



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

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. Tepley, 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.