345-414.

¹²⁰ Rous, *Meditations of Instrvction*, 456-7.

¹²¹ See Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 487-608.

¹²² Rous, *Meditations of Instrvctions*, 459-60.

for ye withhold the key of knowledge, ye either enter not your selues, or you do not helpe those that would, to enter."¹²³

(3) Rous's *Arte of Happiness* (1619) presents his view of how a Christian is to attain "true happiness" in this life. Throughout there are tones reminiscent of the medieval mystics, and yet Rous remains grounded in more "mainstream" Reformed spirituality, noting that such heavenly joy comes from election, justification, regeneration, and perseverance.¹²⁴ With more mystic overtones, Rous writes, "the very substance of the Spirit in us, is a kinde of heavenly oyl, which makes glad, not so much the face as the very heart of Man. It has a taste and relish of the Deity, and therefore above all other, this is the true oyl of gladness. The heart anointed herewith, as it finds a light to guide it, and a virtue moving it to good, and freeing it from the slavery of sin, so also feeleth in itself a blessed Rest, and heavenly Sabbath, a joy glorious and unspeakable, an harmony with God, which passeth all understanding."¹²⁵ Somewhat akin to Richard Rogers's popular *Seven Treatises*, the *Arte* shows the extent to which the theme of happiness enabled questions of personal piety, and was used to promote both the *vita contemplativa* and the *vita activa*, much in the same way that Downname and Robert Bolton wrote of the active Christian life as the fruit of meditation. Further, LaFountain correctly observes that Puritans, such as Rous, drew upon Aristotle's notion of *εὐπραξία* in which godly living is equated with "a work of art" by the divine hand; says LaFountain, "Its practitioners are called artists, right artist, and artificers. These Puritan artists are, at the same time, said to be living images, lively images, living paintings, right images, pictures of God, pictures of Christ, true images, true portraits, and even divine landscapes."¹²⁶ This is clearly another instance of what Margo Todd has called "Christian humanism" within "the Puritan social order" in that Puritans, though reforming their own vision for society, were not originators but heirs to a complex intellectual tradition, which incorporated various aspects of the arts and humanism.¹²⁷

(4) Rous's *Diseases of the Time* (1622) condemns the Catholic Church for differing from the Protestant by preventing its people from learning the truths of God.¹²⁸ Woven throughout are various social ills and theological topics; for instance, Rous begins this work questioning those who love to publish books simply to advance their own reputation. He criticizes those who rely on natural wisdom, preferring the handmaid before the mistress (philosophy before divinity). He attacks the hierarchy of the Roman church and includes a section called "Aphorisms of Predestination."¹²⁹

Remarkable in *Diseases of the Time* is a threefold division of kinds of religion in the Romish church: First, there is what Rous calls *religio curialis* or the religion of the court

¹²³ Rous, *Meditations of Instrvctions*, 462; the reference is to Luke 11:52.

¹²⁴ Cp. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, 57-8, with Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 27-8.

¹²⁵ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 35. Quoted in Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 27.

¹²⁶ Jason David LaFountain, "The Puritan Art World" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2013), 6.

¹²⁷ Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1-21, 53-95; Laam, "Borrowed Heaven," 83-7; Peltonen, *Classical Humanism*, 241.

¹²⁸ Marc L. Schwarz, "Some Thoughts on the Development of a Lay Religious Consciousness in Pre-Civil-War England," in *Popular Belief and Practice*, ed. G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 173-4.

¹²⁹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 93-214.

whereby the hierarchy in the Church sets forth its false interpretations, counsels, and excommunications. Second, there is a *religio theologorum* or religion of the divines, which is taught for the “saving of souls.” For Rous, there are three degrees to this kind of religion: the first is *crassa doctrina* or the “less refined doctrine” that was common before Luther and which includes the doctrine of merits, condignity, predestination *ex praevisis operibus*, and worshipping images, among others; the second degree is *doctrina limata* or the “more refined doctrines” which were hatched by the Bible’s “genuine interpretation,” confirmed by the “light of the Word,” and which come near to that of the Reformed; the third degree is the *doctrina spiritus aut conscientia* or the “doctrine of the Spirit” or “conscience” which are taught by the Spirit of God and enforced by the “light of their own conscience” to admit their own worthlessness and praise God’s mercy in Christ. Here Rous lists the work of Bernard, Thomas a Kempis, and others like-minded mystics who were sanctified and taught by the Spirit. Noteworthy, Rous refers to Stephen Gardiner and Bellarmine who, at the close of their works, express their reliance on God. Indeed, Rous states that there is a “special place” among God’s elect for those theologians who are among the *ecclesia electorum*. The third and last kind of religion is the *doctrina idiotarum* or the doctrine that is taught to the laity to reinforce their ignorance by teaching a mindless reciting of confessions, penance, the creeds and Ave-Maria, and worshipping images, among others.¹³⁰ Also worth noting is Rous’s use of “Children of the Light” to refer to “spiritual Christians,” a term later adopted by Quakers.¹³¹

(5) Rous’s *Oyl of Scorpions* (1623) argues that divine judgments cast upon nations are for the purpose of bringing a people to repentance; indeed, such providential plagues, storms, and fires are sent to remedy such ills as swearing, blasphemy, drunkenness, deceit, backsliding, and idolatry. Similar to Thomas Vincent’s *God’s Terrible Voice in the City* (1667), Rous’s *Oyl* seeks to remedy social ills by calling to attention past or present judgments.¹³²

(6) *The Only Remedy* (1627) continues Rous’s efforts to reform the nation by again drawing parallels between sin and punishment, the “only remedy” being “a sure and sound repentance.” It is a work that combines anti-popery with an attempt prevent those pursuing godly living from being styled as a “Puritan.”¹³³ Indeed, name-calling is but one of many tactics the devil uses to disparage the godly: “for in the Devils language, a Saint is a Puritan.” Rous adds, “Wherefore know, that for some good work, he calls thee Puritan, understand, that in this language he calleth thee Saint: wherefore let this turn to thee for a testimonial, that even thy enemies being judges, thou art such a one as is truly honourable here on earth, and shall eternally be honoured hereafter in heaven.”¹³⁴

¹³⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 140-43.

¹³¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 134. Cf. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, 42.

¹³² For recent studies of Puritan providentialism, see Michael P. Winship, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 74-137; Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978); Bercovitch, ed., *The American Puritan Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 45-55.

¹³³ S. Mutchow Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003), 183.

¹³⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 318; Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft*, 109.

(7) Rous's *The Balme of Love* (1648), finally, is a short continuance of *The Mystical Marriage* aimed at healing divisions among the people of God. As the fuller title suggests, it was written and published to address ongoing divisions among the godly within the Calvinist-Puritan circle. Rous had hoped that his *Mystical Marriage* would have ameliorated divisions among the godly. This further confirms his optimism for a utopian Christian society and agenda for a Puritan Reformation. In *Balme of Love*, consistent with a mystical emphasis on love, Rous argues that Christians should love each other, especially those who are of other nationalities. Rous writes, "And is not the internall unity of the Spirit a greater band of love and peace than difference in small matters or externals, be of hatred, division, and mutual destruction?" Such divisions among true Christians, says Rous, is a "breaking of the covenant" and a "tearing of the Body of Christ."¹³⁵ George Yule states that Rous "favored toleration" and that the *Balme* advocated this, but Van den Berg questions this interpretation by stating that Rous's concept of toleration was confined to those of "lesser differences" within his own Reformed sphere.¹³⁶ In my view, both are correct: Rous did "favor toleration" for dissidents, but excluded those who were too far from his utopian Puritan Reformation, and therefore posed a threat to its realization.

We will now examine the three works of *Interiora Regni Dei*, which will provide a better perspective on Rous's *mystica theologia*.

4.3.1 *The Heavenly Academie* (1638, 1656; Latin 1655, 1674)

Johannes van den Berg calls Rous's *The Heavenly Academie* his "most interesting" because it was "written for young people who were studying [for a career in divinity] and because of this...[is] provided with lengthy quotations and references."¹³⁷ It is the text in which Rous most clearly outlines his paradigm for the ascent of knowledge, from its "lower" rudiments to its higher, more mystical and celestial form. Van den Berg calls attention to the motto on the title page, which provides the central message of the *Academie*, quoted from Augustine: "*Cathedram in Coelo habet, qui corda docet*" ("He who teaches hearts has his chair in heaven").¹³⁸ This coincides with the title, which equates the "highest teaching" with "the teaching of the heart."¹³⁹ Christ is "the Teacher of those Teachers," his instruction being heavenly and perfect. Christians have an "advantage over

¹³⁵ Rous, *The Balme of Love: To Heale Divisions, and the Wounds Made by Them, and to Make the Body of Christ Whole and Entire For Its Own Beauty, Strength, and Safety, Partly Presented in a Former Discourse, When It Might Have Prevented, and Now After Many Evils For Want of Prevention Re-Enforced in a Second* (London, 1648).

¹³⁶ Cp. George Yule, "Presbyterians and Independents: Some Comments," *Past and Present* 47 (1970): 131, with Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 33 (fn. 38). Worden also criticizes Yule's position that "Rous [had] a tolerant disposition for a commitment to the principle of religious toleration: Rous does not, in *The Balm of Love*, 'advocate toleration.'" Worden, *The Rump Parliament*, 127 (fn. 4).

¹³⁷ Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 30.

¹³⁸ The quote from Augustine is from *In Epistolam Joannis Tractatus III* in Augustine, *Opera Omnia, Tom. III* (Paris, 1837), 2515.

¹³⁹ Rous, *The Heavenly Academie; Or, the Highest School Where Alone is That Highest Teaching, the Teaching of the Heart* (London, 1638), title page. There is a 1702 edition which uses the Latin title *Academia Coelestis*, and is touted as a "third edition, revised and compared with the Latin."

all other people” because, in the end, they are taught heart-religion.¹⁴⁰ But Rous is careful not to disparage the “lower Academies,” as though they were of little or no use; indeed, throughout *Heavenlie Academie* he reiterates the importance of “lower learning” because it provides a necessary foundation for higher, more celestial attainments. Further, Rous himself was educated in the finest British and Dutch schools, and valued their contribution to his godly pursuits. In an “Advertisement to the Reader,” prefixed to a 1702 reprint of *Academie*, the publisher states that Rous’s work was written several years before the English Revolution, and, consequently, before the rise of the Quakers who believed in the “more vivid Operations of the Internal Light of Souls.” It further states that the *Academie* was not written for their defense or that of “any Party or Society whatever,” but only for the “Service of the *Church of Christ* in Generall, and more especially of all Teachers and Ministers.”¹⁴¹

The *Academie* is divided into ten chapters and includes a preface in which Rous expresses his desire to give witness to what he himself had experienced.¹⁴² His desire is to glorify God for the grace he received “and because I desire also that others may have the like grace, that God also from others may have the like glory.”¹⁴³ The purpose of Rous’s testimony was to move his readers to graduate “from the grammar school of ordinary piety to the celestial university.” Just as students moved from junior to senior academies, so too must Christians matriculate to the “heavenly academy,” where they can gain “a divine, spiritual, and heavenly knowledge.”

Further, for Rous, there are three schools for divinity students: the first is the lower school in which students learn how to read and write, and becomes familiar with basic concepts that are retained throughout life (grammar school); the second is the place where students advance to higher subjects and greater degrees of knowledge (university), and the third is the highest form of learning, which Rous tells us, “I have evidently seen and felt, that Men are Taught of God” (celestial academy). This highest place of learning is where Christians are taught by God’s Spirit, having “quenched their own natural lamps, that they might get them kindled above by the Father of Lights.”¹⁴⁴

Reflecting on Rous’s contribution to godly learning, Morgan opines, “Francis Rous made it clear that, while reason might see the shadows, it could not perceive the Forms.” Thus, “Puritans sought a new equilibrium...that would recognize the different areas of expertise for reason and faith, and would confine reason to the status of an ‘aid’ in the achievement and propagation of belief.”¹⁴⁵ For Morgan, Richard Sibbes is characteristic of this mindset, when he chides the “Schoolmen” for relying too much on Plato in their quest to understand the mysteries of godliness “with their Logick onely, and strong wits...to speake of Grace, of the Gospel of justification; they spake of it, and distinguished in a meere metaphysicall and carnall manner.”¹⁴⁶ However, Rous nowhere offers similar criticisms. Instead, he elucidates that “the greatest Doctor on earth” cannot “in picture and

¹⁴⁰ Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 30.

¹⁴¹ Rous, *Academia Coelestis* (London, 1702), Sig. A2-3.

¹⁴² Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, 85.

¹⁴³ Rous, *Heavenlie Academie*, 13.

¹⁴⁴ Rous, *Heavenlie Academie*, 14; the reference is to James 1:17.

¹⁴⁵ Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 50.

¹⁴⁶ Richard Sibbes, *The Fovntaine Opened; Or, The Myserie of Godlinesse Revealed* (London, 1638), 20-1. Cited partially in Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 50.

representation” convey those divine things, which “no man can see but by tasting; and by tasting it may be seen.”¹⁴⁷

This divine ravishment, for Rous, moves the teacher to teach others; moreover, learning in this highest academy is a process: “And it is a good ambition, not to stint [and] stop our selves in the lower Academie, but to ascend by it to the higher.”¹⁴⁸ Were one to persevere, the reward would be immense: “There drops and dewes of grace, by which you are now taught, shall bring you to the sight and fruition of the Teacher himself, who is an ever-flowing Fountaine, and boundless ocean of light, wisdom, grace, and glorie.” Thus, being overwhelmed with divine goodness, “the most glorious Sun-lgiht and influence of Gods presence, irradiating and overflowing thee, and so more than fully teaching thee, shall drowne the Star-light of this teaching, which you receivedst here below.” But, unlike Sibbes, who could possibly be read as vilifying the “lower academy,” or perhaps its over-reliance on logic, Rous states that Christians will “magnifie this lesser teaching, because it hath brought thee to this great and glorious Teacher, whose light shall give thee the sight of the highest wisdom; whose presence shall ebriate thee with the fullnesse of joy, whose right hand shall give thee the pleasures of eternitie.”¹⁴⁹ Dewey Wallace, Jr., states, “The climax of heavenly blessedness would be the *beatific vision*, a term Puritans used in common with medieval theologians.”¹⁵⁰

In his *Academie*, Rous outlines familiar steps among mystics; that is, the moving of the soul from basic rudiments to more personal and intimate union with God. While Rous mimics some of the teachings of the mystics in this regard, and often writes of union in deeply mystical terms, in contrast, he is careful to uphold the Bible, or “external Word,” as the academy “in which we hear the voice of Christ.”¹⁵¹ Throughout the text, Rous advocates, “the climbing of the mystical ladder” through four general steps: (1) desiring God; (2) denying human wisdom; (3) conforming to God; and (4) conversing with God continually. This theme of “conversing with God” is further developed in the *Mystical Marriage* (see below).¹⁵²

The *Academie* is unique among Rous’s greater corpus in that, aside from his *Catholick Charity*, it is the most heavily annotated and source-cited piece and shows Rous’s liking for continental thought. Whereas the *Mystical Marriage* contains numerous references to the Song of Solomon and other biblical passages in the margins, the *Academie* quotes in Latin (with the number of occurrences in brackets): Dionysius the Areopagite (4); Irenaeus (1); Clement of Alexandria (1); Justin Martyr (2); Tertullian (3); Origen (2); Firmilian (1); Cyprian (1); Ambrose (1); Basil (2); Gregory Naziansen (2); Gregory of Nyssa (1); Chrysostom (2); Augustine (7); Primasius (1); Anselm (2); Rupert of Deutz (1); Bernard of Clairvaux (1); Richard of St. Victor (3); Aquinas (3); Jean Gerson (2); Thomas à Kempis (4); Henry Harphius (1); Savonarola (4); Luther (1); and Gabriel Vasquez

¹⁴⁷ Rous, *The Heavenly Academie*, 38-9.

¹⁴⁸ Rous, *Heavenly Academie*, 157.

¹⁴⁹ Rous, *Heavenly Academie*, 187-9.

¹⁵⁰ Wallace, “Glorification,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, 405.

¹⁵¹ John Barber, *The Road to Eden: Studies in Christianity and Culture* (Palo Alto: Academia Press, 2008), 330.

¹⁵² Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, 86.

(1).¹⁵³ Rous's sources show heavy influence from the continent and especially from the early and medieval church, in an eclectic medley of source citing.

Rous's cultivating of these sources likely began when he undertook translating his lengthier work, *Mella Patrum*, a budget-conscious collection of patristic quotations he translated into Latin. From this short list, we can see how Rous favored Augustine, Savonarola, and Pseudo-Dionysius and especially Dionysius's *De Mystica Theologia*; in fact, Rous's readings of Aquinas are solely from Aquinas's commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius. Rous's readings of Gerson, another favorite, are chiefly from the latter's glosses on *De Mystica Theologia*.¹⁵⁴ Though some of these texts had made it into English translation by mid-seventeenth century, such as à Kempis's *Imitatio Christi*, most remained in either Greek or Latin texts. Rous's ability to forage books for such source citing shows his skill in Greek and Latin; indeed, Rous seemed to favor whenever possible Latin texts, even when English equivalents were available. His fluency in Greek and Latin further brings into question royalist derision of his character and talents.

Rous had studied "very closely" the mystics of former centuries. He quoted standard mystical texts "at random" and was well acquainted with their contents and concepts. More than any of the other Puritan mystics (such as Peter Sterry, Walter Cradock, or Henry Venn) Rous's brand of mysticism more closely reflects the spirituality of Bernard of Clairvaux, with its heavy emphasis on mystical union; and while digging into the deeper waters of the mystics, Rous still retained more mainstream notions of being taught by the Spirit and of being united to Christ than many of his contemporaries did, as Jacob Boehme. Stoeffler surmises what saved Rous from being among the enthusiasts was his "Puritan Biblicism" or grounding in God's Word. Even when at his most mystical, Rous believed he was merely interpreting the Bible.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ The Latin translation, *Academia Coelestis*, more clearly references the quotes within the main text. Noticeably absent is Calvin. On the historical question of the reception of Calvin's ideas in later Reformed theology, see Carl R. Trueman, "The Reception of Calvin: Historical Considerations," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 19-27. Trueman correctly sees the reception issue as needing to be understood within a communal context, both synchronic and diachronic, and cautions against anachronistic criteria intruding into the historical task. There was a complex relationship between the theological work of the Reformers and that of later generations, and it should be noted that the absence of direct citation does not necessarily imply the absence of Calvin's influence, nor does citation imply direct causation. Rather, one must assess the context of an individual's thought and in the way in which the reading of Calvin or any influential thinker might have impacted the way a particular writer reads a biblical text or interprets doctrine. In the case of Rous, Augustine seems to be more influential than Calvin, though, arguably, Calvin had some influence contextually and communally. Further, the use of Augustine among early modern authors was quite flexible, and it could be argued that there were "Augustinianisms" that were derived either directly from Augustine or indirectly from the broader intellectual tradition to which they belonged. See Arnoud S. Q. Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 95-114.

¹⁵⁴ Like Lombard's *Sentences*, the rather short *De Mystica Theologia* was a heavily glossed text in the late Middle Ages. See James McEvoy, ed., *Mystical Theology: The Glosses by Thomas Gallus and the Commentary of Robert Grosseteste on De Mystica Theologia* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

¹⁵⁵ Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, 86-7.

4.3.2 *The Great Oracle* (1641; 1656; Latin, 1655, 1674)

This short piece was published in English in 1641 and then in 1656 as part of *Treatises and Meditations*.¹⁵⁶ The Latin edition appeared in 1655. Though printed as part of *Interiora Regni Dei*, the work is not overtly mystical in that there is no elaborate discussion of union or spiritual marriage, and for this reason it was left out of the Dutch edition. *The Great Oracle* does, however, complement the other two works printed in this collection in that it shows Rous's covenant theology and reliance on the Bible. It argues that salvation is not dependent on "free will," but only on God's "special" and "efficacious" grace. Here Rous writes of "God's plot of glory," in language reminiscent of Thomas Shepard's *Autobiography*.¹⁵⁷ Rous begins his work, stating, "God is the end of himself, in all his ways, works and Counsels; [n]either is there any end worthy of God, but God."¹⁵⁸ This language of God as humanity's *summum bonum* is common within Puritan devotional texts, is found in Perkins, Ames, Greenham, Gouge, the Westminster catechisms, and numerous others, and provides an attitude, which formed the basis for the active and contemplative life.¹⁵⁹

Rous next proceeds to recount the history of God's plot upon mankind and man's beginnings in the Garden of Eden and redemption through Christ. Though Adam was created with "free will," there was joined to his estate a "covenant of works" in which, "Life and Death, a tree of Life, and a tree of death; a tree of standing, and a tree of Falling" was set before him.¹⁶⁰ Adam, who had both "free will" and "free-will grace," did not fall into "a single sin" but into "a state of bondage under sin." Human love is turned away from the Creator to the creature; it is from God's infinite goodness that a way of restoration is given to humanity. God thus sets out "to make good his own Plot" and fights "the self-sufficiency of fallen mankind," which Rous divides into "philosophers," "justitiary Jews," and "philosophizing Judaizing Christians." Here Rous cites Cicero, Seneca, Exodus, Romans, Pelagius, Faustus, and Cassian. Rous then discusses the Incarnation in which humanity was united to divinity, and the New Covenant given to the Son, in which God promised that Eve's seed would "break the Serpents Head." This promise, says Rous, is "even the brief and sum of the new Covenant of grace given to man upon the breach and forfeiture of the old Covenant of works; broken and forfeited by Free-will attended with general grace: the grace of the old Covenant."¹⁶¹

Rous praises God's wisdom and chastises those who value "human wisdom." He cites Pierre Charron's revised preface to *De la sagesse* (1601) as an example of this folly, where Charron justifies his decision to omit a discussion of "divine wisdom" on the

¹⁵⁶ Bradford F. Swan, *Gregory Dexter of London and New England, 1610-1700* (New York: Printing House of Leo Hart, 1949), 22.

¹⁵⁷ Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 3. Shepard refers to "God's great plot" of reformation and redemption, thus identifying God's providence in working all aspects of life for his divine purpose.

¹⁵⁸ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 651.

¹⁵⁹ See, for instance, Anne Bradstreet's poem in Robert D. Richardson, Jr., "The Puritan Poetry of Anne Bradstreet," in *American Puritan Imagination: Essays in Revolution*, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 110.

¹⁶⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 652-53.

¹⁶¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 656-57.

grounds that it is different from human wisdom, and best treated elsewhere.¹⁶² The rest of the book details the insufficiency of free will and the need for efficacious grace. He concludes *Great Oracle* with direct quotes, respectively, from Augustine, Luther, and Paolo Sarpi's immensely popular *History of the Council of Trent* (1619), on grace, bondage of the will, and predestination.¹⁶³

4.3.3 *The Mystical Marriage, Or, Experimental Discoveries of the Heavenly Marriage between a Soul and Her Savior* (1631, 1635, 1653-56; Latin, 1655, 1674)

Mystical union was a common theme among seventeenth-century mystics and Puritans, such as Peter Sterry, who drew extensively on the imagery of the Song of Songs and wrote a paraphrase of it, and Richard Sibbes, whose *Bowels Opened* (1639), representative of precisianism, reflects a more ecclesiastical reading of the text.¹⁶⁴ This union between Christ and the church, or Christ and the believer, was seen as the highest blessing a Christian could experience in this life, even being more important than their justification.¹⁶⁵ For Rous, the theme dominated his writings but was most articulately expressed in his slim allegory, *The Mystical Marriage*, which is "the apotheosis of Reformed thinking on the Song of Songs."¹⁶⁶ Both Elizabeth Clarke and Erica Longfellow have commented on Rous's integration of mystical union in his political reforms. It is also telling that Frederick Newenham's painting of Rous as Speaker of the House (1653) depicts Rous, wearing a broad-brimmed black hat and gold-braided black gown, resting his right

¹⁶² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 658; cf. Maryanne Cline Horowitz, *Seeds of Virtue and Knowledge* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 224-25. Charron states that human wisdom is that "integrity, a beautiful and noble composition of the entire man, in his insides, his outsides, his thoughts, his words, his actions, and all his movements; in the excellence and perfection of man as man." Cited in Horowitz, *Seeds of Virtue and Knowledge*, 224.

¹⁶³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 678-79. Sarpi's work is notorious because it arose during a Venetian crisis in 1606, in which the Pope commanded all Venetians to not celebrate the Mass due to jurisdictional disputes. Sarpi, a Venetian, was enlisted by the state to lead "a propaganda effort to defend the Venetian case against the papacy," which he did, but which ultimately led to his appearance before the Spanish Inquisition and excommunication. Matthew Vester, "Paolo Sarpi and Early Stuart Debates over the Papal Antichrist," in *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture*, ed. Karl A. Kottman (New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001), 53.

¹⁶⁴ Erica Longfellow makes the distinction between "ecclesiastical" and "personal" readings of the Song of Songs within the Reformed tradition. The former focuses on Christ being betrothed to the institutional church, whereas the latter focuses more on personal and intimate union. Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*, 47; Gordon S. Wakefield, "The Puritans," in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainright, and Edward Yarnold (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 444; and Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, 67.

¹⁶⁵ Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 483-4. It is in this sense that mystics refer to "unitive" theology, in that, as the highest part of theology, it unites the believer with Christ and other fellow believers. Rous, *Academia Coelestis* (1702), Sig. A5.

¹⁶⁶ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 52; Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*, 47-50.

hand on a ceremonial mace, which represents his authority in Parliament, and a book in his left hand which reads on its top edge "Mysticall Marriage."¹⁶⁷

The Mystical Marriage was published several times in the seventeenth century and a Latin edition appeared in 1655.¹⁶⁸ Why Rous translated this work into Latin is open to conjecture. Given that Latin was the language of academic theology, it is possible that this translation was made in order to advance Rous's concept of *mystica theologia* and *experimentalis* among theologians. Clarke has stated that there were strong political overtones to *Mystical Marriage* which suggest an inherent anti-Catholic and anti-Arminian nature.¹⁶⁹ But she also sees uniting characteristics in the work, which was meant to bring the Reformed together and heal divisions among them. This reading of Rous's text is consistent with his other works and with the political atmosphere of the 1630s.¹⁷⁰ Rous was a longtime advocate of *sensus unitatis* among the Reformed, and conceived of a utopian society where all true Christians were in harmony, being in mystical union with Christ and communion with one another. Rous, of course, was not the first or only one to conceive mystical union as a ground for *sensus unitatis*. In 1647, Joseph Hall published his *Christ Mystical*, which used the doctrine equally as grounds for ecclesiastical unity.¹⁷¹

There are nine chapters in *Mystical Marriage*, and Rous provides four reasons for his work, which is fit for "all times and seasons," in his short preface. First, it is suitable to the present time, there being many divisions and laxity among Christians. "For our Communion with Christ is a fastening of the soul to a mighty and impregnable Rock, that makes her steadfast even against the gates of hell." Second, "it presents to the view of the world some bunches of Grapes brought from the land of promise, to shew that this Land is not a meer imagination, but some have seen it, and brought away parcels, pledges, and earnest of it." Thus, mystical union "is a place where love passes human love, peace passes understanding, and where there is joy unspeakable and glorious." Third, this mystic marriage affects the Christian's whole experience, moving "the will and affections...it warms and draws them..." Here Rous envisions a kind of mystical knowledge which can come only through experience: "And that as by a borrowed sight men are provoked to come to tasting, so by their own tasting, they may come to a sight of their own, which only tasting can teach them." This inner nourishing and tasting causes Christians to "eternally be satisfied." Finally, the fourth reason is to inspire others to "bring forth more boxes of this precious ointment" into the world, and to write of "that mystical love which droppeth down from the Head of Christ Jesus, into the souls of the Saints, living here below."¹⁷²

¹⁶⁷ Frederick Newenham, "Francis Rous," oil painting. Collection: Palace of Westminster (WOA 2690).

¹⁶⁸ Belden C. Lane erroneously states that Rous's *Mystical Marriage* began as a sermon. Rather, it began as a private manuscript published for the edification of "the Bride the Lambs wife." Cp. Lane, *Ravished by Beauty*, 100, with Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 83-4.

¹⁶⁹ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 52-3.

¹⁷⁰ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 54-5.

¹⁷¹ Joseph Hall, *Christ's Mystical; Or, the Blessed Union of Christ and His Members* (London, 1647), 113-48. It is noteworthy that John Downname gave his *imprimatur* to this work.

¹⁷² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 683-4.

There are three unique characteristics of Rous's *Mystical Marriage*. First, Rous advances what may be called a more *personal* reading of the Song of Songs.¹⁷³ In contrast to Sibbes's more ecclesiastical reading where the Song shows Christ's union with the church, Rous sees intimate and even erotic union between the believer and Christ. Thus, he more freely employs sensual language: "Looke on him so, that thou maist lust after him, for here it is a sinne not to looke that thou maist lust, and not to lust having looked."¹⁷⁴ Further, the soul experiences a kind of romantic, if not erotic, surrender to Christ.¹⁷⁵

Second, in contrast to other, more cautious Reformed treatises on the subject, Rous sees spiritual marriage as a reality in this life and not merely of betrothal.¹⁷⁶ Thus, the believing soul, for Rous, is *already* married to Christ. Rous writes, "Let it be the main endeavvour of a soul married to Christ, to keep her self still in that point wherein she may keep him; and so keep him that she may still say, and feel what she sayes, 'My wel-beloved is mine, and I am my wel-beloveds.'" Those married to Christ must be active in their communion and often look to heaven: "Let her often go out of the body, yea out of the world by heavenly contemplations; and treading on the top of the earth with the bottom of her feet, stretch herself up, to look over the world, into that upper world, where her treasure, her joy, her beloved dwelleth."¹⁷⁷

Third, Rous speaks of various signs and marks of *true* "heavenly visitations." These marks are seen through the use of human reason and heavenly light; thus, the believer first experiences or witnesses "a Light not fitted for the eye, but the soul." This light must agree with the word, the Bible; thus Rous distinguishes himself from those prophets of the English Revolution who abandoned the Bible as the guiding interpretive framework for experiential divinity. He did not see *experientia* as a higher authority than the Word of God. The second mark is an intense joy, which comes from Christ's divine visits. The third mark is holiness: "For when Christ visits the Soul, as he doth clarifie her with light, and ravish her with joy, so he doth beautifie her with holiness."¹⁷⁸

In sum, Rous sees Christian union with Christ mainly in terms of happiness, joy, and fruition. While there are times when the Christian is sad or depressed (when Christ is absent), the prevailing emotional state is that of bliss and pleasure, which works in love. With Downname, Rous did not see the Christian life as one of morbid introspection, or navel-gazing piety, which only looked inward, and not outward to Christ. Though he used language reminiscent of medieval mystics, and drew heavily from their writings, his "classical Christian-mysticism" is seen in his metaphors of the Christian's vision of God,

¹⁷³ Intriguingly, while the English edition, in its subtitle, refers to marriage "between a Soul and her Savior," thus intimating "personal" union, the Latin text has "*Quo Junguntur Christius et Ecclesia*." Other than this slight difference in wording the two texts appear to be the same.

¹⁷⁴ Rous, *Mystical Marriage*, 13, 25. Philip C. Almond suggests that, for Rous, lust and sexuality were intertwined and that Rous, possibly being influenced by Jacob Bohme, believed that the Fall was caused by sexuality. Philip C. Almond, *Adam and Eve in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 162. For Augustine's view that sexual desire or "lust" was the result of the Fall, see David G. Hunter, "Augustine on the Body," in *A Companion to Augustine*, ed. Mark Vessey (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 358-61. It is equally possible that Rous was influenced by Augustine.

¹⁷⁵ Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 55.

¹⁷⁶ In Sibbes's *Bowels Opened*, for instance, there is only passing reference to marriage. Sibbes, *Bowels Opened*, 47-54, 470.

¹⁷⁷ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 726.

¹⁷⁸ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 720-26.

the overpowering sense of light, and mystical union which ravishes “the imagination, the intellect, and the will.”¹⁷⁹

So far we have seen how Rous was active in Parliament, and how he opposed Arminianism and Roman Catholicism. We have seen how he was involved in many of the religious controversies in Caroline England and how in his writings he sought to advance the Calvinist cause with his own vision of mystical union in the Commonwealth. We will now turn to Rous’s theology so that we can better see Rous’s harmony with the Reformed tradition, and his various points of unity with Downname and Crisp.

4.4 Rous’s Theology in Historical Context

Though Rous was not a “trained” theologian, he must have been exposed to some extent to theological studies at Oxford and Leiden, the latter of which he graduated as a “*studiosus artium liberalium*.”¹⁸⁰ Like Richard Baxter, Rous’s theological education came primarily through private reading and reflection, church attendance, dialogue with Calvinist brethren, and polemics.¹⁸¹ Through these studies he gained an uncommon awareness of the Catholic mystical tradition.¹⁸² Remarkable is his awareness of Aquinas and Lombard, among others, dogmatists most commonly found in the footnotes of Protestant scholastics and academically trained theologians.¹⁸³ Even though Rous did not have a “formal” theological education, he nonetheless showed an awareness of the major themes within Reformed theology, a testament to the “rise of the laity in Evangelical Protestantism.”¹⁸⁴ For convenience, Rous can be classified as a lay affectionate theologian who sought to advance what he called “experimental knowledge” of divine things; that is, that one’s religiosity would affect “all religious obedience, actions, and virtues.” Brauer states that this type of piety “was the source for the way one worshipped, for the style and content of one’s actions—both private and public, and it was the fundamental experience that one sought to explore through rational categories...[piety] was the root of everything for the Puritan.”¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁹ Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” 53.

¹⁸⁰ Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, 26.

¹⁸¹ See “Of Reading Books” (Meditation No. 71) in Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 560. For Baxter, the greater part of theological education should consist of a thorough acquaintance with “as many affectionate practical English writers” that one “can get their hands on.” Simon J. G. Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter’s Methodus Theologiae* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 36.

¹⁸² Howard L. Rice, *Reformed Spirituality: An Introduction for Believers* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 14, 66; Emma Wilby, *The Visions of Isobel Gowdie: Magic, Witchcraft and Dark Shamanism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 406.

¹⁸³ Luca Baschera, “Aristotle and Scholasticism,” in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 140; Jordan J. Ballor, *Covenant, Causality, and Law: A Study in the Theology of Wolfgang Musculus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 215.

¹⁸⁴ See Carl R. Trueman, “Reformers, Puritans and Evangelicals: The Lay Connection,” in *The Rise of the Laity in Evangelical Protestantism*, ed. Deryck W. Lovegrove (New York: Routledge, 2002), 17-35.

¹⁸⁵ Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” 39; Wainwright, “Jonathan Edwards and His Puritan Predecessors,” 228; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, 74. Wallace correctly sees Rous as a mainstream Puritan alongside Ames and Owen. For the practice of prayer among the laity, see Alec Ryrie, *Being*

In order to assess Rous's unity and continuity with the Reformed tradition and with Downname and Crisp we will now turn to Rous's teachings on the loci previously examined with Downname. In short, we will examine Rous's ideas in context on (a) Doctrine of God and Humanity; (b) Predestination and Assurance; (c) Covenant of Works and Grace; (d) Justification and Sanctification; and (c) The Christian Life and Piety. Though we will see similarities with Downname, we will put off a more thorough comparison until Chapter 6.

4.4.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

With Downname, Rous believed in the classical formulation of the Triune God who exists in three Persons and who is responsible for the salvation of humanity.¹⁸⁶ Indeed, Rous's reliance on Augustine is suggested in that he quotes him more than any other authority.¹⁸⁷ Though Calvin's influence is evident in Rous's understanding of God the Creator, there are no direct references to him. Augustine's influence is seen in that Rous often speaks of God as light.¹⁸⁸ It is in the Second Part of *The Art of Happiness* that Rous gives his most extensive account of God.¹⁸⁹ Here he writes that God is a Spirit of the highest excellence, wisdom, and power. God is the most excellent being because he is the most pure, again echoing Augustine. He is a "glorious, single, uncompounded Essence" which is the cause, fountain, and Father of all spirits; all other beings borrow their being from him.¹⁹⁰ God is thus *causa sui*; he is the "fountain" and "beginning" from which everything flows. The Creator is his own end in his creation, and does all things for himself. Man's happiness rests in the existence of a Creator, without which eternal bliss would be impossible. He is not a God one can see with human eyes, however; the purer the essence is, the more invisible it is to a "gross and carnal light."¹⁹¹ Further, "this glorious and eternal

Protestant in Reformation Britain (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 99-258; Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie, eds., *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012); and Christopher Haigh, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1-16, 218-28.

¹⁸⁶ Brauer, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic," 51-98.

¹⁸⁷ In 1939, Perry Miller proposed that Augustine had more influence on the "Puritan mind" than John Calvin. Thus, Miller sees the prominence of "Augustinian piety" within Puritanism. While it is plausible to call Puritans "Augustinian" in that they were heirs to a complex variegated tradition bequeathed through the Reformation, some caution needs to be exercised. Even in the case of Rous, where Augustine is frequently cited, one cannot infer direct causation, but only possible influence. Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1939), 4-5. James Calvin Davis and Charles Matthewes refer to the "Augustinian legacy" within Puritanism. Davis and Matthewes, "Saving Grace and Moral Saving: Thrift in Puritan Theology," in *Thrift and Thriving in America: Capitalism and Moral Order from the Puritans to the Present*, ed. Joshua J. Yates and James Davison Hunter (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 89ff.

¹⁸⁸ Rous, *Mystical Marriage*, 44-46; *Treatises and Meditations*, 495, 499-500; Lewis Ayres and Michel R. Barnes, "God," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1999), 384-90.

¹⁸⁹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 15-19.

¹⁹⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 15. See also Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 577, where God is said to be "the cause of all under-causes and effects."

¹⁹¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 15-16.

Spirit” reveals himself in three Persons, whose “print and impression” is to be found on every creature, there being an “absolute necessity” that all three should coincide in creation. Rous distinguishes between the three Persons of the “timeless” Trinity in this way: the first or God the Father is the great and infinite mind or understanding which begets a great wisdom, thought or word; even the first and radical light, the almighty begetter of the second light; the second or God the Son is the begotten and second light, even the wisdom and conceivment of the mind or understanding; an image and issue thereof; the third or God the Holy Ghost is the virtue and power which breaths or flows down from the Godhead, whereby God loves and enjoys himself and puts in execution whatsoever he will have done for himself.¹⁹² The rest of the *Art of Happiness* deals with the redemption of humanity and the devotional practices which bring about a state of happiness and contentment, such as prayer, humility, and meditation.¹⁹³

Elsewhere Rous reaffirms that the Trinity alone, apart from any human activity, causes salvation.¹⁹⁴ Rous writes of God’s oneness and immutability in his *Meditations of Instrvction* (No. 17), but even here he has more practical ends in mind: “God is one and immutable, so may we as certainly know what he will be hereafter, as what he hath been alreadie...if we feare him he will also to vs be a mercifull God.”¹⁹⁵

Throughout Rous’s writings there is an emphasis on the jealousy of God, as when, for instance, Rous writes, “The Lord of hosts, is as iealous of his spouse, as thou of thy wife; he wil not haue temptations set before her, and therefore forbids altogether the making of images for any worship.”¹⁹⁶ Because God only is worthy of worship and guards his glory, he is to be loved above the creature. Humanity was made in “God’s image” and “likeness.”¹⁹⁷

What is significant about Rous’s conception of God is that he always places it within the greater context of redemption. His overarching aim is to show the path to humanity’s *Summum bonum*.¹⁹⁸ This is not surprising in that this was the aim of Puritanism in general and reflects mainstream Puritanism’s contention that theology is the science of knowing and living to God, and is to be learned with a submissive and humble mind.¹⁹⁹ While Reformed theologians often wrote of the doctrine of God in order to defend it against the Socinians and thus had more polemic aims, Rous wrote of it and the other loci in order to provide a “delightful use and advantage unto souls...to have intimate, large and frequent soul-ravishing meetings, communions, and communications with the Bridegroom of souls.”²⁰⁰

There was nothing radical about Rous’s understanding of the doctrine of God or humanity. As even a casual observance of the many Reformed treatises on the subject shows, this doctrine was a point of unity and continuity between the Reformed in England

¹⁹² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 16.

¹⁹³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 19-92.

¹⁹⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 509-10.

¹⁹⁵ Rous, *Meditations of Instrvction*, 60-1.

¹⁹⁶ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 436.

¹⁹⁷ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 12, 493, 659.

¹⁹⁸ See title page to *The Art of Happiness*.

¹⁹⁹ William Ames, *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity* (London, 1623), 1-4; Edward Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity* (London, 1654), 3.

²⁰⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, sig. B1.

and in the Continent. Where Rous was distinct was in the way in which he clothed the doctrines with mysticism.

4.4.2 *Predestination and Assurance*

For Rous, as for other Reformed polemicists, predestination was the central theme in the Arminian-Calvinist debates of the 1620s. Much effort was spent in his *Testis Veritatis* to show the catholicity of the doctrine. Indeed, Rous contends that double predestination has been and continues to be the doctrine of the English Reformed church and cites in support Augustine, Justin Martyr, Anselm, Vincent of Lerins, Isidore of Seville, Aquinas, John Field, John Rogers, and Theodore Beza.²⁰¹ Rous quotes from various ancient and medieval theological texts and shows awareness of scholasticism and its major sources, which is remarkable given his lack of formal theological education.

Other than his arguments for the catholicity of predestination found in *Testis Veritatis*, the only other place where predestination receives more extensive treatment is in his “Aphorisms of Predestination.”²⁰² Rous begins his discussion of predestination with a comment on how difficult the doctrine is to comprehend given that the doctrine is “unsearchable.”²⁰³ He therefore says that it is best to “set down short and evident Truths” and “by light to chase away the errors of those that deceive” and so “by brevity to make knowledge portable, and so either easie or pleasant to the knower.”²⁰⁴

There are ten short points in “Aphorisms of Predestination”: (1) That the doctrine is sweet and mysterious and so must be received with a passive and submissive receiving of the Bible’s teaching; (2) though God chooses some and leaves others (here echoing Dordt), the reason for God’s choosing is hidden and known only to him; (3) God’s will is joined with wisdom and justice; predestination and reprobation are just judgments of God;²⁰⁵ (4) since all humanity fell into sin freely, God is free to be a Judge and to punish sin; (5) before the foundations of the world, God has decided to leave some to their “self-purchased misery” and chooses or leaves according to what will bring him the most glory; (6) God fore-appointed Christ to be the Savior of the elect, and his elect to be saved by Christ, from eternity; (7) God is free to allow Adam to either take of the Tree of Life and Stability or the Tree of Death and Apostasy; (8) though God hardens, he does not do it by infusing corruption and is absolutely clear of causing sin; “God is not the cause of sin no more then the Sun is the cause of Ice”; “God...doth not put the hardness into the heart, but he leaves the heart and hath nothing to do with it” (more echoes of Dordt); (9) though Adam’s offspring are necessarily sinful, they may be justly punished because this necessity came from Adam’s voluntary sinning; “And surely if they had been in his place they would likewise have done the same; for *Adams Children* would have been no better then their Father, the print no better than the stamp;” (10) predestination is a mysterious doctrine

²⁰¹ Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, 3-5, 8-9, 15, 17.

²⁰² Rous, *Treatises and Mediations*, 137-40.

²⁰³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 137.

²⁰⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 137.

²⁰⁵ Rous does not here use the word “reprobation” but refers to it in substance in the hardening of Pharaoh. Rous does, however, use the word “reprobation” in *Testis Veritatis*, 18.

and every person should tread carefully; and rather than trying to understand mysteries above them, one should rather aspire to understand the doctrines of salvation, such as one's grafting into Christ by faith, growing in Christian love, and establishing of the heart in the earnest of the Spirit.²⁰⁶ Rous concludes, "Miserable it is to see (as I have seen it) a man possessed by pieces of this secret, rather than possessing them, and so uttering his distractions rather than resolutions, that one might pity his amazement sooner than conceive his meaning."²⁰⁷

Rous also sought to address the experiential questions or problems that arose for parishioners which predestination would undoubtedly cause, especially when it came to the assurance of faith. He opted for a more infralapsarian line of thought and may have been influenced by the Canons of Dordt. In his "Aphorisms of Predestination," Rous clearly emphasizes the passive aspects of reprobation when he writes that "[God] does not put the hardness in the heart, but he leaves the heart and hath nothing to do with it; and then where God doth nothing to soften, there will quickly enough be done by sin and Satan to harden. Therefore, when we are hardened, Let us rather complain that God doth nothing, then that he doth something in us."²⁰⁸ God thus does by not doing or by withholding his grace as the sun, when it is down, withholds its warmth.²⁰⁹ In conjunction with predestination, Rous emphasized the work of the Holy Spirit as the effector and sanctifier of salvation, even more so than the Father as Creator or the Son as Redeemer.²¹⁰ Rous's path to assurance seems more grounded in mysticism and mystical union with the blessings or testimonies of the Spirit than in the marks of grace, though he does, at times, correlate growth in grace and assurance.²¹¹ At times, Rous implies that the elect might be more numerous than one might suspect and that any operation of grace, however small, should be looked on as the possibility of effectual grace.²¹² Rous cautions against too much sorrow for sin and says it may be a sin not to joy after sorrow for sin.²¹³

Again, with more mystical overtones, Rous writes, "there is a secret earning and owning of God for a Father, put into the soul of a son of God, by the Spirit which new begetteth him, and thereby he calls God Father; and yet not he, but the very seed and spirit of his Father in him...There is an Abba, Father, which no man knows but he that hath it; and he that hath it cannot express it; it is like the earning of a Lamb, whereby she owneth her Dam; by which she owneth her, but knows not her self whereby she owneth her."²¹⁴ Rous elsewhere emphasizes the testimony of the Spirit.²¹⁵ For Rous, assurance is a foretaste of one's true end in eternal life and bliss, and one of the many benefits of one's mystical marriage with Christ in the present life.²¹⁶

²⁰⁶ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 137-40.

²⁰⁷ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 140.

²⁰⁸ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 139.

²⁰⁹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 139.

²¹⁰ Brauer, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic," 75-85, 219-20.

²¹¹ Brauer, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic," 213.

²¹² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 137.

²¹³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 603-4.

²¹⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 302.

²¹⁵ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 597-9.

²¹⁶ Gibbons, *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought*, 66.

4.4.3 Covenant of Works and Grace

While Rous does not formally articulate a covenant theology along the lines of Cocceius, John Ball or Francis Roberts, he does show awareness of its thought.²¹⁷ Whether or not he had read or was aware of the many English texts on the subject is uncertain; Rous does refer to the Covenant of Works and Covenant of Grace and possibly hints at a Covenant of Redemption.²¹⁸ He sees Christ as the Second Adam in his *Meditations* and presents Adam as the head of humanity in his “Aphorisms of Predestination.” He sees the Covenant of Grace as, essentially, a marriage contract.²¹⁹ He maintains the balance between the idea of man’s voluntary sinning and the unavoidability of the fall under the covenant of free will and general grace. Though Rous calls the fall a “voluntary certainty;” he says that Adam, having an enlightened understanding, was created with a holy will set in “equipoise” and “freedom;” he could choose to continue to depend upon grace and remain righteous or refuse divine grace and fall from his righteousness. His choice was between living as a “true expression” of the divine image by staying obedient or living in self-sufficiency by following the light of reason apart from the divine and heavenly light.²²⁰ Whether Rous conceived of Adam’s integrity, had he chosen to obey, as *non posse peccatum* is not certain. What is certain is that post-Fall, all humanity is *non posse non peccatum*; God is thus free to punish all humanity because not only did Adam fall “for himself” but all humanity “in gross” fell “in him.”²²¹

Throughout his writings, however, Rous seems unaware or unaffected by the technical terms of Protestant scholasticism. For instance, in his “Aphorisms” just referred to, Rous distinguishes between an active necessity (*necessitas activa*) and a passive necessity (*necessitas otiosa*) in reference to the freedom of Adam’s will and fall into sin. He notes that since the material cause (*causa sine qua non*) is called a stupid reason (*stolida causa*) he sees no reason for not calling the material necessity (*necessitas per quam*) a stupid necessity (*stolida necessitas*).²²² This distinction between active and passive necessity does not reflect the patterns of definition typically found within Protestant scholasticism and its lineage has not been possible to trace.²²³

The idea of the covenant is spread throughout Rous’s writings and is arguably in the background, but there is no elaborate discussion of it. Remarkable, however, there is a

²¹⁷ For Cocceius’s doctrine of the covenants, see Willem J. van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603-1669* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 248-70; Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, ed. E. Bizer and trans. G. T. Thomson, 2nd ed. (1934; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978), 281-319.

²¹⁸ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 138, 652-53, 655.

²¹⁹ Emma Wilby, *The Visions of Isobel Gowdie: Magic, Witchcraft and Dark Shamanism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 406-15.

²²⁰ Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic,” 65-66.

²²¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 138-9, 504-5, 507-8, 542, 660, 675.

²²² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 138-9.

²²³ For Protestant scholastic distinctions on *necessitas*, see J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden; Brill, 2010), 96-156, esp. 142; and Richard A. Muller, “*necessitas consequentiae*” and “*necessitas consequentis*,” in *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms, Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1985), 200.

lengthy discussion of personal covenanting.²²⁴ Though Rous does refer to the new covenant of grace and salvation, the overall absence of a more nuanced articulation of covenant theology is suggestive of Rous's preoccupation with mystical piety and his status as a lay devotional writer. This is not to say that federal theologians were not equally preoccupied with piety; indeed, as Van Asselt has shown, Protestant scholasticism was much more than a reasoned exposition of biblical theology and had as its focus more nuanced pastoral concerns.²²⁵ Further, the heart of covenant theology, which is the binding relationship between God and his elect, does indeed play a prominent role within Rous's work.

4.4.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

We observed before how predestination and not justification was the hot topic of debate in the English Reformation.²²⁶ This too seems to have been the preoccupation of the religious debates of the 1620s when Rous, as a polemicist, was most active.²²⁷ For Rous, the term "justification" is only used sporadically and never receives a formal articulation, as does predestination. However, it is important to note that for Rous justification and sanctification are coterminous works of the Holy Spirit. Rous equates the removing of filth (sanctification) with the taking away of guilt (justification) in two distinct though simultaneous acts.²²⁸

Rous refers to the perpetual use of one's justification and sanctification. He writes that the "putting away the particular guilt of...sin by the washing of Christs blood, and the particular uncleanness of that sin by the washing of Christs Spirit, which we were before generally cleansed and justified, may also have a particular and continuall cleansing and justification." Both inward and outward baptism, though once performed, is of continual use and daily we must have recourse thereto that the "stock of justification, and sanctification at first imparted may be daily applied."²²⁹ Rous sees the act of justification as occurring only once, but sees sanctification as an ongoing process. Both have ongoing effects for the believer.

Rous extols the work of the Trinity in salvation when he writes that believers should ascribe glory to the Trinity for "our Election, for our Justification, for our Regeneration, which are the main works of our salvation, and are the joint works of the undivided Trinity."²³⁰ Further, good works come after the Christian enters "the state and right of life and glory." Thus it is from the Christian's regeneration that good works flow: "Therefore works add not a new part of salvation but onely increase the issues and fruit of

²²⁴ Rous, *The Only Remedy*, 299-300.

²²⁵ Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, 101-5.

²²⁶ See Chapter 2.

²²⁷ So his *Testis Veritatis* attacks Arminianism on the grounds of predestination, free will, and assurance.

²²⁸ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 311, 449.

²²⁹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 511-12.

²³⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 509-10.

a part formerly possessed.” Good works are thus the “fruits of our salvation,” and do not give any glory to the individual, but to God.²³¹

4.4.5 *Law and Gospel*

In the *Mediations*, Rous includes a short statement on the relation between law and gospel, though the themes do occur throughout his other writings. Here Rous distinguishes between the “preaching” which is from God and that which is from the devil. The former begins with the law, and ends with the gospel. This is seen in God’s command to Adam: “When you eat, ye shall die;” and yet, when humanity falls, God “giveth Christ to restore him.” The latter preaches that man shall not die at all, and, after the Fall, that “God is merciful, and Christ is a reconciler of our sins,” in order to “go about to kill that Christ which was to be the life of them.” After sins are committed, the devil charges to those who have yet to receive grace, “whosoever sinneth is not born of God; The soul that sins shall die.” To those who have grace, he attacks, saying, “There remains no more sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking for of judgement.”

Rous’s solution to the devil’s assault is to “use Gods kind of Preaching” before the commission of sin, in order that the “the whole Law, even the terror of God,” should be considered to frighten and prevent willful sin. When sin is committed, Christians must “carry the yoke of the Law,” until one is humbled for it, and, after “due humiliation” to “take hold of the Gospel,” which is promised to all who are truly penitent. This, Rous says, “is the true and rightful successor of the Law.”²³²

In his view of the relation between law and gospel, Rous, though a mystic, distances himself from some of the more radical mystics of his time, who would disparage any positive use for the law, and instead focus on love and feeling.

4.4.6 *Christian Life and Piety*

Of the topics discussed in this section, the subject of the Christian life, and the life of piety, is the most prevalent within Rous’s writings. Rous’s purpose in composing *Art of Happiness* is to bring believers to a state of perpetual happiness in the divine or “*summa philosophia est, quae exquirat Summum bonum.*”²³³ The *Diseases of the Time* contains numerous remedies for spiritual ailments and emphasizes the practice of holiness.²³⁴ The *Oyl of Scorpions*, Rous’s work on providentialism, traces the causes of the pestilence, economic crisis, poverty, and extreme weather to such social diseases as swearing and blasphemy, drunkenness, unthankfulness, deceitfulness, filthiness, prophaneness, and backsliding.²³⁵ *The Only Remedy* is a biblical exposition of the practice of repentance.²³⁶ The

²³¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 510.

²³² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 559-60.

²³³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, Sig. A3r, 1-92.

²³⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 93-214.

²³⁵ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 215-80.

²³⁶ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 281-332.

Meditations, devoted to the edification and reparation of the house of God, covers such themes of piety as motives to increase knowledge and good works, the excellency of Christian happiness, avoiding extremes of passion and despair, loving God, combating the devil, meditating on the divine, godly submission, trusting God, patience, humility, cards and dice, and maintaining a good conscience, among many others.²³⁷ Rous's intent with his *Meditations* is to gather "the diverse sparks of Holy fire, which have issued from the Spirit that baptizeth with fire...[and by] their united heat, to kindle a flame where is none or to increase it, where it is already kindled."²³⁸ Rous's "A Reason of This Threefold Work" for his *Interiora Regni Dei* gives the reason for his devotional writing: to "propose to the interal Eys of souls, the internal operations of this Kingdom...that hence they may gather true, and solid consolations, while they find themselves inwardly taught, drawn, and united to Christ."²³⁹ Prayer, for Rous, is essential for the believer; he or she can rest in the providence of God.²⁴⁰ Rous elsewhere writes that even one's best works are mixed with sin.²⁴¹

For Rous, the "fundamentals" are simple for the Christian life and without controversy: "to know God and Jesus Christ by a true faith unto justification and sanctification is life eternal." He continually returns to mystical union with Christ as the central theme in Christianity, and the Christian's motive for godly living.²⁴² As we saw before, this was a theme Rous integrated into his utopian vision for a Christian society. It is in the believer's personal awareness of the divine (*unio* and *communio*) that he or she best serves God in this world, and in which the mending of fences is possible with the disenfranchised and persecuted Reformed. In this sense, Rous's mysticism should be seen as contributing to the Reformed *sensus unitatis*.

4.5 Conclusion

Rous was an enigmatic character in many ways. First, he delved into the more mystical currents within the Christian tradition and articulated a utopian dream of toleration in which all true believers worshipped and adored the Triune God while protesting the advance of Arminianism. Second, though Rous employed sensual and mystical language that was both common and uncommon among his peers, he nonetheless retained prestige among orthodox Puritans, which is suggestive of tolerance and flexibility among confessionally minded Puritans. That none of his peers questioned his standing as a prominent member of "the godly," is attested by the reception of his Psalter by the Westminster Assembly. With his cousin John Pym, Rous had the reputation of being uncompromising in his adherence to Reformed doctrine, and saw the doctrine of

²³⁷ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 487-608.

²³⁸ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 489.

²³⁹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 610.

²⁴⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 544-5; Brauer, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic," 137-47; C. A. Patrides, "The Experience of Otherness: Theology as a Means of Life" in *The Age of Milton: Backgrounds to Seventeenth-Century Literature*, ed. C. A. Patrides and Raymond B. Waddington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), 187.

²⁴¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 481-5.

²⁴² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, 116, 209, 375, 445, 598.

predestination as conciliatory among the Reformed. Third, Rous's brand of mysticism is in keeping with earlier medieval trajectories and the robust interpretive tradition of the Song of Songs and teachings on spiritual marriage. Eclectically borrowing from patristic, medieval, and Reformation writings, Rous's unique contribution to *mystica theologia* was his belief that believers, as spiritual lovers and brides of Christ, were co-heirs of God and could experience the bliss of spiritual marriage in this life. Union and communion with Christ dominated his writings. Fourth, Rous was an active educator when most mystics were berating philosophy and secular learning. He shared Hartlib's vision to revive the intellectual life of Britain and by extension, Europe. He was *au courant* in matters that helped him promote a Puritan Reformation.

Rous demonstrates the internal polarities of the period, namely, the desire to be orthodox and counted among the historic Reformed or Calvinist line on the one hand (rational) while also delving into the deeper mysteries surrounding union and communion with Christ (emotional, spiritual) on the other. Rous's mysticism served as a way of bringing the Reformed together in a shared experience of other-worldliness in his attempt to unite a struggling and factious English Church. His thought shows a variety of emphases that constitute a distinct strain from that of precisionism, and yet nonetheless "mainstream" and "Reformed orthodox."

That Rous's writings were published in the Netherlands and were popular in the *Nadere Reformatie* further evidences the desire for the Reformed to come together with a common religious experience. The broad appeal of Rous's mysticism and its beatific and even erotic language among English laity, Quakers, German Pietists, and Norwegian clerics is suggestive of the spiritual atmosphere of the English Revolution as it magnified inherent tendencies within Puritanism.

Finally, Rous's life and work expresses the continuity with the earlier English Reformed tradition in its eclectic use of sources and attests to the diverse reading culture within mainstream Puritanism. Rous, though more mystical than Downname, shared a common style of experimental divinity that surrounded a cluster of Reformed doctrines, including the doctrine of God and man, predestination and assurance, justification and sanctification, covenant, and the Christian life. We will now turn to Tobias Crisp, who represents the antinomian strain within the Puritan Reformation.

Chapter 5

Tobias Crisp (1600-1642/3)

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we will assess the “radical” Puritan Tobias Crisp, whose life and thought illustrates both *unitas* and *diversitas* within Puritanism.¹ As a representative of the antinomian strain, his teachings and emphasis on non-introspective piety illuminate internal tendencies within Puritanism to come up with an alternative to the precisianist strain.² Within the literature, Crisp has been called “an antecedent of the Ranters,” “the great champion of antinomianism,” the “arch-Antinomian” and “a stimulator of religious controversy.”³ In his own time, Crisp was accused of both “Antinomianisme” and “Libertinisme,” the latter title of which he fully embraced because, for Crisp, at the heart of the theological debate that characterized his ministry was one’s freedom (*libertas fidelium*) in Christ,⁴ and the attainment of assurance.⁵ Crisp remains one of the most

¹ As we saw in Chapter 1, identifying a Puritan as either “orthodox” or “radical” is not always easy, nor are the terms always mutually exclusive. As with Rous, Crisp typifies elements of Reformed orthodoxy and more “radical” notions associated with antinomianism.

² David Como, “Crisp, Tobias (1600-1643),” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 1:64; Victor L. Nuovo, “Crisp, Tobias (or Crispe: 1600-43),” in *The Continuum Encyclopedia of British Philosophy*, ed. A.C. Grayling, Naomi Goulder, and Andrew Pyle (London: Continuum, 2006); Roger Pooley, “Crisp, Tobias (1600-1643),” *ODNB*; Christopher Hill, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, Vol. 2* (Malden: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 141-61; *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century, Vol. 1 A-F*, ed. Richard L. Greaves and Robert Zaller (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982), 191-92; Benjamin Brook, *The Lives of the Puritans* (London: Printed for James Black, 1813), 2:471-75; Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, ed., John Gill, 4th ed. (London, 1791), 1:v-xii; *A Biographical History of England, from Egbert the Great to the Revolution*, ed. James Granger, 2nd ed. (London: T. Davies, et al., 1775), 2:179-80.

³ James G. Turner, “The Properties of Libertinism,” in *’Tis Nature’s Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality during the Enlightenment*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 86 (n. 21); Robert Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 30; Tim Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter, and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 299; Pooley, “Crisp, Tobias,” *ODNB*. For a helpful study on the rhetoric of seventeenth-century language, see Conal Condren, *The Language of Politics in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1994), 140-68. The best analysis of Ranter mythology is J. C. Davis, *Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986). Davis correctly challenges the assumption of a “Ranter” existence in the seventeenth century. It is noteworthy, however, that Laurence Clarkson, a supposed Ranter, listed Crisp as one of his mentors. Christopher Hill, *The World of the Muggletonians* (London: Temple Smith, 1983), 167.

⁴ Crisp said, “To be called a libertine, is the most glorious title under heaven; take it from one that is truly free by Christ.” Quoted in Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity*, 33; Nicholas McDowell, “The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism: Richard Crashaw, John Saltmarsh and the Language of Religious Radicalism in the 1640s,” in *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century Religious Radicalism in Context*, ed. Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 43. William Lamont sees Crisp’s “libertinism” as the apotheosis of Puritan commitment to liberty. See Lamont, “Puritanism, Liberty, and the Putney Debates,” in *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State*, ed. Michael Mendle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 250-51. While we must consider such labels within the context of a hot-tempered seventeenth-century rhetoric, they

vilified and misunderstood personas of the early modern period, having been credited, among other things, with the rise of Ranterism and Hyper-Calvinism.⁶ That the Westminster Assembly recommended his sermons be burnt is indicative of the atmosphere and general disfavor with which the antinomian strain, whether genuine or merely perceived, was met with.⁷ Crisp's sermons, despite suggestions of some of the assembly's members, were issued in various editions (1643, 1644-46, 1690, 1755, 1791), and brought his life and work to the forefront of late seventeenth-century theological debate in a second wave of the English Antinomian crisis.⁸ While alive, Crisp ministered in relative

nonetheless are useful classifications for the purposes of historical inquiry. Though Crisp never embraced the term "antinomian" (and his defenders constantly repudiated its use), Crisp can cautiously be classified "antinomian," if, by this, we contrast with the prevailing "legal" strain or precisianism within English practical divinity. Further, it is indeed interesting that seventeenth-century antinomians were wont to cite Luther, Calvin, Zanchi, and Augustine. For contemporary accusations against Crisp, see Robert Lancaster, "The Preface to the Christian Reader," in Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted in Fourteen Sermons Preached in and neere London* (London, 1644).

⁵ That the doctrine of assurance was of paramount importance to English Puritans has been demonstrated, chiefly, in Joel R. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991). Cf. David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590-1644* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), 88-130, esp. 106-15.

⁶ Robert J. Mckelvey, "'That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism': Eternal Justification," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 233-37; Curt Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," in *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697-1771). A Tercentennial Appreciation*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 172-75. Peter Toon sees Crisp as a major contributor to the rise of hyper-Calvinism. Peter Toon, *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity* (London: The Olive Tree Press, 1967), 49-50, 82-3, 96. Crisp's connections to the Ranters are suggested in that Laurence Clarkson, their alleged founder, sat for a time under Crisp's ministry in London c.1640 before moving on in his spiritual pilgrimage.

⁷ In 1646, William Gouge and John Ley brought up the subject of Crisp's books before the Assembly. Chad B. Van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 2:452; 3:750; Chad B. van Dixhoorn, "Reforming the Reformation: Theological Debate at the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652" (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 2004), 2:26-35. The Independent divine Joseph Caryl was appointed in 1643 to a committee of the Westminster Assembly to consider the spread of antinomianism. In his report, he referred to the "unhappy differences...that had lately broken out afresh amongst us." See Robert S. Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the "Grand Debate"* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985), 180. For the clash between the precisianists and antinomians, see Theodore D. Bozeman, "The Glory of the 'Third Time': John Eaton as Contra-Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996): 638-54.

⁸ Victor Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment: Interpretations of John Locke* (New York: Springer, 2011), 32; Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993), 62-3. For histories of English Antinomianism and its various stages, see David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Barry H. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: The Question of Orthodoxy Regarding the Theology of Hanserd Knollys, c. 1599-1691* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 79-132; Norman B. Graebner, "Protestants and Dissenters: An Examination of the Seventeenth-Century Eatonist and New England Antinomian Controversies in Reformation Perspective" (PhD diss., Duke University, 1984). For an older, though still useful history, see Gertrude Huehns, *Antinomianism in English History with Special Reference to the Period 1640-1660* (London: The Cresset Press, 1951).

obscurity, was respected by his peers, and had a popular following of London Puritans; it was only in his final year, and later, with the posthumous publication of his sermons, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1643-1646), that he grew to immense fame, popularity, and controversy.⁹ This posthumous collection, prefaced by Robert Lancaster, an uncontested antinomian, and publisher of John Eaton's controversial *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (1642), presented a somewhat radical interpretation of the absolute, unconditional consequences of Christ's atonement, and the grounds of assurance for the converted;¹⁰ so much so that over the next hundred years following Crisp's death, his thought (dubbed "Crispianism" by his critics)¹¹ remained a strong and contentious system within English divinity, culminating in the later eighteenth-century debates among the English Particular Baptists.¹² "Crispianism" in the winter of 1694-5 also caught John Locke's attention, and drew him into a closer inquiry into the question about justification.¹³ The infectious nature of antinomianism within the seventeenth century, first as an "underground" in the 1630s, but which then emerged to public attention, and some form of acceptance and credibility in the 1640s, through the English Revolution, should not be underestimated. Indeed, not only did it catch ire from William Gouge at the Westminster Assembly, but it also forced the hand of Latitudinarians to "formulate one of the most thorough moral programmes in the history of the Church of England."¹⁴ Further,

⁹ Alan P. F. Sell, *Philosophy, Dissent, and Nonconformity, 1689-1920* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2004), 20; Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment*, 32; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 114; Peter Lineham, "Antinomianism," in *The Encyclopedia of Protestantism Vol. 1: A-C*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (New York: Routledge, 2004), 128-29; Knud Haakonssen, ed., *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 25.

¹⁰ Crisp's attackers vilified his theology as inducing all sorts of wickedness; Crisp, however, always maintained that free grace and holiness were irrevocably tied.

¹¹ E. F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law: A Study in Puritan Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), 26; Robert J. McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan's Holy War* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 61.

¹² Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 168-70; Curt Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," 171-90; Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780, Volume 1: Whichcote to Wesley* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 98.

¹³ Locke said that it was the "noise" and "heat" of the controversy rather than any substantive statement about justification that caught his attention. John Locke, *Vindications of the Reasonableness of Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 34. Cf. Victor Nuovo, ed., *John Locke and Christianity. Contemporary Responses to The Reasonableness of Christianity* (Bristol: Thoemmes, 1997), xviii-xix, 111-48; Nuovo, "Locke's Proof of the Divine Authority of Scripture," in *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies*, ed. Ruth Savage (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 70; Nuovo, "Locke's Theology, 1694-1704," in *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke*, ed. M. A. Stewart (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 195-6; Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment*, 32-33; Patrick Muller, *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-Century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 67-8.

¹⁴ Patrick Müller, *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth Century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 67-8; Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001), 22; Alan D. Strange, "The Imputation of the Active Obedience of Christ at the Westminster Assembly," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 31-51, esp. 38-39.

the later heated debates on antinomianism often occurred within a churchly framework, being a dispute between Independents and Presbyterians, and on more than one occasion threatened the *unitas* between “the godly.”¹⁵

While Crisp had several precisianist defenders, and was revered during his lifetime, many prominent divines, such as Thomas Bakewell, Richard Baxter, Isaac Ambrose, John Edwards, and Daniel Williams, all sought to discredit Crisp for allegedly teaching licentious doctrine and a perverted form of justification.¹⁶

In 1643, Bakewell published *A Short View of the Antinomian Errovs*, in which charged that antinomians teach (1) that a person is justified “as soon as he hath a being in the sight of God, before they had any faith or calling;” (2) that God “cannot see their sinne;” (3) that this they know by the witness of the Spirit in the soul, in contrast to “our legall Teachers, which goe by marks and signes;” (4) that God does not chide them for sin; and (5) that they are free from the “commanding power of the law of God,” and free from any duty to it as a rule for life.¹⁷ Bakewell blasts the antinomians for willfully misrepresenting the teachings of the precisianists, since they knew that none of “those worthy Divines” ever taught that anything causes one’s salvation other than the grace of God, apart from works.¹⁸ Though Bakewell does not name any of the antinomians in his first tract, he has no reservation in stating, in a second, *The Antinomians Christ Confovdnded and the Lord’s Christ Exalted* (1644), that Crisp and Lancaster did “rake out of Eatons *dunghill*,” the belief that a Christian is justified in God’s sight before faith.¹⁹

Baxter’s entrance into the debate was his *Aphorisms of Justification* (1649), which postulated some conditionality in the doctrine of justification; he would later rise to the occasion when Crisp’s sermons were published in their definitive form in 1690 with his *A Defense of Christ and Free Grace* that same year.²⁰ Samuel Rutherford launched his attack

¹⁵ For example, the Presbyterian Thomas Edwards lists “Independents” first in his heresiography, next to Brownists, Millenarists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Arminians, Libertines, Familists, Enthusiasts, Seekers, Perfectists, Socinians, Arians, Antitrinitarians, Antiscripturalists, and Skeptics. *Gangraena* (London, 1646), 13. Though many antinomians were Independents, most Independents were not antinomians; indeed Henry Burton denounced antinomianism as a heresy spreading like a canker or gangrene. Quoted in Stephen Foster, “New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630-1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 38 (1981), 638. Edwards’s source for much of antinomianism was Thomas Gataker’s *God’s Eye on His Israel* (London, 1645); he did not quote from Stephen Gere’s *The Doctrine of Antinomianisme Confuted* (London, 1644), which was the first published attack on Crisp.

¹⁶ Thus, David Parnham sees Crisp as a critic of the precisianist *ordo salutis*. David Parnham, “The Humbling of ‘High Presumption’: Tobias Crisp Dismantles the Puritan Ordo Salutis,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2008), 50-74.

¹⁷ Bakewell further comments, “These things I have gathered both from their Sermons, and by conference with them, as also out of their books, which have passed privately among themselves.” This gives possible credence to the theory that antinomian tracts, such as Eaton’s *Honeycombe*, and possibly Crisp’s sermons, were circulated among London “antinomians” prior to the permissiveness of the presses during the 1640s. Bakewell, *A Short View of the Antinomian Errovs* (London, 1643), Sig. A2v.

¹⁸ Bakewell, *A Short View of the Antinomian Errovs*, 33.

¹⁹ Bakewell, *The Antinomians Christ Confovdnded, and the Lords Christ Exalted* (London, 1644), Sig. A1. The occasion for this second tirade was Bakewell’s borrowing of the first edition of *Christ Alone Exalted* for two days, presumably borrowed from Lancaster (1-2).

²⁰ Thus the antinomian crisis, as Baxter saw it, gave his life-work symmetry. Mendle, *Putney Debates of 1647*, 250-51. See also Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter, and the Formation of Nonconformity*, 74-82; and Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth Century England*, 87-191.

on the antinomians with his massive *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist* (1648), which thrashed the dissenting radicals as proponents of a damnable heterodoxy, which “stretched strict Calvinist theologies of grace to heretical lengths.”²¹ Isaac Ambrose, known as a proponent of a “contemplative-mystical piety,” called Crisp “our open adversary” in his manual of affectionate divinity, *Prima, Media, et Ultima* (1650).²²

John Flavel chimed in during the second phase of the debate with his *Planelogia* (1691), which charged Crisp with adhering to the contentious doctrine of justification from eternity. Robert Traill strategically published his *Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification* (1692), which also comprised a tempered criticism of Crisp, to combat the perceived ragings of antinomianism.²³ The Anglican-Calvinist John Edwards published *Crispianism Unmask’ed* (1693), aimed at dismantling the “pernicious doctrines” maintained in Crisp’s sermons; and, finally, Daniel Williams wrote his *Gospel Truth* (1693), which not only hinted at carrying out Gouge’s earlier wish to burn Crisp’s books, but provided a side-by-side comparison between Crisp’s teachings and that of the assembly.

Thus, as with other hotly contested doctrines of the seventeenth century, there was a plethora of pamphlets published from both sides of the antinomian question, and a long, protracted, “orthodox” war ensued over who had the correct doctrine of justification.²⁴ While Crisp was often associated with other antinomian “radicals,” including Eaton, Saltmarsh, Denne, Traske, and Gerrard Winstanley, among others, Crisp more effectively “sought to establish the doctrine of free grace on a respectable intellectual basis.”²⁵

²¹ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Wig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 58. Rutherford equates Crisp with John Saltmarsh, Henry Denne, John Traske, and other “radicals,” and makes no distinction between their theologies.

²² Isaac Ambrose, *Prima, Media, and Ultima: The First, Middle, and Last Things, in Three Treatises* (London, 1657), 14; Tom Schwanda, *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative-Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2012).

²³ Traill actually, in a sense, vindicated Crisp. He credits the rise of antinomianism not to Crisp’s sermons (or their republication) but to the ragings of Arminianism in the 1630s. While he distances himself from Crisp (“Let not Dr. Crisp’s Book be looked upon as the Standard of our Doctrine”), he also confesses, “there are many good things in it; and many expressions in it that we generally dislike.” Traill, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification, And of its Preachers and Professors from the Unjust Charge of Antinomianism* (London, 1692), 1, 10, 16-17. Charles Pastoor and Galen K. Johnson erroneously cite Traill’s work as a posthumous publication and mistakenly see it as an attack on Crisp’s theology. See their “Traill, Robert (1642-1716),” in *Historical Dictionary of the Puritans* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2007), 321.

²⁴ The “antinomian” Robert Lancaster, who also published Eaton’s *Honeycombe*, wrote the initial hagiographic preface to Crisp’s *Christ Alone Exalted*. In fact, “Crisp was damned as an apostle of ‘his Master Eaton, from whom he hath borrowed most of his new Divinity;” yet, it is not so certain whether Crisp had in fact read Eaton, or was even a frequenter of Eaton’s parish in London. However, given the tight-knit “free grace” community, it is reasonable to assume that Crisp knew of Eaton, but he also distanced himself from the latter in several important ways (e.g. Crisp could be classified as “Reformed orthodox,” but not Eaton). Moreover, Crisp had an extensive collection of books, and may have come to similar ideas as Eaton independently. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 196; Michael Hunter, Giles Mandelbrote, Richard Ovenden, and Nigel Smith, *A Radical’s Books: The Library Catalogue of Samuel Jeake of Rye, 1623-1690* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999), xli (fn. 1).

²⁵ McDowell, “The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism,” 43. Though there was a definite “radical godly community,” it is less certain to what degree each thinker relied on the other or who influenced whom. Further, it is difficult to assess where contemporaries drew the borders of orthodoxy

Thus, during the era of English Revolution (1640-1660), the *ordo salutis* became a central point of contention as Puritans attempted to define with greater clarity the subjective experience of salvation, the role of faith in justification, and confessional boundaries and trajectories within which one could express their ideas and still have credibility.²⁶

Crisp's social and theological contexts show the elasticity of English Reformed divinity during this time, the popularity of radical doctrines, the perceived weakness of precisionism, and its alleged "navel gazing," and the allure of more radical notions concerning free grace and justification, which appealed to those overly burdened by their fears of hell.²⁷ While Crisp had an affinity to the radical theologies of the time, he stands out as distinct because of the numerous precisionist divines who came to his defense.²⁸ This uniqueness makes him an excellent case study when assessing *unitas* and *diversitas* within Puritanism.²⁹

Before we turn to Crisp's social contexts it would be prudent to attempt to define antinomianism.³⁰ In essence, antinomianism can be defined as the "tendency to exalt the transformative power of free grace on believers and to denigrate, or even deny, the role and use of the Moral Law as revealed in the Old Testament in the lives of converted

because there were competing ideas about it. Moreover, Eaton did not believe that he was departing from the normative tradition within Reformed theology.

²⁶ This was especially the case with the first Antinomian crisis. Rutherford exerted great effort to confute Eaton's claim that he was merely reviving Luther's teachings. Whoever could present a better case for being in harmony with Luther, could show that they stood within authentic Protestantism. John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 132-40; Carl R. Trueman and Carrie Euler, "The Reception of Martin Luther in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," in *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, ed. Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 76. Though "antinomians" favored Luther and his Galatians commentary, Calvin was a close second. G. A. van den Brink, "Calvin, Witsius (1636-1708), and the English Antinomians," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 231-2.

²⁷ Two founders of "radical" revolutionary sects, Laurence Clarkson and Lodowick Muggleton, both credit fears of hell, and doubts about salvation, as primary motives for departing from orthodox Puritanism. See Clarkson, *The Lost Sheep Found; Or, The Prodigal Returned to His Fathers House, after Many a Sad and Weary Journey Through Many Religious Countreys* (London, 1660), 8-10; T. L. Underwood, *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 35, 38, 43.

²⁸ As far as I have been able to discern, Crisp was unique in this, though there are perhaps parallels and similarities in John Cotton's defense of Anne Hutchinson.

²⁹ While Crisp is ideally situated to test my hypothesis, a similar test case is John Cotton, vicar of St. Botolph's, Boston, Lincolnshire, who immigrated to New England in 1633, and became intertwined in the antinomian controversy there. Cotton's association with antinomianism, especially in view of his later invite as a delegate to the Westminster Assembly, warrants further investigation. See, for instance, Cotton's defense of Anne Hutchinson in David D. Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1990), 78-151. Perry Miller made the astute observation that Thomas Hooker's preparationism was at the center of the antinomian storm. John H. Ball, *Chronicling the Soul's Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1992), 57.

³⁰ For an outline of antinomian tenets more generally, see Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 114-15; William K. B. Stoever, "A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven": *Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1978). See also Ephraim Pagitt, *Heresiography: Or, A Description of the Heretickes and Sectaries of These Latter Times* (London: Printed by M. Okes, 1645), 88-101.

Christians,” either in preaching or in the practice of piety.³¹ Thus Ephraim Pagitt wrote, “The *Antinomians* are so called, because they would have the Law abolished.”³² But this neat definition is not without its difficulties, and is complicated by the fact that very few alleged antinomians embraced the name (one exception was Richard Coore); further, depending on the antinomian there were varying degrees of favorable uses for the law. Thus, a more nuanced definition is warranted.³³

Second, in the first half of the seventeenth century, when Crisp ministered, British antinomianism was still an emerging phenomenon that defies easy classification, and it is uncertain how widespread these ideas were.³⁴ What is certain is that “antinomian” tenets were circulating London in the 1630s, as Bakewell attested, possibly being spurred on by recent printings of Luther’s Galatians commentary at that time.³⁵ It was not until after mid-century when the English presses were less governed, and more antinomian tracts published, that a more cohesive structure or theology emerged. Thus, while Crisp was promoting his brand of antinomianism during the 1630s it was still coming into being. Not long after, John Sedgwick, rector of St. Alphage’s, London Wall, made the distinction between “doctrinal” and “practical” antinomianism.³⁶

Third, British antinomianism surfaced in response to particular themes within British practical divinity, and emerged out of its shadows, and should be seen as a reactionary movement; antinomians believed that a legal strain had infiltrated and thus compromised English Puritanism. That antinomians in this period are often identified with Lutheranism, not only for their sharp distinctions between law and gospel, but also for their preference to be affiliated with Luther, is indicative of an English-Lutheran renaissance within the movement.³⁷ Indeed, as before stated, there were many English reprints and translations of Luther’s Galatians commentary, and at least one new translation of *The Freedom of the Christian*, published in 1636 in London, during these formative years.

Yet, even considering these difficulties, there emerged core beliefs among the proponents of “anti-legal” divinity, which gave it some sense of solidarity and a platform for recurring critiques of precisianist piety. At the center of this belief-set was the idea that the moral law, including the Ten Commandments, had no or little role in the salvation or

³¹ Como, “Antinomianism,” 305.

³² Pagitt, *Heresiography*, 88.

³³ Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 325; G. F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (1946; repr. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 179. As with “Puritan,” *antinomian* was a term of abuse that suggested its adherents were lawbreakers or otherwise taught Christians to live immoral lives.

³⁴ Davis, *Ranters and the Historians*, 21 (n. 20); Huehns, *Antinomianism*, 8, 28, 66, 68, 71.

³⁵ Thus, on the published edition of John Eaton’s *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (1641), which circulated in MS form in the 1630s, is a direct but altered citation from Luther’s commentary on Galatians 2:11. The publisher changed “justification” in Luther’s text to “free justification” on Eaton’s. Cp. Martin Luther, *A Commentarie of Mater Doctor Martin Luther upon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Galathians* (London, 1635), 55v.

³⁶ Huehns, *Antinomianism*, 40.

³⁷ Beeke and Jones, *A Puritan Theology*, 325; Van den Brink, “Calvin, Witsius (1636-1708), and the English Antinomians,” 231-2; Tim Cooper, “The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the ‘Radicals’ from Mid-Seventeenth-Century Religion,” *Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000): 247-62; Baker, “The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England,” 115-33.

lives of believers and that its integration (to varying extents) compromised true spirituality. Implicit in this denunciation was a critique of what was seen as the precisianist's obsession with sanctification or fierce self-examination, which, in turn, often led to crises in assurance. Thus, the origins and defining characteristics of British antinomianism, and its early contexts, have to be equated with an early-modern religious crisis of conscience.³⁸ But we will now move on to consider Crisp's social contexts, and will later return to Crisp's antinomianism and assess its relation to the orthodoxy circulating among the mainline.

5.2 Social Contexts

Relatively little is known about Crisp's life, other than that he was born into a wealthy London family and instigated a hotly contested theological crisis.³⁹ He was born in Bread Street, London, the third son of Alderman Ellis Crisp and his wife, Hester, and the younger brother of Sir Nicholas Crisp. Educated at Eton and Cambridge, Crisp took up livings successively at Newington Butts (Surrey) and Brinkworth (Wiltshire), the latter of which royalist soldiers ejected him from in 1642 because of his Parliamentarianism.⁴⁰ Having earned several degrees—BA (Cambridge, 1621); MA (Oxford, 1627); DD (Cambridge, c. 1638)—Crisp was one of the more educated Puritans at the time and one of the few to have earned a Doctor of Divinity degree.⁴¹ He was known to have entertained up to 100

³⁸ Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 12-27; Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 89; Como, "Antinomianism," 305-7.

³⁹ The two most substantial accounts of Crisp's life are John Gill's "Memoirs of the Life, &c. of Tobias Crisp, D.D.," prefaced to his 1791 republication of Crisp's sermons, and Christopher Hill's "Dr. Tobias Crisp (1600-1643)," in his *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, Volume Two: Religion and Politics in Seventeenth Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 141-61. Shorter accounts can be found in Roger Pooley, "Crisp, Tobias (1600-1643)," *ODNB*; and David Como, "Crisp, Tobias (1600-1643)," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 1:64.

⁴⁰ Crisp was deprived of his Newington post because of accusations of simony, that he had bought the living with his substantial wealth. However, he purportedly "swore on the Holy Evangelists" that he was innocent. See John A. Vern, *Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 337.

⁴¹ Pooley, "Crisp, Tobias" *ODNB*; Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," 172. Pooley has Crisp earning a B.D. from Oxford in 1638, based on his reading of Joseph Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses* (1891), which seems unfeasible. Crisp likely proceeded D.D. directly from M.A. (in the seventeenth century there was a statute at Cambridge that a master of arts could be admitted to the degree of D.D. had he been a master of twelve years and had a teaching position). This is further attested in Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*, where Crisp is said to have earned only three degrees: B.A., M.A., D.D., and "was admitted to proceed in [Oxford's] faculty" in 1626/7.

There also appears to be some confusion in the literature whether Crisp earned his doctorate from Oxford or Cambridge. Several older sources have Crisp earning the degree at Oxford, but Pooley has cited Cambridge based on J. A. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (1922), and here I concur. I have not been able to discover the subject of Crisp's thesis. On the "Doctor of Divinity" degree in the seventeenth century, see G. D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937), 40-43. Other noted D.D.'s were William Twisse, George Downam, John Preston, Joseph Hall, John Everard, John Wallis, Robert Harris, and James Ussher. Edward Wells states that the conferring of the degree to Crisp

guests at a time at his estate, and had a reputation for being generous; he raised a large family, having thirteen children.⁴²

Though Crisp was imbued with the Arminianism that was sweeping through the English churches in the 1620s-1630s, he drifted toward doctrinal antinomianism likely in response to either personal or pastoral difficulties associated with the intensive introspection and moral imperatives of Stuart Arminianism, and the perceived inadequacies of precisianist Puritanism.⁴³ He frequented London in the 1630s during the height of the first Antinomian crisis, and likely had contact with the famed “antinomian heresiarch” John Eaton, though there were important doctrinal differences between the two, specifically that Crisp acknowledged that true believers experience sin.⁴⁴ Crisp later preached his “controversial message” in London after leaving the rectorship of Brinkworth, but does not seem to have garnered severe criticism until shortly before his death from smallpox in February 1642/3.⁴⁵

Historian Anthony Wood notes that it was a dispute in London against 52 famed ministers, which Crisp “eagerly managed,” which brought about his last illness.⁴⁶ As said before, Crisp also favored parliamentarianism in the English Civil Wars, which may

was “to the Scandal and Reproach of [the] Faculty.” Wells, *An Help for the Right Understanding of the Several Divine Laws and Covenants* (Oxford, 1729), 140.

⁴² Crisp married Mary Wilson in 1626, daughter of Rowland Wilson, a London merchant and activist in the Civil War. Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, 471-72; Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, Vol. 3, 50-51; Hill, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*, Vol. 2, 141.

⁴³ Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist*, Part I, 193; Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, 27; Hill, *Collected Essays*, Vol. 2, 141-2; Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans* (London: Printed for James Black, 1813), 2:473; Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Non-Conformists, from the Battle of Edge-Hill, to the Death of King Charles I*, Vol. 3 (Boston and Newburyport: Charles Ewer and William B. Allen & Co., 1817), 44-45. Rutherford comments that “Crisp, a godly man...who having builded much on qualifications and signes, fell to the other extremity of no signes of sanctification at all.” Brook states that Crisp’s “ideas of the grace of Christ had been exceedingly low, and he had imbibed sentiments which produced in him a legal and self-righteous spirit. Shocked at the recollection of his former views and conduct, he seems to have imagined that he could never go far enough from them.”

⁴⁴ In current scholarship various individuals have been dubbed the “antinomian heresiarch,” including Crisp, Anne Hutchinson, and John Everard. Consequently it is difficult to trace the precise origins of who first disseminated antinomianism within England or British North America. Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 29; Peter W. Williams, *Popular Religion in America: Symbolic Change and the Modernization Process in Historical Perspective* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 107; William Hunt, “Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War,” in *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 227.

⁴⁵ Como, “Crisp, Tobias,” 64; Alison Jasper, “Female Genius: Jane Leade (1624-1704),” in *Literature and Theology: New Interdisciplinary Spaces*, ed. by Heather Walton (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 84-85. See also Parnham, “The Humbling of ‘High Presumption,’” 50-74. Crisp’s wife, Mary Wilson, died September 20, 1673, and left her estate to be divided among her children and grandchildren, with the exception of “my grandson Tobias...[who] opened and read this my will contrary to modesty and ingenuity...” Henry F. Waters, *Genealogical Gleanings in England*, Vol. 1 (Boston: New-England Historical Genealogical Society, 1901), 835.

⁴⁶ Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford, to which Are Added The Fasti, or Annals of the Said University*, Vol. 3, ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1817), 50-51.

possibly explain his popularity among its regiments; but as Robert Rix states, “he never supported the execution of the monarch or other extreme solutions.”⁴⁷

Though his life was cut short in his forty-third year, he proved to be immensely influential not only among the Civil-War chaplains, and various seventeenth-century radicals, such as Jane Leade, but among Christians well into the eighteenth century.

The mystic Leade, who went to London “chiefly in order to find a religious context for and deepening of her visionary experience,” was disillusioned until she met with Crisp. He was able to “resolve all her doubts and give her a much clearer understanding of what had happened to her.”⁴⁸ Though she later went beyond “orthodox” bounds, Leade often reminisced of her time with Crisp, and even wrote that Crisp’s “free-grace sermon was quite different from the others I had heard so that I decided to tread no other path.”⁴⁹ Indeed, Crisp had such a formative influence on Leade’s theology that such themes as the freeness of God’s redemptive love and the blotting out of sin were more impressionable than the doctrine of predestination. Leade would later, from the mid-1680s, embrace the idea that everyone would eventually be saved.⁵⁰

But Leade was not alone in attributing influence to Crisp. The Ranter founder Laurence Clarkson says that he “went to” Tobias Crisp, having heard of his ministry, and sat “under Doctor Crisp’s Doctrine, in which I did endeavor to become one of those that God saw no sin.” It is not certain whether Clarkson actually attended Crisp’s London parish, or whether he merely read Crisp’s books, which he “seriously perused.”⁵¹ In 1644, John Coulton gives evidence of the influence of *Christ Alone Exalted* within the Parliamentary forces. Henry Pinnell, an army radical, vindicated Crisp and ascribed to Crisp a formative influence in shaping his own religious identity.⁵² In 1646, Mary Greaves, an avid reader of “radical” writings, lent her copy of Crisp’s sermons to Adam Eyre.⁵³

⁴⁷ Robert Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 30. Regarding Crisp’s books in the army, Samuel Rutherford wrote, “It shall never be well with England, till the like abjuration of the doctrine of... Wil. Del, Joh. Saltmarsh, of Town, Eaton, Den., Crispe... be tendered to most of the Army of Sir *Thomas Fairfax*, and all the Sectaries in England.” Idem, *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist* (London, 1648), Part I, 354. See also Leo F. Solt, *Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell’s Army* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), 25-42.

⁴⁸ Arthur Versluis, *Wisdom’s Children: A Christian Esoteric Tradition* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1999), 58; Julie Hirst, *Jane Leade: Biography of a Seventeenth-Century Mystic* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 18-19; E. P. Thompson, *Witness Against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 41.

⁴⁹ Leade, *Lebenslauff*, 417. Quoted in Hirst, *Jane Leade*, 19.

⁵⁰ Alana Vincent, “Two (and two, and two) Towers: Interdisciplinarity, Borrowing, and the Limits of Interpretation,” in *Literature and Theology: New Interdisciplinary Studies*, ed. Heather Walton (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 84-5; Douglas H. Shantz, *Between Sardis and Philadelphia: The Life and World of Pietist Court Preacher Conrad Broske* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 130-31.

⁵¹ Laurence Clarkson, *The Lost Sheep Found: or, The Prodigal Returned to his Father’s House* (London, 1660), 9.

⁵² Hill, *The Collected Essays*, Vol. 2, 142; John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 414-15. According to Richard Baxter, antinomianism was the predominant infection in the army, and books by Crisp, Paul Hobson, John Saltmarsh, and Walter Cradock were there in abundance. See N. H. Keeble, “Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposing on Others’: orthodoxy and heresy in the Baxterian tradition,” in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 287; Richard L. Greaves, *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University

It is not surprising then that when Crisp's works resurfaced in the 1690s, and *ad hominem* attacks became common fare, that a number of testimonies were quickly sent to the press to show how Crisp had lived an exemplary life, and transformed the lives of others. One supporter opined that, "There has been a great deal of Talk about *Dr. Crisp*, but I look upon him to have been a Godly, Holy Man, and that he was Sound and Orthodox, and that he brought in more Souls to Christ than any of us."⁵⁴ This later testimony echoes William Twisse's earlier observation that the only reason Crisp's sermons were opposed by many of the orthodox was because "so many were converted by his preaching, and so few by ours."⁵⁵

Those opposing Crisp were Richard Baxter and Daniel Williams, among others; those defending were Isaac Chauncey, Increase Mather, and others, thus illustrating the theological diversity of English Reformed thought.⁵⁶ Long before, John Saltmarsh, an alleged antinomian, had ridiculed Baxter for his views on grace on the charge that it failed to separate free grace from works.⁵⁷ Just prior to his death in 1691, Baxter launched a campaign against antinomianism that resulted in hotly contested pamphlet wars.⁵⁸ Keeble states that Baxter's attack on antinomianism and Crisp was at odds with Baxter's conciliatory efforts and reputation as an "irenical Reconciler," in his later writings. This bitterness is suggestive of how much Baxter hated the doctrine of antinomianism, and its tendency to belittle the law, and, in his mind, Christian conduct.⁵⁹

The prolific millenarian Thomas Beverley defended the republication of Crisp's sermons by stating that "as the Preaching of these Sermons was before a notable Breaking out of Gospel Light...So I cannot but hope, The Reprinting of these Sermons is order'd by Providence, as a Fore-Running of a much Clearer opening of that Kingdom of

Press, 1985), 136. Tim Cooper states that Crisp became Baxter's chief antinomian boogeyman. Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, 27.

⁵³ Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1990), 159. This is further evidence of Crisp's popularity among the laity. Further, John Jones remarked how Crisp popularized the grace of God for the laity. See John Jones, *Balliol College: A History*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 109.

⁵⁴ Hananiel Philalethes, *Christ Exalted and Dr. Crisp Vindicated in Several Points called Antinomian* (London, 1698), sig. Alv. See also Thomas Beverley, *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp's Sermons, and Mr. Baxter's Dissatisfactions in Them* (London, 1690); and Beverley, *A Conciliatory Discourse upon Crisp's Sermons, on the Observation of Mr. Williams's Dissatisfactions in Them* (London, 1692). Beverley, who had been imprisoned along with Baxter in 1686, attempted to arbitrate between Baxter and Crisp's supporters. He argued that both Baxter and Crisp reflected the two sides of the same coin and that their differences lay only in emphasis. Beverley's support of Crisp alienated him from Baxter and his efforts proved unfruitful. See Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, 174-77.

⁵⁵ Quoted in McKelvey, "Eternal Justification," 242.

⁵⁶ Baxter called Crisp the "most eminent Ring-leader whose books took wonderfully with ignorant Professors." Baxter, *A Treatise of Justifying Righteousness* (London, 1676), I, 21.

⁵⁷ John Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace: Or, the Flowings of Christs Blood freely to Sinners* (London, 1646), [find source]; William M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (London: Croom Helm, 1979), 308.

⁵⁸ R. K. Webb, "The Emergence of Radical Dissent," in *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 25-26.

⁵⁹ Keeble, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition," 295. One can understand Baxter's opposition to antinomianism because it was, in the end, and if carried to its logical extreme, a repudiation of his life work.

Redemption.”⁶⁰ Beverley supported Crisp’s notions of righteousness by grace alone and sought to defend these against Baxter’s, and Williams’s, criticisms by stating that Crisp “had simply concentrated his expositions on the doctrines of election and imputed righteousness through Christ.”⁶¹ The antinomian strain, so long as it was expressed within orthodox rubric, was an acceptable, alternative position, and matter of emphasis, so long as it was not too “successful” to impinge upon the sensibilities of less popular clergy.

Thus, in sum, Crisp ministered during a pivotal time during the Post-Reformation period, in the years immediately prior to the English Civil Wars, when radical theologies were surfacing in response to precisianism, and spreading like wildfire. Crisp was alive during the second antinomian crisis, and would have been familiar with the heresiarch John Eaton, though the extent to which they may have conversed has been lost to history. While he may have been conversant with Eaton, and possibly read the latter’s MS on free justification, the major distinction between the two are: (1) Crisp was a well-known and well-liked cleric among the “orthodox;” it was only during the final year of his life that his teachings brought forth controversy due to his “success;” and (2) Crisp, as we will see, distanced himself from Eaton’s “rigid” antinomianism, in that God could see no sin within the believer.⁶²

5.3 Crisp’s Writings in Historical Context

We come now to consider Crisp’s sermons in their historical context. Though better educated than many of his peers, Crisp’s entire corpus rests not in technical works of theology, but in the sermons he preached during his ministry, which were taken in shorthand and posthumously published. Crisp’s sermons reflect the bias in Puritan divinity towards more practical works or handbooks; and while some noted Puritan theologians wrote systems or manuals of more technical divinity, as Edward Leigh’s *A System or Body of Divinity*, the far majority of Puritan tomes can be classified as published “sermon-cycles,” on issues of current pastoral or controversial importance, which, when published, became part of the theological literature.⁶³ John Preston’s *Breastplate of Faith and Love* (1630), Richard Sibbes’s *Soul’s Conflict* (1635), and Joseph Caryl’s *An Exposition with Practicall Observations upon...the Chapters of...Job* (1643-66), are cases in point. Edward Fisher’s *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (1645) was another popular work that

⁶⁰ Thomas Beverley, *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp’s Sermons and Mr. Baxter’s Dissatisfaction in Them* (1690), 11. See also Warren Johnston, *The Apocalypse in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), 97.

⁶¹ Warren Johnston, “Beverly, Thomas (d. 1702),” *ODNB*.

⁶² Isaac Chauncy, Crisp’s foremost defender during the third antinomian crisis, said that Crisp was an antinomian “falsely so called.” Chauncy, *Neonomianism Unmask’d: or, The Ancient Gospel Pleaded* (London, 1692), 2, 14-15.

⁶³ William K. B. Stoever, “Nature, Grace and John Cotton: The Theological Dimension in the New England Antinomian Controversy,” *Church History* 44 (1975), 24.

sought to restate traditional federal theology in more practical garb, but was readily accused for its “antinomian” tendencies.⁶⁴

Thus, it is no surprise that Crisp’s sermons were quickly disseminated, purchased, and read by all sorts of godly citizens; nor is it surprising that almost as soon as the first edition of *Christ Alone Exalted* issued from the press in 1643, two notable texts were published to confute its doctrines. Stephen Gere’s *The Doctrine of the Antinomians* (1644) was published “in an answer to divers dangerous Doctrines, in the seven first sermons of Dr. Crisps fourteen.” That Gere only addressed the first half of this printing of *Christ Alone Exalted* is suggestive of the sense of urgency that some of the “orthodox” felt. Indeed, Gere writes, “Having sadly considered how busie *Satan is to sow Tares*, where the precious seed of Gods saving truth has been sowne, I thought it necessary for every Seeds-man to hinder the growth thereof, by word or writing, by conference or calling on the name of God, by one means or other, according to our occasions and abilities, lest Satans vigilancy rise in judgement against us for our negligence.”⁶⁵

Thomas Bakewell’s *The Antinomians Christ Confounded, and the Lords Christ Exalted* (1644) also charged Crisp and Lancaster with teaching eternal justification, a tenet in which he believed “they did but rake out of Eatons dunghill;”⁶⁶ Bakewell further sought to show how Crisp had offended orthodox sensibility on regeneration, faith, adoption, union with Christ, and assurance of faith.⁶⁷ For Bakewell, as for some other orthodox writers at the time, Crisp and the antinomians had constructed “a false Christ.”⁶⁸

Precisianist reaction to Crisp was fueled, in part, by the earlier controversy with Eaton and the Eatonists. Indeed, a whole slew of “anti-Eaton” works were pushed from the press in the 1630s, such as Henry Burton’s *Law and the Gospel Reconciled* (1631), and Thomas Taylor’s *Regula Vitae: The Rule of the Law under the Gospel* (1631). That both Crisp and Eaton were clerics further compounded the problem. Gere complained, “I did not clearly see that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is absolutely overthrown by this *Antinomian* [Crisp], or rather Anti-evangelicall Doctrine, under very faire and specious pretences, (even as that false Apostle and traitor *Judas* killed Christ when he betrayed him) I had help my peace at this time, and saved myself a great deal of paines. But finding that these foure last yeers, this *gangrene* hath eaten very sore into many poore soules, who looke upon the guilded or sugared bait, but see not the poysoned and dangerous hook, I have ventured into the battell.”⁶⁹

In spite of precisianist criticisms and objections, two more collections of Crisp’s sermons were published between 1644-1646, both introduced by Robert Lancaster. Crisp’s grandson, Samuel, compiled and published the definitive edition of *Christ Alone Exalted* in 1690, comprising the previously printed sermons, as well as new transcriptions from his

⁶⁴ David C. Lachman observes, however, that the *Marrow*’s stress on the absolute, free, and gracious nature of the covenant avoids antinomianism. Lachman, *The Marrow Controversy, 1718-1723: An Historical and Theological Analysis* (Edinburgh: Rutherford Books, 1988), 38.

⁶⁵ Gere, *Doctrine of the Antinomians*, sig. A2.

⁶⁶ Thomas Bakewell, *The Antinomians Christ Confounded and the Lords Christ Exalted* (London, 1644), sig. A1.

⁶⁷ Bakewell, *Antinomians Christ*, 29-30.

⁶⁸ Bakewell, *Antinomians Christ*, 1-26.

⁶⁹ Gere, *Doctrine of the Antinomians*, sig. B3.

grandfather's own handwritten manuscripts.⁷⁰ We will now look at this edition more closely, then examine Crisp's theology, to see whether orthodox criticisms were justified, and then conclude this chapter.

5.3.1 *Christ Alone Exalted: Being the Compleat Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D. Containing XLII Sermons on Several Select Texts of Scriptures (1690)*

This third and enlarged 1690-edition of the previously printed *Christ Alone Exalted* (1643-1646) contains all of the formerly printed forty-two sermons and adds ten more, eight of which were never before printed and which were collected from manuscripts; the 1690 text swells to 726 pages. The forty-two sermons, which were printed between 1643-1646, were compiled from shorthand and compared with Crisp's own notes. The 1690 edition (which was printed at the behest of the London bookseller William Marshall)⁷¹ contains an attestation by twelve nonconformists that the newly transcribed sermons were authentic reproductions of Crisp. The twelve were George Griffith, George Cokayn, Isaac Chauncy, John Howe, Vincent Alsop, Nathaniel Mather, Increase Mather, Hanserd Knollys, Thomas Powell, John Turner, Richard Bures, and John Gammon.⁷² While many of these divines would also endorse or defend Crisp's work, seven would later testify that they merely attested to its authenticity.⁷³ Whatever the intent, the list would inevitably be seen as an endorsement of the contents of *Christ Alone Exalted*, born by its strategic placing before prefatory material.⁷⁴ Indeed, in Samuel Crisp's defense of his father's

⁷⁰ Roger Pooley, in his entry on Crisp in *ODNB*, states incorrectly that the 1690 edition of Crisp's *Christ Alone Exalted* contains a life by John Gill. Gill's life of Crisp was first prefaced to the annotated 1755 edition, which was reprinted with corrections in a fourth edition in 1791.

⁷¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, sig. A3. The Marshall bookshop, located at the Bible in Grace-Church Street, London, had a thriving Puritan trade. See Frederick Joseph Harvey Darton, *Children's Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), 70. Peter Toon incorrectly refers to Marshall as an undertaker. Cp. Toon, *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity*, 49, with *Elizabethan Non-Conformist Texts, Volume 3: The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson (New York: Routledge, 2003), 60.

⁷² Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, sig. A2.

⁷³ Boersma, *Hot Pepper Corn*, 63 (n. 317). John Fesko incorrectly states that the signers endorsed the republication of Crisp's work. Rather, they were merely attesting to the fact that Volume 4 was, in fact, in Crisp's own hand and never intended their signatures as an endorsement of Crisp's theology. Cp. John Fesko, *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology, 1517-1700* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 342-3, with Henry Rogers, *The Life and Character of John Howe, With an Analysis of His Writings* (London: Printed for William Ball, 1836), 390-7. Cooper suggests that given the limited scope of the statement the signatories signed to, their signatures were never intended as an endorsement of Crisp's theology. However, Baxter saw these as endorsements and it seems probable that Samuel Crisp intended their use for such purposes. Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, 171. John Howe, Vincent Alsop, and Richard Bures, three of the twelve divines who signed *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), also signed and attested to Williams's *Gospel Truth*, which was an attack on Crisp's theology; cf. Williams, *Gospel Truth*, sig. A2-3

⁷⁴ Whether intentional or not (Howe's biographer believed it was a trick by Samuel Crisp and his publisher), the list of divines was interpreted as fully endorsing Tobias Crisp's theology, and this led to a division in the "Happy Union" of 1691. See C. G. Bolam, et al, *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Modern Unitarianism* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1968); and David L. Wykes, "After the

ministry (“good wholesome Household Divinity”), in his, “To the Christian Reader,” rests, in part, in appeals to the thought of such precisianist divines as William Perkins, Thomas Manton, and Thomas Jacomb, and in “the Testimony of many Eminent Divines...all contending against the Mixture of our Righteousness with Christ’s, in the Matter of Justification...”⁷⁵ This strategy is similar to Samuel Crisp’s further defense of his father’s work in *Christ Made Sin* (1691), where he enlists the reputations of Chamier, Perkins, Polanus, Twisse, Reynolds, Manton, and others, as supporting his father’s emphasis on the freeness of justification aside from works.⁷⁶

Samuel Crisp’s appeal to such authorities of the “mainline” tradition show two things: (1) The overwhelming desire of antinomians to be seen as being harmonious with the orthodox tradition; and (2) the existence of an incipient antinomian strain within the writings of precisianist divinity books, especially on the subject of justification, which became magnified, and exaggerated among its “radical” proponents.⁷⁷

Antinomians, whether self-attested or merely accused, were not ultimately desirous to prove themselves systematic theologians, nor even, perhaps, to prove that such authorities as Luther and Calvin, or Perkins and Owen, systematically agreed with them on every point of contention, but rather to show that their assertions were compatible with the orthodox tradition, and could be substantiated from orthodox writings on the doctrine of justification. This is, perhaps, similar in the way the scholastics and reformers used Augustine;⁷⁸ regardless, the antinomian desire for continuity, if not replication, warrants a broadening of our understanding of confessional boundaries within the seventeenth century.⁷⁹

The “Compleat Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D.,” consist of four books, the three previously published throughout the 1640s, and a fourth containing the ten previously

Happy Union: Presbyterians and Independents in the Provinces,” in *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Oxford: Ecclesiastical History Society, 1996), 283-96.

⁷⁵ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A8r.

⁷⁶ Samuel Crisp, *Christ Made Sin: 2 Cor. 5:21 Evinc’d from Scripture, Upon Occasion of an Exception Taken at Pinnars-hall, 28 January 1689, at Reprinting the Sermons of Dr. Tobias Crisp* (London, 1691), sig. B2.

⁷⁷ Thus Robert Traill’s vindication of the doctrine against charges of antinomianism.

⁷⁸ Here see Arnoud S. Q. Visser’s excellent *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), which shows how Augustine was variously portrayed as Lutheran, Catholic, and Calvinist in the early modern period. Cf. Ann-Stephane Schafter, *Auctoritas Patrum? The Reception of the Church Fathers in Puritanism* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012), 65-146, 214-84.

⁷⁹ This was truer of the earlier Luther than Calvin. While Calvin was cited as an authority, Luther was more so. Van den Brink, “Calvin, Witsius (1636-1708), and the English Antinomians.” See also Richard A. Muller, “Reception and Response: Referencing and Understanding Calvin in Seventeenth-Century Calvinism,” in *Calvin and His Influence, 1509-2009*, ed. Irena Backus and Philip Benedict (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 182-201; and Muller, “The ‘Reception of Calvin’ in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 255-74, esp. 273-4.

I agree with Bozeman that the antinomianism of John Eaton is contra orthodox Puritanism, but I do not believe the antinomian strain to be inherently “contra- and post-Puritan.” Bozeman does not take fully into account the subjective belief of the antinomians that they were merely replicating the theologies of the “common consent of the Learned Orthodox Writers.” Moreover, a case could be made that Eaton, though not “mainstream,” and not “orthodox,” should still be classified as “Puritan.” Bozeman, “John Eaton as Contra-Puritan,” 653-4; John Eaton, *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (London, 1642), sig. B4; Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans* (London: Printed for James Black, 1813), 2:466.

unpublished sermons. Among the hitherto unpublished corpus are the sermons, “Free-Grace the Teacher of Good Works” (Sermons 3-6), and “The Use of the Law” (Sermon 9), both of which serve to confute accusations of antinomianism because Crisp here speaks of the duties of a godly life for the Christian, and a positive use of the law (which the very name of *antinomian* rejects). It is thus not surprising that Samuel Crisp capitalizes on these sermons to combat the indictments of Daniel Williams, and others. Given their subject matter, there seems to have been some dispute as to the authenticity of these sermons.⁸⁰ They refute the typical “mainline” idea of the antinomian as a proponent of lawless living. Further, one wonders why these sermons were not published before, in the 1640s. It is possible that Robert Lancaster, who had known Eaton, and published the latter’s *Honey-combe*, chose, for polemical purposes, to only issue those sermons of Crisp which were more congruous with Eaton.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the later eighteenth-century reception of Crisp’s sermons provoked fierce debate between the Congregationalists, who became more and more identified with a “theologically high” Calvinism that could be close to antinomianism, while Presbyterians adopted a more moderate Calvinism closer to Arminianism, the dividing issue here being to what extent human beings are actively involved in their salvation? Antinomians were on one end by denying any appearance of human cooperation, whereas Arminians openly advocated some degree of activity on the human part. Half a century prior, at the time of the Restoration, there was little doctrinal difference between the two groups. Nuovo credits this division to the republication of Crisp’s sermons in 1690, which exposed the tendencies of both groups.⁸¹ The use of Crisp by English Particular Baptists has also been well documented.⁸² Indeed, Particular Baptist John Gill’s critical and explanatory edition of *Christ Alone Exalted* was printed at least twice in the eighteenth century (1755, 1791), and, again, defends Crisp from doctrinal and practical antinomism.

5.4 Crisp’s Theology in Historical Context

To date, no exhaustive book-length analysis of Crisp’s theology exists.⁸³ Though Crisp never wrote a *medulla* or *corpus theologiae*, or with a view to publication, his transcribed

⁸⁰ This seems to be the reason why Samuel Crisp enlisted the nonconformist authenticators for his father’s work. Daniel Williams had denounced the reprinting of Crisp’s sermons in a lecture at Pinner’s Hall, which further divided the united ministers (Presbyterians and Congregationalists). See Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1953), 218-19, and above (n. 64-66).

⁸¹ Nuovo, “Crisp, Tobias”; David Steers, “Arminianism among Protestant Dissenters in England and Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,” in *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60-1609)*, ed. Th. Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 166.

⁸² See Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” 171-90. John Coffey notes that Crisp was also popular among Wesleyan Methodists. Coffey, “Puritan Legacies,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 334.

⁸³ Studies of Crisp’s theology can be found, in part, in G. A. van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme: Met Tekst en Vertaling Van De Animadversiones Irenicae* (Apeldoorn: Instituut voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2008), 23-4, 66-86; David Parnham, “The Humbling of ‘High Presumption,’” 50-74;

sermons nonetheless portray a Puritan pastor concerned with the interplay between *dogma* and *praxis*, especially its terms of the formers implication for the attainment of assurance. Throughout his sermons, Crisp shows intricate awareness and sensitivity to such orthodox doctrines as the covenant of grace, election, justification, regeneration, sanctification, and assurance, but he often employs more “radical,” or “unguarded” language when using these categories.⁸⁴

Crisp’s chief concern in *Christ Alone Exalted* was not to illustrate or defend a highly scholastic theology, but to confute any notions of a human works-based righteousness and undue introspection. Through four volumes of published sermons, Crisp time and time again combats notions that Christian liberty, free grace, and free justification induce ungodly behavior. However, what infuriated Crisp’s attackers was his seeming careless expressions about the forgiveness of God: “There is not one sin you commit, after you receive Christ, that God can charge upon your person.”⁸⁵ Crisp did not see holiness as an evidence of grace, as did most precisianist Puritans, but he did not deny the obligations of “the godly” to live godly lives; indeed, says Crisp, “There is no believer who hath received Christ but he is created in him unto good works, that he should walk in them.”⁸⁶ Throughout *Christ Alone Exalted*, Crisp emphasizes the beauty of holiness and good works as the believer’s duty, but maintains the unconditional nature of salvation: “But I must withal tell you that all this sanctification of life is not a jot in the way of that justified person unto heaven.”⁸⁷ The point is that believers are required to live moral lives, and to conduct themselves as citizens of a heavenly world, but none of it matters when it comes to how a person is saved, or whether they remain saved. In the end, works merit nothing, not the cause, and surely not the continuance of justification.⁸⁸

Because of Crisp’s clear and repeated emphasis on godly living and the role of the law as the believer’s guide in this life, contemporary charges of antinomism seem dubious and can be credited to overreaction to the more extreme statements that Crisp made about free grace and the forgiveness of sins prior to their actual commission.⁸⁹

As with the method in prior chapters, we will now turn to Crisp’s comments on (a) Doctrine of God and Humanity (b) Predestination and Assurance; (c) Covenant of Works

Parnham, “The Covenantal Quietism of Tobias Crisp,” *Church History*, Vol. 75, No. 3 (2006): 511-43; Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 143-45, 157-59, 172-73; and Hill, *Collected Essays*, Vol. 3, 142-61.

⁸⁴ On the antinomian use of language, see Nicholas McDowell, “The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism: Richard Crashaw, John Saltmarsh and the Language of Religious Radicalism in the 1640s,” in *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*, ed. Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 1-30.

⁸⁵ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:7-8, 11, 16, 429-30, 437-40.

⁸⁶ McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, 62.

⁸⁷ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:68-69, 76-77, 123.

⁸⁸ In stressing this point, Crisp offended “mainline” sensitivity to the Catholic charge that Protestants were just antinomians in theological dress. Further, there were major fears concerning the consequences of actually saying these things from the pulpit, perhaps warranted by the “excesses of the extreme Calvinism prominent among Dutch Contra-Remonstrants...such as Rippertus Sixtus, who taught that a faithful man could commit murder and adultery yet God could not dam him for it.” Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 419.

⁸⁹ This is likely what Traill was referring to when he noted some expressions of Crisp that the precisianists disliked.

and Grace; (d) Justification and Sanctification; (e) Law and Gospel; and (f) Christian Life and Piety.

5.4.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

Crisp does not formally articulate a doctrine of God as Downname does. He does, however, believe in the basic Thomist metaphysics that underlie Reformed orthodox opinion at the time, including strong adherence to the Trinity, divine eternity, omnipotence, foreknowledge, decrees, predestination, and high distinctions between Creator and creature.⁹⁰ Again, belief in the Trinity is a point of *unitas* among orthodox

⁹⁰ Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 115, 358 (n. 128), 391 (n. 174). For a Reformed orthodox exposition of the doctrine, see Robert Letham, "John Owen's Doctrine of the Trinity in Its Catholic Context," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology*, ed. Kelley M. Kapic and Mark Jones (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), 187-97; and Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 35-66.

It should be noted that there is some scholarly debate as to the identification of Reformed thought as holding to a basically "Thomist" metaphysic. The opposing school identifies Reformed thought as essentially or increasingly "Scotist," and is seen in J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as Against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 29-33, 497-526; Antonie Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 99-119; Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 7; Vos and F. Dekker, "Modalities in Francis Turretin: An Essay in Reformed Ontology," in *Scholasticism Reformed. Festschrift Willem van Asselt*, ed. Marcel Sarol, et al (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 74-92; and Andreas Beck, "Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676): Basic Features of His Doctrine of God," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, 205-26. While Bac correctly sees Scotism in William Twisse and even classifies him as essentially "Scotist" because of Twisse's emphasis on divine agency, he does not give adequate consideration to the influence of Thomism on other Reformed thinkers of the seventeenth century, especially on John Owen, or in certain Reformed categories that seem to have Thomist origins. Vos correctly notes that "Aristotelianism" and "Thomism," in the early modern centuries should not be confused with the *historical* Aristotle, and that "the seventeenth-century Utrecht *Aquinas* is Reformed," but the same caution should be asserted towards classifications of Scotus. Perhaps early modern Reformed thought is best seen as an eclectic use of medieval strains, both Thomist and Scotist, which were appropriated and used much in the same way that Augustine was. This is in line with Sebastian Rehnman's sympathetic assessment of Vos's work but which also concedes to the strongly Thomistic nature of Owen's thought, for instance, by classifying Owen as holding to a "Scotistically modified Thomism." See Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation*, 94-114; Sebastian Rehnman, *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 62-4, 181; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 58; and Christopher Cleveland, *Thomism in John Owen* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2013). Cf. Richard A. Muller, "The 'Reception of Calvin' in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 258-60.

Simon J. G. Burton has argued for Scotist strains in Baxter's metaphysics of the Trinity in his *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's "Methodus Theologiae"* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), and Rehnman has aptly observed that Baxter listed Aquinas among his favorite authors, even before Scotus (Rehnman, *Divine Discourse*, 32). This further evidences the widespread use of both Scotus and Thomas among the Reformed. See Leonard Bacon, ed., *Select Practical Writings of Richard Baxter* (New Haven, 1831), 1:26; John K. Ryan, *The Reputation of St. Thomas Aquinas among English Protestant Thinkers of the Seventeenth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press of America, 1948); Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen, "Scotus and the Scotist School: The Tradition of Scotist Thought in the Medieval and Early Modern Period," in *John Duns Scotus, 1265/6-1308: Renewal of Philosophy*, ed. E. P. Bos (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), 197-210. Cf. Henry G. van Leeuwen, *The Problem of Certainty in English Thought, 1630-1690*, 2nd ed. (Hague: Kluwer, 1970).

divines in the seventeenth century.⁹¹ Though Crisp does not provide an elaborate discussion of the order of the divine decrees, as Twisse does, he nonetheless seems to confuse primary and secondary causes.⁹² In fact, Williams criticizes Crisp on this point, “The Doctor mistakes the Nature of God’s Decree, because a Decree ascertains a thing shall in time be, therefore he thinks it gives a thing a present subjective Being.”⁹³ For Crisp, the paradox is that while God, from all eternity, looks on his people with love, he, at the same time, comprehends their sins which alienate them from him; yet, because God sees Christ’s satisfaction at the same time that he sees their sins, there is never a moment when the elect are at enmity with him. This is not because God sees no sin, but because at the same eternal moment God comprehends both sin and satisfaction.⁹⁴

Crisp’s point of continuity with the mainstream is seen in that they agree that (a) God has *eternally* decreed that certain persons elected by him shall be justified and adopted; (b) that these elect are the objects of God’s love of good-will, even while they are sinners; (c) God continues his gracious purpose to do them good in his appointed time; (d) Christ has made full satisfaction for sin and merited eternal life for the elect; (e) that there is a significant difference between the elect sinner and others as to what they shall be in time.⁹⁵ Their differences have to do with how God sees the elect prior to the moment they believe, and whether they are children of wrath.⁹⁶ Further, Crisp harmonizes on the nature of the fall into sin, and its ramifications for posterity. At no point does he suggest, as Eaton seems to, that Christians are wholly without sin.⁹⁷

Criticisms of Crisp’s doctrine of God in the seventeenth century centered on his understanding of the nature of the divine decrees, and how they were executed in time. The mainstream of Puritans saw this as an important distinction because it had implications for preaching the gospel, the use of the law in that preaching, and the moral conduct of the believer.⁹⁸

On the question of Scotus and Calvin, see Richard A. Muller, “Scholasticism in Calvin: A Question of Relation and Disjunction,” in *Calvinus Sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion*, ed. Wilhelm Neuser and Brian Armstrong (Kirkville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1997), 247-65; and Heiko A. Oberman, *Initia Calvini: The Matrix of Calvin’s Reformation* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1991), 10-19.

⁹¹ Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 47. For a history of the decline of the Trinity, see Philip Dixon, *Nice and Hot Disputes: The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century* (London: T&T Clark, 2003). See also William Placher, *The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking about God Went Wrong* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996). While Placher correctly sees the emergence of modernity and Enlightenment rationality as eclipsing classical Christian theism in the seventeenth century, he incorrectly sees the doctrine of Scripture as eclipsing the Trinity within Puritanism.

⁹² Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 69-70.

⁹³ Williams, *Gospel Truth*, 6-7.

⁹⁴ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 325-27.

⁹⁵ Williams, *Gospel Truth*, 3. Cf. Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 69-71.

⁹⁶ Williams, *Gospel Truth*, 4-7; Rutherford, *Spirituell Antichrist*, 2, 208-9; cf. Boersma, *Hot Pepper Corn*, 80-87, 114-118.

⁹⁷ Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 75-77.

⁹⁸ In Rutherford’s *Spiritual Antichrist*, where Crisp is cited more than twenty times, the majority of criticisms have to do with the doctrine of justification, the experience of faith, and the relation between law and gospel. See idem, *Spiritual Antichrist*, Part I, 14, 105; Part II, 3, 17-19, 24, 27, 30, 39, 47, 49, 55, 63, 80, 87, 115, 158, 170-71, 174, 176, 220, 234.

5.4.2 *Predestination and Assurance*

Though Crisp never uses the word “predestination,” as do Downname and Rous, he nonetheless refers to it in substance: “You know well, in respect of men, who are the elect, they are from all eternity in the purpose of God...he had them in his thoughts, as the objects of his love, from eternity.”⁹⁹ Further, the sins of the elect were laid on Christ in eternity, as to obligation or covenant, but in respect to the actual execution of this in time was when Christ was upon the cross. Crisp objects to the application of redemption in time, whether while the children are in the womb or at the moment of baptism, because “the Lord loves his people with everlasting love; there is not a moment of time in which iniquity is transacted back again from Christ, and remains upon a particular person.” Crisp avoids scrupulously any pretension that human faith might be a condition of justification; and unlike a contemporary, William Eyre, Crisp does not go so far as to assume that believers are justified before faith on the basis of predestination, but rather on account of the cross.¹⁰⁰

Crisp’s understanding of assurance, being the testimony of the Holy Spirit to man’s own spirit, was not dissimilar to either Calvin or Perkins.¹⁰¹ Crisp’s emphasis on the testimony of the Spirit, and the confirmation of the word of grace that one’s sins are forgiven is distinct from the precisianist strain’s emphasis on self-examination for signs and marks.¹⁰² Though Crisp critiqued universal obedience, sincerity of heart, and love for the brethren, as sufficient marks to assess one’s assurance, he did not disregard them altogether. His criticism surrounded their *sufficiency* to bring abiding assurance to the believer.¹⁰³ Thus, for genuine assurance, the “voice of the Spirit of Grace” testifies inwardly to the believer that they have been adopted into God’s family.¹⁰⁴ Crisp further distinguishes between “revealing and working evidence,” which is the Spirit’s witness to the believer,

⁹⁹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:396.

¹⁰⁰ William Eyre, *Vindiciae Justificationis Gratuitae* (London, 1654). Eyre’s work, which sought to prove justification without conditions, was endorsed by Owen and was consonant with the theologies of John Eedes and John Crandon. Michael Bryson, *The Tyranny of Heaven: Milton’s Rejection of God as King* (Cranbury: University of Delaware Press, 2004), 188. See also C. Fitzsimons Allison, *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (New York: Seabury Press, 1966), 171-72.

¹⁰¹ Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 79-82; James Leo Garrett, *Baptist Theology: A Four-Century Study* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2009), 90-1; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 69-75; cf. Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 119-37. At times, Perkins speaks of faith as a certain and particular persuasion of one’s own salvation; at other times he identifies this persuasion as the fruit of faith and not to be identified with faith itself. He divides those who have strong faith and who are fully persuaded of their salvation from those of weak faith who have been forgiven but do not yet believe it. See Joel R. Beeke, *The Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 49-50, 108; Robert Letham, “Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology” (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1979), 1:285. Letham believes that the tensions in Perkins’s statements are suggestive of internal struggles within Reformed theology between two concepts of faith: one that derives from Zwingli, Calvin, Bucer, and other continental Reformed theologians who equate faith with assurance; and the other from Bullinger, Ursinus, and Gomarus, which separates faith from assurance and promotes a subjective discernment of its effects within believers.

¹⁰² Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 478.

¹⁰³ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 478-9. Crisp does not deny that the believer can gain some comfort from his sanctification. “The Assurance of Faith” (153).

¹⁰⁴ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 483-5.

and “revealing evidence,” which is the faith of the believer. Though the Spirit reveals to men their assured estate, it is not fully resolved until, by faith, they receive it.¹⁰⁵ For Crisp, there is a full assurance available for the believer; one need only to look inside to hear the Spirit’s assuring voice that “your sins are forgiven you.”¹⁰⁶ Thus, for Crisp, the act of faith that joins one to Christ is the medium of certainty; it is one’s trust in Christ that provides the certainty that one is elect and redeemed.¹⁰⁷ This teaching contrasts with precisianist notions of the marks of grace and of reading the inward signs.¹⁰⁸ Crisp writes that though a thousand sureties were set before believers, there would be no comfort in them; indeed, among those attempt to read the inward signs, there is “not one in a thousand” who has actually attained full assurance. This same point was a bone of contention with John Goodwin as well, and numerous other disenfranchised “radicals.”¹⁰⁹

Related to Crisp’s doctrine of assurance is his understanding of receiving faith. Crisp says that faith results from Christ’s work; being called “the Radicall grace of all graces,” it is not given until Christ himself has been given to the believer. Further, “there is a passive receiving of Christ” that is “just such a receiving of him, as when a forward patient takes a purge, or some bitter physick; he shuts his teeth against it, but the Phisitian forceth his mouth open, and pours it down his throat...the Father does force open the spirit of that person, and poures his Sonne in spite of the receiver.”¹¹⁰ Though the believer is co-active in his sanctification, “Christ is given to men first, before they doe any thing in the world...Christ is the soule of every believer, that animates, and acts the believer in all things whatsoever.”¹¹¹

This passive nature of receiving faith and assurance is similar to Cotton’s criticisms of the orthodox in New England, who argued that similarly concerning the “sandy ground” of “good qualifications” or religious assurance. Thus Crisp challenges faith based on prayers, tears, humiliation, sorrows, reformation, and obedience. An assured faith is grounded in an objective reality, namely, Christ’s covenant and promise.¹¹²

Though Crisp does not overtly link predestination with assurance, Wallace is correct in that for most Puritans the doctrine of assurance was tied to predestination.¹¹³ Moreover, for Crisp, the solution to the assurance problem caused by the precisianists was to see that the believer’s apprehension of himself might differ from God’s apprehension of him.¹¹⁴ This alternative path to an assured state was in direct response to such precisianist manifestos as Thomas Shepard’s *The Sincere Convert* (1640), which argued that “true

¹⁰⁵ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 485.

¹⁰⁶ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 489-91.

¹⁰⁷ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 491-4.

¹⁰⁸ Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 195-6; Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 269.

¹⁰⁹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:5, 82. Cp. John Goodwin, *Redemption Redeemed* (London, 1651), 108-9.

¹¹⁰ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 98-9; Scott Paul Gordon, *The Power of the Passive Self in English Literature, 1640-1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 39, 45, 47-50, 54.

¹¹¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1643), 65. Quoted in Scott Paul Gordon, *The Power of the Passive Self in English Literature, 1640-1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 45.

¹¹² Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 255.

¹¹³ Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 91, 195-6.

¹¹⁴ Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 45-47.

believers” were scarce, and that there was “great difficulty” in attaining “saving conversion.”¹¹⁵

5.4.3 *Covenant of Works and Grace*

Crisp’s discussions on covenant theology are seen in his sermons on the covenant of grace, where he distinguishes between two general covenants that God enters into with humanity.¹¹⁶ The first covenant is called the “old covenant” or the covenant of works and stood upon the terms “Do this, and live.” The second covenant is the new covenant of free grace. For Crisp, Christ is likely the first covenant given to men, even the covenant of works, and though it is not a covenant of grace as the second covenant is, it may in some sense be called a covenant of grace in reference to creation.¹¹⁷ The covenant of works differs from the covenant of grace in that it was based on a stipulation with conditions on both sides: on God’s part was the promise of life upon obedience and on man’s part was obedience (“Do this, and live”).¹¹⁸ However, man broke this covenant and so God was free from giving life and thus humanity lay under the curse of the breach of the covenant.¹¹⁹ The covenant of grace differs from the covenant of works in that there are no conditions to this covenant. Crisp explains that since the covenant of grace is an *everlasting covenant* that it cannot be tied to conditionality; moreover, since God performs the covenant by uniting himself to his people, purging and cleansing them from their sins, there can be no conditions.¹²⁰ Further, faith is not the condition of the covenant and is simply the manifestation of justification.¹²¹

For Crisp, Christ can be identified with the covenant of grace in a threefold sense: first, Christ is the covenant *fundamentally*, in the sense that he is the one who establishes or originates the covenant with the Father; here Crisp describes Christ as being the maker, undertaker, dispatcher, and author of the covenant who manages the whole affair. Second, Christ is the covenant *materially*, as he both represents God to the people, by becoming human, and the people to God, by being mystically united to them as Head. Third, Christ

¹¹⁵ Thomas Shepard, *The Sincere Convert, Discovering the Paucity of True Beleevers and the Great Difficulty of Saving Conversion* (Cambridge, 1640).

¹¹⁶ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 74-92, 241-59, 501-47. See Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 85-86; Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 81-118. Perry Miller states that Crisp began “as an orthodox federalist, basing the Covenant of Grace between man and God upon an anterior Covenant of Redemption between Christ and the Father, but came to the same conclusion as Anne Hutchinson that the Covenant of Grace had nothing to do with moral behavior...therefore no ethical duty could be imposed upon, or any response expected, from mankind.” Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 219. For an overview of the covenant of grace within Puritanism, see John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (1986; repr., Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010), esp. 53-86, 155-91.

¹¹⁷ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 79. See also Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, 148-55.

¹¹⁸ Other theologically high Calvinists, such as Bunyan, did not believe in the covenant of works. Roger Sharrock, ed., *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan: The Doctrine of the Law and Grace Unfolded and I Will Pray With the Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), xxv.

¹¹⁹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 80.

¹²⁰ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 82-3.

¹²¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 84-7.

is the covenant *equivalently* in the sense that once the believer has the “earnest of salvation” (Christ himself) he or she has the whole covenant, even though there is progress in the Christian life.¹²² Trueman notes that this latter sense is problematic for those who dismiss Crisp as antinomian “*tout court*,” that is, if there is progress in the Christian life then there is need for a more nuanced understanding of how time and eternity coalesce, which, in turn, affects the timing of justification. Further, Crisp’s notions of the covenant of grace parallel the Christological representations of Owen’s own understanding of covenant theology.¹²³

Crisp emphasizes the absolute and unconditional nature of the covenant of grace in that all the benefits that Christ is or that Christ can be to the believer is a gift which is given upon no other consideration than the Father’s good will. Thus, in administering the covenant, God requires nothing from man and will not give Christ to those who not take him freely. Further, there is no vileness or sinfulness that can bar anyone from having a full part and portion in Christ.¹²⁴ Rutherford cites and critiques Crisp on this point. Says Rutherford, “But the question is, of Christs order of bringing us to believe and close with Christ; and the question is, whether a damned Pharisee on his high horse of merits and law-righteousness, an *undaunted Heifer*, a *Simon Magus*, a despitiful *Atheist*, *Elymas* a Witch never broken, nor convinced by the law, must in that distance to Christ and the Gospel, be charged to believe an everlasting love of election toward himselfe, and without more adoe, be led to the *Kings chamber of wine*, to the flowings of soule-redeeming blood; or must he first bee humbled, convinced of sinne, burdened with everlasting burning due to him, and so led to Christ.”¹²⁵ Crisp proceeds to discuss how Christ is the beginning and Head of the covenant in that he precedes and oversees all its gracious effects.¹²⁶

Crisp further differentiated between the covenant of works and two covenants of grace (of the Jews and Christ). The covenant of grace with the Jews was administered by the priests and is not to be equated with the covenant of grace under Christ, which is a better covenant with respect to the remission of sins, the peace of conscience, and freedom from punishment.¹²⁷ Finally, the covenant provides tremendous comfort and assurance for the believer as God is forever bound to be their God.¹²⁸

¹²² Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 87-9. See Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 114.

¹²³ Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 114.

¹²⁴ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 90-2.

¹²⁵ Rutherford, *Spiritual Antichrist*, II, 3; Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 94.

¹²⁶ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 93-110.

¹²⁷ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 241-59. See Edmund Calamy, *Two Solemn Covenants* (London, 1647), sig. A2-3, where Calamy notes the various opinions of divines on the number of covenants. Burroughs is said to have held to three covenants but believed in contrast to Crisp that there were two of works and one of grace. Covenant theology within Puritanism often had a highly dispensational structure in how covenants were understood, such as Samuel Mather’s numerous “dispensations,” in which God in the Old Testament reveals the covenant. Karen E. Rowe, *Saint and Singer: Edward Taylor’s Typology and the Poetics of Meditation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 17-23. Crisp’s particular formulation of one Covenant of Works and two Covenants of Grace, as stated here, seems to be unique. Another source on covenantal diversity within Puritanism is Samuel Bolton, *The Trve Bovnds of Christian Freedome* (London, 1656), 128-62. Bolton’s work is interesting because printed with it is Bolton’s English translation of John Cameron’s *De Triplici Dei cum Homine Foedere Theses* (1608), which Bolton says, “...is...the best resolver that I have met with all of those intricate Controversies, and Disputes concerning the Law” (Sig. Aa). Cameron’s influence on

With John Saltmarsh, Robert Towne, John Traske, and other “high” Calvinists, Crisp emphasized the absolute and unconditional nature of the covenant of grace; he sought to remove any sense of conditionality from the covenant because he saw such conditionality as compromising the integrity of the covenant with an undue stress on unreliable human activity. Crisp repeatedly stressed that Christ was an absolute and free gift, and was only given to the elect by God’s pleasure and will. This stress on the unconditional nature of the covenant should not be seen as properly antinomian because its burden was to remove any sense of human activity in the free grace of salvation, and to show that God was the sole architect of the covenant.¹²⁹

Thus, a more nuanced understanding of Crisp’s teachings on the covenant shows only partial affinity to high Calvinism. There is no discussion of the order of divine decrees, no doctrine of justification from eternity, and no mention of a Trinitarian covenant. Crisp’s twofold understanding of the covenant of grace and his equating of Christ with the covenant of works is somewhat unique. However, his emphasis on the unconditional nature of the covenant was consistent with Calvin, John Owen, and other Reformed orthodox.¹³⁰

5.4.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

The subjects of justification and sanctification in Crisp’s theology are significant in that he was criticized for teaching justification from eternity and for confusing justification with sanctification in ascribing the perfection of the former with the latter, thus compromising sanctification’s moral urgency;¹³¹ thus Flavel protests that “the

Puritanism (e.g. John Preston, Nicholas Byfield, Obadiah Sedgwick), has been well noted, but warrants further investigation. Cf. Richard A. Muller, “Divine Covenants, Absolute and Conditional: John Cameron and the Early Orthodox Developments of Reformed Covenant Theology,” *Mid-America Journal of Theology* (2006): 49-53; Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 218-19.

On covenant theology within Puritanism, see Perry Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” in *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), 48-98; Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), esp. 365-462 (see his “Appendix B” which lists the chief seventeenth-century works on the subject); David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); Michael Walzer, *Revolution of the Saints* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Christopher Hill, “Covenant Theology and the Concept of ‘A Public Person,’” in *Powers, Possessions and Freedom: Essays in Honor of C. B. Macpherson* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 3-21; William Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), esp. ch. 3; John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969); John von Rohr, “Covenant and Assurance in Early English Puritanism,” *Church History* 54 (1961): 195-203; and Von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (1986; repr., Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010).

¹²⁸ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 501-47.

¹²⁹ On the question of equating antinomianism with the unconditional nature of the covenant, see McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, 58-9.

¹³⁰ McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, 59; Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 103-15.

¹³¹ Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 71-73; Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 145.

Antinomian...makes our actual justification to be nothing else but the manifestation or declaration of our justification from eternity.”¹³² Como notes that the doctrine of justification before faith had cropped up repeatedly in the history of Puritanism, and cites Ezekiel Culverwell’s complaint in 1623 that “I see some honestly minded, to imagine that a man may be a true member of Christ, and so be justified, before he thus actually believe, and thereby apprehend Christ;” indeed, adds Como, the idea “appears to have spread with some speed and breath within the puritan community many years before the idea came to be associated with antinomianism proper.”¹³³ Where these ideas originated from is difficult to discern. William Pemble was circulating the idea of justification before faith (but not from eternity) at Oxford in the 1610s in a series of lectures on the nature of grace and justification by faith.¹³⁴ William Twisse, the first prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly and an erudite scholar, who advocated justification from eternity, was influential in Oxford in the early-1610s when he was a divinity student there. Twisse earned his D.D. from New College, Oxford, in 1614, and would later write an elaborate defense of supralapsarianism.¹³⁵

While most high Calvinists taught some form of justification from eternity, it is questionable whether Crisp did; nowhere in his published sermons do we find a clear articulation of justification from eternity.¹³⁶ Rather, there is some affinity to the work of William Pemble and his *Vindiciae gratiae* (1625), which distinguishes between justification *in foro Dei* (“in the court of God”) and *in foro conscientiae* (“in the court of conscience”),

¹³² Flavel, *Planelogia*, 260; Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, 94-101; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 114. Fesko, Coffey and Lim all say Crisp taught eternal justification. See Fesko, *Beyond Calvin*, 336 (n. 63); Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions*, 134; Lim, *Mystery Unveiled*, 358 (n. 128). For seventeenth-century responses to Crisp’s sermons, see Stephen Gere, *The Doctrine of the Antinomians by Evidence of Gods Truth, Plainly Confuted in An Answer to Divers and Dangerous Doctrines in the Seven First Sermons of Dr. Crisps Fourteen, which Were First Published* (London, 1644); and John Benbrigge, *Christ Above All Exalted, As in Justification so in Sanctification, Wherein Severall Passages in Dr. Crisps Sermons are Answered* (London, 1645).

¹³³ Ezekiel Culverwell, *A Treatise of Faith: Wherein is Declared How a Man May Live By Faith, and Find Releefe in All His Necessaries. Applied Especially unto the Use of the Weakest Christians* (London, 1623), 16-17. Cf. Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 204.

¹³⁴ Remarkable, such mainstream authors as Richard Capel, who was Pemble’s divinity tutor at Oxford, and John Gere praised the contents of the lectures and remarked how they were well received by those in attendance, which attests, in itself, to diversity of thought on justification within Puritanism.

¹³⁵ E. C. Vernon, “Twisse, William (1577/8-1646),” *ODNB*; Peter J. Thuesen, *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 49-54. Remarkably, no extensive study of Twisse’s theology and method exists. For fragmentary studies on various aspects of Twisse’s theology, see J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 99-156; Richard H. Popkin, *The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 99-103; and Stephen Strehle, *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: A Study in the Reformed Doctrine of the Covenant* (New York: Peter Lang, 1988), 104-11.

¹³⁶ Trueman comments that Crisp’s views are more sophisticated than the term “eternal justification” imports. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 114. For distinctions between high and evangelical Calvinism, see Ian J. Shaw, *High Calvinists in Action: Calvinism and the City, Manchester and London, 1810-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 10-36. Andrew Fuller called “high Calvinists” those who were “more Calvinistic than Calvin himself; in other words, bordering on Antinomianism.” Idem, *High Calvinists in Action*, 10.

distinctions that occur throughout Crisp's sermons.¹³⁷ This is not to suggest Crisp teaches that there are two justifications, but rather that there is one active justification before God with its passive receipt in the court of conscience, which is the evidence of faith.¹³⁸ Both Pemble and Crisp place the moment of justification before faith, at the time of Christ's death: "Christ justifies a person before he believes; for, he that believes is justified before he believes."¹³⁹ In fact, Samuel Crisp defended his father's doctrine of justification before faith by identifying it with Pemble and Twisse: "'Tis well known Mr. *Pemble* was no *Antinomian*, yet he saith, in concurrence with Dr. *Twisse* and Dr. *Crisp*...*In foro Divino...Justification goeth before our Sanctification; for even whilst the Elect are unconverted, they are then actually justified and freed from all Sin by the Death of Christ...*"¹⁴⁰

Crisp elsewhere describes the *obligation* of justification, which occurs in eternity, and its *execution*, which took place within time on the cross; and its *application*, which occurs in the womb.¹⁴¹ At the moment of justification the sins of the elect are forever discharged and forgiven and cast upon Christ, and the Covenant of Grace is fulfilled in its substance.¹⁴² Christ's righteousness, in turn, was transferred to the believer, even before he was born.¹⁴³ Thus, for Crisp, as for Pemble, justification occurs within time and not from eternity, even though justification has as its foundation God's love for the elect, which is from eternity, but this love is not justification itself.¹⁴⁴ Crisp allowed that in a sense no one is saved until he believes, but this refers to one's awareness of salvation, and not its fact.¹⁴⁵ Further, when one receives Christ one is instantly justified, and freed from all faults that may be laid to their charge: "There is not one sin you commit, after you receive Christ, that God can charge upon your person."¹⁴⁶ Faith is the fruit of union, and the evidence of justification, both union and justification occurring before faith and being the spring or root from which faith flows freely.¹⁴⁷ When one is united with Christ, God cleanses and

¹³⁷ Crisp writes, "You may consider justification in a double sense, and that, according to the opinion of our divines, there is justification in heaven, and in a man's conscience." Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 515-16; Samuel Crisp, *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated* (London, 1698), 27. Curt Daniel suggests that Crisp popularized this distinction. "Hyper-Calvinism and John Gill" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1983), 309. See William Pemble, *Vindiciae Gratiae: A Plea for Grace More Especially the Grace of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London, 1629), 21-22. Cf. Fesko, *Beyond Calvin*, 336-7; Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn*, 71-72;

¹³⁸ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 144-7.

¹³⁹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 356-7, 360; Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 141, 144-45; II, 345; Flavel, *Planologia*, 318-19; Boersma, *Hot Pepper Corn*, 71-74; Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 77-9. In his 1791 edition, Gill adds a note that "Justification before faith...has been embraced, affirmed, and defended by the divines of the greatest note for orthodoxy and piety, as *Twisse*, *Pemble*, *Parker*, *Goodwin*, *Ames*, *Witsius*, *Maccovius*, and others."

¹⁴⁰ Crisp, *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated*, 27.

¹⁴¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 365-66; G. A. van den Brink, "Impetration and Application in John Owen's Theology," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology*, ed. Kelly M. Kopic and Mark Jones (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), 93.

¹⁴² Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 141, 151-2, 512-16, 569.

¹⁴³ Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 145.

¹⁴⁴ Boersma, *Hot Pepper Corn*, 72-4.

¹⁴⁵ Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 144.

¹⁴⁶ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 7-8, 68.

¹⁴⁷ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), II, 381.

purges, sanctifies, and refines; indeed, Christ's righteousness is *imputed* to the believer.¹⁴⁸ Faith is the fruit of union.¹⁴⁹

For Crisp, justification was a distinct act from sanctification and preceded it. Further, while justification is a single act of God and occurs only once, sanctification is a successive act in which God sanctifies the believer again and again.¹⁵⁰ No matter how advanced one might be in the process of sanctification, it can never move one towards heaven, as only Christ is the way to heaven.¹⁵¹ This is because even the best sanctification is mixed with sin and pollution. Finally, Crisp divides sanctification, which he calls the end of the believer's love toward God, into two branches, mortification and renovation. Christ merited salvation and sanctification for the elect. Crisp cites in support of his doctrines various biblical texts. He does not, as Downname and Rous do, cite authoritative sources from church history or other divines, but he does, at times, refer to "our divines."¹⁵² Later, when controversy resurfaced with Samuel Crisp's publication of his father's work, there was a more concerted effort to identify Crisp's *unitas* with mainline divines, especially in the former's *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated* (1698).¹⁵³

Crisp's understanding of sanctification as distinct from justification is consistent with Reformed orthodoxy, though there is some question whether Crisp ascribed the gracious acts of believers to regeneration or the indwelling Spirit.¹⁵⁴ Where contemporaries criticized Crisp was in his deductions drawn from justification and in the way in which he chose to express himself. One of the more prominent critiques had to do with whether God saw sin in his elect.¹⁵⁵ This was a major point in Eaton's *Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone*, and the doctrine most often associated with antinomianism; however, it is questionable whether Crisp actually held this view, at least as stated by Eaton (Crisp never used Eaton's phrase "God sees no sin"); indeed, Crisp's understanding of the accounting of sin in the divine books seem to be more nuanced than that of Eaton or his protégés. Crisp distinguishes between actual sins, which God sees, and sins thus imputed to Christ; while all of the believer's sins are imputed to Christ (presumably at the moment of Christ's death *in time*), such sins no longer hold a *condemnatory* power over the believer; he or she is truly free from them and the curse they bear. Christ thus bearing all and nailing them to the cross. It is, says Crisp, *as if* the believer had committed no sin.¹⁵⁶

¹⁴⁸ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 270-71, 419-20, 428; Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 139. Cf. Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 73-75.

¹⁴⁹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), II, 346, 349-50, 365-86.

¹⁵⁰ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 473.

¹⁵¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), I, 77.

¹⁵² Contrast this with Eaton's practice of source citing.

¹⁵³ The "mainline" Puritan Thomas Cole is reported to have said, for instance, that if he only had £100 in the world, and Dr. Crisp's sermons cost half that, he would willingly spend it than go without them. Further, both John Howe and William Bates are reported to have said that if Dr. Crisp is an antinomian, so are they. Samuel Crisp, *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated* (London 1698), 13-14.

¹⁵⁴ Robert Lancaster, one of Crisp's disciples, was purported to have said that faith and repentance are as much graces as food, money, or clothes, the true grace being God's testimony of love to the soul. See Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 172-73.

¹⁵⁵ Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 82-84; Winship, *Making Heretics*, 264.

¹⁵⁶ Cp. Eaton, *Honey-Combe of Free Justification*, 362-65, with Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1643), 146-47; and Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), 286-88; 405-6. See Bozeman, "John Eaton as Contra-Puritan," 638-54. Bozeman sees Crisp's view as a variant of Eaton's. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 197.

Crisp insists that sin is *imputed* to Christ so as to make Christ a sinner; not that he had actually *committed* sin, which was impossible, but only that he bore the sins of the elect by imputation. It was this kind of language which brought disfavor with some of the orthodox, and a point for which Rutherford repeatedly assailed him. Both Daniel and McKelvey believe that Rutherford misrepresents Crisp's teachings on the imputation of sin to Christ, and, in fact, sets forth a position of double imputation similar to Crisp's.¹⁵⁷

Many of Crisp's statements could be taken in an orthodox sense. This is one reason for the divide among them; and, as later defenders of Crisp would point out, Crisp's enemies would as often misread or misinterpret his meaning as they did properly interpret him. That Crisp endorsed a rigorous spirituality is evidence of his Puritan focus.¹⁵⁸ That he chose to criticize precisianist piety for its introspection is indicative of the discontent then circulating among the more "radical" London clergy.¹⁵⁹

Whether Crisp was more influenced by Twisse or Pemble is not so certain. J. I. Packer suggests that Twisse had the formative role, but given Crisp's closer affinity to Pemble, and the fact that when Crisp entered Balliol College, Oxford, in 1626, Pemble's *Vindiciae Gratiae* had been recently published, it seems probable that Pemble, not Twisse, had more influence.¹⁶⁰ Whoever influenced whom, the antinomian-like trajectories before the English Civil Wars, which caught the attention of the Westminster Assembly, and which were challenged in the *aula orthodoxae*, were never officially charged "heresy;" that is, outside of Presbyterian heresiographies. Crisp's doctrines, in spite of accusations, did not breach the greater consensus that could be found in Pemble and Twisse, among others. It was disheartening for Samuel Crisp that the same doctrine could be called "orthodox" in one, and "heresy" in another, which suggests that opposition to Crisp was based on more than his idea that justification preceded faith.¹⁶¹

In sum, Crisp taught justification before faith but not from eternity. In this context, faith manifests what was before hidden, and declares the presence of the righteousness of Christ which was before faith.¹⁶² Though Crisp writes of the eternal love of God the Father for the elect, he does not by this mean eternal justification. While the mainstay of Reformed orthodox writers repudiated the doctrine of justification from eternity, such as the mature Owen, other noted theologians, as William Twisse, Johannes Maccovius, and Thomas Goodwin, advocated some form of the doctrine that would characterize later generations of theologically "high" Calvinists. Though Baxter equated justification before faith, and from eternity, as being the "pillar" of Antinomianism, the

¹⁵⁷ Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," 184; McKelvey, "Eternal Justification," 233; Rutherford, *Spiritual Antichrist*, II, 18.

¹⁵⁸ Peter Lineham, "Antinomianism," in *The Encyclopedia of Protestantism, Vol. 1:A-C*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (New York: Routledge, 2004), 128-30.

¹⁵⁹ Peter Lake and David Como, "'Orthodoxy' and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of 'Consensus' in the London (Puritan) 'Underground,'" *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), 34-70.

¹⁶⁰ Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 50; J. I. Packer, *The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003), 250. The Puritan Robert Harris, sometime President of Trinity College, Oxford, was said to do nothing without Pemble "especially in Divinity." William Durham, *The Life and Death of...Robert Harris, D.D.* (London, 1662), 20-21; Stephen Wright, "Harris, Robert," *ODNB*.

¹⁶¹ Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 99-100; McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism," 237-45, 259-62; Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," 17-30.

¹⁶² Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 3:225.

correlation is not so simple. Crisp's concern was to remove any sense of human activity being ascribed a *causative* role in justification; faith, therefore, must be subsequent to justification, and correlated with coming to awareness of one's justification before God. Crisp understood justification within a strictly Christological and covenantal framework.¹⁶³

5.4.5 *Law and Gospel*

The dialectic of law and gospel relates, practically, to the role of the law in the preaching of the gospel and its place as a moral compass in the life of the believer. It was the hinge upon which the antinomian controversies had spun.¹⁶⁴ Within British Puritanism, this distinction traces to the first generation Puritans and earlier, where law and gospel was the governing hermeneutic of the Bible.¹⁶⁵ Calvin, following Melancthon, had proposed three uses of the law: *usus politicus*, to restrain sin within society by the passing of edicts and laws against immorality; *usus pedagogus*, within the church's teaching ministry to lead people to Christ; and *usus normativus*, or as a moral compass for the believer's conduct.¹⁶⁶ Few religious radicals in the seventeenth century denied the first use of the law and thus taught anarchy; however, the second and third uses of the law were often divisive matters among the Reformed, as some believed only the gospel, and not the law, should be preached to believers, such as John Saltmarsh, or that there was an imbalance within precisianist piety with a needless emphasis on the terrors of the law.¹⁶⁷ Within this context Crisp preached to his hearers: "If you be freemen of Christ, you may esteem the curse of the law as no more concerning you than the laws of England concern Spain."¹⁶⁸ In 1646, Anthony Burgess, a delegate from Warwickshire to the Westminster Assembly, critiqued Crisp for this statement and suggested that Crisp here taught lasciviousness or lawlessness.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶³ Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 114; McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism," 261.

¹⁶⁴ Rutherford, *Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist*, 120; David Parnham, "Soul's Trial and Spirit's Voice: Sir Henry Vane against the 'Orthodox,'" *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 70, No. 3 (September 2007): 375-85.

¹⁶⁵ Only later in Puritanism would the covenant supersede law/gospel distinctions. John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 93; Primus, "Lutheran Law and Gospel in the Early Puritan Theology of Richard Greenham," *Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 3 (Autumn, 1994): 287-98.

¹⁶⁶ Richard A. Muller, "Ordo docendi: Melancthon and the Organization of Calvin's *Institutes*, 1536-1543," in *Melancthon in Europe: His Work and Influence Beyond Wittenberg*, ed. Karin Maag (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999), 138; Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, 38; John Witte, Jr. *The Reformation of Rights: Law, Religion, and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 39-80.

¹⁶⁷ Thus John Saltmarsh accused mainstream precisianist divinity for preaching "usually but a Grain or Dram of Gospel, to a Pound of Law." Saltmarsh, *Free Grace: Or, The Flowing of Christ's Blood Freely to Sinners* (London: John Marshall, 1700), 38. Walter Cradock said that Christ had "dissolved those little childish laws, those beggarly Rudiments." Quoted in Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory*, 107.

¹⁶⁸ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 19; cf. Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, 15; Ariel Hessayon, "The Making of Abiezer Coppe," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (January 2011): 52. Gill notes that Burgess misrepresents Crisp's meaning in that Crisp had meant that Christ's free-man should esteem the curse of the law (not the law itself) as no more concerning him than the laws of England concern Spain.

¹⁶⁹ Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, 15.

Regardless of precisianist criticisms, however, the questions we are here concerned with are (a) to what extent did Crisp believe the law could be used in preaching Christ to sinners; (b) did Crisp believe that the law was a moral compass or guide for believers; (c) in what sense did Crisp believe the law to be abrogated or done away with; and (d) does Crisp share any affinity with the mainstream in his law/gospel distinctions?¹⁷⁰

Crisp's understanding of the law and gospel is more complex than the simple charge of antinomianism would suggest; he did not throw out every positive use of the law. Rather, for Crisp, there were five distinct ways the law could be understood: First, in respect to the "Rules of Righteousness" the believer is still under the law, else lawlessness prevails; however, the law being the rule of life does not mean that the law *gives* life, as it was in its intent; thus, "A Believer is not tied to seek Life by his Obedience to the Law, but by his Faith in Christ."¹⁷¹ Second, as to the *curse* of the law the believer is free, Christ being made a curse for them and enduring the wrath which their sins deserved. Third, the law required perfect obedience to every jot and tittle "for matter, manner, measure, time, and end" of every duty; Christ has removed this rigor so that a believer's weak performances, if they are sincere, are accepted by him. Fourth, Christ has abolished the "irritating" or provoking power of the law, so that, with Paul, believers can say, "I am dead unto the Law." Fifth, the law offers no comfort for believers since it is impossible to live to its standard; however, Christ removes the rigor and stress caused by the law and brings comfort to his beloved and empowers them to do what they before could not do.¹⁷²

In sum, Crisp did not deny that the law had some use for believers as they sought to live the godly life, but he did reject the *curse* or *condemnatory* power of the law for believers. Thus, the law could not be used as the glass of righteousness in which one could examine oneself to see if they are in the faith.¹⁷³ Further, the law could not give life as eternal life can only be found by faith in Christ. Crisp was sensitive to the charges that his teachings taught waywardness and though he embraced the term "libertine" he did not by it mean lawlessness.¹⁷⁴

Precisianist criticisms of Crisp centered on the moral *implications* or *consequences* of his teachings; for instance, to disparage the law as Crisp and other antinomians did was believed to remove any sense of moral urgency or motive for good works.¹⁷⁵

5.4.6 Christian Life and Piety

In spite of precisianist criticisms that Crisp's teachings tended toward ungodliness or lawless living, there is little evidence to support them.¹⁷⁶ Crisp was reacting to what he

¹⁷⁰ Stoever writes, "Formally, much of Tobias Crisp can be derived from Perkins and Ames, if certain elements in the latter's theology are highlighted and others are suppressed." Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 233. See also Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 84-85; cf. Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, 14-15, 208-10, 212-20.

¹⁷¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, IV, 89-94.

¹⁷² Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, IV, 93-95.

¹⁷³ Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 157.

¹⁷⁴ Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, 33-34.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Williams, *Gospel Truth*, 120-52, 207-34.

¹⁷⁶ See Cooper, "The Antinomians Redeemed," 251-62.

believed to be a legal strain within mainstream piety.¹⁷⁷ Crisp encouraged an intense spirituality that rose above mere legalism; he taught his parishioners to be active in doing good in church and society.¹⁷⁸ To love God is to deny ungodliness.¹⁷⁹ Further, wherever the grace of God brings salvation the heart is inclined towards new obedience. This necessary obedience exists in three parts: first, there is obedience *ex parte Dei* or obedience before God in that God in Christ has engaged himself to establish and set up obedience in the heart and life of those whom he saves; second, there is a necessary relation *ex parte rei* in that obedience and free grace are proportionate and connatural with each others; and third, obedience is necessary *ex parte nostri*; that is, in regard to oneself, having submitted oneself to God and living a life of gratitude for being set free.¹⁸⁰ With regard to the question whether sin still exists within believers, Crisp writes, “[When the Apostle John] speaks of Gods forgiving freely, he would not have people mistake, as if his revealing of pardon of sin, did intimate, that people did not sin any more...sin we do, but the grace of God stands in this, that when we sin, sin is forgiven, and it is an act of justice for God to forgive these sins that are committed.”¹⁸¹

While Crisp’s *Christ Alone Exalted* contains various aspects of the life of piety, such as being active in good works, its main focus, time and again, is to remedy what was seen as a legal strain within English divinity; thus, the majority of sermons confront controversial themes in mainstream piety, such as the implications of one’s sins being cast upon Christ, to what degree God sees or remembers the sins of believers, how faith is to be expressed and assured, and whether forgiveness precedes confession.¹⁸² For Crisp, God casts the sins of believers upon Christ and remembers them no more; that is, the transgressions of the members of Christ “come not into the thoughts of God, so as...to think that such and such a man stands guilty before him.”¹⁸³ This divine forgetting of sins occurs from the time believers enter into covenant with God through the Covenant of Grace and forevermore.¹⁸⁴ Crisp believes that a Christian should be sensible of their sin, but should also know that their sins are forgiven before confession.¹⁸⁵ Though Crisp taught that sin can do the believer no harm, Curt Daniel notes that this is to be interpreted in the context of Romans 8:28 in that God overrules sin in believers so that all things, even sin, eventually work out for their own good. Thus, sin cannot condemn those whom God has elected and justified.¹⁸⁶ Further, Gill puts Crisp’s comments within the context of

¹⁷⁷ Bozeman calls Crisp a “disillusioned [veteran] of Puritan piety.” Bozeman, “John Eaton as Contra-Puritan,” 641.

¹⁷⁸ Lineham, “Antinomianism,” 129.

¹⁷⁹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 4:33.

¹⁸⁰ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 4:35-6.

¹⁸¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 548-49.

¹⁸² For instance, Crisp goes so far as to say that God made Christ sin. Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 270. See also Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, 84-104, 105-20, 183-210; Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 104-37; Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 71-73.

¹⁸³ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 166-7.

¹⁸⁴ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 167. Crisp answers the objection that when believers confess their sins, God then brings it into remembrance by saying this is according to man’s understanding; for God, in mystery, does not bring the believer’s sins to remembrance after he has cast them off forever. Cf. Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 167-74.

¹⁸⁵ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 325; cf. Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, 172.

¹⁸⁶ Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” 180.

alleviating a distressed conscience, but distances himself from employing their use; God does not see a believer's sin in order to condemn, but he does see sin in a believer because of omniscience and when chastising his children for waywardness.¹⁸⁷ For Crisp, though God sees sin his justified children in the *fact*, he does not see it to condemn.¹⁸⁸

5.5 Conclusion

Within the literature, Tobias Crisp has been called both a “radical” and an “antecedent to the Ranters.” Much controversy has surrounded his ministry, as specially concern his alleged antinomian doctrines, and disparaging of the law as a rule for godly conduct. Though some members of the Westminster Assembly proposed that his books be burned, other members, such as William Twisse, were favorable to Crisp's doctrines and could see nothing unorthodox in them. Crisp's sermons *Christ Alone Exalted* went through numerous editions before their final and definitive edition in 1690. Their content show a Puritan pastor who was thoroughly imbibed in the theological identity of “mainline” Puritanism, but who sought to correct its deficiencies by stressing the highness of God's justification and grace, and the lowliness of human works. He did this as a paradigm for the actual attainment of assurance of faith, as opposed to the mere possibility of it. As such, he influenced numerous radicals who would later emerge during the English Revolution, and carry the antinomian strain to its logical extremities. Crisp's reputation was both vilified and defended. Though Baxter hated him, and the implications of doctrinal antinomism, Twisse, Cole, Mather, among others, believed that there neither was a doctrinal nor a practical antinomism within Crisp. Overall, Crisp's teachings, as seen in the doctrinal themes explored in this chapter, confirm that Crisp had much more in common with the orthodox than many have supposed. They further reveal that “mainline” Puritans were united around common themes as they sought to hammer out the best way to resolve the Puritan crisis of conscience, and though different, exemplified a *unitas* within *diversitas*. We will now turn to this last point in the next chapter.

¹⁸⁷ John Gill, *Sermons and Tracts* (London: W. Hardcastle, 1814-15), 3:8-19, 42-49. Quoted in Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” 180.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, 157-59.

Chapter 6

Unitas within Diversitas: Downname, Rous, and Crisp

6.1 Introduction

While recent academic trends have focused more on Reformed theological diversity, such findings do not suggest either a radical break with the past or the absence of a greater theological consensus and unity among its doctrines and piety, but rather an ongoing concern for further Reformation through a clarification of its doctrines and an interaction with confessional boundaries.¹ While there were debates and discussions that were clearly held within confessional limits and that dealt more with preferences for wording or ordering of doctrines than substantial differences, there were those discussions which threatened to rise to a confessional level (e.g. hypothetical-universalism) and those which crossed over (e.g. Socinianism, Arminianism) and which were taken more seriously.² Suggestions of Reformed theological unity should not minimize substantive differences where they do exist; nor should diversity within the tradition be exaggerated at the cost of its unity or *sensus unitatis*.³

Given the current academic atmosphere and tendencies towards deconstruction, it is essential to clarify how unity and diversity worked within Puritanism. Thus, in this chapter I will consider unity and diversity within Puritanism by comparing and contrasting the social contexts and theologies of Downname, Rous, and Crisp (with accents

¹ Richard A. Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 11-30; esp. 29-30. Another reason for theological variance has to do with concerns over heresy and heterodoxy; thus religious writers would often clarify a prior doctrine or expand on it in order to solidify confessional teaching and suggest its possible parameters. More broadly, Emidio Campi and Willem van Asselt have argued that the Reformed tradition should not be seen as a static movement, but as one that evolves in different but interrelated patterns and directions. It is possible to see mainstream Puritanism as a subtype of broader Reformed orthodoxy, with its own challenges, patterns, and currents. See Campi, *Shifting Patterns of Reformed Tradition* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); and Willem J. van Asselt, "Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 11-26.

² Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," 23-29; Sarah Mortimer, "Human and Divine Justice in the Works of Grotius and the Socinians," in *The Intellectual Consequences of Religious Heterodoxy, 1600-1750*, ed. Sarah Mortimer and John Robertson (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 75-94; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 13-38, 177-204. Jan Rohls sees internal polarities between strict Calvinists and those more broadly oriented as the impetus for criticisms of Arminius and his followers, whereas the latter were more tolerant of differences in theological viewpoints. Jan Rohls, "Calvinism, Arminianism and Socinianism in the Netherlands until the Synod of Dort," in *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. Martin Mulsow and Jan Rohls (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 3.

³ Edwardus van der Borcht, "The Unity of the Church and the Reformed Tradition: An Introduction," in *The Unity of the Church: A Theological State of the Art and Beyond*, ed. Edwardus van der Borcht (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 5.

to Baxter). I will assess whether any of their distinctive traits pressed or crossed over consensus on the confessions. Based on these findings, in the next chapter, I will suggest the concept of metanarrative as a way to understand *unitas* within *diversitas*, and propose a working definition for *Puritanism* going forward. As we shall see, current academic pessimism on defining Puritanism, while duly noted, should be overturned; the phenomena of Puritans and Puritanism and their classification has had a long and esteemed existence within the literature, and even with its irradiant confusion and perceived lack of a “static spiritual or moral ‘essence,’” the terms are not going away.⁴ Further, too much deconstruction and proposals of *Puritanisms* are, in the end, equally unhelpful, since though they curb notions of “rigid” monolithicism, they undermine Puritanism’s greater social and theological coherence, especially as expressed among confessionally minded Puritans.⁵

6.2 Reformed Theological Unities and Diversities

The topic of Reformed theological diversity has been the subject of several recent works, and relates, by implication, to the thesis proposed by R. T. Kendall’s *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, among others.⁶ Kendall has suggested that the differences between Calvin and his successors, such as Theodore Beza or William Perkins, as, for instance, on the extent of the atonement or the nature of faith, showed a radical shift in emphasis and break with the earlier Reformed tradition rather than a natural progression of variegated development.⁷ This thesis, known as “the Kendall thesis,” has been sufficiently repudiated; Muller, Trueman, Van Asselt, Helm, Beeke, and others have shown convincingly that while differences between Calvin and his successors do exist they are consistent with the trajectory of Calvin’s thought and are consistent with the earlier Reformed tradition.⁸

⁴ Catherine Gimelli Martin, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 32.

⁵ John Coffey has aptly called Puritanism an “evolving, protean phenomenon” while giving assent to “Puritanisms.” John Coffey, “Puritanism, Evangelicalism and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition,” in *The Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2008), 261.

⁶ R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Basil Hall, “Calvin against the Calvinists,” in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 19-37; Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969); James B. Torrance, “The Incarnation and ‘Limited Atonement,’” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983): 83-94; Charles Bell, *Calvin and Scottish Theology: The Doctrine of Assurance* (Edinburgh: The Handsel Press, 1985).

⁷ Kendall, *Calvinism and English Calvinism*, 1-9, 29-41, 51-78, 151-66, 197-208; Graham Redding, *Prayer and the Priesthood of Christ in the Reformed Tradition* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 98-101.

⁸ The “Kendall thesis” in substance was proposed before Kendall’s work. See Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 158-221. For repudiations of the “Kendall thesis,” see Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 63-104; Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark, “Introduction,” in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark (London: Paternoster, 1999), xiii-ixx; Van Asselt, “Scholasticism Revisited.’ Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-century Reformed Thought,” in *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, ed. Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 154-174; Paul Helm,

Thus, differences among the Reformed of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on the extent of Christ's satisfaction or the particular ordering of the divine decrees or the nature of faith and assurance, to name but three, should not be seen as a profound break with the past, but rather as a continuous line of Reformed exegesis, growth and development.⁹

This is important to note because when one considers diversity within the Reformed tradition, one has to understand that doctrines and clarifications of those doctrines develop over time; further, by the time of the confessional consensus brought about by the Westminster Assembly and thus the codification of English Reformed orthodoxy, there had already been a robust and diverse Reformed culture of ideas which is seen in the many Reformed confessions of the sixteenth century, and evidenced by the debates within the Assembly itself.¹⁰ That there was a pervasive harmony across the Reformed confessions suggests the greater unity among the Reformed, even when at their most controversial, and a desire to find common ground.¹¹

Many of the differences among the Reformed were held within confessional limits; others threatened to cross over or did cross over; yet, even within internal Reformed debates in the seventeenth century, there was an overarching unity and common theological ancestry. While such debates sufficiently contradict an older academic notion of a "rigid orthodoxy" when referring to seventeenth-century Reformed theology, they nonetheless confirm the core identities of such orthodoxy, and suggest a tradition that was to a large extent unified, even if varied in its background and sources.¹² We will now turn to Reformed theological unities and diversities within Puritanism more generally, and then we will examine how these relate to Downname, Crisp, and Rous, and then draw some conclusions.

Calvin and the Calvinists (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1999); and Joel R. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991). Though the "Kendall thesis" has been supplanted by current scholarship, there are still remnants of it in recent scholarship, as in John Spurr's *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (New York: Palgrave, 1998), 166-70.

⁹ Muller, *After Calvin*; Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1986). See also I. John Hesselink, "The Revelation of God in Creation and Scripture," in *Calvin's Theology and Its Reception: Disputes, Developments, and New Possibilities*, ed. J. Todd Billings and I. John Hesselink (Louisville: John Knox Press, 2012), 19-21; Joel R. Beeke, "Faith and Assurance in the Heidelberg Catechism and Its Primary Composers: A Fresh Look at the Kendall Thesis," *Calvin Theological Journal* 27:1 (1992): 39-67.

¹⁰ See Jan Rohls, *Reformed Confessions: Theology from Zurich to Barmen* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 29-264; Chad Van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1653, Volume 1: Introduction and Supplementary Materials* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Robert Letham, *The Westminster Assembly: Reading Its Theology in Historical Context* (Philipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing, 2009); Robert S. Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the "Grand Debate"* (London: T&T Clark, 1985), 175-94.

¹¹ For instance, the Heidelberg Catechism (HC) contains no article on predestination. This absence is because HC was an "ecumenically-protestant" document which sought to encompass Zwinglian, Bullingerian, Calvinist and Philippist notions. See Lyle D. Bierma, *The Theology of the Heidelberg Catechism: A Reformation Synthesis* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013); and Bierma, ed., *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, History, and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005).

¹² Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," 30.

6.3 Reformed Theological Unities and Diversities within Puritanism

Questions of Reformed theological diversity and debates within seventeenth-century British Puritanism have also gained recent academic attention.¹³ That there was a rich and vibrant diversity among the Reformed theologians of the seventeenth century on various aspects of its Reformed *loci* seems without question. Varying facets of Christ's satisfaction, millennialism, supralapsarianism, covenant, justification, and assurance were all at the forefront of seventeenth-century debate.¹⁴ While the Westminster Assembly and its standards represent a mammoth achievement in theological consensus, its various internal debates are suggestive of its underlying diversity. Thus, the codification of Reformed theology within the seventeenth century was not an end to its differences but rather a *litmus test* of its orthodoxy.

Debates among of the Reformed of the seventeenth century may be classified as *internal* or those that did not press confessional boundaries, and those which were *external* and threatened to or did in fact cross over such boundaries. Such differences should not be minimized for the sake of unity, nor should they be exaggerated at the cost of unity. Even when the Reformed were at their most polemical, there was still an overarching theological consensus both with the past and among themselves.¹⁵ British Puritans generally agreed on the existence of a covenant, for instance, though this too was developed over time, and had near unanimous consent on predestination and its practical implications.¹⁶ This is not to minimize significant areas of contention, but rather to suggest that while the pastors and theologians of British Puritanism engaged in debate with one another and often employed harsh rhetoric, there was still a clear sense of confessional unity on most of the other *loci*. As Muller has pointed out, there was an understanding among Reformed theologians that the confessions were "specifically worded to exclude certain positions," but also "very carefully worded either to discourage certain positions without overtly condemning them or to allow a significant breadth of theological expression within and under the confessional formulae."¹⁷ This understanding fostered a rich and vibrant interpretive confessional tradition that allowed for *unitas in diversitate* and *diversitas in unitate*.

¹³ See, for instance, Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," 12-30; Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations*, 2nd ed. (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 1-22; 293-320; Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., "Puritan Polemical Divinity and Doctrinal Controversy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 206-22; Richard A. Muller, "John Calvin and Later Calvinism: The Identity of the Reformed Tradition," in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 130-49; and Janice Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), 1-12.

¹⁴ Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," 17-29.

¹⁵ For the "Calvinist consensus" in the English Church, see Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); and Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 262-319.

¹⁶ J. Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 19-76; Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

¹⁷ Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," 29.

It is my contention that though there were significant points of dispute among the Reformed of the seventeenth century, there was nonetheless a greater sense of unity and harmony among its variants.¹⁸ This is evident in the numerous conciliatory works of the period, as Jeremiah Burroughs's *Irenicum* (1645), which sought to restore peace among the orthodox godly; in the similar aims and methods of the contested godly (as Peter Sterry);¹⁹ in doctrinal agreements and the various bodies of divinity; and in combined efforts to combat Socinianism and Arminianism.²⁰ Further, studies of orthodoxy and heresy, and the often-blurred line between the two, have also been the subject of more than one recent monograph, and suggest, at times, possible misrepresentation for polemical ends.²¹ Thus, given the current academic atmosphere on the codification of early modern Reformed theology and its reception throughout the seventeenth century, it is essential to attempt to shed some further light on this discussion, and strive to decipher how diversity and unity worked within the spectrum of English Puritanism.²² That there was a mainstream of Reformed opinion among English divines is without question: the various confessions and creeds of the period prove this point, as does the often-intense debate of the Westminster Assembly, the period's pamphlet wars, the polemics and proliferation of heresiographies, the numerous "bodies of divinity," catechisms, and countless practical works, all of which served to solidify Reformed doctrine and practice.²³ But there is more here than either a bare assent to the circulating Reformed theology or a blatant dissent among sectaries: There was a wider spectrum of unity and diversity, of unity amid diversity and diversity amid unity.²⁴

¹⁸ This unity can be seen in social contexts and theology; e.g. covenant and predestination. See Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 24; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, eds., *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996).

¹⁹ Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, 51-86.

²⁰ Burroughes purportedly put on his study door the motto: "Variety of opinions and unity in opinion are not incompatible." Quoted in Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610-1692* (Lebanon: Northeastern University Press, 1994), 168.

²¹ Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan, ed., *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), 1-50; 161-82; 241-60; David Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1-22, 191-236; David Loewenstein and John Marshall, eds., *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1-10; 108-59; Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 9-50; Muller, *After Calvin*, 63-104; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 377-477; Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 2-10; David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1-16.

²² R. N. Swanson, ed., *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (Oxford, 1996); Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, 3-8.

²³ I here use "Reformed" in a broad sense to refer to the theologians and theologies that stood within the Reformed community during and after its confessional codification; thus it refers to the Reformed tradition from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-eighteenth century.

²⁴ Thus, for instance, when one strips away polemics, there often remains an overarching sense of unity or a sharing of a common Reformed ancestry and reliance on authority and sources (e.g. both Rutherford and Eaton's shared use [and misuse] of Luther). Again, this is not to minimize substantial differences where they existed or to belittle significant departures from Reformed orthodoxy, but only to assert that the rhetoric of the seventeenth century was often laced with all sorts of unjustifiable charges.

As prior chapters have shown, in English Puritanism there was a strong consensus and continuity with core doctrines of the Reformation and often dissent only in matters of emphases or ordering of doctrines.²⁵ While it is true that at times dissent is more substantial (and thus potentially presses confessional boundaries), such as how a sinner is to be justified (*eternal justification, neonomianism*) or how deeply one is to experience God in this life (*mysticism, biblical authority, inner light*) or beliefs about the law and gospel (*antinomism, legalism*), it is equally true that even within this complex diversity there was still a greater overarching sense of unity and continuity with the earlier English and Continental Reformations.²⁶ Thus, for instance, all three authors (Downname, Rous, and Crisp) shared a reverence for the vernacular Bible and its importance in defining religious experience; even at their most mystical the Bible was the guiding rudder.²⁷ All three authors in this study, though representative of variant strains, stood within mainstream Puritanism, though others, such as John Eaton, moved beyond the mainstream and beyond Reformed orthodoxy. Indeed, as Nicholas Tyacke has argued, in the seventeenth century, there was “a radical puritan continuum,” and, as I will argue in the next chapter, a *Puritanism*.²⁸ And even with the myriad of complexities and nuances involved in the various formulations of the *ordo salutis* and such concepts as union with Christ and justification, there was still a harmony among theologians and religious writers on what union generally was and its benefits for the Christian.²⁹ The authors in this book drew on a vast wealth of theological inheritance and cited numerous and diverse sources, and yet all

²⁵ Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition,” 25-29.

²⁶ See Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, eds., *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); John Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 149-204; and Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: On English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), 245-72.

²⁷ John Coffey warns of “the folly of trying to understand the ideas of Puritan writers without reference to their principal intellectual source, the Bible itself.” Coffey, *Religion and the British Revolutions*, 81. Thus, one must duly consider the importance of biblical language and its categories, giving consideration to “scholastic, humanist, and Ramist influences on Puritan thinking” which emphasized more literal readings of the biblical text.

²⁸ Nicholas Tyacke, *The Fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603-1640* (London: Friends of Dr. Williams’s Library, 1990), 20-1; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 116; Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c. 1560-1643* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), 7.

²⁹ For union with Christ and justification in the Reformed theology of the period, see J. V. Fesko, *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology, 1517-1700* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 13-33, 251-68, 300-17, 380-84. Fesko shows the departure of later Reformed theology from Calvin on the logical importance of union and justification as it pertains to sanctification. He questions whether Calvin was normative for the later Reformed tradition and concludes that Calvin, while revered, was but one of many early modern sources. I concur with Fesko that Calvin was indeed one voice in the Reformed chorus, and with Muller that Calvin’s influence on later Reformed theology was prominent in many areas but not as the original source of their thought. This should not be seen as a defense or a condoning of the “Kendall thesis;” rather, only to comment on the actual source citing of the seventeenth century. Calvin was indeed influential, being cited by orthodox and heretic alike, but the status of Calvin as the supreme originator of everything seventeenth-century Reformed does not seem to have arisen until the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. For more on this, see Richard A. Muller, “Reception and Response: Referencing and Understanding Calvin in Seventeenth-Century Calvinism,” in *Calvin and His Thought, 1509-2009*, ed. Irena Backus and Philip Benedict (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 182-201; Muller, *After Calvin*, 63-104.

agreed that mystical union was always “in Christ;”³⁰ nor, for that matter, did they conceive of such benefits aside from a sanctifying Spirit; thus, among the Puritans, as has elsewhere been asserted, living the Christian life was utmost in their minds.³¹ Indeed, James R. Martel has observed that Thomas Hobbes was not alone in his interest in the Holy Spirit, and that such notions of a personal connection to the Spirit were markers of distinguishing Puritanism from both Catholicism and ceremonial Anglicanism.³²

This is not to say that the Reformed were always congenial towards one another, or that sometimes-fierce debates never occurred. Rather, I would suggest that even within the polemical furor of the Reformed there were still striking similarities. For instance, Samuel Rutherford, one of the most virile attackers of antinomism and enthusiasm (in his *A Spiritual Antichrist*) was equally charged for holding such doctrines himself because of his own endorsement of personal experience and affectionate religion, and which competes even with the most mystical utterances of Rous or Saltmarsh.³³ Rutherford’s criticisms were as often based on inference as on evidence; in keeping with common Reformed polemic, he was free and loose with all kinds of charges against those he disagreed with.³⁴ That such books as Thomas a’ Kempis’s *Imitatio Christi* were read and endorsed by both mainstream authors and radicals is further suggestive of similar or shared kinds of piety, as does their reliance on the major authors and sources of the Reformation.³⁵ Bernard of Clairvaux was not only a favorite of Calvin’s, but also among the Puritans.³⁶ Piety and the godly life were the strongest points of unity within English Puritanism and were, arguably, its *sine qua non*, as were notions of the covenant, predestination, and mystic union.³⁷ When one removes polemical jargon from even the most virile of pamphlets (or better, places them within their context of controversy), there often remains a sense of unity and similar aims, and a common theological method. This is

³⁰ Belden C. Lane sees “union with Christ” as the chief theme within Puritan experience. Lane, “Puritan Spirituality,” in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, ed. Philip Sheldrake (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 519.

³¹ Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 243-5. Cf. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*.

³² James R. Martel, *Subverting the Leviathan: Reading Thomas Hobbes as a Radical Democrat* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 179.

³³ John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 114-45. Cf. and cp. the many *Letters* of Rutherford (comp. 1664) with Saltmarsh’s *Sparkles of Glory* (1647) and Rous’s *Mystical Marriage* (1631).

³⁴ Coffey, *Mind of Samuel Rutherford*, 114-45.

³⁵ Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 34; J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 107ff. See also Maximilian von Habsburg, *Catholic and Protestant Translations of the Imitatio Christi, 1425-1650: From Late Medieval Classic to Early Modern Bestseller* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), 107-78; Ha and Collinson, *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*. Cf. Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

³⁶ Anthony N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 1999), 87-114; Charles L. Cohen, *God’s Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 6.

³⁷ As I will argue in Chapter 7, Puritanism cannot be equated with isolated doctrines or experiences; rather, Puritanism, while chiefly a movement of piety and godly reform, has to be seen as a cluster of traits interacting and interwoven at a specific period in time.

the case with such vehement opponents as John Owen and Richard Baxter, who, though they hated each other, were united in their vision for the godly life and in their use of scholastic method and acceptance of the Westminster Standards.³⁸

That there was some variance or variety within Reformed expression seems uncontested (such as minor differences in definition or emerging uses over the course of scholastic development), but to what extent were these Reformed writers at liberty to formulate their own distinctive theologies or to digress from the *status quo*; to what extent did they receive or inherit a theological language from those who went before; and do such differences reflect a radical departure or do they suggest continuity? Using Downname, Rous, and Crisp as case studies, I will here attempt to answer these questions. In short, Downname, Rous, and Crisp had much more in common among them than they differed, though they were not all cast from the same stone. Their disagreements did not press confessional boundaries, even though some of their contemporaries did push them. Thus, even in the instance of how to understand the doctrine of justification, whether to place its occurrence within time or eternity, there was a sense of greater unity among the Reformed, and a shared acknowledgement that whenever justification is to be placed, it was a free and gracious act of a sovereign God and without consideration of meritorious works (in this sense there was a common understanding among the Reformed and a consistent repudiation of Roman Catholicism).³⁹ Though there was a sense of unity in ascribing justification to unmerited grace, this is not to minimize differences where they do exist or suggest that they were inconsequential; numerous mainstream authors were vehemently opposed to eternal justification and believed that it led to lawless living; this seems to have been the motive for Baxter's suggestion that faith constitutes a "hot pepper corn" tossed into the fray, which, in turn, received criticisms for compromising the doctrine of grace. However the pendulum swung, Reformed theologians were quick to safeguard the doctrine of justification from both notions of undue liberty and a new legalism.⁴⁰

But where did Downname, Rous, and Crisp agree most? Their unity can be seen (1) in their social contexts, (2) in their theological convictions and heritage, and (3) in their pursuit of the godly life. Whatever Puritanism was, it was first and foremost a movement of committed evangelical Protestantism.⁴¹

³⁸ For a comparison of Owen and Baxter and their similar aims, see Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity*, 55-86, 137-68, 303-11.

³⁹ McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism," 223-62; Robert J. McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan's Holy War* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 44-73.

⁴⁰ Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001), 1-12, 15-45, 87-151; Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993), 41-56.

⁴¹ Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 3; Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 11.

6.4 Unity in Society

Any study of or attempt at understanding Puritanism must give due consideration to its social contexts and the greater narrative of the English Reformation.⁴² That Puritanism was a movement within a certain identifiable period of time has been shown in Chapter 2. Downname, Rous, and Crisp, all lived within the Jacobean and Caroline eras of English history, and were members of Stuart Puritanism. They all witnessed radical change in the English Church as it strived to fashion its own identity in the wake of numerous political and theological controversies. All three authors sought to advance their brand of Puritanism through the pen and godly communion. They directly influenced the reading culture of “the godly,” and radiate internal tensions and trajectories within that society.

Of the three writers discussed in this book, two of them were clergy (Downname and Crisp) and one was a politician (Rous). All three were respected in their spheres, though Crisp, by far, received the most criticism for his alleged antinomism, and challenge to precisianist piety. All three were educated at major English universities (Downname and Crisp at Christ’s College, Cambridge; Rous at Broadgates Hall, Oxford, and Leiden University); and all three studied theology, though Crisp seems to have been the most educated, having earned a D.D. Their lives thus reflect Puritanism’s greater concern for education, and in particular for a well-educated ministry, and strove to “keep justification by faith from becoming justification of illiteracy.”⁴³ Richard Greaves commented, “The Puritan problem was to prevent such an occurrence, and in doing so to avoid the pitfalls of an educated but equal congregation of saints and an uneducated congregation subservient to the whims of the clergy.”⁴⁴

All three were concerned with a Puritan Reformation of the English Church, and strived within their own spheres to bring it about through preaching, teaching, publishing, and politics.⁴⁵ Their sermons and treatises reflect growing concern over many social ills from the theater to poverty to drunkenness to Sabbath breaking; they were equally concerned for the poor as for the nobility.

6.5 Unity in Reformed Theology

While Downname, Rous, and Crisp, shared similar social contexts and agreed on the need for a further Reformation of the church, for the downfall of the papal antichrist, for an eradication of Arminianism, and for the advance of theological education, they were also united in many aspects of their respective theologies, showing significant agreement on (a) Doctrine of God and Humanity; (b) Predestination and Assurance; (c) Covenant of

⁴² See Todd, *Christian Humanism*, 1-21; Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 1-15; Leland Ryken, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were* (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, 1986), 1-23.

⁴³ See Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 1-8, 23-40, 121-41.

⁴⁴ Richard L. Greaves, *The Puritan Revolution and Educational Thought: Background for Reform* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 8-9.

⁴⁵ Patrick Collinson, “Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 32-57.

Works and Grace; (d) Justification and Sanctification; and (e) The Christian Life and Piety. Their social and theological contexts thus reflect the unities and diversities within British Puritanism and its *sensus unitatis*. We will now turn to a more thorough comparison of these themes.

6.5.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

One of the greatest (if not *the* greatest) threats to mainstream Reformed orthodoxy during the seventeenth century was from the Socinians, those who challenged the doctrine of the Trinity on rational and sometimes spiritual grounds. The doctrine of the Trinity was thus hotly contested between the Reformed orthodox and the heretics. While significant agreement existed among the Reformed, there were pressing challenges to this doctrine by the Socinians which demanded greater articulation and clarification. Indeed, much of the Reformed distinctions on the Trinity were formed in polemics against Socinianism and a growing appreciation for the scholastic method. Many of the Reformed wrote in defense of the Trinity or otherwise sought to clarify its doctrine, and thus contributed to a swelling “body of divinity,” which helped to clarify, sustain, and defend classical Trinitarianism.⁴⁶

One of the most influential manuals of divinity in Stuart Puritanism was Ames’s *Medulla Sacrae Theologiae* (1627), which Downname, Rous, and Crisp would have been familiar with. While Downname, Rous, and Crisp may have varied in minor aspects of understanding the Triune God or in presenting their views somewhat differently, there was a prominent consensus as to God’s existence, character, person, and work. This Stuart-Puritan consensus is reflected in Ames’s *Medulla*. They believed human language about God to be analogous and that ultimately God was characterized by incomprehensibility.⁴⁷ The essence of God is thus understood fully only by God; or, as Ames put it, “God as he is in himself cannot be apprehended of any, but himself...Dwelling in that inaccessible light, whom never man saw, nor can see.”⁴⁸ There was significant agreement on the *incommunicable* attributes belonging only to God, such as eternity, infinity, simplicity, omnipotence, omniscience and immutability, and on the *communicable* attributes that are shared with human beings, such as life or goodness.⁴⁹ They believed in one divine essence and argued that God was not an abstraction but a

⁴⁶ On the unity in the Reformed orthodox doctrine of God, see Dolf te Velde, *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School: A Study in Method and Content* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 246-55. See also Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1-15, 69-123, 172-216, 320-28; Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, 1-38, 147-204, 233-41. For a thorough explication of the Reformed orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, see Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, Vol. 4: The Triunity of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 143-381.

⁴⁷ See Larry Siekawitch, *Balancing Head and Heart in Seventeenth-Century Puritanism: Stephen Charnock’s Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012), 77-118, 147-92. Cf. Ralph M. McInerney, *The Logical of Analogy: An Interpretation of St. Thomas* (New York: Springer, 1971).

⁴⁸ Ames, *Marrow of Theology*, 9.

⁴⁹ See Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, Vol. 3: The Divine Essence and Attributes* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 212-26.

living being. He thus enjoys himself in infinite self-love and subsists in three distinct Persons. All three Persons are active in creation and salvation, and have different, though complimentary, roles.⁵⁰

Thus Downname, Rous, and Crisp, being fully Trinitarian, restated traditional Christian concepts drawn from the Bible, creeds, church fathers, and medieval scholastics, all of which were interpreted through the earlier Continental Reformation and their own English dogmaticians in what may be classified as a Reformed Thomistic and Scotistic understanding of the doctrine of God.⁵¹ For the Puritans, the Trinity was an essential article of faith, and one that was defended in their copious manuals of divinity.⁵² The doctrine was also used to promote experiential piety and love towards God, and became a basis for fostering devotion to the Triune God.⁵³ Further, historians have seen the Trinity as a central dogma in understanding as diverse Puritans as John Owen and Jonathan Edwards.⁵⁴

As they shared a common belief in the doctrine of God, so they shared belief in the doctrine of humanity and specifically its fall into sin and inability to achieve perfection or repentance on its own without the intervention of grace. Downname, Rous, and Crisp all believed in the total depravity of the sinner and thus restated and confirmed Reformed orthodox thought on this subject, though they varied in matters of emphasis.

⁵⁰ Ames, *Marrow of Theology*, 9-23.

⁵¹ See, for instance, Christopher Cleveland's *Thomism in John Owen* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), 11-18, which sets forth a case for "Reformed Thomism" among seventeenth-century theologians and moves the discussion of this theme beyond that of Peter Martyr Vermigli and Jerome Zanchi; and Simon J. G. Burton's *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's Methodus Theologiae* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 14-15, which sees "Nominalized Scotism" in Baxter's Trinitarianism. Cf. John Patrick Donnelly, "Calvinist Thomism," *Viator* 7 (1976): 441-55; Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden: Brill, 1976); and Otto Grundler, *Thomism and Calvinism in the Theology of Girolamo Zanchi, 1516-1590* (PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1961).

One of the possible ways in which Thomas was appropriated among seventeenth-century divines was in their conviction that knowledge of God was possible through analogical reasoning by way of using Aristotelian arguments of causation. Of course, such appropriations of medieval metaphysics were generally subservient to biblical reasoning and the systematic task at hand, and while Thomas was more influential in the doctrine of God than has often hitherto been acknowledged, so too was Scotus and other medieval scholastics. Further, it seems likely that both Thomas and Scotus were employed or appropriated at varying stages of a Protestant scholastic's career, often dependent the polemical needs of the day, and thus as Van Asselt has stated "terms like Scholasticism, Aristotelianism, Thomism, and Scotism can no longer be seen as referring to purely static entities." See Willem J. van Asselt, "Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 25; and Randall J. Pederson, "Review of Cleveland, *Thomism in John Owen*," *Westminster Theological Journal* 76:1 (2014): (forthcoming).

⁵² See, for instance, Edward Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity, Consisting of Ten Books* (London, 1654), 204-15.

⁵³ See, for example, Lewis Bayly's *The Practice of Piety*, ch. 1.

⁵⁴ See and compare Trueman, *The Claims of Truth: John Owen's Trinitarian Theology* (Cornwall: Paternoster, 1998), 1-46; and his *John Owen, Reformed Catholic*, 35-66, with Amy Plantinga Pauw, *The Supreme Harmony of All: The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2002), 1-18; Steven M. Studebaker and Robert W. Caldwell III, *The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards: Text, Context, and Application* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), 105-24.

6.5.2 *Predestination and Assurance*

The doctrine of predestination, while a hotbed of controversy between the Reformed orthodox and Arminians, was another prominent point of consensus for Downname, Rous, and Crisp. The doctrine has been called the defining feature of Puritanism.⁵⁵ Though Downname, Rous, and Crisp formulated the doctrine in slightly different ways (each adapting it to their own contexts), they agreed that predestination was *double*; that is, they agreed that predestination consisted of both positive and negative aspects or of *election* and *reprobation*; they also agreed that predestination was chiefly a consolatory doctrine in that it alleviated (rather than caused) anxiety for the elect. Predestination was important to their theologies because it magnified the sovereignty of God and salvation as an unmerited gift of God. Thus, it had both polemical and practical uses.⁵⁶ Further, they agreed that predestination does not remove or take away the liberty or conscience of secondary causes; nor does predestination mean that the human will is forced or coerced by God but rather acts willingly and without compulsion so that sinners are responsible for their sins. While the doctrine was important in their disputes with Arminians and Roman Catholics, its chief value lay in its devotional implications, and thus it was a prominent feature of their practical divinity, and was used to foster assurance for the believer, predestination being immutable and from eternity.

6.5.3 *Covenant of Works and Grace*

Alongside predestination, the notion of the covenant has also been seen as a central character of the Reformed orthodox writers of the seventeenth century, thus following earlier motifs in the Reformed theology of Zwingli, Calvin, and especially Bullinger. Again, as with the other Reformed *loci*, there was some variance in expression and growth over the first half of the seventeenth century.⁵⁷ Of all three authors, Downname seems to have been the most consistent with the greater burgeoning tradition. Crisp made his own distinct contributions in emphasizing the unconditional nature of God's grace and equating the Old (Mosaic) Covenant with the covenant of works and the New Covenant with the covenant of grace. Rous's notion of mystical union with Christ was undoubtedly made possible by a covenant of marriage binding God to God's people. Though none of the three authors were as fluent in the minutiae of scholastic definitions that would later characterize such covenant theologians as Cocceius or Turretin, they were nonetheless proficient in the biblical exegesis which gave rise to later developments of the doctrine.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, "Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560-1700," in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 6-9.

⁵⁶ See Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 79-111, 191-6.

⁵⁷ David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), 128-98.

⁵⁸ For the role of biblical exegesis in the rise of federal theology, see Brian J. Lee, *Johannes Cocceius and the Exegetical Roots of Federal Theology: Reformation Developments in the Interpretation of Hebrews 7-10*

As Van Asselt has commented, the rise of federal theology was “fostered by a desire to produce a system that was eminently practical and which promoted genuine devotion (*pietas*) to God.” Thus, for Cocceius, “theology has to do with the manner in which one acquires the love of God (*ratio percipiendi amoris Dei*).”⁵⁹ This inner motive was at the core of British Puritanism; thus Cocceius’s *doctrina est pietas* echoes Ames’s earlier *doctrina est Deo vivendi*. Though federal theology has often been derided for its scholasticism, it is important to note that federal theologians generally disassociated themselves from the *quaestiones stultae* of the medieval scholastics.⁶⁰ Though trained in both philosophy and theology, these theologians believed in *Sola scriptura* and used reason to analyze and assess but always with an eye to its limits and depravity. Their ultimate intent was not speculation but devotion (*doctrina secundam pietatem*).⁶¹

6.5.4 Justification and Sanctification

Downname, Rous, and Crisp all believed that justification was by free grace alone without any consideration of merit or works. Justification was believed to have been “in Christ,” though there were differences as to the placement of justification, either within time at the moment of believing (Downname, Rous) or at the cross (Crisp).

Differences between mainstream authors and so-called high Calvinists on justification were generally limited to its placement (e.g. before faith or at the moment of faith) rather than consisting of more substantial differences regarding its cause. Much of the variance among Puritans on this doctrine had, again, to do with its practical implications: What did a justified sinner look like? How does he or she behave? Does he or she have to prepare for it? Such questions gave rise to self-analysis and became a disputing point within Puritanism, and relates directly to the subject of assurance, its possibility and consoling properties.⁶² The doctrine of preparation for faith, articulated chiefly by Thomas Hooker, argued for several stages of the soul’s humiliation prior to justification or conversion.⁶³ Both the mature John Cotton and Tobias Crisp criticized this doctrine for introducing works into the process of salvation and thus compromising the freeness of divine grace.⁶⁴ Whatever differences in emphasis that existed between the precisianist and

(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 14-18, 23-72; and Willem J. van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603-1669* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 106-31.

⁵⁹ Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, 1.

⁶⁰ Van Asselt, “Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, edited by Herman Selderhuis (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 21. Van Asselt states that Cocceius’s protests against scholasticism are seen in a very narrow sense; that is, in introducing superfluous issues into theological discourse. Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, 102.

⁶¹ Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, 1, 125.

⁶² Joel R. Beeke, “The Assurance Debate: Six Key Questions,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 263-83.

⁶³ See Perry Miller, *Nature’s Nation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 50-77; and Norman Pettit, *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966).

⁶⁴ See John H. Ball III, *Chronicling the Soul’s Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1992), 73-200; William K. B. Stoever, “*A Faire and Easie*

the antinomian, they were essentially agreed on the formal doctrine of justification.⁶⁵ Rhetorically, both sides chided the other for either legalism or libertinism, but, having inherited the doctrine of justification from the Reformers, they were generally united in the *nature* of justification; that is, in *forensic declaration*; in distinguishing between *justification* and *sanctification*; and in believing that the *formal cause* of justification was the alien righteousness of Christ. Como suggests that the doctrine of justification before faith evolved out of mainstream Puritanism and was nothing more than an embellishment of the doctrine of justification through the alien righteousness of Christ.⁶⁶ There is agreement on the nature of sanctification as well, all three distinguishing between justification and sanctification with the latter being coterminous with the former and progressive throughout one's life. As mentioned before, where Downname and Rous differed from Crisp was in how far sanctification could go in confirming one's faith or status as a member of the elect; Downname and Rous saw such marks as evidences for faith while Crisp preferred to move away from discerning the signs or marks of grace to more objective grounds.

6.5.5 *Law and Gospel*

Was there a consensus on the use of the law for Downname, Rous, and Crisp? At first glance, it would seem that there were radical differences between how the precisianists and antinomians understood the role of the law to be. While this divergence is truer of more radical antinomians, such as Eaton, who arguably found no positive use for the law at all, the same could not be said of Crisp, who, as we have seen allowed for a somewhat positive use within Christian conduct. When Crisp did disparage the law, it was in respect to the law's power to condemn believers, or to discourage them in any way. This oppressive nature of the law was abolished in Christ, and had no place in the gospel, which brings comfort to the elect. In contrast, both Downname and Rous allowed for the law to, in some sense, induce humility and contrition in the believer, but even there the emphasis was not on what the law could do, but on what it could not do. It could not bring comfort or serve as grounds for assurance. Downname, Rous, and Crisp, all maintained that Christian's were free from the curse of the law, and agreed to its limited place within the godly life. They all feared that an overemphasis on law would produce a "meere morall Puritane."⁶⁷

Way to Heaven: *Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1978); and Stoeber, "The Covenant of Works in Puritan Theology: The Antinomian Crisis in New England" (PhD. diss., Yale University, 1970).

⁶⁵ McKelvey, "Eternal Justification," 226-37.

⁶⁶ David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 203. Cited in McKelvey, "Eternal Justification," 231-32.

⁶⁷ Robert Bolton, *Instructions for a Right Comforting Afflicted Consciences*, 3rd ed. (London, 1640), 70. Cf. Matthew Meade, *The Almost Christian Discovered; Or, the False-Professor Tried and Cast* (London, 1662), 38-49.

6.5.6 *The Christian Life and Piety*

Even with prominent consensus on major doctrinal themes, perhaps the greatest point of agreement between Downname, Rous, and Crisp has to do with their shared vision for piety and the godly life. Puritanism as a whole excelled in producing treatises that were of a more practical bent and dealt with how to live the Christian life.⁶⁸ Thus, Puritanism is best understood as a variant of Reformed orthodoxy, which laid emphasis on the experiential aspects of faith. Indeed, Hambrick-Stowe has said, “At its heart...Puritanism was a devotional movement, rooted in religious experience.”⁶⁹ Downname’s chief contribution to Stuart Puritanism was his *Christian Warfare*, a representative work known to have been authored by him; Rous’s chief work, *The Mystical Marriage*, was published to promote deeper piety and fellowship with the divine among his Reformed readers; and Crisp’s sermons, as a whole, dealt more with promoting his brand of piety than in expositions of particular doctrines or criticisms of individual thinkers. Thus, the *sine qua non* of the Puritanism of these authors is their overtly experiential emphasis. Their chief end, especially in doctrinal instruction, was to instruct laity in both doctrine and life, to balance head and heart, and to prepare their readers for heaven.

6.6 Conclusion

Downname, Rous, and Crisp represent three different strains within Puritanism (*precisianist*, *mystical*, and *antinomian*). Though there were disagreements among them as to certain features of core doctrines, these differences were often only matters of emphasis or ordering and did not cross confessional boundaries. While their theologies were not identical, and had significant variances in emphasis, they were united both in their social contexts and in their understanding of major doctrines and adherence to confessional orthodoxy. Their distinct theologies were variants of Reformed orthodoxy, and existed under the umbrella of British Puritanism, and thus reflect the elasticity of confessionally minded Puritans, and attest to *unitas* within *diversitas*:

First, they were united in their social contexts in their vision for the reform of the English Church and the advance of the Puritan Reformation. They shared a reverence for the vernacular Bible and biblical exegesis, and had a common distaste for popery and Arminianism. They had a desire to see Christians educated in theology and godly living, and conceived of the Christian life in terms of a spiritual battle.

Second, they were in significant agreement on confessional topics such as the doctrine of God and the order of salvation. They inherited a doctrine of God from prior generations in what may be classified as “Reformed Thomism” or “Christian Aristotelianism,” and were in harmony on the Person and Work of Christ and the activity

⁶⁸ For overviews of the Puritan ethos of godly discipline, see Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 77-8, 100-2, 129-32, 196-7, 203-5, 215-18, 237-8, 245-6, 292-3; and Bernard Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1-12, 87-220.

⁶⁹ Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 1-53, 278-88.

of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Christian. Though they had various emphases and went about the assurance problem in different ways, they essentially agreed on the nature of predestination, covenant, justification, sanctification, and providence. Their chief theological concern was to glorify God and to promote Christian piety, which was defined according to the parameters of the Bible, and the tradition they inherited from former generations. Their bequest consisted of both vocabulary and content from the earlier English and Continental Reformations. They prized education as a means to achieve godliness, but not as an end in itself.

While recent historians have recovered the varieties of religious experience the English religious culture of early modernism, and have pitched the idea of *Puritanisms* as a way of sorting out the definitions problem (see Chapter 1), when one considers *unitas* and *diversitas* as they relate to Downname, Rous, and Crisp, one can reasonably conclude that there is *unitas* within *diversitas*. Whether *Puritanism* or *Puritanisms* better account for this *unitas in diversitate* is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 7

Defining Puritans and Puritanism: Narrative and Metanarrative

7.1 Introduction

While a sufficient definition of English Puritanism continues to elude historians, this has not stayed the use of the terms *Puritan* and *Puritanism*.¹ In the first chapter we saw, briefly, how various historians have attempted to define Puritanism.² We also saw that some leading historians, given the sheer difficulty of identifying a definition that is encompassing enough, are now referring to *Puritanisms*.³ This shift is not too different

¹ Most English historians continue to employ “Puritan” and “Puritanism” with confidence. See, for instance, Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1-12; Bernard Capp, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1-12; Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 10-15; Michael P. Winship, *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012); Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 30-31; Catherine Gimelli Martin, *Milton Among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 31-64; John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, “Introduction,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 1-18; Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1-8; N. H. Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003), 124-40; Ann Hughes, “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), pp 1-7; John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (New York: Palgrave, 1998), 1-16; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560-1700,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism* (New York: Palgrave, 1996), 1-31; and John S. Morrill, “The Impact of Puritanism,” in his *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), 50-66.

² In his essay, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” Peter Lake writes that “The definition of Puritanism is an issue which has been both addressed and avoided to great profit by many scholars. The result is that it is not a subject upon which there is anything very new to say.” Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives in a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993), 3. I agree with Lake’s tempered optimism, but would note that while there may not be much new to say, there is indeed the possibility of reappraising what scholars are currently saying and of addressing tendencies towards deconstruction, which is gaining momentum; indeed, Patrick Collinson has long agonized over the subject. See Alexandra Walsham and John Morrill, “Preface,” in *Richard Bancroft and Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), ix-xvi. See also Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983); Collinson, *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles: Clark Memorial Library, 1989); Collinson, “Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism,” in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

³ Michael P. Winship writes, “It has recently been suggested, somewhat hyperbolically, that it is more useful to talk of ‘puritanisms’ rather than ‘puritanism,’ for there were almost as many puritanisms as there were puritans.” Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 3. Here Winship has in mind Ann Hughes’s influential essay, “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000): 1-7, which is a brief assessment of Lake’s and David R. Como’s work on the subject. As early as 1974, H. J. Kearney wrote that there were as many “puritanisms” as “socialisms.” See Kearney, “Puritanism and Science: Problems of Definitions,” in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Charles Webster (New York: Routledge, 1974), 255.

from recent trends in Reformation historiography that speak of the *Reformations*.⁴ The ideas behind this are simple: there is simply too much diversity within Puritanism (and even more so within the Reformation) to write of monolithicism; the various theologies and expressions are too different and any collective term does not give due weight to the various overtones of sixteenth and seventeenth-century religious history; any attempt to classify Puritanism by its piety minimalizes the pietism of other Reformed writers; the phenomena, it seems, especially within an English context, are too loose and disconnected.⁵ But the lingering question is whether this deconstruction compromises something. With respect to the *Reformations*, Scott H. Hendrix believes so and has argued for a plurality of agendas within the Reformation rather than a plurality of Reformations. The united vision of the Lutheran and Reformed were to “recultivate the vineyard” or promote Christianization; further, all the various branches of the Reformation shared a common patristic and medieval spring from which they drew. Though there were many Reformation “orthodoxies,” they were united in a common vision for the Reformation of the known world.⁶

What of Puritanism? Is there more unity or more diversity within the tradition? Were the Puritans united in a greater vision of Puritan Reformation? Is it possible to write of *Puritanism* when discussing the more pious factions of early modern Protestant religion? Or, given the immense diversity of the religious groups associated with the tradition, especially during the English Revolution and afterwards, is it better to abandon *Puritan* and *Puritanism* altogether and come up with alternatives, such as *Reformed*, *Calvinists*, *Separatists*, *Radicals*, *Evangelicals*, the “*Godly*,” or simply *Reformed orthodox*? Or, was Margo Todd correct when she said, “a puritan by any other name is still a puritan.”⁷ Indeed, there are prominent historians on either side of the question; some have suggested abandoning “Puritan” and “Puritanism” while others have vigorously defended them; and still others have chosen other, seeming more appropriate terms, as just noted. All concede, however, to the immense historical and historiographical problems arising from their use.⁸ Should the terms be retained, how are we to understand them? Is there a

⁴ Cp. C. Scott Dixon, *Contesting the Reformation* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 9-12, with Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations*, 2nd ed. (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 1-22.

⁵ Francis J. Bremer, “Introduction,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 1:xiii-xiv. On pietism within the Reformed more generally, a clear case study is Johannes Cocceius, who combined Reformed theology with piety. More broadly, Stephen Foster writes, “Because practical divinity was so deeply rooted in its own time and place, many of its means for a ‘lively’ education in godliness were endorsed by a great variety of Englishmen who can in no sense be termed Puritan.” Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 76. For a partially opposing viewpoint, see Eric Josef Carlson, “‘Practical Divinity’: Richard Greenham’s Ministry in Elizabethan England,” in *Religion and the English People, 1500-1640: New Voices, New Perspectives*, ed. Eric Josef Carlson (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 1998), 147-200.

⁶ Scott H. Hendrix, *Recultivating the Vineyard: The Reformation Agendas of Christianization* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), xv-xxiv; and cf. the responses to Hendrix’s thesis in *The Reformation as Christianization*, ed. A.M. Johnson and John A. Maxfield (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

⁷ Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 9.

⁸ Perhaps the most comprehensive criticism of “Puritan” and “Puritanism” is C. H. George, “Puritanism as History and Historiography,” *Past and Present* 41 (1968): 77-104. The best defense of its use is

way of defining Puritanism that acknowledges both the unities and diversities within the tradition without having to abandon the term altogether or resigning to alternatives which have their own historiographical issues? Is it possible to distinguish between a confessionally minded tradition within Puritanism, and its more radical expressions? I believe so.

In this chapter, I will attempt to answer these questions and suggest that *Puritan* and *Puritanism* should be retained in scholarly use.⁹ This conclusion is based on the findings of this thesis and on a careful assessment of the massive body of literature on this subject.¹⁰ First, I will present a nuanced agenda for defining Puritanism. Second, I will present a case for metanarrative or the idea that one must consider *Puritanism* as a whole in order to understand its various parts. Third, I will conclude the chapter with observations on how *Puritan* and *Puritanism* should be applied when referring to sixteenth and seventeenth-century individuals. In short, I will criticize the use of *Puritanisms* while also conceding that Puritanism was by no means a monolithic movement, at least not in the sense of Puritans being centered on the notion of the covenant, but rather that there was within Puritanism a majority of confessionally minded Puritans.¹¹ This method, it is hoped, will set the course for future studies in that it reiterates the need for both narrative and metanarrative when looking at early modern intellectual and social history, and, by definition, requires consonance across various cognate disciplines. It suggests that Norbert Elias was correct when he observed that the individual should not be considered above his society, which in itself would tend to *Puritanisms*, but

Lake, "Defining Puritanism—Again?," 3-29. A tempered approach is seen in Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 5-11.

⁹ I am not aware of any recent historian who has actually, in practice, abandoned the term altogether, except Conrad Russell who opts for the synonym "the godly." Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 85. It should be noted, however, that any term used to supplant "Puritan" or "Puritanism" will have equal, if not greater, historiographical issues, as is the case with "Calvinist," "Reformed," and other like terms.

¹⁰ Thus John H. Primus's observation that "an entire dissertation [could] be devoted to the history of efforts to define Puritanism;" and Patrick Collinson's comment that a "secondary academic industry has arisen, devoted to the search for an acceptable definition." John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: The Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 4; Patrick Collinson, *English Puritanism* (London: The Historical Association, 1983), 6.

¹¹ I am here indebted to Janice Knight's *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994). Knight correctly sees certain polarities within Puritanism and questions Perry Miller's idea of monolithicism, but goes too far, I think, in seeing multiple "orthodoxies." While there were indeed multiple confessions in the seventeenth century, there was nonetheless great harmony and agreement on most topics, as is seen in widespread confessional consensus and such harmonies as the English adaptation of the Geneva *Harmonia confessionum fidei* in 1586 and the publication of *An Harmony of the Confessions of the Christian and Reformed Churches* (1643). Thus, while Knight's classifications of "Intellectual Fathers" and "Spiritual Brethren" helps to illuminate various emphases within Puritanism, they should not be seen as rigid distinctions between opposing groups, nor, contra Knight, should orthodoxy be seen as a battleground. Indeed, Knight's major neglect in her work on "orthodoxies" is that she does not give due consideration to the flexibility of confessional boundaries or the overly charged rhetoric of the period's polemical works. Furthermore, disagreements among leading clergy do not suggest vying orthodoxies, but rather the various ways in which doctrines could be understood and restated within an orthodox sense. Cf. Stephen Foster, "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630-1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Oct, 1981): 624-60.

rather within and belonging to a society or plurality of persons who interacted with each other; and that Wittgenstein ideas of *Familienähnlichkeit* is further helpful in understanding both *unitas* and *diversitas* within Puritanism.

7.2 Defining Puritanism

As we saw before, defining Puritanism is wrought with difficulties, and has often led historians to give up the enterprise in utter frustration.¹² This is not only because the literature of the subject is immense, but also because *historically* there are many gray areas and often it is impossible to tell when and where the line should be drawn, as, for instance, between Puritanism and a moderate Calvinist consensus within the English church, or between its majority expression and its more radical developments, as seen in such figures as Giles Randall, John Milton, and Walter Craddock.¹³ Defining Puritanism is further complicated in that the use of the term is heuristic and its usage has changed over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Though the use of the term “Puritan” was initially pejorative, it nonetheless was an attempt to describe and react to something

¹² For studies of the problems and approaches associated with the definition of Puritanism, see Michael G. Finlayson, *Historians, Puritanism and the English Revolution: The Religious Factor in English Politics Before and After the Interregnum* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983); Basil Hill, “Puritanism: the Problem of Definition,” in *Studies in Church History*, Vol. 2, ed. G. J. Cuming (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 283-96; Peter Lake, “The Historiography of Puritanism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 346-71; “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” 1-27; Patrick Collinson, “Puritans,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Lawrence A. Sasek, *Images of English Puritanism: A Collection of Contemporary Sources, 1589-1646* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 1-27; John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 9-22; Patrick Collinson, “A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 483-88; J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620-1670* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 1-14; John Coffey, “Puritanism, Evangelicalism, and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition,” in *Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2008), 255-61; Coffey, “The Problem of ‘Scottish Puritanism,’” 66-90; and Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*, 1-27.

¹³ Michael P. Winship, “Defining Puritanism in Restoration England: Richard Baxter and Others Respond to ‘A Friendly Debate,’” *The Historical Journal* 54:3 (2011): 689; David R. Como, “Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 64-87; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 12. Indeed, Collinson and Tyacke have tended to view puritans as a “hardly-distinguishable” element among the Elizabethan church’s Calvinist consensus. Others, such as Fincham, Lake, and Webster see a more distinct group within that consensus. Cambers, *Godly Reading*, 12. Cp. Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1967); Collinson, *The Religion of the Protestants: The Church In English Society, 1599-1625* (Oxford, 1982); Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987), with Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982); Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford, 1990); Peter Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?”; Lake, “Moving the Goal Posts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), 179-205; and Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*.

real within the Established church;¹⁴ it is undeniable that its initial use was descriptive of a “hotter-sort” of Protestantism characterized by its zeal that was preoccupied with wanting simplicity in worship, and removing its various perceived “popish” ceremonies in an attempt to “ostracize all Catholics.”¹⁵ Some historians have aptly described this Puritan motif as “discontents.”¹⁶ This perceived discontentedness is the earliest use and connotation of the word “Puritan.” Indeed, this early status or connotation of Puritanism as a “movement” for ecclesial reform has led scholars to describe Puritanism chiefly within political terms, and coterminous with such environments. In other words, Puritanism is seen as one half of a stressful relationship within a particular set of circumstances. Where this overt tension does not exist, there is no Puritanism.¹⁷ Thus Collinson and Foster, among others, favor a more *nominalist* approach to defining Puritanism as a “movement” within the English church as opposed to more *realist* intellectual constructs, though Collinson has also defined Puritanism as a “strenuous search for salvation according to Calvinist understandings.”¹⁸ But, as said before, Puritanism cannot simply be defined in

¹⁴ Collinson notes that though the label “Puritan” first arose as “stereotypical stigma” that it was “a badge soon accepted by the so-called Puritans themselves.” Patrick Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), xiii-xiv.

¹⁵ R. C. Richardson, *Puritanism in North-West England: A Regional Study of the Diocese of Chester in 1642* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972), 160; John H. Primus, *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions with the Church of England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth* (Kampen: Kok, 1960), 4. See also Dwight Brautigam, “Prelates and Politics: Uses of ‘Puritan,’ 1625-40,” in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2003), 49-66; Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 1-12; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 27. Carl R. Trueman, who has grown increasingly cautious over the years, once defined “Puritanism” as “that tendency to push fore a more thoroughly Reformed theology and ecclesiology within sections of the Anglican Church between the early 1530s and 1662, the date of the most important Act of Uniformity. The definition is far from perfect; but it is probably as good as it gets...” Trueman, “Puritanism as Ecumenical Theology,” *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 81:3 (2001): 327.

¹⁶ See Laura Lunger Knoppers, ed. *Puritanism and Its Discontents* (Cranbury: University of Delaware Press, 2008). In 1974, H. F. Kearney defined Puritanism as “a growing circle of dissent.” Kearney, “Puritanism and Science: The Problems of Definition,” in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Charles Webster (New York: Routledge, 1974), 255.

¹⁷ Kenneth L. Campbell, *Windows into Men’s Souls: Religious Nonconformity in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2012), 15; Peter Lake, “Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 6 (fn 15); Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988); Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 14.

In *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton* (Cambridge, 1998), Achsah Guibbory divides religion in the seventeenth-century English church between “Puritans” and “ceremonialists,” but Kate Narveson cautions against too sharp of distinctions as the lines are not so easily drawn. Narveson, “Profession or Performance? Religion in Early Modern Literary Study,” in *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, edited by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002), 116

¹⁸ Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 20; John Coffey, “The Problem of ‘Scottish Puritanism’, 1590-1638,” 68; Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967), 33. I am here indebted to Morgan and Coffey for distinguishing between “nominalist” and “realist” approaches in the definition of Puritanism. Intriguingly, Primus calls Lake’s approach “nominalist,” which suggests, as Coffey has observed with Collinson, that various historians have different “modes” which teeter between nominalism and realism. My own approach is a convergence of the two. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 4; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 17. See

terms of its piety, or desire for salvation; were that the case, the whole of Christendom could be classified as “Puritan.”

Though there are generally two sides to the definitions problem; that is, those who question its usefulness (C. H. George, Basil Hall, Michael Finlayson, and Paul Christianson) and those who show more optimism (Patrick Collinson, Ian Breward, Peter Lake, John Coffey, David Como, among others), there exists a wide spectrum of ideas in between.¹⁹ Some have suggested that Puritanism had “no static spiritual or moral essence,” that it was a protean phenomenon.²⁰ Indeed, over the past sixty-five years “great effort has been expended on the attempt to devise a universally acceptable definition of ‘Puritan’ and ‘Puritanism.’”²¹ Various historians, at different times, have suggested different defining features of Puritanism, such as the covenant, experimental predestinarianism, millenarianism, assurance of faith, affective Biblicism, or even iconoclasm.²² For Sprunger, “the essence of Puritanism was a balanced combination of Calvinist theology and intense personal piety;” thus Puritanism is essentially to be identified as a highly experiential or “hot” English Reformed theology.²³ John Spurr claimed that Puritans “were simply more intensely protestant than their protestant neighbors or even the Church of England.”²⁴ Others, as said before, prefer to define Puritanism chiefly within its political contexts.²⁵ The major flaw in this last approach, however, is that it suggests the “collapse of Puritanism into the Calvinist mainstream” when there was not a strong overt “agitation for

also Patrick Collinson, “The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture” (University of California, Los Angeles, 1989); Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*; and Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Sapping of New England Culture, 1570-1700* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991).

¹⁹ C. H. George preferred “the Protestant mind” over “Puritan” but the former is too inclusivist in that a robust Anglican ceremonialism and thoroughbred Arminianism could equally be included in the term. In 1972, Breward predicted, “It is my conviction, that far from leading to the abolition of ‘puritanism,’ further study will lead to its reinstatement as an important factor in the causation of the civil war and the search for a new basis for church and society that marked the interregnum.” Breward, “The Abolition of Puritanism,” *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (1972), 34. I applaud Breward’s optimism because he rightly sees this fierier brand of Protestant religious experience as a causative force in the period’s society and politics. Cf. John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 9.

²⁰ Martin, *Milton among the Puritans*, 32.

²¹ Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 9.

²² David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985); Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*, 156-7; Lake, “Puritan Identities,” 118-19; Stephen A. Bondos-Greene, “The End of an Era: Cambridge Puritanism and the Christ’s College Election of 1609,” *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (March 1982): 197-208; David George Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 41; Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003), xiii.

²³ Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of the English and Scottish Churches in the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 457.

²⁴ Spurr, *English Puritanism*, 4.

²⁵ Thus, Puritanism, in this sense, becomes irrevocably tied to anti-Puritanism. See Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 1-12, 60-82; Collinson, “Antipuritanism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 24.

further reformation.”²⁶ This view essentially challenges distinctive characteristics within Puritanism, and should either be dismissed (for those who would define Puritanism solely as a political movement), or nuanced to allow for a distinctive style of piety and divinity. Lake and Como have suggested that the various internal Puritan tensions within Puritanism and its competing strands have, at times, had the potential to threaten the social order and its religious unity.²⁷ Arnold Hunt sees preference for the spoken word as distinguishing puritan culture.²⁸ Others have focused on various aspects of piety, the pious life, or “reformation of morals and manners.”²⁹ N. H. Keeble wrote that though “it is impossible to offer a precise definition of Puritanism in ecclesiological, doctrinal, or political terms, there is not, in practice, much difficulty in recognizing the puritan spirit.”³⁰ Thus, there is a certain intuition on what Puritanism is, though there has never been, and possibly never will be, a consensus on how to understand it. This intuition has, perhaps, most often identified Puritanism as a distinct forms of religious experience, which centers on divine love, both in the soul and in the life of the community, and an extreme sense of self-sinfulness.³¹ William A. Dryness sees within Puritanism a distinct approach to visual

²⁶ Lake, “Introduction,” 6 (n. 15); on Haigh and Walsham’s views on the internal tensions, see Lake, “Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke,” in *Religious Politics in Post Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 13 (n. 40). Foster criticizes this view when he states, “Frequent points of contacts...never added up to wholesale congruence, and it has become too easy to dissolve the Puritan movement in the larger culture of which it was a subspecies.” Foster, *The Long Argument*, 76.

²⁷ Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 439; Peter Lake and David R. Como, “‘Orthodoxy and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of ‘Consensus’ in the London (Puritan) Underground,” *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (January, 2000): 66-70; David R. Como and Peter Lake, “Puritans, Antinomians and Laudians in Caroline London: The Strange Case of Peter Shaw and Its Contents,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 50, No. 4 (October, 1999): 684-715; Ian Atherton and David Como, “The Burning of Edward Wightman: Puritanism, Prelacy and the Politics of Heresy in Early Modern England,” *English Historical Review* (December 2005): 1215-50; Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge: “Orthodoxy,” “Heterodoxy” and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002); Lake, *The Anti-Christ’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); and Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

²⁸ Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, 30.

²⁹ Bernard S. Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum 1649-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1-3; Bruce C. Daniels, *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), 3-26; Ronald P. Gildrie, *Profane, the Civil, and the Godly: The Formation of Manners in Orthodox New England, 1679-1749* (University Park: Penn State Press, 1994), 1; Dewey D. Wallace, *The Spirituality of the Later English Puritans: An Anthology* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987), i; Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982); Levin L. Schücking, *The Puritan Family: A Social Study from the Literary Sources* (1929; New York: Schocken Books, 1970); Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England* (1944, repr. New York: Harper, 1966). Patrick Collinson wrote, “a whole book could be devoted to the distinctive culture of the godly household.” Collinson, “Puritanism as Popular Religious Culture,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996), 56.

³⁰ Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” 125.

³¹ Charles Cohen, *God’s Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 3-5; Hugh M. Richmond, *Puritans and Libertines: Anglo-French Literary Relations in*

culture, which centered on attitudes toward popular culture, within a strict biblical framework, for which the Bible “was not a straightjacket, but a ‘rich and infinitely varied source of imagination and formal inspiration.’”³²

While there are merits in the many approaches to definition just mentioned, they are either too negative or isolationist. They either deny the heuristic use of the term or suggest a defining feature of Puritanism where there is none; thus, John Stachniewski sees English Puritanism as an impulse driven by intense predestinarian convictions, which lead to and are interwoven with religious despair.³³ R. T. Kendall’s notion of “experimental Calvinism,” which is again tied to predestination, does little to alleviate the problem, because while Puritanism was that, it was much more.³⁴ Indeed, predestination was a central and commanding influence among Puritans, but it was not the *sine qua non* of Puritanism because there were varieties of opinion on how it should be understood; further, it was a common doctrine among Catholics, Reformed, and Arminians.³⁵ Though predestination should not be seen as the defining feature of Puritanism, or of the Reformed more broadly, this is not to minimize the strong predestinarian convictions that the Puritans generally shared; indeed, as I have shown in prior chapters, predestination and assurance were often inseparable from the Puritan conscience, and great effort was expended in order to resolve the pastoral issues that it inevitably raised, especially as the movement grew in maturity and came into its own in the seventeenth century.³⁶

the Reformation (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 166. There is much warrant in seeing a distinctive sense of sinfulness, which are clearly depicted in the diaries of Richard Rogers, Samuel Ward, Thomas Shepard, Michael Wigglesworth, Samuel Rogers, and Cotton Mather. See M. M. Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Diaries by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward* (Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1933); Michael McGiffert, ed., *God’s Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard’s Cambridge* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1994); Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653-1657: The Conscience of a Puritan* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965); Tom Webster and Kenneth Shipps, ed., *The Diary of Samuel Rogers, 1634-1638* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004); Worthington Chauncey Ford, ed., *The Diary of Cotton Mather*, 2 vols. (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1911).

³² William A. Dryness, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 118-21; Richard D. Altick, *The Shows of London* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 99. Cf. Robert Whiting, *The Reformation of the English Parish Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 136, for Puritan hatred of stain-glassed windows.

³³ See John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1991).

³⁴ R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), esp. pt. III; John Coffey, “A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution,” in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 108.

³⁵ See David R. Como, “Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 64-87. Augustinian and Thomist notions of predestination and election come scintillatingly close to that of the Reformed. Cf. Frank A. James III, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination from Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 62.

³⁶ Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 8.

Defining Puritanism in more *realist* terms as a particular style within English divinity, which expressed itself in varying degrees of hotness or intensity, as the times dictated, over the course of its theological, historical, and social existence, can ameliorate these difficulties.³⁷ Understanding Puritanism as a consisting of *Familienähnlichkeit*, co-existing in relation to earlier Elizabethan Puritanism, is not only essential to allow for *diversitas* among Puritans, but also to give due weight to their remarkable *unitas* and theological identity. This “style” or Puritan “ethos” was not so much the existence of any particular doctrines, which could not be seen in other religious circles, as, in fact, they were, but the way in which these doctrines were interwoven into something unique. Thus Puritanism should be seen as a cluster of attitudes and priorities that worked within but were not absorbed by “the wider bodies of Reformed thought and feeling” which dominated “the Elizabethan and Jacobean theological and ecclesiastical establishments.”³⁸ The unities found within Downname, Rous, and Crisp, as discussed in Chapter 6, confirm this approach to definition; indeed, this broader definition allows for variance among its adherents as well as for both synchronic and diachronic unity. Puritanism defined too narrowly would exclude those dissenters who characterized the movement in the latter half of the seventeenth century, while making Puritanism too broad so as to include all of the most radical sects of the English Revolution would, to some degree, compromise any meaningful designation.³⁹ In short, Puritanism should be defined diachronically in looking at how it changed or evolved from its earliest political and religious ambitions in the sixteenth century, to its more mature expression and confessionalization in the seventeenth; and synchronically in the lives and theologies of its particular adherents. In other words, Puritanism should be assessed in its narrative and metanarrative.

The benefit of this approach is seen, partly, in Lake’s work on the subject. In his *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (1982), Lake examines the life and work of Laurence Chaderton, the “pope of Cambridge puritanism,” and contrasts that to other noted “puritans” of the time: Edward Dering, Thomas Cartwright, William Whitaker, and William Bradshaw.⁴⁰ Lake sees a distinctive approach to divinity in these pastors and a common thread or style among them.⁴¹ Further, in his “Defining Puritanism—Again” (1993), Lake outlines his approach to defining Puritanism by combining two distinct paths:

I would wish to see Puritanism as a distinctive style of piety and divinity, made up not so much of distinctively Puritan component parts, the mere presence of

³⁷ Lake, “Puritan Identities,” 20. Kenneth L. Campbell affirms the merits of Lake’s approach in seeing Puritanism tied to godly expression and religious zeal in contrast to a “clear-cut party label.” Campbell, *Windows into Men’s Souls: Religious Nonconformity in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012), 13.

³⁸ Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*, 12; Hunt, *The Art of Preaching*, 30.

³⁹ See, for instance, Michael P. Winship’s “Defining Puritanism in Restoration England: Richard Baxter and Others Respond to a Friendly Debate,” *The Historical Journal* 54, No. 3 (September 2011): 689-715, esp. 714-15, where Winship applies the term “puritanism” to the internal conflicts within the Restoration Church of England. Gary S. De Krey has suggested that early-modern Protestantism should be divided into Anglican, Reformed Protestant (Puritan as a subset), and Sectarian. Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 5, 92, 125-34.

⁴⁰ Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 116; see also 77-115, 262-78. For the “pope” comment, see Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 435.

⁴¹ Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 279-92.

which in a person's thought or practice rendered them definitely a Puritan, as a synthesis made of strands most or many of which taken individually could be found in non-Puritan as well as Puritan contexts, but which taken together formed a distinctively Puritan synthesis or style.⁴²

This approach prevents historians from seeing distinctive traits where there are none; it also allows for a variance of expression within Puritanism over the course of its existence. Thus, for instance, predestination should be seen not as a distinctive Puritan trait in the sense that were one to adhere to it that would classify them as a Puritan, but rather predestination woven with an English Reformed symbiosis of doctrine and practice, generally operating within confessional sensibilities, and united in common understandings of God, covenant, justification, sanctification, the Christian life, morals and manners, among others, within a specific historical context.⁴³ Affinities to other Reformed expressions, such as that of Dutch precisianism, or the experiential theology of Johannes Cocceius, for instance, were as influenced by English Puritanism, as they were independent from it.⁴⁴ This is seen not only in their direct relationships with many English Puritans, but also through the existence of English churches in the continent, rogue Puritan presses overseas, and the distribution of “canonic” English Puritan sources.⁴⁵

While I favor Lake's more *realist* approach to defining Puritanism, especially in that it posits Puritanism as a more distinguishable group among the “Calvinist bedrock” within the English Church,⁴⁶ I cannot deny the merits of Collinson's *nominalist* approach. Puritans not only had a distinct way of doing things, a distinct way of thinking about the Christian life and the Christian's place within this world, they were also involved in

⁴² Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” 6.

⁴³ This approach comes close to Ludwig Wittgenstein's theory of *familienähnlichkeit* in that it suggests that things or concepts believed to be connected by a common feature may be connected by “overlapping similarities” and family resemblances. See Michael Forster, “Wittgenstein on Family Resemblance Concepts,” in *Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations: A Critical Guide*, ed. Arif Ahmed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 66-87.

⁴⁴ Voetius's reliance on English Puritanism is well known. Cocceius was a student of William Ames at the University of Franeker when the latter was in exile there. See Keith L. Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Backgrounds of English and American Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1972).

⁴⁵ See Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism*, 13-42; Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 1-27; 84-169. By “canonic,” I refer to the growing body of divinity and piety endorsed or recommended in popular Puritan treatises. For instance, for the study of divinity, Cotton Mather recommends Wollebius's *Manuductio ad Theologiam*, Ames's *Medulla Theologiae*, Markus Friedrich Wendelin's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* (1646), the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* of the Leiden divines (1642), Ussher's *Body of Divinity* (1645), as well as the works of Alting, Tuckney, Heningius, Aretius, Edwards, Witsius, Maastricht, Gerhard, Voetius, Owen, Perkins, Scudder, Bolton, Dyke (Jeremiah and Daniel), Sibbes, Capel, Fenner, Burroughs, Gurnall, and Baxter, among others of that “good old puritan divinity.” Cotton Mather, *Manuductio ad Ministerium* (Boston, 1726), 84-89, 100-1.

Though Mather prefers Maastricht's *Theoretico-Practica Theologia* above all, he does say of Calvin, “You might wonder at me, if I should forget Calvin's *Institutions*, to which the concurrent opinion of them that wished well to the reformed religion assigned a preference before all the writings that the church of God has enjoyed since the apostolical...” Idem, *Manuductio ad Ministerium*, 84-5. Puritanism itself was an eclectic symbiosis of English and continental sources.

⁴⁶ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, 11.

something greater: an agenda for the reformation of their society. They were involved in a Puritan Reformation, which thought of the ideal Christian life as one of precise living. Given the profundity of positive Puritan “character literature” within the 1640s, and earlier, those Puritans who embraced the term were accustomed to look back on the good “old English Puritan” with nostalgia and respect. This longing became an integral aspect of their kinship with Elizabethan Puritanism.⁴⁷

In addition, this view coincides with the more recent advances in the social sciences proposed by Norbert Elias, who argued that people should be understood within their context of society; being interdependent on one another, and reacting in response to various processes for change, Elias’s concept of “configuration” seeks to see the “web of independences formed among human beings and which connects them; that is to say, a structure of mutually oriented and dependent persons.”⁴⁸ It avoids older sociological notions that would put “the individual above society” and “society above the individual,” as though individuals and societies were distinct and operated in isolation from the other.⁴⁹ This “web” of connections and interdependencies within Puritanism, in its reliance on other forms of thought and “canonical” texts, which were shared across continents, should overturn notions that Puritans were independent from the greater society to which they belonged. At the same time, their reliance on society, as such, should not be seen as an eradication of the individual, or denial of variances in the way thoughts and ideas were expressed, so long as they coalesced with the social and intellectual status of that tradition. It is in this sense that *unitas in diversitate* can help to sort out some of these issues, in that it accounts for diversity and distinction on an individual level, but also for unity in shared social experiences, belief, and *familienähnlichkeit*. Seeing Puritanism as a *cluster* of attitudes and priorities, which exist in relation to each other, and are interdependent on the society and intellectual milieu of the time can provide immense fruition in ongoing studies of how to see and understand Puritanism.⁵⁰ It confirms Coffey’s observation that “the godly were often at odds with each other in matters theological, and such doctrinal consensus as existed did not come easily.”⁵¹

Thus, in sum, Puritanism, though fissiparous in nature, should be seen as a collective cluster of attitudes and ideas shared among its members within an English Reformed context of dissent, and characterized by its degree of hotness or intensity in piety. It cannot be understood only in terms of thought or behavior, but in the way

⁴⁷ See, for instance, John Geree, *The Character of an Old English Puritan* (London, 1646), sig. A2-3, and the many book recommendations in Downname’s *Guide*, which were typical of Puritanism’s “canon” of devotional texts.

⁴⁸ Norbert Elias, *O processo civilizador*, trans. Ruy Jungmaam (Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1990), 249. Quoted in Tania Quintaneiro, “The Concept of Figuration or Configuration in Norbert Elias’ Sociological Theory,” *Teor. Soc. Vol.2 no se Belo Horizonte* (2006).

⁴⁹ Norbert Elias, *Norbert Elias por ele mesmo*, trans. André Telles (Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2001), 148. Quoted in Tania Quintaneiro, “The Concept of Figuration or Configuration in Norbert Elias’ Sociological Theory,” *Teor. Soc. Vol.2 no se Belo Horizonte* (2006).

⁵⁰ For Elias’s ideas on the dependence between society and its members, see Elias, *The Society of Individuals* (1939; repr. New York: Continuum, 1991).

⁵¹ John Coffey, “A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution,” in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 108.

thought and behavior intersect into something unique, a *medulla divinitatis* or *theologiae*.⁵² It was promulgated from the pulpit and presses by members of the “Puritan church militant,” and infected a wider body of Calvinists and others to varying degrees.⁵³ But this simple definition is not enough; due weight must to be given to the greater aims of individual and collective Puritans as they sought to reform their lives, church, and nation. Just as individual Puritans had often unique, though complimentary, ways of discussing the theology to which they subscribed, they were part of something greater. We will now turn to narrative and metanarrative as useful concepts to understand Puritanism.

7.3 Narrative and Metanarrative

In his book *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, Lake suggests that the proper way to come to a definition or understanding of Puritanism is to do so by its characters; that is, by first studying and examining the puritans who by any definition make up the movement.⁵⁴ We thus define Puritanism by Puritans.⁵⁵ He suggests that to define Puritanism too early in a study might create an exercise in circular reasoning; for instance, a definition too narrow brings the danger that “the results of the entire enterprise would be determined by the initial point of reference.”⁵⁶ Thus he urges scholars to take a more inductive approach and suggests that the concept of Puritanism “should only emerge from a study of the activities of particular men [and women] in particular contexts, acting and reacting to events over a period.”⁵⁷ Lake has done this in his work on Chaderton and Stephen Dennison.⁵⁸ Others have done this on Heywood, Wallington, Baxter, Prynne, the Newdigates, or the Harleys.⁵⁹ While Lake used Chaderton, a Puritan by any definition, to

⁵² Thus, Ames’s “*theologia est doctrina Deo vivendi*.” Cf. John Gill’s *A Complete Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity, Vol. 1* (London, 1796), x, where Gill remarks that the use of “divinity” is peculiar to the English in contrast to “foreign writers who never entitle their works of this kind...”

⁵³ David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590-1644* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), 106.

⁵⁴ For biographical memoirs of “common consent” Puritans, see Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, ed., *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America, Volume 1* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006); Joel R. Beeke and Randall J. Pederson, *Meet the Puritans: A Guide to Modern Reprints* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006); Benjamin Brook, *The Lives of the Puritans*, 3 vols. (London: Printed for James Black, 1813); and James Reid, *Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of Those Eminent Divines who Convened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster*, 2 vols. (Paisley: Printed by Stephen and Andrew Young, 1811).

⁵⁵ Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 11; Spurr, *English Puritanism*, 3.

⁵⁶ Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 11.

⁵⁷ Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 11.

⁵⁸ Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 11, 25-54; Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*, 11-85.

⁵⁹ See Samuel S. Thomas, *Creating Communities in Restoration England: Parish and Congregation in Oliver Heywood’s Halifax* (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Paul S. Seaver, *Wallington’s World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985); Paul C. H. Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter’s Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); William Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996), 15-26; 41-54; V. M. Larminie, *Wealth, Kinship and Culture: The Seventeenth-Century Newdigates of Arbury and Their World* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995); and Jacqueline Eales, *Puritans and*

contrast Cartwright and Whitaker to come up with a spectrum of ideas within Elizabethan Puritanism, I have strived to do this with the Stuart Puritans Downname, Rous, and Crisp, which more clearly shows the spectrum, continuity, and unity of Puritans across widely diversified beliefs. The findings of these studies confirm that Puritanism should be seen as a cluster of attitudes and ideas which results in a distinct expression of Reformed *dogma* and *praxis*, and which was shared across a specific time, and connected by overlapping similarities.⁶⁰ The strains of Puritanism discussed in this book (*precisianist, mystical, antinomian*) depict internal tendencies inherent within Puritanism.

It is not enough, however, to examine individual lives or narratives of Puritans because they lived within specific social, cultural, economic, political, and religious contexts. Their lives must also be seen as part of the greater context or narrative of the Puritan Reformation. This Puritan Reformation began sometime in the 1550s with a desire for further ecclesial reform, and spread into the seventeenth century with its distinctive experiential piety, and grew to maturation in the codification of that tradition at the Westminster Assembly. This tradition was challenged during the English Revolution, as its inherent tendencies became more radicalized, and then slowly dissipated towards the end of the seventeenth and into the eighteenth centuries. What were the chief concerns of this Puritan Reformation, or how should we see it? In short, the Puritan Reformation was a movement characterized by an insistence on correct doctrine and godly conduct in concert with a further reformation of society.⁶¹ This “doctrine according to godliness” consists of a distinct approach to personal reformation which wove self-examination and assurance with experimental predestinarianism, stressed the binding covenant that God had with his elect, endorsed justification by faith alone as distinct but inseparable from the sanctifying effects of the Spirit, and all within the rubric of anti-popery, millenarianism, sabbatarianism, and other refinements of morals and manners.⁶² This blend or cluster of ideas and attitudes expressed within sixteenth and seventeenth century British contexts formed the Puritan ethos, and this is what historians have intuited since the seventeenth century. Indeed, I agree with Jacob Bronowski and Bruce Mazlish when they stated, in 1962, “Alongside or in place of the Elizabethan spirit arose a new ethos, the Puritan ethos. It was the Puritan ethos which served as the English counterpart to the displacement of the Italian Renaissance by the Reformation.”⁶³ In other words, the Puritan

Roundheads: The Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the English Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

⁶⁰ Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*, 6-8.

⁶¹ Thus Richard L. Greaves writes, “Nonconformists of nearly all stripes shared a common goal—the dream of a church conformable to the precepts of Scripture.” Greaves, *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983), 2.

⁶² I here include Sabbath observance because this was an important aspect of Puritan practical divinity. See John H. Primus, *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1989); and Kenneth L. Parker, *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). Both Primus and Parker have also studied the life and work of Richard Greenham, Puritanism’s famous Sabbatarian. Cf. John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: The Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998); Kenneth L. Parker and Eric Josef Carlson, eds., “Practical Divinity”: *The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998).

⁶³ Jacob Bronowski and Bruce Mazlish, *The Western Intellectual Tradition: From Leonardo to Hegel* (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), 145.

Reformation is distinct from the Protestant Reformation, and even the English Reformation from which it grew, and came into its own identity and ethos over the course of its existence.

Thus, Downname, Rous, and Crisp, were members of the Puritan Reformation. Their narratives should be seen as part of the greater narrative of English Puritanism as a whole; that is, an overarching agenda to for reformation, which, in turn, expressed differently as it adapted to and evolved with the society around them, but which nonetheless show a natural progression and development. Not only were these Puritans influenced by the writings of earlier Puritans from the sixteenth century, their own writings contributed to the existence and promulgation of the Puritan Reformation throughout the seventeenth century. This contribution is attested to not only in that their writings were often republished, but also when, where, and how often they were disseminated across cultures. Thus, in short, these Puritans should be seen as contributors to a cultivation of their own English vineyard, as members of the Puritan Reformation of the seventeenth century, which had its roots and impetus in Elizabethan Puritanism, but which came its own formal identity at Westminster. Though distinct, they should not be seen as members of different *Puritanisms*, which suggests irreconcilable diversity, but rather as members of a richly diversified *Puritanism*, united not only in their social contexts and theologies, but also in their vision of the Christian life. But how do we identify Puritans? Let us briefly turn to that question, draw some conclusions, and then conclude this book.

7.4 Identifying Puritans

Given the general pattern of Puritanism as a distinctive style of divinity and piety, and as a form of “hot” and “intense” Protestantism, which generally related to Reformed orthodoxy, how are we to understand or apply this term to such controversial figures as John Goodwin, Joseph Hall, John Eaton, Lodowick Muggleton, Thomas Adams, and John Milton, among others? Were they Puritans? For Goodwin, historians Coffey, Webster, and Spurr allow for the existence of Arminian or Arminian-like Puritans.⁶⁴ While I am reticent to follow suit, given the immense anti-Arminianism of Puritanism in general, and consequently its status as a “heresy” in the seventeenth century, perhaps the best way is to assess Goodwin and those like him as forms of “hybrid” or “radical” Puritanism, or those Puritans who stood close to the mainstream and had its characteristic theological and pietist structures, but who digressed significantly from its orthodoxy, had more “radical” leanings, or that possibly metamorphosed into something other, being influenced by competing theological currents and crossing confessional boundaries (e.g. Muggletonians, Ranters, Family of Love). As Glenn Burgess observed, “historians are much more concerned with origins and causes than they are with consequences, effects or

⁶⁴ John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 10; Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*, 147; Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*, 68. Cf. Peter Lake, “Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, ed. Kenneth C. Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 1-15.

‘aftermath.’”⁶⁵

This broader definition would allow room for Goodwin and Baxter, both of who offered competing ideas about justification and predestination, but who were undoubtedly “Puritan” with respect to the hotness of their piety, overall theology, and recognition as such by contemporaries.⁶⁶ Though Baxter did digress from Reformed orthodoxy in his formulation of justification, he nonetheless should be seen as being within its borders, advancing both precisianist and neonomian strains. Thus, there is some plasticity within the confessional boundaries of confessionally minded Puritanism, which has been shown in the case studies of Downname, Rous, and Crisp.

This broader approach would allow qualified use for the “puritan phases” of Joseph Hall, who, though being born to Puritan parents and imbibed with Puritanism at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, came to defended episcopacy by divine right, but whose *Meditations* (1606), and other devotional works were favored among the Puritans; and John Milton, who seems to defy Puritan classification because of his Socinian and quasi-Arian tendencies, as members of the greater narrative, though definitely on the fringes and not orthodox Reformed.⁶⁷ Indeed, Coffey remarks that English religion should be seen

⁶⁵ Glenn Burgess, “Radicalism and the English Revolution,” in *English Radicalism, 1550-1850*, ed. Glen Burgess and Matthew Festenstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 62.

⁶⁶ For a recent attempt to classify Thomas Adams, see J. Sears McGee, “On Misidentifying Puritans: The Case of Thomas Adams,” *Albion* 30 (Autumn, 1998): 401-18. McGee concludes that though Adams is more like Puritans than others he “is best seen as a mainstream Protestant—A Calvinist, a great evangelist like John King or George Downham, both preachers as well as bishops, sharing much with their puritan confreres but in no sense puritans themselves.” McGee bases his conclusion, in part, on the fact that Adams was not in the “web of connections” of London Puritans and did not associate himself with them. It is noteworthy that though Adams’ *Works* were printed in the nineteenth century as part of the “Nichol’s Series of Standard Divines: Puritan Period,” he is not counted among those Puritan divines in Benjamin Brooks’s *Lives of the Puritans* (1813). Cf. Moira P. Baker, “Thomas Adams,” in *Dictionary of Literary Biography: British Prose Writers of the Early Seventeenth Century, Volume 151*, ed. Clayton D. Lein (Detroit: Gall Publishers, 1995): 3-10.

⁶⁷ See John Rogers, “Milton and the Heretical Priesthood of Christ,” in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 203-20. Keeble, who aptly observes Milton’s digression from Puritan doctrine, in the end, sees Milton’s obsession with the conscience as indicative of the puritan bias and even makes the provocative statement, “To read Milton is to know what it was to be a Puritan.” Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” 126, 139-40. Cf. Stephen M. Fallon, *Milton’s Peculiar Grace: Self-Representation and Authority* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 21-44, where Fallon correctly sees Milton as embodying “the extreme development of Puritan belief and practice,” but not as representative of mainstream Puritan practice and perspective. In some sense Milton defies classification because of his adeptness at mixing orthodox structures with heretical ones. On Milton’s exposure to moderate Puritanism in his early life, which consisted of both personal and family connections, see Jeffrey Alan Miller, “Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young,” in *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620-1642*, ed. Edward Jones (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 72-106. Though Milton was imbibed in Puritan *dogma* and *praxis* in his youth, he would later “retain his anti-Papist views and his dislike of rich, morally lax aristocrats throughout his life, but he would later repudiate [Puritan] views on marriage...Sabbatarianism...and...tithes. Indeed, later in his life, Milton did not even attend church.” Neil Forsyth, *John Milton: A Biography* (Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2008), 17.

In his book on Milton, David Loewenstein distinguishes between “orthodox” and “radical” Puritanism, which in itself is a helpful distinction in that it bifurcates between the mainstream of Puritan thought and those branches that significantly stretched beyond it. He writes, “Puritanism itself harbored contradictory impulses: its tendencies towards liberty of conscience and towards discipline, towards

as a continuum whose positions were often blurred at the edges; this should allow for some flexibility when determining “Puritan” classifications.⁶⁸ Scholars should also take into account that various conformist divines either inclined towards puritanism (e.g. James Ussher) or had phases when they were more sympathetic to Puritan intensity (e.g. Lancelot Andrewes, Joseph Hall).⁶⁹ Identifying Puritans within the seventeenth century is based, in part, on intuition, and on the evidence of historical inquiry. This intuitive sense dates to the seventeenth century, and continues to this day; however, evidence should guard intuition. By examining thinkers within their theological and social contexts, and especially in relating them to the consensus reached at Westminster and embodied within the devotional corpus of its members, one can get a sense of whether “Puritan” really applies in any given case, or at any given time in a person’s maturation.

But how can one be excluded from being a Puritan? Those thinkers who endorsed strict ceremonial forms of worship, or who allowed for the use of images within personal or corporate devotion, who deviated significantly from the teachings espoused at

spiritual individualism and towards building a godly community.” David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 6, 8, 20, 65, 95, 178, 183, 190, 238-9. Other than Milton, Loewenstein’s “radicals” include Gerrard Winstanley, Abiezer Coppe, George Fox, and William Dell. There is indeed a spectrum of *dogma* and *praxis* within Puritanism.

On Joseph Hall’s relation to Puritanism and divine meditation, see Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen, “Love Tricks and Flea-Bittings: Meditation, Imagination and the Pain of Christ in Joseph Hall and Richard Crawshaw,” in *Meditatio-Refashioning the Self: Theory and Practice in Late Medieval and Early Modern Intellectual Culture*, ed. Karl Elenkel and Walter Melion (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 212-14; Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London: Money Publishing, 2006), 71-95; D. C. Mantz, S. E. Gardiner, and E. M. Ramsden, “‘The Benefit of an Image, Without the Offence’: Anglo-Dutch Emblematics and Hall’s Liberation of the Lyric Soul,” in *Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem*, ed. Bart Westerweel (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 253-76; and Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, “Popularity, Prelacy, and Puritanism in the 1630s: Joseph Hall Explains Himself,” *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 111, No. 443 (September, 1996): 856-81. Van Dijkhuizen notes that prior to the first decade of the seventeenth century the practice of meditation had been mostly a Catholic discipline with most English books consisting of those translated from Spanish sources. Hall was able to popularize the discipline within the English church and had a profound influence on the Puritan devotional writers of the seventeenth century, including Isaac Ambrose, whose definition of “meditation” is almost word-for-word from Hall. Moreover, “the sea change that Hall engineered in Protestant meditation led to the release of a flood of Puritan aesthetic energy, central to England and the Dutch Republic, which, from thence and Germany, rolled throughout the Protestant world for centuries to come” (Mantz, et al, 254). Damrau equates “Puritan meditation” with Hall. There is some scholarly debate as to how “Protestantized” Catholic sources became before they made it to England’s printing presses. See Richard A. McCabe, *Joseph Hall: A Study in Satire and Meditation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982); Frank Livingstone Huntley, *Bishop Hall and Protestant meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study with the Texts of “The Art of Divine Meditation” (1606) and “Occasional Meditations” (1633)* (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1981); and U. Milo Kauffmann, *The Pilgrim’s Progress and Traditions in Puritan Meditation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 120-33. Cf. Frank Livingstone Huntley, *Bishop Joseph Hall, 1575-1656: A Biographical and Critical Study* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1979), 71-90, 91-101.

⁶⁸ Coffey, “The Problem of ‘Scottish Puritanism,’” 69.

⁶⁹ Jonathan D. Moore, “James Ussher’s Influence on the Synod of Dort,” in *Revisiting the Synod of Dort, 1618-1619*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 163, 177; P. E. McCullough, “Andrewes, Lancelot (1555-1626),” *ODNB*; Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), 438-9. See also M. M. Knappen, “The Early Puritanism of Lancelot Andrewes,” *Church History*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (June 1933): 95-104.

Westminster, and who criticized “the godly” for their reformation of morals and manners can, to a large degree, be seen as being outside the confessionally minded fold.⁷⁰ They represent the class of society to which Puritans were reacting.⁷¹ But even here one needs nuancing. There are those ceremonial Anglicans, such as Lancelot Andrewes, who was renowned for his promotion of a deeply devotional and personal faith, who were exposed to Puritanism in their formative years. Indeed, Andrewes carried with him elements of the Puritan ethos, which he had been exposed to in his youth, well into adulthood.⁷² Further, those Puritans who deviated from the greater theological consensus, but who nonetheless retained aspects of its practice and theology, can, with qualified use, be understood to stand within relation to that consensus, as members of the greater Puritan Reformation, because that is the society from which they emerged, and, in some ways, never left.

Daniel Featley is another interesting case because he was a confessionally minded Calvinist who advocated episcopacy, but was nonetheless invited to and did attend the Westminster Assembly. He was “Calvinist” and “Reformed,” but not necessarily “Puritan,” seen, perhaps, in the severe way in which Parliament imprisoned him later in life. He did, however, have a reputation as a controversialist and refuter of Arminianism, and in this sense he found common ground with the assembly’s hatred of “free-will” doctrine. Moreover, it is possible his invitation to sit at Westminster and confer on the debates was politically motivated. Regardless, Alec Ryrie opines that Featley was both a “patron of puritanism” and a “contented conformist,” and adds, “As Julia Merritt has pointed out, while historians are naturally attracted to ‘cantankerous, divisive, and controversial figures,’ we should not ignore ‘emollient, unifying, pastorally sensitive puritan clergymen.’”⁷³

Peter Heylyn, who wrote approvingly of iconoclasm, and praised Thomas Cartwright’s critique of the Rhemish Testament, and had numerous Puritan connections, evidences some approval of Puritan attitudes, but as Anthony Milton points out, “Heylyn’s

⁷⁰ As, for instance, in allowing images of the Incarnation to be produced. See William Perkins, *A Reformed Catholike* (London, 1597), 169-82. David J. Davis elaborates on Perkins’s general disdain for image use within devotion, in contrast to Vermigli’s permitting that the humanity of Christ could, like all other physical subjects, be depicted and painted. Davis, *Seeing Faith, Printing Pictures: Religious Identity During the English Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 59-60, 107, 159-60.

⁷¹ See, for instance, William Ames, *A Fresh Svit Against Human Ceremonies in God’s Worship* (s.l., 1633). See also David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 197-98, where Cressy comments on the “sensitive” and “opaque areas of early modern culture” as they relate to the further Reformation of ceremonies as reforming “allegedly Jewish, popish, or superstitious practices.”

⁷² Thus Kenneth L. Parker points out that Andrewes, for instance, retained strict Sabbatarian views long after his youthful “puritan phase.” Parker, *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99. Whether or not a strict Sabbath observance was a unique Puritan contribution to the English Church bears further investigation. Cf. Parker, *The English Sabbath*, 2; Laurie Throness, *A Protestant Purgatory: Theological Origins of the Penitentiary Act, 1779* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 159; Edward Martin Allen, “Nicholas Bownde and the Context of Sunday Sabbatarianism” (PhD thesis; Fuller Theological Seminary, 2008), 6; John H. Primus, *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990); John Wigley, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Sunday* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), 15-16.

⁷³ Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 7; cf. Julia F. Merritt, “The Pastoral Tightrope: A Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London,” in *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain*, ed. Thomas Cogswell, et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 160.

opinions were convention ones for his time. While not overtly ‘godly,’ they nonetheless displayed none of the divisive attitudes and reservations of a new breed of ‘avant-garde conformist’ such as Lancelot Andrews, John Buckeridge, William Laud or Richard Montagu.”⁷⁴

Perhaps much confusion within this enterprise of identifying and defining Puritans rests in the symbiotic nature of religious belief within the English Church itself. Further, while Puritans generally sided with Parliament during the English Civil Wars, this was not always the case, as the historical events surrounding the execution of the Puritan Christopher Love point out.⁷⁵ This points again to diversity of opinion in how to achieve the Puritan Reformation.

In sum, classifications are not always easy and require careful contextualization, if, for no other reason, than because human beings are complicated, contradictory, and defy neat categories. Classifications are based on evidence and intuition, but the former should outweigh the latter. Moreover, consideration must be given to the society in which an individual belonged. Individuals are not above society, nor are societies merely the ideations of an individual. Distinctions could, and perhaps should, be made between identifiable “mainstream” Puritanism, and non-mainstream “Radical Puritanism,” the former having strong confessional commitments and sensibilities, and the latter that, at times, moved beyond the former, but even here one must concede to the strong ties between “radicals” and their confessionally minded counterparts.

7.5 Conclusion

Since the sixteenth century, “the terms Puritan” and “Puritanism” have had a robust industry of use. Historians have attempted, with varying degrees of success, to come to some sort of consensus as to their precise meaning. There are generally two perspectives with a wide spectrum between. On one end are those who have questioned the historical validity of these terms as useful designations because of their seeming inability to be applied evenly and accurately within various contexts. Those of the other side have defended its use to varying degrees and projected more optimistic outcomes of historical inquiry. Within this latter group there are those who prefer either more *nominalist* or *realist* approaches. Those advancing nominalism generally see Puritanism as a movement for reform, and those of the realist persuasion focus on identifying Puritanism as a distinctive way of weaving doctrine with piety. Puritanism cannot be understood only in terms of its behavior or thought, both of which could be seen in wider groups of the

⁷⁴ Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 10, 14.

⁷⁵ In 1649, Love became involved in a plot to assist Scottish covenanters to bring back the exiled Charles II to the English throne. He was executed in 1651 after being found guilty of treason by the High Court. See Christopher Love, *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication of the Principles and Practices of Me Christopher Love, Since my Tryall Before and Condemnation by, the High Court of Iustice, whereby It is Manifested, That a Close Prison, a Long Sword, a High Court, and a Bloody Scaffold, Have Not in the Least Altered My Judgment* (London, 1651), 9-11; Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-53* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 244.

seventeenth century, but in its style; that is, in the way thought and behavior intersect to form a *medulla divinitatis*.

To account for *diversitas* among Puritans, some historians have begun to speak of *Puritanisms* as preferable to *Puritanism* in the singular. This deconstruction is not unlike that of the *Reformation* versus *Reformations* debate in that both fields are trying to account for both *unitas* and *diversitas*. However, the matter is more important in Post-Reformation England because *Puritanisms* suggests that there was greater or irreconcilable diversity among “the godly,” as opposed to a more unifying standard to which they generally subscribed. To address this lacuna, Ludwig Wittgenstein’s *Familienähnlichkeit* offers valuable and insightful ways to begin to sort out the definitions problem.

There is not one single defining feature of Puritanism. Rather, Puritanism was a cluster of attitudes and priorities that centered on a distinctive style that combined divinity with the practice of piety, characterized by its degree of hotness or intensity. Drawing insight from Norbert Elias’s formative work on the society of individuals, the simple narrative of a thinker is not enough to enrich our understanding of Puritanism. The individual must be understood to exist within relation to their society, being intimately connected to its sages and pariahs. Therefore, the concept of narrative and metanarrative is a useful, even essential, way of understanding the collective identity of Puritans cultivating their own English vineyard for greater reform of not only their own lives, but other members of the English Church and nation.

Identifying Puritans in the seventeenth century is a difficult enterprise and needs nuancing. However, given Puritanism’s strong theological identity, and its production of a confessional standard, one can employ both evidence and intuition to assess whether an individual advanced the Puritan Reformation and whether they were the objects of that reforming society.

Thus, Puritans and Puritanism should be seen as a cohesive though varied movement and network of individuals connected by overlapping similarities and representing distinct though often-complementary strains. Notions of *Puritanisms*, while helpful in distinguishing between different polarities within English Puritanism, do not ultimately allow for or recognize the undeniable continuity existing within Puritanism; it inadvertently places too much attention on the individual being above the society to which they belonged, and does not sufficiently account for the relatedness and interdependence of confessionally minded Puritans, or adequately concede that “radical” Puritans as often emerged from the shadows of their mainstream counterparts, as they were innovators of something new.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

The study of English Puritanism remains a vibrant, rewarding, if not utterly frustrating, endeavor for historians of early modern English religious culture. While scholarship has made significant strides over the past sixty or so years, there are still several issues within the literature that need to be addressed and nuanced; they, a veritable quagmire, have to do with how Puritans and Puritanism are best identified, defined, and understood, and how this, in turn, relates to their desire for greater reform.

While books continue to be published on this subject, and have explored various facets of Puritan religion and practice, there is within scholarship not only pessimism in being able to define or identify Puritanism, but emerging reference to *Puritanisms*, as though there were numerous competing systems of thought and practice to the exclusion of a confessional tradition. While it is possible to speak of *Puritanisms* to highlight its varieties, as between “orthodox” and “radical” Puritanism, this deconstruction seems to compromise the greater intellectual and social unities among members of not only confessionally mined Puritans, but among the more radical sectaries, in their combined pursuit for a further Puritan Reformation. *Puritanisms* suggest that there was more or greater diversity than harmony and unity; or that *diversitas* was more of a guiding force than *unitas*. The aim of this study, therefore, has been to address this issue and consider whether three uncontested Puritans, representative of vying strains and trajectories within Puritanism were so diverse that hardly any discernable unity could be identified, or whether there was indeed some sort of theological identity, and, if so, to what extent this *unitas* contributed to the “ethos” of Puritanism itself. Put another way, if there was a *sensus unitatis* within Puritanism, then, given its diversity, there must be a *unitas* within *diversitas*.

This study has shown that though Puritans were diverse and expressed, at times, competing ideas, there was still significant unity among them, both historically, in that they were clearly progenitors of a movement for further reform, and theologically, in that they exemplified a distinct style of divinity and piety. Indeed, any study of the writers of the seventeenth century has to take into consideration the various historical and intellectual forces then converging together. The challenges of studying religion in this period will not be overcome until we develop competency in various cognate disciplines; indeed, as historians, we need greater communication across our fields in order to provide more holistic portraits of early modern Puritanism. While I have focused on theological identity, and have incorporated insights from the social sciences, wherever possible, as, for instance, from Norbert Elias, this is not a book of social research; more work will need to be done on how this Puritan identity relates to the other concerns of the Puritan Reformation.

Thus, in sum, the findings of this research is fivefold:

First, it argues to retain “Puritan” and “Puritanism” as helpful, even essential, designations. For the past sixty-five years historians have postulated with varying degrees of optimism over how to define and identify Puritanism. Some of the more critical

historians, such as C. H. George or Conrad Russell, have suggested abandoning the term because of its “obfuscating” nature, though very few, if any, have actually, over the long term, consistently dropped its use. The terms *Puritan* and *Puritanism* have been employed since the sixteenth century to describe a certain stream within the English Church, and there is no sign that they are going away. This study thus contributes to this ongoing academic discussion and suggests that both terms, though hotly contested, should continue to be used when discussing this fiery brand of early modern English Protestantism. While other terms such as the *Godly* or *Reformed orthodox* will undoubtedly continue to be used to refer to Puritans, they should not supplant *Puritan* and *Puritanism*, but rather complement them because the terms suggest something unique and distinctive, perceptions that date to the 1560s, if not earlier, and continue to this day. While these terms are often interchangeable, they are not always so, nor is it always easy to identify those thinkers on the fringes of the movement. Moreover, Puritanism should further be understood as a rather broad conglomerate of tendencies and trajectories, such as precisianism, mysticism, antinomism, and neonomianism, and *Familienähnlichkeit*.

This broader approach to Puritanism concedes to *diversitas* within Reformed orthodoxy itself, and indicates that Puritanism could possibly be classified as a unique subtype of that orthodoxy, at least in its mainline expression, which, as it expressed itself within an English Reformed context adapted to its own challenges, patterns, and currents. This hypothesis is suggested in that these vying strains, as depicted in Rous and Crisp, for instance, despite accusations, never actually pushed past confessional bounds, and so their emphases were never unequivocally regarded as a “heresy.” While there were those thinkers who could be classified as “Puritan” more generally, but who were neither “mainstream” nor “Reformed orthodox,” such as John Goodwin, John Milton, John Eaton, Lodowick Muggleton, among others, they do not seem to have formed a consensus on the scale of those who were confessionally minded. It is perhaps better to see these religious thinkers as proponents of a radicalized Puritanism, which was even more varied than those who were confessionally minded, but which nonetheless remain within its trajectories by magnifying the themes depicted in Rous and Crisp. Does this mean there are two or more *Puritanisms*? While one could see the evidence this way, and many historians have suggested this, the evidence does not necessarily mandates this interpretation. Research suggests that “radical” Puritanism arose in response to and out of frustration with mainstream Puritanism, especially on the issue of attaining assurance and comforting the afflicted conscience. Rous’s bridal mysticism was as much a response to his own perceived absence of “boxes of this precious ointment,” as Crisp’s antinomism was to what the latter believed to be insurmountable pastoral issues arising from “navel gazing.” As we have seen, Crisp criticized the precisianists for their seeming overemphasis on works to, what he believed, was a denial of the doctrine of free justification by faith. But even within his “radicalism,” there were strong affinities to the mainstream, further evidenced by Samuel Crisp’s placing of his father within the tradition of Perkins, Jacomb, Twisse, Manton, among others (See 5.3.1). In this sense, Bozeman is essentially correct in seeing the antinomian strain as a “backlash” within Puritanism that sometimes did cross over confessional lines and received doctrine. The mystical strain, as evidenced in Rous, could be seen as a trajectory within Puritanism, which not only had the potential to cross

over confessional lines, but would also do so in many radicals of the English Revolution (See 4.5).

Thus, within Puritanism, there was a confessional tradition (*unitas*), which in itself was varied in its emphasis (*diversitas*), but nonetheless was bound by a confessional standard (*unitas in diversitate*). Further, the distinctive traits of mainline Puritanism, in its emphasis on practical divinity, and the unique way in which it embraced or rejected social customs and manners, came to be appreciated by other groups and sectaries during the English Revolution, but even here their appropriation of elements from the mainstream do not nullify the merits of seeing that tradition as a collective of belief and practice. Thus, the question of *Puritanism* and *Puritanisms* is an important one because, unlike that of the Reformation, English Puritanism produced one major confessional standard to which the mainstay of “the godly” subscribed as accurately reflecting their theological and social inheritance. This Puritan and Reformed orthodoxy is evidenced in the numerous divinity books, catechisms, and casuist works produced and disseminated among “the godly,” since its very beginning in the sixteenth century (e.g. Richard Greenham’s catechism) through its era of codification (e.g. Westminster Standards, London Confession) and long afterwards (e.g. Samuel Willard’s *Body of Compleat Divinity*). This Puritan-Reformed tradition allowed for sufficient variance of emphases and doctrinal plasticity. Moreover, the codifiers at Westminster did not see themselves as innovating new theology; they were simply confessionalizing what they believed to be their inheritance from the originators, heirs, and proponents of Puritanism from its inception through to their time. Those radicals and revolutionaries who challenged the confessional mainstream, and arguably, at times, moved beyond its borders, were so splintered and fractured that they never achieved the consensus reached at Westminster, but they nonetheless stood in relation to it.

Second, all three Puritans discussed in this work have, for the most part, hitherto been much neglected. While recent studies have focused on John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, Cotton Mather, Peter Sterry, and Jonathan Edwards, among others, this is the first major attempt, in English, to assess Downname’s contributions to Reformed theology, Rous’s contributions to mystical piety, and Crisp’s contributions to theologically high Calvinism within their historical, theological, and mainline contexts. Taken together, they show the unity that existed among widely diverse Puritans in the era of orthodoxy, and how their writings promoted a Puritan Reformation of self, church, and state. The strong theological identity of these authors is significant precisely because none of them wrote systematic works of divinity, but promulgated the writing of *practical divinity* or “lived theology,” in which they drew from their theological inheritance, and advised readers, for instance, how to dress oneself, how frequently to attend church, how to observe the Sabbath, how to avoid the theater and the appearance of evil, how to cultivate a good conscience, cut one’s hair short (for men), and abstain from wearing whigs in daily living. These morals and manners, however, were inseparable from their theological identity, and were deduced from their understanding of such doctrinal themes as the doctrine of God and humanity, predestination and assurance, justification and sanctification, covenant of works and grace, and their view of the Christian life. This convergence between *dogma* and *praxis* is what William Ames called “the Doctrine according to godliness.”¹

¹ William Ames, *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof* (London, 1643), Sig. A2.

Third, this work has shown that in order to begin to assess the distinctive qualities of Puritanism, so as to distinguish them from other forms of early modern religious identities, one has to first assess the Puritans themselves, in their immediate social and intellectual contexts, and then their standing within the greater narrative or meta-narrative of the Puritan Reformation. The more diverse the Puritans, the more one can get at the Puritan “ethos.” This approach combines, in parts, Collinson and Lake’s attempt at defining Puritanism, and allows for a richly diversified understanding of Puritanism, while at the same time retaining its core semblance as a distinctive *style* of divinity and piety, and especially in the way these two interact and coalesce to form an English *practical divinity*. It also confirms Nuttall’s work in that it sees similarities of style and expression across the radical Puritan spectrum. It avoids the opposite pitfalls of being too narrow, and thus excluding Separatists or Baptists, and too wide which would nullify any significant meaning. It suggests that there was an “orthodox” or “mainstream” Puritanism, and a more “radical” Puritanism, which, though distinct, are nonetheless related and indicative of a magnification of the trajectories seen in Rous and Crisp. It further identifies Puritanism as a discernable movement within the English Church, and corrects notions that Puritanism was a “hardly discernable” core within the Calvinist bedrock. Further, it suggests that when looking at Puritanism, historians have to do more than see its *pietism*, strictly speaking, and give due consideration to its theological identity and homogeneity.

Fourth, this work shows that continuity existed, not only among Puritans of various persuasions, but also between the Reformation and Post-Reformation eras; thus, it confirms Muller’s work that there was not as an intense break between the theologians of these periods as some historians have suggested. Rather, the Reformed theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had considerable continuity and confluence, and exhibited within it a strong *sensus unitatis*. This greater *unitas* among these Puritans, however, does not suggest that Puritanism, as a whole, was monolithic, or that Puritans were cast from one stone, or that Calvin, for instance, was their only or chief source, but that it was a *unitas* within *diversitas*. Far from being meaningless, *Puritan* and *Puritanism* have rich and vibrant connotations; the terms suggest an immense devotion and interest in Reformed piety, and a strong adherence, with some flexibility, to Reformed orthodoxy, woven into a distinctive style of lived or applied theology, which often resulted in unique or seemingly odd customs and manners. Thus, Lake is essentially correct in wanting to see Puritanism as a style that is distinct from its ceremonial Anglican counterpart; and Collinson is correct in that there is a discernable reform movement at work in which Puritans, depending on ecclesiastical and political pressures, varied in its degree of hotness and intensity. Cohen is correct in identifying a large reliance within Puritanism on the experience of conversion, and of personally clinging to God; and many of the other “definitions” proposed to date are all partially correct in that they tap into the Puritan “ethos,” but only present a partial, and not holistic, portrait. None of these identities, when considered atomically, render someone a Puritan. It is only when they are considered together, as a style that weaved *dogma* and *praxis*, as a *cluster* of attitudes and expressions, as a movement for further reform of morals and manners, as a desire to renovate the state for God’s glory, as a continuance of an earlier tradition which came into its own, does one begin to get a sense of who a Puritan really is.

Fifth and finally, this study emphasizes the importance of intellectual history in the study of early modern religion, as well as the importance of society and social interactions. While the English Reformation has largely been the field of social historians, this study suggests the need for more communication among experts in a broader spectrum of disciplines, such that will illuminate the English Reformation's intellectual and spiritual origins and ramifications among a thinking people. Social histories should neither ignore nor minimize the greater intellectual continuity within the tradition, nor should intellectual histories suggest the absence of diversity by identifying one feature where there is not one but many. Social histories provide the contexts in which ideas were circulated and advanced. I have attempted to see the immediate social and intellectual contexts in which Downname, Rous, and Crisp, lived and ministered. Admittedly, my focus has largely been on intellectual identity, and while I have tried to incorporate insights from both fields, much more work needs to be done.

In sum, the three Puritans in this study show *diversitas* and *unitas* within seventeenth-century Puritanism. They show that the identity of Puritans as strangers and pilgrims on earth was inseparable from their vision of the Puritan Reformation. John Downname was chiefly concerned with promoting precisianism. He did this through advocating Reformed divinity through a series of works, which, in turn, fostered a distinctive Puritan piety. His *Christian Warfare* and *Guide to Godliness* are clear examples of the way in which Puritans explained the "doctrine according to godliness." Francis Rous, whose political career spanned generations, was a writer of mystical devotional works, and champion for spiritual reform. His *Mystical Marriage*, arguably his chief and most important work, shows how important union and communion with Christ was to Puritan piety, and how it can be seen as a central feature of the Puritan Reformation. Tobias Crisp, who advanced an alternative to precisianist introspection, was concerned with his parishioners' assurance of faith and devotion to piety in his *Christ Alone Exalted*, again reiterating a distinct yet harmonious emphasis on faith and its experience among "the godly." All three authors were connected together with a common *style* of experimental divinity and piety, were perceived as orthodox Puritans by their peers, and had a profound influence on the "Puritan" ethos. They reflect the broad confessional atmosphere of the Reformed orthodox, and attest to its *unitas in diversitate*. In the very least, they show much more plasticity to confessional orthodoxy than more modern notions of a "rigid orthodoxy" sometimes allow.

Thus English Puritanism should be thought of as a discernable and distinct style of divinity and piety, shared among its members across a specific period of time and in concert with a reform of morals and manners. Their distinctiveness is seen in their experiential weaving of the doctrine of God and humanity, predestination and assurance, covenant of works and grace, justification and sanctification, law and gospel, and the Christian life, which, when considered as a whole, suggest a distinctly Puritan way of reasoning from the Bible and received tradition. Though diverse, it is better to speak of *Puritanism* in its mainstream expression rather than *Puritanisms*, while conceding that those "radical" Puritans who contested the confessionality of that mainstream stood within relation to it, and progressed in an amplification of the mystical and antinomian strains.

Notions of *Puritanisms*, not properly qualified, compromises the theological identity of confessionally minded Puritans shared across cultures and time, in that they fail to properly account for its strong confessional impetus and harmony since accusations first rose within the English Reformation; nor, in my view, does it reflect the strong *sensus unitatis* among those divines who codified their tradition at Westminster, or those founding fathers of American Puritanism who continued to teach the “doctrine according to godliness.”

Admittedly, given its limited focus, this book is not the final word on identifying Puritanism in the early modern period. It is a contribution to the ongoing muskeg of Puritan Reformation studies. Due to space restrictions this study was not able to consider the work of Richard Baxter, John Goodwin, John Eaton, John Milton, Lodowick Muggleton, Gerrard Winstanley, Laurence Clarkson, and other “Puritans” to any great extent. It is believed, however, that future studies of these individuals will not only further tap into the Puritan “ethos” as a distinctive style that wove divinity with piety, but will also emanate the *plasticity* of confessional adherence, the social and theological ramifications for the transgressing of those bounds, and serve to heighten the importance that most Puritans placed on theological identity and solidarity. In the very least, this study has shown that *unitas* and *diversitas* are not conflicting ideas, and that there are strong theological semblances across Puritans of diverse backgrounds. While the discoveries of this research require a broader approach to understanding confessionally minded Puritans, more work will need to be done on how Puritanism’s unity in diversity relates to those “radical” Puritans who were neither “Reformed” nor “orthodox.”

English Summary

The central thesis of this study is that within seventeenth-century English Puritanism there is a *unitas* and a *diversitas* that, when considered together, suggest a *unitas in diversitate* that warrants the use of term “Puritanism,” in the singular, and is preferable to more deconstructionist notions of *Puritanisms*, which would seem to undermine confessional sensibilities of most Puritans. In order to investigate this thesis, three English Puritans (John Downname, Sir Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp) were chosen not only because of their status as being uncontested Puritans within the literature, but also because they represent vying strains within what has historically been identified as “Puritanism.”

The first chapter of this dissertation (1) reveals the significance of this discussion within current literature, its irradiant confusion on coming to terms with how to understand Puritanism’s complexity, and the tendencies towards deconstructionism, which have been proposed not only as an attempt to “solve” the *diversitas* question, but also arising from competing ideas in identifying the one defining feature of Puritanism. This chapter suggests a fresh approach to the definitions problem by focusing both on *unitas* and *diversitas*, and placing these concepts within the context of the Puritan Reformation. It suggests that sociologist Norbert Elias was essentially correct in seeing a *society* of individuals, who, though diverse and expressive of, at times, vying interests, were nonetheless interrelated, and dependent upon one another. It also proposes that Ludwig Wittgenstein’s theory of *Familienähnlichkeit* may serve as a helpful tool in our understanding of Puritanism’s diversity and unity. It discusses, briefly, the difficulty in employing such terms as “Reformed,” “Calvinist,” and, “Reformed orthodox,” to individual English Puritans since, as a whole, there was variety within the movement. These terms are often overlapping, but not always so, as can be seen when they are applied to John Downname, John Goodwin, and John Milton. However, that there was something of a “normative tradition” within Puritanism is clearly evidenced in the assembly and consensus of divines at Westminster (1643-1649), and consequently this “consensus” has consistently been identified as “mainstream,” “mainline,” or “orthodox” Puritanism.

Chapter two (2) provides an overview of seventeenth-century background, which places the three case studies within their greater historical, intellectual, and social contexts, and introduces the reader to the precisianist, mystical, antinomian, and neonomian strains present within identifiable Puritanism. The seventeenth century was a dramatic time of change for British society, and witnessed change from a royal monarchy to an English Commonwealth, in a move that “turned the world upside down.” Studies of thinkers and writers of this era, therefore, need to take into consideration the various political, cultural, social, and religious currents then converging together. While Puritanism arose during the Elizabethan era, there were traces of “proto-Puritanism” earlier in the evangelical mindset of English reformers under Edward VI. Puritanism’s roots can possibly be traced earlier to Lollardy, though more work will need to be done to assess this possibility. “Mainstream” or “mainline” Puritanism was a conglomerate of internal tendencies and strains, which had the possibility to, and sometimes would, cross

confessional boundaries. These strains consisted of precisianism, mysticism, antinomism, and neonomianism.

These two chapters provide the necessary background for Chapters three through five (3-5), Part I, which provides detailed contextual and theological analyses of the three case studies.

Chapter three (3) introduces John Downname (1571-1652), as a Puritan clergyman ministering in London, who advocated the precisianist strain within Puritanism, and shows that within his “affective” divinity there is a strong adherence to Reformed orthodoxy, and a promoting of the “consensus” typified at the Westminster Assembly. Further, it reveals how Puritans typically combined both *dogma* and *praxis*, and applied it to the various cases burdening the Puritan conscience. His two most important works, *Christian Warfare* and *A Guide to Godliness*, exemplified the precisianist strain by focusing on the implications that doctrine had for practice, and especially that relates to resolving the issue of assurance of faith. Downname’s emphasis on the doctrine of predestination further reflects how important this doctrine was for precisianist Puritans, but it was not the only doctrine that Downname elaborated on; rather, his writings indicate a world and life view bathed within orthodox structures.

Chapter four (4) presents the more “radical” Francis Rous (1579-1659), who while still operating within confessional bounds developed a form of bridal mysticism, which went beyond most of the precisianists in its emphasis on immediate experience with the divine. Rous’s mysticism gives further evidence to an internal mystical trajectory within Puritanism that had the potential to cross confessional lines, and which, at times, would do so in the “prophets” of the English Revolution. Further, it shows that though his chief contribution centered on mystical themes, as in his views on education, he nonetheless was versed in Reformed orthodoxy, and strongly identified with it.

Chapter five (5) places Tobias Crisp (1600-1642/3) within his seventeenth-century context of controversy, and suggests that the antinomian strain was reactionary, and a “backlash,” to precisianist notions of piety, or what has been called “navel gazing.” This chapter indicates that while Crisp’s status as an “orthodox” divine was contested, his views never crossed confessional bounds, as seen not only in the way he theologically identified himself with the orthodox tradition, but in the way “orthodox” Puritans defended his work. That his son, Samuel Crisp, defended his father’s teachings by appealing to William Perkins, Thomas Jacomb, Thomas Manton, and others, further suggests a broadening of our understanding of the Reformed orthodoxy to which Crisp undoubtedly belonged, and thus to possibly see it as a subtype of the greater Reformed orthodox tradition, as it was expressed in the continent, with its own concerns, patterns, and directions.

These three case studies pave the way to Part II of the dissertation, leading with Chapter six (6), which looks more deeply into the question of *unitas* within *diversitas*, and contrasts the different, but complementary, ways in which these Puritans expressed their theological identity. While there were differences of opinion in how received doctrine should be applied, neither Rous nor Crisp departed significantly from the confessional mores of the normative tradition, in spite of accusations, in the case of Crisp, to the contrary.

This evidence, then, gives weight to Chapter seven (7), which coalesces the research to suggest how these findings give consideration to a working definition of

Puritanism, indicating the need for some revising of deconstructionist and revisionist tendencies within the literature that overly fragment the phenomenon. It is proposed that Puritanism should be seen as a rather diverse conglomerate of tendencies with vying attitudes and priorities. In this sense, Ludwig Wittgenstein's theory of *familienähnlichkeit* is suggested as a helpful way to address the definitions problem, and provide a better working definition for Puritanism, which allows for *unitas* and *diversitas* within the movement. Further, it confirms an earlier hypothesis that the concepts of narrative and metanarrative are indeed useful aids in understanding the phenomenon that has been consistently identified as "Puritanism." By seeing Puritans in their own individual contexts, within their own *diversitas*, we can get a better sense of what themes bind Puritans together in *unitas*, and what makes them different. Seeing English Puritans as members of a greater movement for reform, the Puritan Reformation, shows that Puritans were united not only many of their shared beliefs, as, for instance, in their understanding of who God is and his relation to humanity, but in their zeal for a further reform of godly conduct, and their promotion of the *praxis pietatis*. It also suggests that greater nuance needs to be exercised in identifying Puritans, allowing for various "puritan phases" of such individuals as Lancelot Andrewes, Joseph Hall, John Milton, and others.

Chapter eight (8) summarizes the book's contents by noting five ways in which this work contributes to a further, more nuanced, understanding of the "thorny problem" of English Puritan identity. The findings of this study show that *unitas* and *diversitas* are not competing ideas, that there are strong theological semblances across Puritans of diverse backgrounds, and that inherent within Puritanism are certain trajectories which had the potential to cross confessional lines, and would do so among its more "radical" advocates. It suggests that more work will need to be done on the "radical" Puritanism of the English Revolution, especially in how it relates to the confessionally minded tradition set forth in these case studies.

Nederlandse samenvatting

De centrale these van deze studie is dat het zeventiende-eeuwse Engelse puritanisme gekenmerkt wordt door een eenheid in verscheidenheid die het wetenschappelijk gebruik van de term 'puritanisme' in het enkelvoud rechtvaardigt. De term 'puritanisme' valt te prefereren boven de meer deconstructionistische notie van 'puritanismes' of 'puritanismen', meervoudsvormen die de meeste puriteinen als oneigenlijk zouden hebben ervaren. Teneinde deze these op haar houdbaarheid te onderzoeken, worden in deze studie drie Engelse puriteinen – John Downname, Sir Francis Rous en Tobias Crisp – geselecteerd voor een nadere analyse. Niet alleen gaat het hier om personen wier status als puritein in de literatuur onomstreden is, ook vertegenwoordigen zij met elkaar wedijverende stromingen binnen wat traditioneel aangeduid werd als 'puritanisme'.

Het eerste hoofdstuk (1) legt het belang van deze discussie bloot tegen de achtergrond van het bestaande literatuurcorpus. Er blijkt in de literatuur sprake te zijn van aanzienlijke verwarring als het gaat om de vraag hoe recht gedaan kan worden aan de complexiteit van het puritanisme. De hedendaagse tendens in de richting van deconstructionisme laat zich enerzijds begrijpen als een poging om de vraag naar de diversiteit binnen het puritanisme adequaat te beantwoorden, anderzijds als een gevolg van elkaar uitsluitende ideeën over wat 'het' onderscheidende kenmerk van puritanisme zou zijn. Dit hoofdstuk oppert een nieuwe benadering van de definitie-problemen door zowel op de *unitas* als op de *diversitas* te focussen en deze concepten in de context van de puriteinse reformatie te plaatsen. Bij wijze van analogie wordt in dit verband verwezen naar Norbert Elias' bepaling van een samenleving als bestaande uit individuen die, hoewel divers en vaak dragers van tegenstrijdige belangen, niettemin onderling verbonden en van elkaar afhankelijk zijn. Ook Ludwig Wittgensteins notie van *family resemblance* kan behulpzaam zijn om zowel de diversiteit als de eenheid binnen het puritanisme te begrijpen. Kort wordt ingegaan op de moeilijkheid om begrippen als 'gereformeerd', 'calvinistisch' en 'orthodox' te gebruiken als karakteristieken voor het puritanisme. Weliswaar overlappen deze termen elkaar in veel gevallen, maar toch is dat gezien de variëteit in de beweging niet altijd het geval. Dat er binnen het puritanisme echter zoiets was als een normatieve traditie, bewijst de Synode van Westminster (1643-1649) en de consensus die de afgevaardigden daar bereikten; deze consensus is dan ook altijd gezien als bepalend voor het 'mainstream', 'mainline', of 'orthodoxe' puritanisme.

Hoofdstuk twee (2) plaatst de drie casus-studies in hun grotere historische, intellectuele en sociale samenhangen in het Engeland van de zeventiende eeuw. Ook wordt de lezer ingeleid in de precisiaanse, mystieke, antinomiaanse en neonomiaanse stromingen binnen wat als puritanisme bekend stond. De zeventiende eeuw was een tijd van ingrijpende veranderingen in de Engelse samenleving, zoals de overgang van de monarchie naar het Britse Gemenebest, voor velen een verandering die 'de wereld op z'n kop zette'. Onderzoekers die denkers of schrijvers uit deze periode bestuderen moeten dan ook de verschillende convergerende politieke, culturele, sociale en religieuze ontwikkelingen uit die tijd verdisconteren. Hoewel het puritanisme ontstond gedurende het Elizabethaanse tijdperk, waren er daarvoor reeds sporen van 'proto-puritanisme' te vinden in de evangelische *mindset* van Engelse reformatoren onder Edward VI. Mogelijk

kunnen de wortels van het puritanisme zelfs verder terug getraceerd worden tot de Lollarden, hoewel meer onderzoek gedaan zou moeten worden om dit vast te stellen. Het *mainstream of mainline* puritanisme was in elk geval een conglomeraat van tendensen en stromingen die over confessionele grenzen heen konden gaan, en dat soms ook deden. Bij die stromingen ging het dan met name om het precisianisme, mysticisme, antinomianisme en neonomianisme.

Deze beide inleidende hoofdstukken verschaffen de benodigde achtergrond voor de hoofdstukken drie tot en met vijf, waarin de drie bovengenoemde casus gedetailleerd geanalyseerd worden. De desbetreffende analyses vormen gezamenlijk deel I van deze studie.

Hoofdstuk drie (3) introduceert *John Downname* (1571-1652) als een puriteinse geestelijke en pastor in Londen, die de precisiaanse richting binnen het puritanisme voorstond. Duidelijk wordt dat zijn affectieve theologie een sterke trouw aan de gereformeerde orthodoxie vertoont, waarbij Downname met name de consensus van de Synode van Westminster promootte. Downname laat fraai zien hoe puriteinen gewoon waren dogma en praxis op elkaar te betrekken in hun benadering van de verschillende kwesties die het puriteinse geweten kwelden. Zijn twee belangrijkste werken, *Christian Warfare* en *A Guide to Godliness*, vertegenwoordigden de precianistische stroming doordat ze zich richtten op de implicaties van de leer voor de praktijk, in het bijzonder voor de problematiek van de geloofszekerheid. Downname's nadruk op de predestinatieleer weerspiegelt daarbij het grote belang van dit leerstuk voor precisiaanse puriteinen, maar het was niet het enige leerstuk waarop Downname voortborduurde; zijn geschriften vertonen veeleer een complete wereld- en levensbeschouwing die gedrenkt is in orthodoxe denkpatronen.

Hoofdstuk vier (4) schuift de meer 'radicale' *Francis Rous* (1579-1659) naar voren. Hoewel deze zich nog altijd binnen confessionele kaders bewoog, ontwikkelde hij een vorm van bruidsmystiek die in haar accent op onmiddellijke godservaring verder ging dan de meeste precisianisten konden meemaken. De mystiek van Rous laat bovendien zien dat er binnen het puritanisme een mystieke onderstroom was die confessionele grenzen kon overschrijden en dat bij tijden ook zou doen, zoals bij de zogeheten 'profeten' uit de tijd van de Engelse Revolutie. Verder wordt duidelijk dat, ook al betrof zijn belangrijkste bijdrage mystieke thema's, Rous geverseerd was in de gereformeerde orthodoxie en zich daar sterk mee identificeerde, zoals onder meer blijkt uit zijn ideeën over onderwijs en opvoeding.

Hoofdstuk vijf (5) plaatst *Tobias Crisp* (1600-1642/3) in de context van de politieke en theologische controverses van zijn tijd. Geopperd wordt dat de antinomiaanse stroming waarmee hij geassocieerd wordt een reactionaire tegenbeweging was tegen de precianistische opvatting van vroomheid, door tegenstanders wel aangeduid als 'navelstaarderij'. Hoewel Crisp's status als orthodox godgeleerde omstreden was, gingen zijn theologische opvattingen de gangbare confessionele grenzen niet te buiten, zoals niet alleen zichtbaar wordt in zijn zelf-identificatie met de gereformeerde orthodoxie maar ook in het feit dat als onverdacht orthodox te boek staande puriteinen zijn werk verdedigden. Tobias' zoon Samuel Crisp verdedigde de leer van zijn vader met een beroep op William Perkins, Thomas Jacomb, Thomas Manton en anderen; dit suggereert dat Crisp mogelijk deel uitmaakte van de veel bredere orthodox-gereformeerde traditie zoals die op

het continent tot ontwikkeling was gekomen, met haar eigen accenten, aandachtspunten en richtingen. We moeten het type gereformeerde orthodoxie waar Crisp zonder twijfel toe behoorde dus niet te smal opvatten.

Deze drie casus-studies bereiden de weg naar deel II van de dissertatie. Daarin keren we om te beginnen in hoofdstuk zes (6) met het gevondene in ons achterhoofd terug naar de problematiek van eenheid en verscheidenheid. De uiteenlopende, maar complementaire manieren waarop de drie onderzochte puriteinen hun theologische identiteit tot uitdrukking brachten worden met elkaar gecontrasteerd. Hoewel er verschillen van inzicht waren ten aanzien van de wijze waarop de overgeleverde leer toegepast moest worden, week noch Rous noch Crisp significant af van de confessionele kaders van de normatieve traditie, ondanks (in het geval van Crisp) beschuldigingen van het tegendeel.

In hoofdstuk zeven (7) worden de verschillende draden van het voorafgaande onderzoek bijeengebracht in een poging tot een werkdefinitie van 'puritanisme' te komen, waarbij we de noodzaak laten zien om de deconstructionistische en revisionistische tendensen in de literatuur die het fenomeen te zeer fragmentariseren enigszins te corrigeren. Voorgesteld wordt om het puritanisme te zien als een tamelijk divers conglomeraat van stromingen met wedijverende houdingen en voorkeuren. Wittgensteins notie van *family resemblance* ('Familienähnlichkeit') kan hier dienst doen als een behulpzame manier om met het definitie-probleem om te gaan en tot een betere werkdefinitie van puritanisme te komen, waarbij zowel aan de *diversitas* als aan de *unitas* in de beweging recht gedaan wordt. Verder bevestigt hoofdstuk 7 de eerder geuite hypothese dat de concepten van 'narratief' en 'metanarratief' een geëigend begrippenpaar vormen om het verschijnsel dat de eeuwen door consequent als 'puritanisme' werd aangeduid te begrijpen. Door puriteinen in hun individuele contexten te plaatsen, met alle *diversitas* die daarbij hoort, krijgen we een helderder zicht op de thema's die hen samenbinden in *unitas* – alsook op wat hen verschillend maakt. Door Engelse puriteinen bovendien te zien als deelnemers aan een meer omvattende reform-beweging, de puriteinse Reformatie, wordt duidelijk dat zij niet slechts verenigd waren door hun gedeelde geloofsvoorstellingen, zoals bijvoorbeeld wie God is in zijn verhouding tot de mensheid, maar ook door hun inzet voor een verdere reformatie van het leven in de richting van een godvruchtige levenswandel en een *praxis pietatis*. Dat bij het identificeren van individuen als puritein grote zorgvuldigheid in acht genomen moet worden, blijkt overigens uit het feit dat mensen ook een bepaalde 'puriteinse fase' in hun leven konden doormaken (zoals het geval was bij Lancelot Andrewes, Joseph Hall, John Milton en anderen).

Hoofdstuk acht (8) ten slotte vat de inhoud van het boek samen door vijf manieren op te sommen waarop het verrichte onderzoek bijdraagt aan een meer genuanceerd verstaan van de zo omstreden identiteit van het Engelse puritanisme. Vastgesteld wordt dat eenheid en verscheidenheid elkaar niet uitsluiten, dat er sterke theologische overeenkomsten bestaan tussen puriteinen van uiteenlopende achtergronden, en dat er binnen het Engelse puritanisme van de zeventiende eeuw bepaalde onderstromen waren die confessionele grenzen konden overschrijden en dat ook deden bij zijn meer radicale vertegenwoordigers. Op dit laatste terrein dient overigens nog wel nader onderzoek verricht te worden, dat hopelijk duidelijk zal maken hoe het 'radicale' puritanisme van de

Engelse Revolutie zich verhoudt tot de meer confessioneel georiënteerde traditie die in de hier onderzochte casus-studies tot uitdrukking komt.

[vertaling Gijsbert van den Brink]

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Adams, Thomas. *A Commentary or Exposition Vpon the Diuine Second Epistle Generall, Written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter*. London, 1633.
- Airay, Henry. *Lectures Upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians*. London, 1618.
- Anonymous. *Charity Mistaken, with the Want Whereof Catholickes Are Vniustly Charged: for Affirming, as They Do with Grief, that Protestancy Vnrepented Destrois Salvation*. 1630.
- Ambrose, Isaac. *Prima, Media, and Ultima: The First, Middle, and Last Things, in Three Treatises*. London, 1657.
- Ames, William. *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*. London, 1623.
- Baillie, Robert. *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662*. Edited by David Laing. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Printed for Robert Ogle, 1841.
- Bakewell, Thomas. *The Antinomians Christ Confounded and the Lords Christ Exalted*. London, 1644.
- Barbee, David M. "A Reformed Catholike: William Perkins's Use of the Church Fathers." PhD. Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2013.
- Baxter, Richard. *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter, Volume 5*. Edited by William Orne. London: James Duncan, 1830.
- _____. *A Treatise of Justifying Righteousness*. London, 1676.
- Bayly, Lewis. *The Practice of Pietie*. London, 1611.
- Baynes, Paul. *A Commentarie Vpon the First Chapter of the Epistle of Saint Paul, Written to the Ephesians*. London, 1618.
- Benbrigg, John. *Christ Above All Exalted, As in Justification so in Sanctification, Wherein Seuerall Passages in Dr. Crisps Sermons are Answered*. London, 1645.
- _____. *Gods Fury, Englands Fire. Or A Plain Discovery of Those Spiritual Incendaries, which have Set Church and State on Fire*. London, 1646.
- Beverley, Thomas. *A Conciliatory Discourse upon Crisp's Sermons, on the Observation of Mr. Williams's Dissatisfactions in Them*. London, 1692.
- _____. *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp's Sermons, and Mr. Baxter's Dissatisfactions in Them*. London, 1690.
- Bernard, Nicholas. *The Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Learned Father of Our Church, Dr. James Usher, Late Arch-Bishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland*. London: Printed by E. Tyler, 1656.
- Bunyan, John. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan: The Doctrine of the Law and Grace Unfolded and I Will Pray With the Spirit*. Edited by Roger Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Burgess, Anthony. *The True Doctrine of Justification Asserted and Vindicated*. London, 1644.
- Burgess, Cornelius. *No Sacrilege Nor Sinne To Aliene or Purchase the Lands of Bishops or Others, Whose Offices are Abolished*. London, 1659.
- Calamy, Edmund. *Two Solemne Covenants made Between God and Man: That is, the Covenant of Workes and the Covenant of Grace*. London, 1647.
- Cartwright, Thomas. *A Second Replie*. London, 1575.
- Clarkson, Laurence. *The Lost Sheep Found: or, The Prodigal Returned to his Father's House*. London, 1660.
- Chauncy, Isaac. *Neonomianism Unmask'd: or, The Ancient Gospel Pleaded*. London, 1692.
- Crisp, Samuel. *Christ Made Sin: 2 Cor. 5:21 Evinced from Scripture, Upon Occasion of an Exception Taken at Pinnars-hall, 28 January 1689, at Reprinting the Sermons of Dr. Tobias Crisp*. London, 1691.

- Crisp, Tobias. *Christ alone exalted in fourteen sermons preached in and neere London, / by the late Reverend Tobias Crispe...As they were taken from his own mouth in shortwriting, whereof severall copies were diligently compared together...And published for the satisfaction and comfort of Gods people.* London, 1644.
- _____. *Christ Alone Exalted being the Compleat Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D., Containing XLII Sermons...which were Formerly Printed in Three Small Volumes...to which is Now Added Ten Sermons, Whereof Eight Were Never Before Printed Faithfully Transcribed from His Own Notes, which is All That Will Ever Be Printed of the Said Doctor's.* London, 1690.
- Culverwell, Ezekiel. *A Treatise of Faith: Wherein is Declared How a Man May Live By Faith, and Find Releefe in All His Necessaries. Applied Especially unto the Use of the Weakest Christians.* London, 1623.
- Dering, Edward. *A Sermon Preached Before the Queens Maiestie.* Awdely, 1569.
- Donne, John. *The Works of John Donne, D.D., Dean of Saint Paul's 1621-1641.* Edited by Henry Alford. 6 vols. London: John W. Parker, 1839.
- Downame, George. *A Godly and Learned Treatise of Prayer.* London, 1640.
- Downame, John. *Additional annotations or, A collection of all the several additions to the third (above the first and second) impression of that most excellent work, intituled, annotations upon all the books of the Old and New Testament. By the labour of certain learned divines, thereunto appointed, by authority of Parliament. Published for the ease and benefit of th[ose] [w]ho have already bought the former impressions; with directions at the end of the preface, for the more ready finding where these additions should be inserted in the greater volume, to supply what is wanting therein.* London, 1658.
- _____. *Annotations upon all the books of the Old and New Testament wherein the text is explained, doubts resolved, Scriptures paralleled and various readings observed / by the joynt-labour of certain learned divines, thereunto appointed, and therein employed, as is expressed in the preface.* London, 1645.
- _____. *A brief concordance, or table to the Bible of the last translation serving for the more easie finding out of the most useful places therein contened [and] carefully perused and enlarged by Mr. John Downame.* London, 1630.
- _____. *The Christian warfare against the Deuill world and flesh wherein is described their nature, the maner of their fight and meanes to obtaine victorye.* London, 1634.
- _____. *A guide to godlynesse or a Treatise of a Christian life shewing the duties wherein it consisteth, the helps inabling & the reasons perswading vnto it ye impediments hindering ye practise of it, and the best meanes to remoue them whereunto are added diuers prayers and a treatise of carnall securitie by Iohn Douname Batcheler in Diuinitie and minister of Gods Word.* London, 1622.
- _____. *Lectures vpon the foure first chapters of the prophecie of Hosea Wherein the text is expounded and cleered, and such profitable instructions obserued, and applied, as naturally arise out of this holie Scripture, and are fit for these times. By Iohn Dovname Bacheler in Diuinitie, and preacher of Gods word.* London, 1608.
- _____. *The Plea of the Poore; Or, A Treatise of Beneficence and Alms-Deeds.* London, 1616.
- Durham, William. *The Life and Death of...Robert Harris, D.D.* London, 1662.
- Dury, John. *The Earnest Breathings of Foreign Protestants, Divines and Others to the Ministers and Other Able Christians of These Three Nations for a Compleat Body of Practicall Divinity.* London, 1658.
- Eaton, John. *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone.* London, 1642.
- Edwards, Thomas. *The First and Second Part of Gangraena: Or, A Catalogue and Discovery of Many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of This Time, Vented and Acted in England in These Four Last Yeers.* London, 1646.

- Eyre, William. *Vindiciae Justificationis Gratuitae*. London, 1654.
- Finch, Henry. *The Summe of sacred Diuinitie, First Briefly and Methodically Propounded and then More Largly and Cleerely Handled and Explained*, Edited by John Downname. London, 1620.
- _____. *The Worlds Great Restauration; Or, The Calling of the Jewes, and (with them) of all the Nations and Kingdomes of the Earth, to the Faith of Christ*. London, 1621.
- Gataker, Thomas. *God's Eye on His Israel*. London, 1645.
- Geree, John. *The Character of an Old English Puritan*. London, 1646.
- Geree, Stephen. *The Doctrine of the Antinomians by Evidence of Gods Truth, Plainly Confuted in An Answer to Divers and Dangerous Doctrines in the Seven Frist Sermons of Dr. Crisps Fourteen, which Were First Published*. London, 1644.
- Goodwin, John. *Redemption Redeemed*. London, 1651.
- Gouge, William. *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews*. London, 1655.
- Greenhill, William. *An Exposition of the Five First Chapters of the Prophet Ezekiel*. London, 1645.
- Hall, Joseph. *Christ's Mystical; Or, the Blessed Union of Christ and His Members*. London, 1647.
- _____. *Revelation Unrevealed: Concerning the Thousand Yeares Reigne of the Saints with Christ upon Earth*. London, 1650.
- Hartlib, Samuel. *The True and Readie Way to Learne the Latin Tongue*. London, 1654.
- Jenkyn, William. *An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude*. London, 1652.
- Leigh, Edward. *A Systeme or Body of Divinity, Consisting of Ten Books*. London, 1654.
- Montagu, Richard. *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers*. London, 1625.
- Nedham, Marchamont. *The Cases of the Commonwealth of England Stated*. Edited by Philip A. Knachel. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969.
- Norton, John. *Abel Being Dead, Yet Speaketh*. London, 1658.
- Pagitt, Ephraim. *Heresiography: Or, A Description of the Heretickes and Sectaries of These Latter Times*. London, 1645.
- Pemble, William. *Vindiciae Gratiae: A Plea for Grace More Especially the Grace of Faith*. Second Edition. London, 1629.
- Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. New York: Croscup and Sterling Company, 1893.
- Perkins, William. *A Golden Chaine; or, The Description of Theologie Containing the Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, According to Gods Word: A View of the Order Whereof, Is to Be Seene in the Table Annexed*. London, 1591.
- _____. *The Workes of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the University of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins*. Cambridge: Printed by Cantrell Legge, 1616-18.
- Philaethes, Hananiel. *Christ Exalted and Dr. Crisp Vindicated in Several Points called Antinomian*. London, 1698.
- Porter, Edmund. *Θεός Ανθρωποφόρος; Or, God Incarnate, Shewing that Jesus Christ is the Onely and the Most High God*. London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, 1655.
- Rogers, Richard. *A Commentary Vpon the Whole Book of Iudges*. London, 1615.
- Rous, Francis. *The arte of happines Consisting of three parts, whereof the first searcheth out the happinesse of man. The second, particularly discouers and approues it- The third, sheweth the meanes to attayne and increase it*. By Francis Rous. London, 1619.
- _____. *The balme of love: to heale divisions, and the wounds made by them, and to make the body of Christ whole and entire for its owne beauty, strength, and safety. Partly presented in a former discourse, when it might have prevented, and now after many evils for want of prevention re-enforced in a second*. London, 1648.
- _____. *The booke of Psalmes in English meeter*. London, 1641.
- _____. *The bounds & bonds of publike obedience, or, A vindication of our lawfull submission to the present government, or to a government supposed unlawfull, but commanding lawfull things*

- likewise how such an obedience is consistent with our Solemne League and Covenant : in all which a reply is made to the three answers of the two demurrers, and to the author of The grand case of conscience, who professe themselves impassionate Presbyterians. London, 1649.
- _____. *Catholick charitie: complaining, and maintaining, that Rome is uncharitable to sundry eminent parts of the Catholick Church, and especially to Protestants, and is therefore Uncatholick: and so, a Romish book, called Charitie mistaken, though undertaken by a second, is it selfe a mistaking.* London, 1641.
- _____. *The diseases of the time, attended by their remedies.* By Francis Rous. London, 1622.
- _____. *The heavenly academie: or The highest school, vwhere alone is that highest teaching, the teaching of the heart.* London, 1638.
- _____. *Interiora regni Dei.* London, 1655.
- _____. *The lavvfulness of obeying the present government and acting under it by one that loves all Presbyterian lovers of truth and peace, and is of their communion.* London, 1649.
- _____. *Meditations of instruction, of exhortation, of reprofedeindeavouring the edification and reparation of the house of God.* London, 1616.
- _____. *Mella patrum nempe, omnium, quorum per prima nascentis & patientis Ecclesiae tria secula, usque ad pacem sub Constantino divinitus datam, scripta prodierunt, atque adhuc minus dubiae Fidei supersunt / collegit, & Ecclesiae in Terris militanti, in Coelis conversanti dicavit Franciscus Rous.* London, 1650.
- _____. *The mysticall marriage Experimentall discoveries of the heavenly marriage betweene a soule and her saviour.* By F. Rous. London, 1631.
- _____. *Mysticum matrimonium quo junguntur Cristus et ecclesia.* London, 1655.
- _____. *Oile of scorpions The miseries of these times turned into medicines and curing themselues.* By Francis Rous. London, 1623.
- _____. *The onely remedy that can cure a people, when all other remedies faile.* London, 1627.
- _____. *Testis veritatis the doctrine [brace] of King Iames our late soueraigne of famous memory, of the Church of England, of the Catholicke Church : [brace] plainly shewed to bee one in the points of [brace] pradesination, free-will, certaintie of saluation [brace] : with a discouery of the grounds [brace] naturall, politicke [brace] of Arminianisme.* London, 1626.
- _____. *Treatises and meditations dedicated to the saints and to the excellent throughout the three nations.* London, 1657.
- _____. *Thule, or Vertues historie To the honorable and vertuous Mistris Amy Audely.* By F.R. The first booke. London, 1598.
- _____. *The truth of three things viz, the doctrine of predestination, free-will, and certainty of saluation. As it is maintayned by the Church of England, Vwherein the grounds of Arminianisme is discovered, and confuted.* London, 1633.
- Rutherford, Samuel. *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist.* London, 1648.
- Saltmarsh, John. *Free Grace: Or, The Flowing of Christ's Blood Freely to Sinners.* London: John Marshall, 1700.
- Taylor, Thomas. *A Commentarie Vpon the Epistle of S. Paul written to Titus.* London, 1612.
- Traill, Robert. *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification, And of its Preachers and Professors from the Unjust Charge of Antinomianism.* London, 1692.
- Twisse, William. *The Riches of Gods Love Unto the Vessells of Mercy, Consistent with His Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the Vessells of Wrath.* Oxford, 1653.
- Ussher, James. *A body of divinitie, or, The summe and substance of Christian religion catechistically propounded, and explained, by way of question and answer : methodically and familiarly handled / composed long since by James Vsher B. of Armagh, and at the earnest desires of divers godly Christians now printed and published ; whereunto is adjoynd a tract, intituled*

- Immanuel, or, The mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God heretofore written [sic] and published by the same author.* Edited by John Downname. London, 1645.
- _____. *Eighteen Sermons Preached in Oxford, 1640.* London, 1660.
- _____. *The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, with a Life of the Author and An Account of His Writings, Volume 1.* Edited by Charles Richard Elrington. Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1897.
- Wickens, Robert. *A Compleat and Perfect Concordance of the English Bible.* Oxford, 1655.
- Widdowes, Giles. *The Schysmatical Puritan.* London, 1631.
- Wilburn, Percival. *A Checke or Reproofe of M. Howlet's Untimely Screeching.* London, 1581.
- Wotton, Samuel. *Mr. Anthony Wotton's Defence Against Mr. George Walker's Charge, Accusing Him of Socinian Heresie and Blasphemie.* Cambridge, 1641.
- Yates, John. *Ibis ad Caesarem.* London, 1626.

Secondary Sources

- Achinstein, Sharon. *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ahlstrom, Sydney E., ed. *Theology in America: The Major Protestant Voices from Puritanism to Neo-Orthodoxy.* 1967; reprint. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2003.
- Ahmed, Arif, ed. *Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations: A Critical Guide.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Alford, Stephen. *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558-1569.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- _____. *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Allen, J. W. *English Political Thought, 1603-1660, Volume 1: 1603-1644.* London: Methuen & Co., 1938.
- Allison, C. Fitzsimons. *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter.* New York: Seabury Press, 1966.
- Almond, Philip C. *Adam and Eve in Seventeenth-Century Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Ames-Lewis, Francis, ed. *Sir Thomas Gresham and Gresham College: Studies in the Intellectual History of London in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.
- Amory, Hugh, and David D. Hall. *A History of the Book in America, Volume 1: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Anderson, Judith H. *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England.* Bronx: Fordham University Press, 2005.
- Appleby, David J. *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- Armstrong, Brian G. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Aston, Margaret. *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion.* London: Hambledon Press, 1984.
- Atherton, Ian, and David Como, "The Burning of Edward Wightman: Puritanism, Prelacy and the Politics of Heresy in Early Modern England." *English Historical Review* (December 2005): 1215-50.
- Atherton, Ian, and Julie Sanders, eds. *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.

- Atkins, Jonathan M. "Calvinist Bishops, Church Unity and the Rise of Arminianism." *Albion* 18 (1986): 411-27.
- Auchter, Dorothy. *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Auslander, Leora. *Cultural Revolutions: Everyday Life and Politics in Britain, North America, and France*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.
- Bac, J. Martin. *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as Against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Backus, Irena. *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. *Theodore de Beze (1519-1605)*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2007.
- Backus, Irena, ed. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Backus, Irena, and Philip Benedict, eds. *Calvin and His Influence, 1509-2009*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Bagchi, David, and David C. Steinmetz, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Baker, J. Wayne. "Sola Fide, Sola Gratia: The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985): 115-33.
- Ball, Bryan W. *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Ball, John H., III. *Chronicling the Soul's Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1992.
- Ballor, Jordan J. *Covenant, Causality, and Law: A Study in the Theology of Wolfgang Musculus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Barber, John. *The Road to Eden: Studies in Christianity and Culture*. Palo Alto: Academia Press, 2008.
- Barbour, Reid. *Literature and Religious Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Barnard, John, and D. F. McKenzie, eds. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Barton, Stephen C. *Holiness: Past and Present*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Bast, Robert J., and Andrew C. Gow, eds. *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late-Medieval and Reformation History*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Beach, J. Mark. *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Beardslee, John W., III, ed. *Reformed Dogmatics: J. Wollebius, G. Voetius, F. Turretin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Bedford, Ronald, and Lloyd Davis and Philippa Kelly. *Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation, 1500-1660*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Beeke, Joel R. *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation*. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.
- _____. "Faith and Assurance in the Heidelberg Catechism and Its Primary Composers: A Fresh Look at the Kendall Thesis." *Calvin Theological Journal* 27, No. 1 (1992): 39-67.
- Beeke, Joel R., and Randall J. Pederson. *Meet the Puritans: A Guide to Modern Reprints*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006.

- Beeke, Joel R., and Mark Jones. *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.
- Bendall, Sarah, and Christopher Brooke and Patrick Collinson. *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999.
- Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Bennet, Joan. *Sir Thomas Browne: "A Man of Achievement in Literature."* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- Bennett, Ralph, ed. *Settlements in the Americas: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The American Puritan Imagination: Essays in Revaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- _____. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- _____. *The American Jeremiad*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.
- Bernard, G. W. *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Betteridge, Tom. *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Bierma, Lyle D. *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996.
- _____. *The Theology of the Heidelberg Catechism: A Reformation Synthesis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013.
- Bierma, Lyle D., ed. *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, History, and Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Bietenholz, Peter G. *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus: Erasmus' Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Billier, Peter, and Anne Hudson, eds. *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Billings, J. Todd, and I. John Hesselink, eds. *Calvin's Theology and Its Reception: Disputes, Developments, and New Possibilities*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.
- Black, Joseph L., ed. *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Black, Michael H. *Cambridge University Press, 1584-1984*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Boase, George Clement, and William Prideaux Courtney. *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis: A Catalogue of the Writings, both Manuscript and Printed, of Cornishmen, and of Works Relating to the County of Cornwall, Volume III*. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1882.
- Boersma, Hans. *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy*. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993.
- Bolam, C. G., et al, eds. *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Moderate Unitarianism*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1968.
- Bondos-Greene, Stephen A. "The End of an Era: Cambridge Puritanism and the Christ's College Election of 1609." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (March 1982): 197-208.
- Booty, John. "Anglicanism." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, edited by Hans Hillerbrand, 1:38-44. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Boran, Elizabethanne, and Crawford Gribben, eds. *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550-1700*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Bossy, John. *Peace in the Post-Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- Bozeman, Theodore D. *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Ante-Bellum Religious Thought*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977.
- _____. *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- _____. "The Glory of the 'Third Time': John Eaton as Contra-Puritan." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (October 1996): 638-54.
- _____. *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Brachlow, Stephen. *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570-1625*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Braddick, Michael. *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars*. London: Allen Lane, 2008.
- Bradley, James E., and Richard A. Muller, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works and Methods*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.
- Bradshaw, Brendan, and Peter Roberts, eds. *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Brauer, Jerald C. "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic, 1579-1659: An Introduction to the Study of the Mystical Element in Puritanism." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1948.
- _____. "Reflections on the Nature of English Puritanism." *Church History*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (1954): 99-108.
- _____. "Types of Puritan Piety." *Church History*, Vol. 56, No. 1 (March, 1987): 39-58.
- Brecht, Martin, ed. *Geschichte Des Pietismus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Breen, Louise A. "Guardians in the Gap: Religious Heterodoxy and the Puritan Officer Corps in Seventeenth-century Massachusetts." PhD diss., University of Connecticut, 1993.
- _____. *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630-1692*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Breitwieser, Mitchell R. *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning: Religion, Grief, and Ethnology in Mary White Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.
- Bremer, Francis J. *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610-1692*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards*. Lebanon: University Press of New England, 1995.
- _____. *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- _____. *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- _____. *Building a New Jerusalem: John Davenport, a Puritan in Three Worlds*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- _____. *First Founders: American Puritans and Puritanism in an Atlantic World*. Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2012.
- Bremer, Francis J., ed. *Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.
- Bremer, Francis J., and Lynn A. Botelho, eds. *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England, 1588-1649*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005.
- Bremer, Francis J., and Tom Webster, eds. *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*. 2 vols. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006.
- Bender, Stephen. *Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Brenner, Robert. *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Breslow, Marvin A. *Mirror of England: English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618-1640*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Breward, Ian. "The Life and Theology of William Perkins." PhD diss., University of Manchester, 1963.
- _____. "The Abolition of Puritanism." *Journal of Religious History* 7 (1972): 20-34.
- Breward, Ian, ed. *The Work of William Perkins*. Appleford: Sutton Courtney, 1970.
- Brewer, Holly. *By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Brockway, Robert W. *A Wonderful Work of God: Puritanism and the Great Awakening*. Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2003.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. *Historical Theology: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1978.
- Brook, Benjamin. *Lives of the Puritans*. 3 vols. London: Printed for James Black, 1813.
- Brooke, John, and Ian Maclean, eds. *Heterodoxy in Early Modern Science and Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Brown, Andrew D. *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England: The Diocese of Salisbury, 1250-1550*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Brown, Keith. "Review of Scottish Puritanism." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002).
- Brown, Matthew P. *The Pilgrim and the Bee: Reading Rituals and Book Culture in Early New England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Buchanan, James. *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of Its History in the Church and of Its Exposition from Scripture*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1867.
- Burton, Simon J. G. *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's "Modus Theologiae."* Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Bush, Sargent. *The Writings of Thomas Hooker: Spiritual Adventure in Two Worlds*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.
- Bush, Sargent, ed. *The Correspondence of John Cotton*. Chapel Hill: University Press of North Carolina, 2001.
- Caldwell, Patricia. *The Puritan Conversion Narrative: The Beginnings of American Expression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Caldwell, Robert W., III, *The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards: Text, Context, and Application*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Cambers, Andrew. "Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, c. 1580-1720." *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (October, 2007): 796-825.
- _____. *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Cameron, Euan. *The European Reformation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Campbell, Gordon. *Bible: The Story of the King James Version*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Campbell, Gordon, and Thomas N. Corns. *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Canizares-Esquerria, Jorge. *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Canny, Nicholas, ed. *The Origins of Empire, Volume 1: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Capp, Bernard S. *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism*. London: Faber and Faber, 1972.

- _____. *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Carlson, Leland H., ed. *Elizabethan Non-Conformist Texts, Volume 3: The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Carlton, Charles, ed. *State, Sovereigns and Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honor of A. J. Slavin*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Casillas, Kenneth. "English Puritan Exegesis as Reflected in Thomas Gataker's Annotations on Isaiah: Toward an Equitable Assessment of Historic Biblical Interpretation." PhD diss., Bob Jones University, 2001.
- Chan, Simon. "The Puritan Meditative Tradition, 1599-1691: A Study in Ascetical Piety." PhD diss., Cambridge University, 1986.
- Chapman, Alister, and John Coffey and Brad S. Gregory, eds. *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Chase, William. *A Catalogue of a Very Valuable Collection of Books*. Norwich, 1753.
- Christianson, Paul. "Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1970): 463-84.
- Chung, Paul S. *The Spirit of God Transforming Life: The Reformation and Theology of the Holy Spirit*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Church, F. Forrester, and Timothy George, eds. *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Clark, Donald Lemen. "John Milton and William Chappell." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (1955): 329-50.
- Clark, Peter, ed. *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Clark, Victoria. *Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Clarke, Elizabeth. *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Press Censorship in Caroline England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Cleveland, Christopher. *Thomism in John Owen*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2013.
- Cliffe, J. T. *Puritan Gentry: The Great Puritan Families of Stuart England*. New York: Routledge, 1984.
- _____. *Puritans in Conflict: The Puritan Gentry During and After the Civil Wars*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Coffey, John. *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- _____. "Puritanism and Liberty Revisited: The Case for Toleration in the English Revolution." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (1998): 961-85.
- _____. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1588-1689*. London: Longman, 2000.
- _____. *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England*. Rochester: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- _____. "The Problem of 'Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638.'" In *Enforcing the Reformation in Ireland and Scotland*, edited by Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben, 68-90. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Coffey, John, and Paul C. H. Lim, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

- Cogswell, Thomas, and Richard Cust and Peter Lake, eds. *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Cohen, Bernard, ed. *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.
- Colacurcio, Michael J. *Godly Letters: The Literature of the American Puritans*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. New York: Methuen, 1967.
- _____. "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31:4 (1980).
- _____. *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- _____. *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1983.
- _____. *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1988.
- _____. *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture*. Los Angeles: Clark Memorial Library, 1989.
- _____. *Elizabethan Essays*. New York: Continuum Publishing, 1994.
- _____. *Elizabethans*. New York: Hambledon and London, 2003.
- _____. *From Cranmer to Sancroft*. London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006.
- _____. *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Collinson, Patrick, and John Craig and Brett Usher, eds. *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church, 1582-1590*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003.
- Collinson, Patrick, and Richard Rex and Graham Stanton. *Lady Margaret Beaufort and Her Professors of Divinity at Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Como, David R. "Women, Prophecy, and Authority in Early Stuart Puritanism." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (1998): 203-22.
- _____. *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Como, David, and Peter Lake, "Puritans, Antinomians and Laudians in Caroline London: The Strange Case of Peter Shaw and Its Contents." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 50, No. 4 (October, 1999): 684-715.
- Condren, Conal. *The Language of Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1994.
- _____. *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Conforti, Joseph A. *Jonathan Edwards, Religious Tradition, and American Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- _____. *Imagining New England: Explorations of Regional Identity from the Pilgrims to the Mid-Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- _____. *Saints and Strangers: New England in British North America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Coolidge, John S. *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible*. London: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Cooper, Tim. "The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the 'Radical' from Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Religion." *Journal of Religious History* 24/3 (2000): 247-62.
- _____. *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001.

- _____. *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- Corns, Thomas N., ed. *A Companion to Milton*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Corns, Thomas N., and David Loewenstein, eds. *The Emergence of Quaker Writing: Dissenting Literature in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Coster, Will. *Baptism and Spiritual Kinship in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002.
- Coward, Barry, and Julian Swann, eds. *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern England: From the Waldensians to the French Revolution*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.
- Craig, John. *Reformation, Politics and Polemics: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns, 1500-1610*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002.
- Cross, Claire. *Church and People: England, 1450-1660*. Second Edition. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
- Crawford, Julie. *Marvelous Protestantism: Monstrous Births in Post-Reformation England*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Cressy, David. *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- _____. *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Crick, Julia, and Alexandra Walsham, eds. *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Cromartie, Alan. *Sir Matthew Hale, 1609-1676: Law, Religion and Natural Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Cross, Frank Leslie, ed. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Cross, Richard. *The Metaphysics of the Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Cuming, G. J., and Derek Baker, eds. *Popular Belief and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert, ed. *A History of Christian Doctrine*. London: T&T Clark, 1978.
- Cunningham, Andrew, and Ole Peter Grell, eds. *The Four Horseman of the Apocalypse: Religion, War, Famine and Death in Reformation Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- D'Addario, Christopher. *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Dahl, Gina. *Book Collections of Clerics in Norway, 1650-1750*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Damrau, Peter. *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany*. London: Maney Publishing, 2006.
- Daniell, David. *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Daniels, Bruce C. *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995.

- Danner, Dan G. *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1555-1560*. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Darton, Frederick Joseph Harvey. *Children's Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.
- Davies, Brian. *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Davies, Catharine. *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edwards VI*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970, 1975.
- _____. *The Worship of the English Puritans*. Grand Rapids: Soli Deo Gloria, 1997.
- Davies, Julian. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Davis, J. C. *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1516-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- _____. *Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the Historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- _____. "Puritanism and Revolution: Themes, Categories, Methods and Conclusions." *Historical Journal* 33 (1990): 693-704.
- _____. *Oliver Cromwell*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- De Krey, Gary S. *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- De Reuver, Arie. *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation*, Translated by James A. De Jong. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Degler, Carl N. *Out of Our Past: The Forces that Shaped Modern America*. New York: HarperCollins, 1984.
- Den Boer, William. *God's Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius, 1559-1609*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Dever, Mark E. *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- DeVries, Pieter. "Die Mij Heft Liefgehad" *De Betekenis van de Gemeenschap Met Christus in de Theologie van John Owen, 1616-1683*. Heerenveen: Groen, 1999.
- DeVun, Leah. *Prophecy, Alchemy, and the End of Time: John of Rupecissa in the Late Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Dickens, A. G. *The English Reformation*. Second Edition. University Park: Penn State University Press, 1991.
- Dillon, Jannette. *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Dixon, C. Scott. *Contesting the Reformation*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Dixon, Philip. *Nice and Hot Disputes: The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Dobranski, Stephen B., and John P. Rumrich, eds. *Milton and Heresy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Dodds, Gregory D. *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Doerkson, Daniel W., and Christopher Hodgkins, eds. *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004.
- Dolezal, James E. "A Practical Scholasticism? Edward Leigh's Theological Method." *Westminster Theological Journal* 71 (2009): 337-54.

- Donnelly, John P. *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Religion, 1558-1603*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Doran, Susan, and Christopher Durston, *Princes, Pastors and People: The Church and Religion in England, 1500-1700*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Duffin, Ann. *Faction and Faith: Politics and Religion of the Cornish Gentry Before the Civil War*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- _____. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580*. Second Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- _____. *Marking the Hours: English People and Their Prayers, 1240-1570*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Duffy, Eamon, and D. M. Loades, eds. *The Church of Mary Tudor: Catholic Christendom, 1300-1700*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Dunan-Page, Anne. *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots, 1660-1750*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Durston, Christopher. *The Family in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- _____. *James I*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- _____. *Cromwell's Major Generals: Godly Government During the English Revolution*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- Durston, Christopher, and Jacqueline Eales, eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996.
- Durston, Christopher, and Judith Maltby, eds. *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Dutton, Richard. *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.
- Dzelzaninis, Martin, and Annabel Patterson, eds. *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell, Volume 1: 1672-1673*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Eales, Jacqueline. *Puritans and Roundheads: The Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- _____. *Women in Early Modern England, 1500-1700*. London: UCL Press, 1998.
- _____. *Community and Disunity: Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640-1649*. London: Keith Dickson Books, 2001.
- Egan, Jim. *Authorizing Experience: Refigurations of the Body Politic in Seventeenth-Century New England Writing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Elton, G. R. *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government, Papers and Reviews, 1946-1972, Volume 2: Parliament [and] Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Elwood, Douglas J. *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Emerson, Everett H. *English Puritanism from John Hooper to John Milton*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1968.

- Englander, David, et al, eds. *Culture and Belief in Europe, 1450-1600: An Anthology of Sources*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 1990.
- Erickson, Robert A. *The Language of the Heart, 1600-1750*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Evans, G. R. *Alan of Lille: The Frontiers of Theology in the Later Twelfth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- _____. *The University of Cambridge: A New History*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2010.
- _____. *The University of Oxford: A New History*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2010.
- Fallon, Stephen M. *Milton's Peculiar Grace: Self-Representation and Authority*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Feingold, Mordechai. *History of Universities*, XVII, 2001-2002. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne, and Peter McCullough, eds. *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1600-1750*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Ferngren, Gary B., ed. *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Fesko, John V. *Diversity within the Reformed Tradition: Supra- and Infralapsarianism in Calvin, Dort, and Westminster*. Greenville: Reformed Academic Press, 2001.
- _____. *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology, 1517-1700*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Fessenden, Tracy, and Nicholas F. Radel and Magdalena J. Zaborowska, eds. *The Puritan Origins of American Sex: Religion, Sexuality, and the National*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Field, David P. *Rigide Calvinisme in a Softer Dresse: The Moderate Presbyterianism of John Howe, 1630-1705*. Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2004.
- Fincham, Kenneth. *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- _____. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998.
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake. "Popularity, Prelacy and Puritanism in the 1630s: Joseph Hall Explains Himself." *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 111, No. 443 (1996): 856-81.
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake, eds. *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Finlayson, Michael G. *Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution: The Religious Factor in English Politics Before and After the Interregnum*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.
- Finlayson, Michael. "Puritanism and Puritans: Labels or Libels?" *Canadian Journal of History* 8 (1973): 201-33.
- Fischer, David Hackett. *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Fisher, George. *The Reformation*. New York: Scribner & Armstrong, 1873.
- Fitzgerald, Alan D., ed. *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- Fleming, W. K. *Mysticism in Christianity*. London, 1913.
- Ford, Alan. "Church of Ireland, 1558-1641: A Puritan Church?" In *As by Law Established: The Church of England Since the Reformation*, edited by Alan Ford, J. I. McGuire, and Kenneth Milne. Dublin: Lilliput, 1995.
- _____. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997.

- _____. *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early Modern Ireland and England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Ford, Alan, and John McCafferty, eds. *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Foster, Stephen. "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630-1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective." *William and Mary Quarterly* 38 (1981): 624-60.
- _____. *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Foxe, John. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs: Select Narratives*. Edited by John N. King. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Freedman, Lila, ed. *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Freeman, Thomas S., and Thomas F. Mayer, eds. *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007.
- Freist, Dagmar. *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645*. London: I. B. Tauris, 1997.
- Fritze, Ronald H., and William B. Robison, eds. *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- Fuller, Thomas. *The Church History of Britain*. Oxford, 1845.
- Games, Alison. *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Ganzer, Klaus, and Bruno Steimer, eds. *Dictionary of the Reformation*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2002.
- Gardiner, Dorothy, ed. *The Oxinden Letters, 1607-42*. London, 1933.
- Gardiner, S. R. *History of England, 1603-1642*. 10 vols. London: Longman, Greens, and Co., 1883-84.
- Garrett, Christina H. *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Garrett, James Leo. *Baptist Theology: A Four-Century Study*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2009.
- Gaunt, Peter. *The English Civil Wars, 1642-1651*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2003.
- Gaunt, Peter, ed. *The English Civil War*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Gavrilyuk, Paul L., and Sarah Coakley, eds. *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- George, C. H. "Puritanism as History and Historiography." *Past and Present* 41 (1968): 77-104.
- Gerstner, Jonathan N. *The Thousand Generation Covenant: Dutch Reformed Covenant Theology and Group Identity in Colonial South Africa, 1652-1814*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Gibbons, B. J. *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought: Behmenism and Its Development in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Gibson, William, and Robert G. Ingram, eds. *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660-1832*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Gill, John. *Truth Defended in Sermons and Tracts, by the late Reverend and Learned John Gill, D.D. A New Edition*. 1814; reprint Streamwood: Primitive Baptist Library, 1981.
- Gordis, Lisa M. *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Gordon, Scott Paul. *The Power of the Passive Self in English Literature, 1640-1770*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Goudriaan, Aza. *Reformed Orthodoxy and Philosophy, 1625-1750: Gisbertus Voetius, Petrus van Mastricht, and Anthonius Driessen*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Goudriaan, Aza, and Fred van Lieburg, eds. *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt, 1618-1619*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- Gould, Philip. *Covenant and Republic: Historical Romance and the Politics of Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Graebner, Norman Brooks. "Protestants and Dissenters: An Examination of the Seventeenth-Century Eatonist and New England Controversies in Reformation Perspective." PhD diss., Duke University, 1984.
- Graham, Judith S. *Puritan Family Life: The Diary of Samuel Sewall*. Lebanon: Northeastern University Press, 2000.
- Graham, Michael F. *The Blasphemies of Thomas Aikenhead: Boundaries of Belief on the Eve of the Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- Granger, James, ed. *A Biographical History of England, from Egbert the Great to the Revolution*. Second Edition. 4 vols. London: T. Davies, et al, 1775.
- Grayling, A. C., and Naomi Goulder and Andrew Pyle, eds. *The Continuum Encyclopedia of British Philosophy*. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Greaves, Richard L. "Puritanism and Science: The Anatomy of a Controversy." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (1969): 345-68.
- _____. *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.
- _____. *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- _____. *Deliver Us From Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- _____. "The Puritan-Nonconformist Tradition in England, 1560-1700: Historiographical Reflections." *Albion* 17 (1987): 449-86.
- _____. *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Greaves, Richard L., and Robert Zaller, eds. *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century, Volume 1: A-F*. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982.
- Green, I. M. "For Children in Yeeres and Children in Understanding': The Emergence of the English Catechism under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986): 397-425.
- _____. *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England, c.1530-1740*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- _____. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Green, Robert W., ed. *Protestantism, Capitalism, and Social Science: The Weber Thesis Controversy*, Second Edition. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1973.
- Greengrass, Mark, and Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor, eds. *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Greenspan, Ezra, and Jonathan Rose, eds. *Book History, Volume 4*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.
- Grell, Ole Peter. *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Grell, Ole Peter, and Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke, eds. *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Gribben, Crawford. *The Irish Puritans: James Ussher and the Reformation of the Church*. Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2003.
- _____. "Defining the Puritans? The Baptist Debate in Cromwellian Ireland, 1654-56." *Church History* 73:1 (March 2004): 63-89.

- _____. "Rhetoric, Fiction and Theology: James Ussher and the Death of Jesus Christ." *The Seventeenth Century* 20:1 (2005): 53-76.
- _____. *God's Irishmen: Theological Debates in Cromwellian Ireland*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- _____. *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550-1682*. Second Edition. London: Paternoster, 2008.
- _____. "Puritanism in Ireland and Wales." In *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, 159-73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Gribben, Crawford, and David George Mullan, eds. *Literature and the Scottish Reformation*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Griffin, Martin, I. J., Jr., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Griffiths, Paul. *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England, 1560-1640*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Guibbory, Achsah. *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Gunther, Karl. "The Origins of English Puritanism." *History Compass* 4/2 (2006): 235-40.
- _____. "The Intellectual Origins of English Puritanism, ca. 1525-1572." PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2007.
- Gunther, Karl, and Ethan H. Shagan. "Protestant Radicalism and Political Thought in the Reign of Henry VIII." *Past and Present* 194 (2007): 35-74.
- Gura, Philip F. *A Glimpse of Zion's Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620-1660*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1984.
- Guy, John, ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Ha, Polly, *English Presbyterianism, 1590-1640*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Ha, Polly, and Patrick Collinson, eds. *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Haakonssen, Knud, ed. *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Habermann, Ina. *Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003.
- Hackel, Heidi Brayman. *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Haigh, Christopher. *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- _____. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Haigh, Christopher, ed. *The English Reformation Revised*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Hale, Sir Matthew. *The History of the Common Life of England*. Edited by Charles M. Gray. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1971.
- Hall, Basil. "Puritanism: The Problem of Definitions." *Studies in Church History* 2 (1965): 283-96.
- Hall, David D. *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972.
- _____. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

- _____. *Cultures of Print: Essays in the History of the Book*. Boston: University of Massachusetts, 1996.
- _____. *Witch-hunting in Seventeenth-Century New England: A Documentary History, 1638-1683*. Second Edition. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Ways of Writing: The Practice and Politics of Text-Making in Seventeenth-Century New England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- _____. *A Reforming People: Puritanism and the Transformation of Public Life in New England*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011.
- Hall, David D., ed. *Puritanism in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- _____. *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*. Second Edition. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990.
- _____. *Puritans in the New World: A Critical Anthology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Haller, William. *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- _____. *The Rise of Puritanism*. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E. *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Hamil, Hannibal. *Psalm Culture and Early Modern English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hamilton, Donna B., and Richard Strier, eds. *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hamm, Berndt. *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety*. Edited by Robert J. Bast. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Hammond, Jeffrey A. *Sinful Self, Sainly Self: The Experience of Poetry*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- _____. *The American Puritan Elegy: A Literary and Cultural Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hampton, Stephen. *Anti-Arminians: The Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Harris, Johanna, and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, eds. *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558-1680*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Harrox, Rosemary, and Sarah Rees Jones, eds. *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communion, 1200-1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Hart, D. G. *Calvinism: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Hart, Trevor A., ed. *The Dictionary of Historical Theology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Harvey, Gabriel. *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573-1580*. Edited by Edward John Long Scott. Printed for the Camden Society, 1884.
- Hatch, Nathan O., and Mark A. Noll, eds. *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Hatfield, April Lee. *Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Haykin, Michael A. G., ed. *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697-1771): A Tercentennial Appreciation*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Haykin, Michael A. G., and Kenneth J. Stewart, eds. *The Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2008.

- Haykin, Michael A. G., and Mark Jones, eds. *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Hazlett, Ian. *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland: An Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Heal, Felicity. *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*. New York: Clarendon Press, 2003.
- Heimert, Alan and Andrew Delbanco, ed. *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Helm, Paul. *Calvin and the Calvinists*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1982.
- _____. *John Calvin's Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Eternal God: A Study of God Without Time*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Henderson, G. D. *Religious Life in Seventeenth century Scotland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937.
- Hendrix, Scott H. *Recultivating the Vineyard: The Reformation Agendas of Christianization*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2004.
- Heppel, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, Second Edition. Edited by E. Bizer and translated by G. T. Thomson. 1934; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- Hessayon, Ariel. "Gold Tried in the Fire:" *The Prophet Theaurau John Tany and the English Revolution*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- _____. "The Making of Abiezer Coppe." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (January 2011): 38-58.
- Hessayon, Ariel, and Nicholas Keene, eds. *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Hessayon, Ariel, and David Finnegan, eds. *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- Hetherington, William. *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*. Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1843.
- Heyd, Michael. *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Heywood, James, and Thomas Wright, eds. *Cambridge University Transaction During the Puritan Controversies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. 2 vols. 1854; reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Hill, Basil. "Puritanism: The Problem of Definition." In *Studies in Church History, Volume 2*, edited by G. J. Cuming, 283-96. London: Nelson, 1965.
- Hill, Christopher. *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in the Interpretation of the Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*. 1958; reprint, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- _____. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1982.
- _____. *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.
- _____. *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*. 3 vols. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- _____. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. 1972; reprint, London: Penguin, 1991.
- _____. *Liberty Against the Law: Some Seventeenth-Century Controversies*. New York: Penguin, 1996.
- _____. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. 1958; reprint, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- Hindmarsh, D. Bruce. *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Hillerbrand, Hans J. *The Division of Christendom: Christianity in the Sixteenth Century*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
- Hillerbrand, Hans J, ed. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*. 4 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- _____. *The Protestant Reformation: Revised Edition*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2009.
- Hindson, Edward, ed. *Introduction to Puritan Theology: A Reader*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1976.
- Hirst, Julie. *Jane Leade: Biography of a Seventeenth-Century Mystic*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Hoak, Dale, and Mordechai Feingold, eds. *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution, 1688-89*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Hoeveler, J. David. *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.
- Holden, William P. *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572-1642*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570-1720*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2002.
- _____. *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Holstun, James. *A Rational Millennium: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- _____. *Ehud's Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution*. New York: Verso, 2000.
- Hornbeck, Patrick, II, *What is a Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Hotson, Howard. *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.
- _____. *Johann Heinrich Alsted, 1588-1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation, and Universal Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Paradise Postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism*. New York: Springer, 2000.
- _____. *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543-1630*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Howson, Barry H. *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: The Questions of Orthodoxy Regarding the Theology of Hanserd Knollys (c.1599-1691)*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Huehns, Gertrude. *Antinomianism in English History with Special Reference to the Period 1640-1660*. London: The Cresset Press, 1951.
- Hughes, Ann. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. Second Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.
- _____. "Anglo-American Puritanisms." *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000): 1-7.
- _____. *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- _____. *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- _____. "Print, Persecution, and Polemic: Thomas Edwards's Gangraena (1646) and Civil War Sectarianism," in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*, 255-74. Edited by Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hume, David. *The History of Great Britain, Vol. I: Containing the Reigns of James I and Charles I*. Edinburgh, 1754.
- Hunt, Arnold. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- Huntley, Frank Livingstone. *Bishop Joseph Hall and Protestant Meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study with Texts of "The Art of Divine Meditation" (1608) and Occasional Meditations (1633)*. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1981.
- Hunter, Michael. *Editing Early Modern Texts: An Introduction to Principles and Practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- _____. *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- Hutton, Ronald. *Debates in Stuart History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Hutton, Sarah, ed. *Henry More (1614-1687): Tercentenary Studies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990.
- Ingelhart, Louis Edward, ed. *Press and Speech Freedoms in the World, from Antiquity until 1998*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1998.
- Jackson, Nicholas D. *Hobbes, Bramhill and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity: A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Jagodzinski, Cecile M. *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1999.
- James, Frank A., III. *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- James, Frank A., III, ed. *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Janse, Wim, and Barbara Pitkin, eds. *The Formation of Clerical and Confessional Identities in Early Modern Europe*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Janz, Denis. *Luther and Late Medieval Thomism: A Study in Theological Anthropology*. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1983.
- Jaumann, Herbert. *Handbuch Gelehrtenkultur der Frühen Neuzeit: Band 1: Bio-bibliographisches Repertorium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Jeffs, Robin, ed. *The English Revolution: Fast Sermons*. Cornmarket Press, 1972.
- Jenkins, Gary W. *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Johnson, A. M. and John A. Maxfield. *The Reformation as Christianization*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Johnston, Warren. *The Apocalypse in Later Seventeenth-Century England*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011.
- Johnstone, Nathan. *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Jones, Chelsea, and Geoffrey Wainwright and Edward Yarnold, eds. *The Study of Spirituality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Jones, J. R. *The Revolution of 1688 in England*. New York: WW Norton & Co., 1972.
- Jones, John. *Balliol College: A History*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Jones, Mark. *Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of the Puritan Reformed Orthodox Theologian, Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Jones, Normal I., and Daniel Woolf, eds. *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Jones, R. Tudor, and Arthur Long and Rosemary Moore, eds. *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Volume 1: 1550-1700*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Jones, Rufus M. *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. London, 1919.
- _____. *Studies in Mystical Religion*. London, 1919.

- Jones, Stephen. *A New Biographical Dictionary: Containing a Brief Account of the Lives and Writings of the Most Eminent Persons and Remarkable Characters in Every Age and Nation*. Third Edition. London, 1799.
- Jonsen, Albert R., and Stephen Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Jordon, W. K. *The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Convention of the Long Parliament to the Restoration, 1640-1660: The Revolutionary Experiments and the Dominant Religious Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Jue, Jeffrey K. *Heaven Upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism*. New York: Springer, 2006.
- Kadane, Matthew. "Les bibliothèques de deux théologiens réformés . du XVIIe siècle, l'un puritan anglais, l'autre pasteur Huguenot." *Bulletin Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 147 (2001): 67-100.
- Kamensky, Jane. *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Kamps, Ivo. *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Kapic, Kelly M., and Randall C. Gleason, *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2004.
- Kapic, Kelly M., and Mark Jones, eds. *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Kastan, David Scott. "Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama." In *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, 167-84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Katz, David. S. *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603-1665*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- _____. *Sabbath and Sectarianism in Seventeenth-Century England*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- _____. *The Jews in the History of England, 1485-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- _____. *God's Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Kaufman, Peter Iver. *The "Polytyque Church": Religion and Early Tudor Political Culture, 1485-1516*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986.
- Kaufmann, U. Milo. *The Pilgrim's Progress and Traditions in Puritan Meditation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Keding, Volker. *Theologia Experimentalis: Die Erfahrungstheologie beim späten Gottfried Arnold*. Marburg: Lit Verlag, 2000.
- Keeble, N. H. *Richard Baxter: Puritan Man of Letters*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- _____. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.
- _____. "Milton and Puritanism." In *A Companion to Milton*, edited by Thomas N. Corns, 124-40. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Keeble, N. H., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Keeble, N. H., and Geoffrey F. Nuttall, eds. *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter, Volume 1: 1638-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- _____. *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter, Volume II: 1660-1696*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Keeler, Mary Frear, and Maija Jansson Cole and William B. Bidwell, eds. *Commons Debates 1628: Volume IV: 28 May-26 June 1628*. Rochester: Yale University, 1978.

- Kelley, Donald R., and David Harris Sacks, eds. *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Kendall, R. T. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Keenan, James F., and Thomas A. Shannon, eds. *The Context of Casuistry*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1995.
- Kennedy, D. E., and Diana Roberts and Alexandra Walsham. *Grounds of Controversy: Three Studies in Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century English Polemics*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1989.
- Kennedy, Gwynne. *Just Anger: Representing Women's Anger in Early Modern England*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000.
- Kennedy, Rick. "The Alliance between Puritanism and Cartesian Logic at Harvard, 1687-1735." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Oct-Dec, 1990): 549-72.
- Kerr, Fergus. *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.
- Kevan, E. F. *The Grace of Law: A Study in Puritan Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Kidd, Thomas S. *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Kiefer, Barbara. "The Authorship of 'Ancient Bounds.'" *Church History* 22 (1953): 192-96.
- King, John N. *Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" and Early Modern Print Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kirby, Torrance, ed. *A Companion to Richard Hooker*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Kirby, Torrance, and Emidio Campi and Frank A. James III, eds. *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Kishlansky, Mark A. *A Monarch Transformed: Britain, 1603-1714*. New York: Penguin, 1997.
- Knappen, M. M. "The Early Puritanism of Lancelot Andrews." *Church History*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (June, 1933): 95-104.
- _____. *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism*. 1939; reprint, Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1963.
- Knight, Janice. *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645-1661*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger, ed. *Puritanism and Its Discontents*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.
- _____. *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger, and Joan B. Landes, eds. *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Knott, John R., Jr. *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Kontos, Alkis, ed. *Powers, Possessions, and Freedom: Essays in Honor of C. B. Macpherson*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Kreider, Glenn R. *Jonathan Edwards's Interpretation of Revelation 4:1-8:1*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2004.
- Kries, Douglas, ed. *Piety and Humanity: Essays on Religion and Early Modern Political Philosophy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. *Providence Island, 1630-1641: The Other Puritan Colony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Laam, Kevin P. "Borrowed Heaven: Early Modern Devotion and the Art of Happiness." PhD diss., University of Southern California, 2006.

- Lachman, David C. *The Marrow Controversy, 1718-1723: An Historical and Theological Analysis*. Edinburgh: Rutherford Books, 1988.
- LaFountain, Jason David. "The Puritan Art World." PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2013.
- Lake, Peter. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- _____. "Puritan Identities." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1985): 112-23.
- _____. "Calvinism and the English Church, 1570-1635." *P&P* 114 (1987): 32-76.
- _____. *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- _____. "Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson." *Journal of British Studies* 27 (1988): 81-116.
- _____. *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy', 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Stuart Parish in Early Stuart London*. Stanford: Palo Alto University Press, 2001.
- _____. *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- _____. "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice." In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 80-95. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier. "Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England." *Past & Present* 153 (1996): 64-107.
- _____. "Puritans, Papists, and the 'Public Sphere' in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context." *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (September 2000): 587-627.
- Lake, Peter, and David Como, "'Orthodoxy and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of 'Consensus' in the London (Puritan) Underground.'" *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (January, 2000), 34-70.
- Lake, Peter, and Maria Dowling, ed. *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth-Century England*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1987.
- Lake, Peter, and Michael C. Questier, eds. *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*. London: Boydell & Brewer, 2000.
- Lake, Peter, and Steven Pincus, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Lambert, Malcolm. *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*. Third Edition. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.
- Lambert, Stella. "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship." *Past and Present* 124 (1989): 36-68.
- Lamont, William. *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-1660*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- _____. "Puritanism as History and Historiography: Some Further Thoughts." *Past & Present* 44 (1969): 133-46.
- _____. *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution*. London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- _____. *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.
- _____. *Historical Controversies and Historians*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Lampros, Dean George. "A New Set of Spectacles: The Assembly's Annotations, 1645-1657." *Renaissance and Reformation* 19/4 (1995): 33-46.
- Lane, Anthony N. S. *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*. London: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Lane, Belden C. "Two Schools of Desire: Nature and Marriage in Seventeenth-Century Puritanism." *Church History*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (June, 2000): 372-402.

- _____. *Ravished by Beauty: The Surprising Legacy of Reformed Spirituality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Lang, August. *Puritanismus and Pietismus. Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung von M. Butzer bis zum Methodismus*. Neukirchen, 1941.
- Larkin, James F., and Paul L. Hughes, eds. *Stuart Royal Proclamations*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973-1983.
- Larminie, V. M. *Wealth, Kinship and Culture: The Seventeenth-Century Newdigates of Arbury and Their World*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995.
- Laurence, Anne, and W. R. Owens and Stuart Sim, eds. *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88*. London: Hambledon Press, 2003.
- Lee, Brian J. *Johannes Cocceius and the Exegetical Roots of Federal Theology: Reformation Developments in the Interpretation of Hebrews 7-10*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Lee, Jason K. *The Theology of John Smyth: Puritan, Separatist, Baptist, Mennonite*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2003.
- Lee, Nam Kyu. *Die Pradestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen, 1583-1622*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- Leites, Edmund, ed. *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Letham, Robert. "Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology." PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1979.
- _____. "The Foedus Operum: Some Factors Accounting for Its Development." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (1983): 457-467.
- _____. *The Westminster Assembly: Reading Its Theology in Historical Context*. Philipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing, 2009.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. *Writing Women in Jacobean England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Life of John Milton*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003.
- Lillback, Peter A. *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Lim, Paul C. H. *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Lim, Won Taek. "The Covenant Theology of Francis Roberts." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2000.
- Lindberg, Carter. *The European Reformations*, Second Edition. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Little, Patrick, ed. *The Cromwellian Protectorate*. London: Boydell & Brewer, 2007.
- _____. *Oliver Cromwell: New Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Liu, Tai. *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660*. New York: Springer, 1973.
- _____. *Puritan London: A Study of Religion and Society in the City Parishes*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986.
- Livingstone, David N., and D. G. Hart and Mark A. Noll, eds. *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Livingstone, David N., and Charles W. J. Withers, eds. *Geography and Revolution*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Lloyd, S. A., ed. *Hobbes Today: Insights for the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

- Loads, David M. *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.
- _____. *John Foxe and the English Reformation*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.
- Loades, David M., ed. *John Foxe at Home and Abroad*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.
- Locke, John. *Vindications of the Reasonableness of Christianity*. Edited by Victor Nuovo. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1997.
- Loewenstein, David. *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Loewenstein, David, and John Marshall. *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Lohse, Bernhard. *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*. Translated by Ernest Stoeffler. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Longfellow, Erica. *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Lovegrove, Deryck W. *The Rise of the Laity in Evangelical Protestantism*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Ludwig, Allen. *Graven Images: New England Stonecarving and Its Symbols, 1650-1815*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2000.
- Lugioyo, Brian. *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Lund, Roger D. *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Lutton, Robert. *Lollardy and Orthodox Religion in Pre-Reformation England: Reconstructing Piety*. London: Royal Historical Society, 2006.
- Lutton, Robert, and Elisabeth Salter, eds. *Pieties in Transition: Religious Practices and Experiences, c.1400-1640*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Luxon, Thomas H. *Literal Figures: Puritan Allegory and the Reformation Crisis in Representation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Lynch, Beth. *John Bunyan and the Language of Conviction*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004.
- Lyte, Henry Charles Maxwell. *A History of Eton College, 1440-1884*. London, 1889.
- Maag, Karin. *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560-1620*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1995.
- Maag, Karin, ed. *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence Beyond Wittenberg*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999.
- Maccubbin, Robert P., ed. *'Tis Nature's Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality during the Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English Country, 1500-1600*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- _____. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1990.
- _____. "The Impact of the English Reformation." *Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 151-53.
- _____. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- _____. *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- _____. *The Reformation: A History*. New York: Penguin, 2005.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, ed. *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy, and Piety*. New York: Palgrave, 1995.
- MacDonald, Michael. *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

- Maclean, Ian. *Learning and the Market Place: Essays in the History of the Early Modern Book*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Maltby, Judith. *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Manning, James Alexander. *The Lives of the Speakers of the House of Commons, from the Time of King Edward III to Queen Victoria, Comprising the Biographies of Upwards of One Hundred Distinguished Persons, and Copious Details of the Parliamentary History of England, from the Most Authentic Documents*. London: George Willis, 1851.
- Marsden, George M. "Perry Miller's Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique." *Church History* 39/1 (1970): 91-105.
- _____. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- Marsh, Christopher. *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Marshall, Alan. *Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II, 1660-1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Marshall, John. *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Marshall, Peter. *The Catholic Priesthood and the English Reformation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- _____. *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- _____. *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Marshall, Peter, and Alec Ryrie, ed. *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Marshall, Peter, and Alexandra Walsham, eds. *Angels in the Early Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Martin, Catherine Gimelli. *Milton among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- Martin, Hugh. *Puritanism and Richard Baxter*. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- Martin, Jessica, and Alec Ryrie, eds. *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Marvell, Andrew. *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell, Volume 1: 1672-1673*. Edited by Martin Dzelzaninis and Annabel M. Patterson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Mascuch, Michael. *Origins of the Individualist Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591-1791*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Mason, Thomas A. *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon, 1582-1663, Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England and Archbishop of Canterbury*. Cranbury: Associated University Press, 1985.
- Mayes, Benjamin T. G. *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning after the Reformation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- McCabe, Richard A. *Joseph Hall: A Study in Satire and Meditation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- McCafferty, John. *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633-1641*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- McClendon, Muriel C., and Joseph P. Ward and Michael McDonald, eds. *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- McCullough, Peter E. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- McCullough, Peter E., ed. *Lancelot Andrews: Select Sermons and Lectures*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- McCullough, Peter E., and Hugh Aldington and Emma Rhatigan, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- McDowell, Nicholas. *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- McEachern, Claire, and Debora Shuger, eds. *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- McElligott, Jason. *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997.
- McElligott, Jason, and David L. Smith, eds. *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- McEvoy, James, ed. *Mystical Theology: The Glosses by Thomas Gallus and the Commentary of Robert Grosseteste on De Mystica Theologia*. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- McGee, J. Sears. *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620-1670*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- _____. "On Misidentifying Puritans: The Case of Thomas Adams." *A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Autumn, 1998): 401-18.
- _____. "A 'Carkass' of 'Mere Dead Paper': The Polemical Career of Francis Rous, Puritan MP." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (September 2009): 347-71.
- McGiffert, Michael. "American Puritan Studies in the 1960s." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser. XXVII (1970): 36-67.
- _____. "Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism." *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 75, No. 4 (Oct, 1982): 463-502.
- _____. "God's Controversy with Jacobean England." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 88, No. 5 (Dec., 1983): 1151-74.
- _____. "Who Wrote the Preface and Notes for Henry Finch's *The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie*, 1590?." *Albion*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (1986): 247-51.
- McGiffert, Michael, ed. *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge*. Revised and Expanded. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004.
- McGinnis, Timothy Scott. *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort: Puritan Priorities in Elizabethan Religious Life*. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2004.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- McGregor, J. F., and Barry Reay, eds. *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- McKelvey, Robert J. *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan's Holy War*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- McKim, Donald K., ed. *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2007.
- McKitterick, David. *A History of Cambridge University Press: Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge, 1534-1698*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- McLachlan, H. John. *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Maclear, J. F. "New England and the Fifth Monarchy: The Quest for the Millennium in Early American Puritanism." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 32, No. 2 (April, 1975): 223-60.
- McNeill, John T. *The History and Character of Calvinism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

- McRae, Andrew. *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- McWilliams, John P. *New England's Crises and Cultural Memory: Literature, Politics, History, Religion, 1620-1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Mendle, Michael, ed. *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Middlekauff, Robert. "Piety and Intellect in Puritanism." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 22, No. 3 (July, 1965): 457-70.
- _____. *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Midgley, Graham, ed. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan VII: Solomon's Temple Spiritualized, The House of the Forest of Lebanon, The Water of Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Miller, Jeffrey Alan. "Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young," in *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620-1642*, ed. Edward Jones, 72-106. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Miller, Perry. *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- _____. *Nature's Nation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- _____. *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts*. 1933; reprint, New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- _____. *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Miller, Perry, ed. *The American Puritans: Their Prose and Poetry*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.
- Miller, Perry, and Thomas H. Johnson, eds. *The Puritans: A Sourcebook of Their Writings*. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1963.
- Milton, Anthony. "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England." *Historical Journal* 41 (1998), 625-51.
- _____. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- _____. *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Milton, Anthony, ed. *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005.
- Montgomery, Michael S. *American Puritan Studies: An Annotated Bibliography of Dissertations, 1882-1981*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1984.
- Moore, Jonathan D. *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.
- Moore, Rosemary Anne. *The Light in Their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666*. University Park: Penn State University, 2000.
- Moore, Susan Hardman. *Pilgrims: New World Settlers and the Call of Home*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- More, Ellen. "John Goodwin and the Origins of the New Arminianism," *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Autumn, 1982): 50-70.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*. New York: HarperCollins, 1958.
- _____. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963.
- Morgan, Edmund S., ed. *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653-1657*. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1970.
- _____. *Puritan Political Ideas, 1558-1794*. 1965; reprint, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2003.
- Morgan, Irvonwy. *Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1957.

- Morgan, John. *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Morrill, John S. *Seventeenth-Century Britain, 1603-1714*. Connecticut: The Archon Press, 1980.
- _____. *The Impact of the English Civil War*. London: Collins and Brown, 1991.
- _____. *The Nature of the English Revolution*. London: Longman, 1994.
- _____. *Stuart Britain: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Morris, Amy M. E. *Popular Measures: Poetry and Church Order in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts*. Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 2005.
- Mortimer, Sarah. *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Mortimer, Sarah, and John Robertson, eds. *The Intellectual Consequences of Religious Heterodoxy, 1600-1750*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Mullan, David George. *Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of An Idea, 1560-1638*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1986.
- _____. *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Mullan, David George, ed. *Women's Life Writing in Early Modern Scotland: Writing the Evangelical Self, c.1670-c.1730*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003.
- Muller, Patrick. *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-Century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Muller, Richard A. "Perkins' A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo Salutis?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978): 68-81.
- _____. "Covenant and Conscience in English Reformed Theology: Three Variations on a Seventeenth-Century Theme." *Westminster Theological Journal* 42 (1980): 312-20.
- _____. "Giving Direction to Theology: The Scholastic Dimension." *Journal of Evangelical Theology* 28:2 (1985): 183-93.
- _____. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. 1986; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- _____. "Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology." *Church History* 55:2 (1986): 193-205.
- _____. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca.1520-ca.1725*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1987-2003.
- _____. "Arminius and the Scholastic Tradition." *Calvin Theological Journal* 24:2 (1989): 263-77.
- _____. *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.
- _____. "The Covenant of Works and the Stability of Divine Law in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Orthodoxy: A Study in the Theology of Herman Witsius and Wilehmus à Brakel." *Calvin Theological Journal* 29:1 (1994): 75-100.
- _____. "Scholasticism, Reformation, Orthodoxy, and the Persistence of Christian Aristotelianism." *Trinity Journal* 19:1 (1998): 81-96.
- _____. *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. "Reformation, Orthodoxy, 'Christian Aristotelianism,' and the Eclecticism of Early Modern Philosophy." *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 81:3 (2001): 306-325.
- _____. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- _____. "John Calvin and Later Calvinism: The Identity of the Reformed Tradition." In *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, edited by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz, 130-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- _____. "The 'Reception of Calvin' in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts." *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 255-74.
- _____. *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Muller, Richard A., and John L. Thompson, eds. *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1996.
- Muller, Richard A., and Rowland S. Ward. *Scripture and Worship: Biblical Interpretation and the Directory for Public Worship*. Philipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2007.
- Murdock, Graeme. *Calvinism on the Frontier, 1600-1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Beyond Calvin: The Intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches, c.1540-1620*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Murphy, Andrew R. *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 2001.
- Murray, James. *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Myers, Robin, and Michael Harris, eds. *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France, 1600-1900*. Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1992.
- Neal, Daniel. *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Non-Conformists, from the Battle of Edge-Hill, to the Death of King Charles I, Vol. 3*. Boston and Newburyport: Charles Ewer and William B. Allen & Co., 1817.
- Neele, Adriaan C. *Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706): Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Netland, John. "Of Philistines and Puritans: Matthew Arnold's Construction of Puritanism." In *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers, 67-84. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.
- Neuser, Wilhelm, and Brian Armstrong, eds. *Calvinus Sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion*. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1997.
- Neville, Robert C. *The Puritan Smile: A Look Toward Moral Reflection*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.
- New, J. H. *Anglican and Puritan, the Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Newcombe, D. G. *Henry VIII and the English Reformation*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Nicolson, Adam. *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003.
- Noll, Mark A. "Science, Theology, and Society: From Cotton Mather to William Jennings Bryan." In *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, edited by David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll, 120-41. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Americas God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- North, Marcy L. *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Notestein, Wallace, and Francis Reif, eds. *Commons Debates for 1629*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1921.
- Nuovo, Victor. *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment: Interpretations of John Locke*. New York: Springer, 2011.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey F. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*. 1946; reprint, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

- _____. *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge: A Study in a Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- _____. *The Puritan Spirit: Essays and Addresses*. London: Epworth Press, 1967.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *Initia Calvini: The Matrix of Calvin's Reformation*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1991.
- _____. *The Two Reformations: The Journey from the Last Days to the New World*, ed. Donald Weinstein. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- _____. *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications*. New York: Continuum, 2004.
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The Debate on the English Reformation*. New York: Routledge, 1986.
- O'Malley, John W., et al, eds. *Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540-1773*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- O'Rourke, Fran. *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Old, Hughes Oliphint. *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Ong, Walter J. *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue from the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason*. 1958; reprint, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Op't Hof, Willem. *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1589-1622*. Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987.
- Orwell, George. *Orwell, As I Please, 1943-1945: Essays, Journalism and Letters*. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Boston: David R. Godine, 2000.
- Overhoff, Jürgen. *Hobbes's Theory of Will: Ideological Reasons and Historical Circumstances*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000.
- Ozment, Steven E. *Homo Spiritualis: A Comparative Study of the Anthropology of Johannes Tauler, Jean Gerson, and Martin Luther (1509-16) in the Context of their Theological Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- _____. *The Age of Reform, 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of the Late Medieval and Reformation Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Ozment, Steven E., ed. *The Reformation in Medieval Perspective*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
- Packer, J. I. *The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter*. 1954; Vancouver: Regent Publishing, 2003.
- Papazian, Mary Arshagouni, ed. *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003.
- Parker, Charles H. *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Parker, Kenneth. *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Parker, Kenneth, and Eric Josef Carlson, eds. *"Practical Divinity": The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998.
- Parnham, David. *Sir Henry Vane, Theologian: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Religious and Political Discourse*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1997.
- _____. "The Covenantal Quietism of Tobias Crisp." *Church History*, Vol. 75, No. 3 (2006): 511-43.
- _____. "Soul's Trial and Spirit's Voice: Sir Henry Vane against the 'Orthodox.'" *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 70, No. 3 (September 2007): 375-85.
- Pastoor, Charles, and Galen K. Johnson, *Historical Dictionary of the Puritans*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2007.
- Patrick, Millar. *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody*. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949.
- Patrides, C. A. *The Cambridge Platonists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

- Patrides, C. A. and Raymond B. Waddington, eds. *The Age of Milton: Backgrounds to Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980.
- Patterson, W. B. *King James VI and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Paul, Robert S. *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the "Great Debate."* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985.
- Pauw, Amy Plantinga. *The Supreme Harmony of All: The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- Peacey, Jason. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.
- Pearson, Andrew F. S. *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603*. 1925; reprint, London: Peter Smith, 1966.
- Pederson, Randall J. "Francis Rous (1580/81-1659) and the Mystical Element in English Puritanism." ThM thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, 2008.
- _____. "Who Wrote the *Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (c.1620)?" (forthcoming in *Reformation and Renaissance Review*).
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Emergence of Catholic Tradition, 100-600*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, and Valerie Hotchkiss, eds. *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition, Volume 2: Reformation Era*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Peltonen, Markku. *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Pendrill, Colin. *The English Reformation, 1485-1558*. Oxford: Heinemann, 2000.
- Pennington, Donald, and Keith Thomas, eds. *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Person, Leland S. *The Cambridge Introduction to Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Pestana, Carla Gardina. *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Peterson, Mark A. *The Price of Redemption: The Spiritual Economy of Puritan New England*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- _____. *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies*. Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996.
- Pettegree, Andrew, ed. *The Reformation World*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Pettegree, Andrew, and Alastair Duke and Gillian Lewis, eds. *Calvinism in Europe, 1650-1620*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Pettit, Norman. *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Phillipson, Nicholas, and Quentin Skinner, eds. *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Pincus, Steven C. A. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Placher, William. *The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking about God Went Wrong*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Platt, John. *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575-1650*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Poiret, Pierre. *Theologiae Pacificae itemque Mysticae ac hujus Auctorum Idea Brevior*. Amsterdam, 1702.

- Poole, Kristen. "Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Spring, 1995): 47-75.
- _____. *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Porterfield, Amanda. "Women's Attraction to Puritanism." *Church History*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (June, 1991): 196-209.
- _____. *Female Piety in Puritan New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Prest, Wilfrid R. *The Rise of the Barristers: A Social History of the English Bar, 1590-1640*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Prest, Wilfrid R., ed. *The Professions in Early Modern England*. New York: Croom Helm, 1987.
- Primus, John H. *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- _____. "Lutheran Law and Gospel in the Early Puritan Theology of Richard Greenham." *Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 3 (Autumn, 1994): 287-98.
- _____. *Richard Greenham: Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Prior, Charles W. A. *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Prior, Charles W. A., and Glenn Burgess, eds. *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- Quantin, Jean-Louis. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Questier, Michael C. *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. "Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism in England during the 1630s." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (March, 2006): 53-78.
- _____. *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c.1550-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Questier, Michael C., ed. *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- _____. *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631-1638: Catholicism and the Politics of Personal Rule*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Quinn, Arthur. *The Confidence of British Philosophers: An Essay in Historical Narrative*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Raven, James. *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- _____. *Milton's Angels: The Early Modern Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Reay, Barry. *Popular Cultures in England, 1550-1750*. London: Longman, 1998.
- Redding, Graham. *Prayer and the Priesthood of Christ in the Reformed Tradition*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Reeve, L. J. *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Rehnman, Sebastian. *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Reid, James. *Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of Those Eminent Divines who Convened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster*. 2 vols. Paisley: Printed by Stephen and Andrew Young, 1811.
- Reis, Elizabeth. *Damned Women: Sinners and Witches in Puritan New England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

- Remer, Gary. *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.
- Rex, Richard. *The Lollards*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Reynolds, Matthew. *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c. 1560-1643*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005.
- Richardson, R. C. *The Debate on the English Revolution*. Third Edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Richardson, R. C., and G. M. Ridden, eds. *Freedom and the English Revolution: Essays in History and Literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986.
- Rittgers, Ronald K. *The Reformation of the Keys: Confession, Conscience, and Authority in Sixteenth-Century Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Rivers, Isabel, and David L. Wykes, ed. *Joseph Priestly: Scientist, Philosopher and Theologian*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Rix, Robert. *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1900.
- Rivers, Isabel. *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion in Ethics in England, 1660-1780, Volume 1: Whichcote to Wesley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Robertson, Robert. *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- Rodgers, Dirk W. *John a Lasco in England*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Rogers, Henry. *The Life and Character of John Howe, With an Analysis of His Writings*. London: Printed for William Ball, 1836.
- Rohls, Jan. *Reformed Confessions: Theology from Zurich to Barmen*. Translated by John Hoffmeyer. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- Rohrer, S. Scott. *Wandering Souls: Protestant Migrations in America, 1630-1865*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, Press, 2010.
- Roney, John B., and Martin I. Klauber, eds. *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564-1864*. London: Greenwood Press, 1998.
- Roper, L. H., and B. van Ruymbeke, eds. *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Rose, Eliot. *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans Under Elizabeth I and James I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Rosemann, Philipp W. *Peter Lombard*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Rosman, Doreen. *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor England*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- _____. *The Evolution of the English Churches, 1500-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Rowe, Karen E. *Saint and Singer: Edward Taylor's Typology and the Poetics of Meditation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters of Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments beginning the Sixteenth Year of King James, Anno 1618, and Ending the Fifth Year of King Charles, Anno 1629, Digested in Order of Time and Now Published*. London: Printed by J. A. for Robert Boulter, 1682.
- Russell, Conrad. *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- _____. *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621-1629*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

- _____. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- _____. *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1990.
- _____. *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- _____. *King James I/VI and His English Parliaments*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ryrie, Alec. *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals and the Early English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- _____. *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realm, 1485-1603*. London: Longman, 2009.
- _____. *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Ryken, Leland. *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.
- Safley, Thomas Max, ed. *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Sarot, Marcel, et al, eds. *Scholasticism Reformed. Festschrift Willem van Asselt*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Sasek, Lawrence A., ed. *Images of English Puritanism: A Collection of Contemporary Sources, 1589-1646*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989.
- Savage, Ruth, ed. *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Scarisbrick, J. J. *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Schafer, Ann-Stephane. *Auctoritas Patrum? The Reception of the Church Fathers in Puritanism*. New York: Peter Lang, 2012.
- Schmidt, Jeremy. *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Schofield, John. *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Schwanda, Tom. *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative-Mystical Piety of Puritanism*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2012.
- Schweitzer, Don, ed. *Jonathan Edwards as Contemporary: Essays in Honor of Sang Hyun Lee*. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Scodel, Joshua. *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- _____. *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985.
- Seaward, Paul, ed. *Speakers and the Speakership*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Selderhuis, Herman J., ed. *The Calvin Handbook*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.
- _____. *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Sell, Alan P. F. *Philosophy, Dissent, and Nonconformity, 1689-1920*. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 2004.
- Sell, Roger D., and Anthony W. Johnson, eds. *Writing and Religion in England, 1558-1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.
- Shagan, Ethan H. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- _____. *Catholics and the "Protestant Nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- Shapiro, Barbara. *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558-1688*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

- _____. *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- _____. *The Personal Rule of Charles I.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Peter Lake, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Steven N. Zwicker, eds. *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- _____. *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Shaw, Ian J. *High Calvinism in Action: Calvinism and the City, Manchester and London, 1810-1860.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Sheehan, Jonathan. *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Sheick, William, ed. *Two Mather Biographies: Life and Death and Parentator.* Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1989.
- Sheldrake, Philip, ed. *The New Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
- Shell, Alison. *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Shepard, Alexandra, and Phil Withington, eds. *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, Place, Rhetoric.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Sherlock, Peter. *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- Sherman, William H. *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Shipley, Gregory E. "Turbulent Times, Troubled Isles: The Rise and Development of Puritanism in Bermuda and the Bahamas, 1609-1684." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989.
- Shuger, Debora K. *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Siekawitch, Larry. *Balancing Head and Heart in Seventeenth-Century Puritanism: Stephen Charnock's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God.* Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012.
- Signori, Gabriela, ed. *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors, 1 and 2 Maccabees in Historical Perspective.* Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Skinner, Quentin. *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- _____. *Visions of Politics, Volume 1: Regarding Method.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- _____. *Visions of Politics, Volume III: Hobbes and Civil Science.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Slights, William W. E. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Smeaton, Donald D. *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale.* Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 1986.
- Smith, Nigel. *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

- Solt, Leo F. *Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell's Army*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- _____. *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509-1640*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Song, Young Jae Timothy. *Theology and Piety in the Reformed Federal Thought of William Perkins and John Preston*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1998.
- Sorkin, David Jan. *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Spadafora, David. *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Spicer, Andrew. *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Spraggon, Julie. *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War*. London: Boydell & Brewer, 2003.
- Springer, Michael S. *Restoring Christ's Church: John a Lasco and the Forma ac Ratio*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Sprunger, Keith L. "Archbishop Laud's Campaign against Puritanism at the Hague." *Church History*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (September, 1975): 308-20.
- _____. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- _____. *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Spurr, John. *English Puritanism 1603-1689*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.
- _____. *England in the 1670s: "This Masquerading Age."* Malden: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- _____. *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714*. London: Longman, 2006.
- _____. *Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, 1621-1683*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Stachniewski, John. *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Staloff, Darren. *The Making of an American Thinking Class: Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in Puritan Massachusetts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Stanglin, Keith D. "'Arminius Avant la Lettre': Peter Baro, Jacob Arminius, and the Bond of Predestinarian Polemic." *Westminster Theological Journal* 67:1 (2005): 51-74.
- _____. *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Stanglin, Keith D., and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Stannard, David E. *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Steinmetz, David C. *Calvin in Context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayersberg to Theodore Beza*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Luther in Context*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Steinmetz, David C., ed. *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Sterry, Wasey. *Annals of the King's College of Our Lady of Eton Beside Windsor*. London: Methuen & Co., 1898.
- Stewart, M. A., ed. *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Stoeffler, F. Ernest. *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

- Stoever, William K. B. "The Covenant of Works in Puritan Theology: The Antinomian Crisis in New England." PhD diss., Yale University, 1970.
- _____. "Nature, Grace and John Cotton: The Theological Dimension in the New England Antinomian Controversy." *Church History*, Vol. 44, No. 1 (1975): 22-33.
- _____. *"A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven": Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1988.
- Stone, John R. *On the Boundaries of American Evangelicalism: The Postwar Evangelical Coalition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642*. 1972; reprint, New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Stone, Lawrence, ed. *Schooling and Society*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Stone, M. W. F., ed. *Reason, Faith and History: Philosophical Essays for Paul Helm*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- Strehle, Stephen. *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: A Study in the Reformed Doctrine of the Covenant*. New York: Peter Lang, 1988.
- _____. *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounter between the Middle Ages and the Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Swan, Bradford F. *Gregory Dexter of London and New England, 1610-1700*. New York: Printing House of Leo Hart, 1949.
- Swanson, R. N., ed. *Unity and Diversity in the Church*. Oxford, 1996.
- Tadmor, Naomi. *The Social Universe of the English Bible: Scripture, Society, and Culture in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Taliaferro, Charles, and Alison J. Teply, eds. *Cambridge Platonist Spirituality*. Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2004.
- Thomas, Keith. *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfillment in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Thompson, E. P. *Witness Against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Thomas, Samuel S. *Creating Communities in Restoration England: Parish and Congregation in Oliver Heywood's Halifax*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Thompson, Roger. *Women in Stuart England and America: A Comparative Study*. New York: Routledge, 1974.
- Thornton, Helen. *State of Nature or Eden? Thomas Hobbes and His Contemporaries on the Natural Condition of Human Beings*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005.
- Thornton, Tim. *Wittgenstein on Language and Thought: The Philosophy of Content*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.
- Thuesen, Peter J. *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Thuesen, Peter J., ed. *The Works of Jonathan Edwards, Vol. 26: Catalogues of Books*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Tittler, Robert. *The Reformation and the Towns in England: Politics and Political Culture, c.1540-1640*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- _____. *English Urban Experience, 1540-1640*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Tittler, Robert, and Norman Jones, eds. *A Companion to Tudor Britain*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.
- Todd, Margo. "An Act of Discretion': Evangelical Conformity and the Puritan Dons." *Albion* 18 (1986): 581-99.
- _____. *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- _____. *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Todd, Margo, ed. *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Toomer, G. J. *Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- _____. *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Toon, Peter. *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity, 1689-1765*. London: The Olive Tree Press, 1967.
- _____. *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600-1660*. London: James Clarke, 1970.
- Towers, S. Mutchow. *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003.
- Trevelyan, G. M. *England Under the Stuarts*. 1904; reprint, New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Trinterud, Leonard J. "The Origins of Puritanism." *Church History*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (March, 1951): 37-57.
- Trinterud, Leonard J., ed. *Elizabethan Puritanism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Trueman, Carl R. *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525-1556*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Claims of Truth: John Owen's Trinitarian Theology*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.
- _____. "John Owen's Dissertation on Divine Justice: An Exercise in Christocentric Scholasticism." *Calvin Theological Journal* 33:1 (1998): 87-103.
- _____. "Puritanism as Ecumenical Theology." *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 81:3 (2001): 326-36.
- _____. *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- _____. *Histories and Fallacies: Problems Faced in the Writing of History*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2010.
- _____. "The Reception of Calvin: Historical Considerations." *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1-2 (2011): 19-27.
- Trueman, Carl R., and R. Scott Clark, eds. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*. London: Paternoster, 1999.
- Turner, Denys. *The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Tutino, Stefanie. *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- _____. "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered." *Past & Present* 115 (1987): 201-16.
- _____. *The Fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603-1640*. London: Friends of Dr. Williams's Library, 1990.
- _____. "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution." In *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*, edited by Margo Todd, 53-70. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- _____. "Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War." *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (1996): 139-67.
- _____. "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier, 5-33. London: Boydell and Brewer, 2000.
- _____. *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- _____. "The Puritan Paradigm of English Politics, 1558-1642." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (2010): 527-50.

- Tyacke, Nicholas, ed. *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- _____. *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- _____. *The English Revolution, c.1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- Underdown, David. *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Underwood, T. L. *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb's War: The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Underwood, T. L., ed. *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Vallance, Edward. *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005.
- Van Asselt, Willem J. *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669)*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Van Asselt, Willem J., and Eef Dekker, eds. *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Van den Berg, Johannes. *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents: Essays on Early Modern Protestantism and the Protestant Enlightenment*. Edited and translated by Jan de Bruijn, Pieter Holtrop, and Ernestine van der Wall. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Van den Belt, Henk. *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Van den Brink, G. A. *Herman Witsius en Het Antinomianisme: Met Tekst en Vertaling Van De Animadversiones Irenicae*. Apeldoorn: Instituut voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2008.
- _____. "Calvin, Witsius (1636-1708), and the English Antinomians." *Church History and Religious Culture*, Vol. 91, No.1-2 (2011): 229-40.
- Van Dixhoorn, Chad. "Reforming the Reformation: Theological Debate at the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652." 7 vols. PhD diss., Cambridge University, 2004.
- Van Dixhoorn, Chad, ed. *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1653*. 5 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Van Eijnatten, Joris, ed. *Preaching, Sermon and Cultural Change in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Van Leeuwen, Th. Marius, and Keith D. Stanglin and Marijke Tolsma, eds. *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60-1609)*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Vern, John A. *Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.
- Von Habsburg, Maximilian. *Catholic and Protestant Translations of the Imitatio Christi, 1425-1650: From Late Medieval Classic to Early Modern Bestseller*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- Von Rohr, John. "Covenant and Assurance in Early English Puritanism." *Church History* 54 (1961): 195-203.
- _____. *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*. 1986; reprint, Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Vaughan, Alden T. *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675*. Third Edition. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.
- Vaughan, Alden T., ed. *Puritans among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- _____. *The Puritan Tradition in America, 1620-1730*. Lebanon: University Press of New England, 1997.
- Visser, Arnoud S. Q. *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

- Vos, Antonie. *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Wabuda, Susan. *Preaching During the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Wabuda, Susan, and Caroline Litzenberger, eds. *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998.
- Wainwright, William J. *Reason and the Heart: A Prolegomenon to a Critique of Passional Reason*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Wakefield, Gordon S. *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety*. London: Wakefield Press, 1957.
- Walker, Julia M., ed. *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Wall, Alison. *Power and Protest in England, 1525-1640*. London: Hodder Arnold, 2000.
- Wallace, Dewey D. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- _____. *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Wallace, Dewey D., ed. *The Spirituality of the Later English Puritans: An Anthology*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Wallace, John M. *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalty of Andrew Marvell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999.
- _____. *Providence in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Walzer, Michael. *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics*. New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Walton, Heather, ed. *Literature and Theology: New Interdisciplinary Spaces*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- Warlow, William Meyler. *A History of the Charities of William Jones at Monmouth and Newland*. Bristol: Printed by William Bennett, 1899.
- Watkin, Edward. *Poets & Mystics*. North Stratford: Ayer Publishing, 1953.
- Watson, George, ed. *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, Volume 1: 600-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism with Other Writings on the Rise of the West*, trans. Stephen Kalberg. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Webster, Charles, ed. *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- _____. *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Routledge, 1974.
- Webster, John, and Kathryn Tanner and Ian Torrance, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Webster, Tom. "Writing to Redundancy: Approaches to Spiritual Journals and Early Modern Spirituality." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (1996): 33-56.
- _____. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620-1643*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- Weir, David A. *The Origins of Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Wells, Edward. *An Help for the Right Understanding of the Several Divines Laws and Covenants*. London, 1729.
- Wells, Ronald. *History and the Christian Historian*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Wengert, Timothy J. *Law and Gospel: Philip Melancthon's Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben Over Poenitentia*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997.
- _____. *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness: Philip Melancthon's Exegetical Dispute with Erasmus of Rotterdam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Wengert, Timothy J., and M. Patrick Graham, eds. *Philip Melancthon (1497-1560) and the Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- White, Micheline, ed. *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- White, Peter. *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Whitford, David M., ed. *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2008.
- Whiting, Robert. *The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Whitney, Dorothy Williams. "London Puritanism: The Haberdashers' Company." *Church History* 32:3 (1963): 298-321.
- Wiggins, Martin. *Drama and the Transfer of Power in Renaissance England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Wilby, Emma. *The Visions of Isobel Gowdie: Magic, Witchcraft and Dark Shamanism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland*. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.
- Willen, Diane. "Thomas Gataker and the Use of Print in the English Godly Community." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70 (2007): 343-64.
- Williams, Mark, and Stephen Paul Forrest, eds. *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History, 1600-1800*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010.
- Wilson, John F. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Winship, Michael P. *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- _____. "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s." *Church History*, Vol. 70, No. 3 (2001): 462-81.
- _____. "Were there any Puritans in New England?" *New England Quarterly* 74 (2001): 118-38.
- _____. *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- _____. *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson: Puritans Divided*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- _____. "Defining Puritanism in Restoration England: Richard Baxter and Others Respond to 'A Friendly Debate.'" *The Historical Journal* 54:3 (2011): 689-715.
- _____. *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Wippel, John F. *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas: From Finite Being to Uncreated Being*. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press of America, 2000.
- Wisse, Maarten, ed., et al. *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honor of Willem J. van Asselt*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

- Witte, John, Jr. *The Reformation of Rights: Law, Religion, and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford, to which Are Added The Fasti, or Annals of the Said University, Volume 3*. Edited by Philip Bliss. London, 1817.
- Woodward, Walter A. *Prospero's America: John Winthrop, Jr., Alchemy, and the Creation of New England Culture, 1606-1676*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Woolf, Daniel R. *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Woolrych, Austin. *England without a King, 1649-1660*. New York: Routledge, 1983.
- _____. *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Woolsey, Andrew A. *Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study of the Reformed Tradition to the Westminster Assembly*. 1988; Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.
- Worden, Blair. *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- _____. *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity*. New York: Penguin, 2002.
- _____. *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Wormwald, Jenny, ed. *The Seventeenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Woudhuysen, H. R. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Wrightson, Keith. *English Society, 1580-1680*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1990.
- Wrightson, Keith, and David Levine. *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525-1700*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Wroughton, John. *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age, 1603-1714*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Young, Michael B. *Charles I*. New York: Palgrave, 1997.
- Yule, George. "Presbyterians and Independents: Some Comments." *Past and Present* 47 (1970): 130-33.
- Yuille, J. Stephen. *Puritan Spirituality: The Fear of God in the Affective Theology of George Swinnock*. London: Paternoster, 2008.
- Zakai, Avihu. "Orthodoxy in England and New England: Puritans and the Issue of Religious Toleration, 1640-1650." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 135, No. 3 (September, 1991): 401-44.
- _____. *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Zaret, David. *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Zagorin, Perez. *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution*. New York: Humanities Press, 1966.
- _____. *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Ziff, Larzer. *Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Zuidema, Jason, and Theodore Van Raalte. *Early French Reform: The Theology and Spirituality of Guillaume Farel*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.

Index of Names

- Ahlstrom, Sydney E. 15
Alsop, Vincent 28, 66, 173
Ambrose, Isaac 56, 66, 163-4
Ames, William 22, 23, 46, 56
Andrewes, Lancelot 3, 223-4
Anselm 58, 144, 153
Aquinas, Thomas 58, 121, 129, 137, 144-5, 150, 153
Arminius, Jacobus 55, 123, 125, 129
Arnold, Matthew 2
Athanasius 58, 129
Augustine 129, 142, 144-5, 147, 151, 153, 174
- Baxter, Richard 13, 20, 24, 26, 28, 53, 55, 57, 66-68,
69, 73, 77, 136, 150, 163, 170, 187, 191, 193, 199,
219, 222, 232
Bayly, Lewis 60
Beeke, Joel R. 193
Benbrigge, John 53
Beza, Theodore 58, 60, 90, 95, 96, 107, 129, 131,
153, 193
Boehme, Jacob 62, 145
Bozeman, Theodore D. 10, 66
Bradshw, William 45, 216
Brearley, Roger 52, 66
Bucer, Martin 40, 42, 44
Bullinger, Heinrich 42, 44, 60, 69, 90, 95, 110, 203
Bunyan, John 24, 34, 53, 93, 136
Burgess, Glenn 11, 221
- Calvin, John 23, 42, 60, 63, 64-5, 69, 90, 95, 110,
136, 174, 179, 183, 188, 193
Campbell, Kenneth L. 14
Capp, Bernard S. 12, 44
Cartwright, Thomas 1, 45, 123, 216, 220
Chaderton, Laurence 45, 75, 216, 219
Charles I 48, 50-53, 120, 126, 130-1
Charles II 53
Charnock, Stephen 23
Christianson, Paul 8, 213
Cocceius, Johannes 104, 155, 203-4, 217
Coffey, John 4, 8, 52, 213, 221-2
Collinson, Patrick 3, 8, 12-14, 17, 39, 54, 212-3, 230
Como, David R. 12, 66, 184, 205, 213-4
Cotton, John 57, 204
Cradock, Walter 66, 145
Cranmer, Thomas 38, 40-1
Crisp, Tobias 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 32, 33, 35,
55, 65, 160-91, 192, 194, 197, 199-207, 216, 220-2,
228, 230
- Cromwell, Oliver 28, 50, 55, 119, 124-5, 134
Cromwell, Richard 51, 53
- Daniel, Curt 64, 187, 190
Daniell, David 38
Danner, Dan G. 41
Davies, J. C. 8
DeFoe, Daniel 34
Dell, William 28, 35, 66
Denne, Henry 66, 164
Denk, Hans 62
Dent, Arthur 45, 60
Dering, Edward 23, 45, 216
Dickens, A. G. 16, 37
Dodds, Gregory D. 49
Donne, John 30
Doran, Susan 8
Downname, John 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31, 33,
35, 55, 71-117, 118, 132, 140, 149, 150, 151, 159, 177,
179, 186, 192, 194, 197, 199-207, 216, 220-1, 222,
231
Dudley, John 40
Duffy, Eamon 37
Durston, Christopher 8
Dury, John 41, 80, 123
- Eales, Jacqueline 8, 16
Eaton, John 23, 28, 32, 52, 65, 69, 164, 168, 171-2,
175, 178, 186, 197, 205, 221, 228, 232
Edward VI 26, 37, 40, 42-3, 69
Edwards, John 25, 163-4
Edwards, Jonathan 202
Edwards, Thomas 23, 25, 64, 67, 133
Elizabeth I 37, 43-47
Elton, G. R. 3
Erbery, William 35, 52
Everard, John 52, 62
Eyre, William 67
- Fenner, Dudley 103
Fessenden, Tracy 5
Field, John 45, 129, 153
Finch, Henry 96-8, 104
Fincham, Kenneth 8, 14, 213
Finlayson, Michael 8
Flavel, John 66, 164, 183
Foster, Stephen 10, 39, 212
Fox, George 62
Foxye, John 41, 48, 54

Fuller, Thomas 8

 George, C. H. 8
 Gere, John 18-19
 Gere, Stephen 172
 Gifford, George 45
 Gill, John 29, 190
 Golding, Arthur 45
 Goodrich, Thomas 20
 Goodwin, John 20, 25-6, 29, 32, 49, 55, 77, 180,
 221-2, 228-9, 232
 Goodwin, Thomas 187
 Gouge, William 23, 76, 79, 92, 95, 97, 146, 162
 Greenham, Richard 23, 45, 56, 57-9, 146
 Gribben, Crawford 8
 Grindal, Edmund 41

 Haigh, Christopher 37
 Hale, Matthew 19
 Henry VIII 36-40, 127
 Hill, Basil 8
 Hill, Christopher 8, 34, 39
 Hobbes, Thomas 34, 49, 198
 Hobson, Paul 28, 66
 Hooker, Richard 34
 Hooker, Thomas 23, 109, 204
 Howe, John 23, 28, 66, 173
 Howson, Barry 63
 Hughes, Ann 8, 10, 13, 64
 Hume, David 2
 Humphrey, Laurence 16, 41, 44

 James I/VI 21, 47-51, 57, 128-9
 James, Frank A., III, 129
 Jue, Jeffrey K. 8
 Junius, Franciscus 90, 107

 Keeble, Neil H. 8, 170, 214
 Kishlansky, Mark 8
 Knappen, M. M. 46
 Knight, Janice 10
 Knollys, Francis 41
 Knollys, Hanserd 28, 66, 173
 Knox, John 42
 Lake, Peter 8-9, 12-13, 66, 77, 109, 213-14, 216, 219,
 230
 Lamont, William 8. 12
 Latimer, Hugh 40-1
 Laud, William 3, 48, 126, 225
 Leade, Jane 62, 66, 169
 Leigh, Edward 23
 Lim, Paul C. H. 8
 Littell, Franklin H. 25

 Lombard, Peter 129, 150
 Luther, Martin 23, 38, 65, 69, 136, 141, 144, 147,
 166, 174

 Maccovius, Johannes 107, 187
 Marsh, Christopher 39
 Marshall, Stephen 53
 Marshall, William (bookseller) 173
 Mary I 40, 41-43, 54
 Mather, Increase 28, 66, 170, 173
 Mather, Nathaniel 66, 173
 Melancthon, Philip 23, 63, 188
 Mencken, H. L. 2
 Miller, Perry 11, 24, 30, 32
 Milton, Anthony 8, 127, 224
 Milton, John 32, 55, 56, 66, 75, 81, 211, 221-2, 228,
 232
 More, Henry 62
 Morrill, John S. 8
 Muggleton, Lodowick 13, 32, 221, 228, 232
 Muller, Richard A. 106, 127, 193, 195

 North, Marcy L. 17
 Nuttall, Geoffrey F. 12

 Omerod, Oliver 1
 Orwell, George 1
 Owen, John 56, 67, 174, 183, 187, 199, 202

 Padget, William 40
 Pagitt, Ephraim 64, 166
 Parker, Henry 1
 Parr, William 40
 Patridge, Nicholas 38
 Perkins, William 18, 23, 25, 45, 46, 56-61, 91, 107,
 116, 146, 174, 179, 193, 228
 Plato 62, 143
 Poole, Kristen 53
 Porterfield, Amanda 39
 Prestana, Carla 51
 Preston, John 23, 109
 Primus, John H. 14
 Prynne, William 13, 51, 125, 136, 219
 Pym, John 26, 27, 51, 119, 125-6, 128, 131, 136, 158

 Radel, Nicholas F. 5
 Rainolds, John 16
 Rous, Francis 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 32, 33,
 35, 51, 55, 62, 118-159, 179, 186, 192, 194, 197, 199-
 207, 216, 220-22, 228, 230-1
 Russell, Conrad 8, 228
 Rutherford, Samuel 23, 61, 66, 69
 Ryre, Alec 37, 224

Saltmarsh, John 23, 28, 35, 57, 66, 164, 170, 183,
188, 198
Sampson, Thomas 44
Sandys, Edwin 41
Sasek, Lawrence A. 14
Scarisbrick, J. J. 37
Scudder, Henry 60
Sibbes, Richard 26, 57-8, 61, 143-4, 147
Solt, Leo F. 42, 43
Spurr, John 8, 213, 221
Steinmetz, David C. 4, 8
Sterry, Peter 26, 145, 147, 196, 229

Tany, TheaurauJohn 13
Tauler, John 62, 121
Todd, Margo 8, 16, 140, 209
Towne, Robert 66, 183
Traill, Robert 66-7, 164
Traske, John 66, 164, 183
Travers, Walter 45
Trinterud, Leonard J. 8, 16
Trueman, Carl R. 56, 68, 182, 193
Tyacke, Nicholas 3, 8, 13, 37, 48, 54, 130, 197
Tyndale, William 38, 110

Underdown, David 8
Ussher, James 23, 28, 31, 79, 80, 95, 99-100, 104,
109, 223

Van den Berg, Johannes 28
Vane, Henry 23, 62
Vermigli, Peter Martyr 40, 42, 44, 127
Vorstius, Conrad 129

Wakefield, Gordon S. 3
Wallington, Nehemiah 13, 219
Webster, Tom 8
Whitaker, William 45, 216, 220
Whitgift, John 1
Widdowes, Giles 1
Wilburn, Percival 10
Willard, Samuel 23
Willet, Andrew 23
Williams, Daniel 67, 163-4, 170, 175, 178
Winship, Michael P. 7, 10
Winstanley, Gerrard 32, 164, 232
Winthrop, John, Jr. 30
Woodhead, Linda 62
Woodward, Walter A. 30
Worden, Blair 8
Wrightson, Keith 8

Young, Thomas 41
Zaborowska, Magdalena J. 5

Curriculum Vitae

Randall James Pederson was born on the 16th of September 1975 in Everett, Washington, in the United States of America. In 2002 he graduated Bachelor of Science (BS) from Kuyper College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He studied theology, Reformation, and Post-Reformation history at Calvin Theological Seminary from 2002-2007, and graduated Master of Theological Studies (2006) and Master of Theology (*summa cum laude*, 2008). In 2007, he entered the doctoral program in church history at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, and completed the coursework *summa cum laude* in 2009, at which time he transferred to Leiden University. He is married to Sarah DeRuiter and they have two children, Tyler and Emelie.