



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 3

John Downname (1571-1652)

3.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.2 Social Contexts

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

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

¹³ See Chapter 6.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁴⁶ Dury, *Earnest Breathings*, 47-48.

⁴⁷ Dury, *Earnest Breathings*, 48-49.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁵⁹ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 157.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁷¹ Seaver, “Downham, John.”

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

3.3 Downname's Writings in Historical Context

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁹⁹ Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 626.

¹⁰⁰ The engraving is also the work of John Payne.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁰⁴ Downname, *Guide*, 329-30.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹²⁰ Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 126.

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

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

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

¹²¹ Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 126.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁴⁹ Finch, *Summe*, 382-311, 339-418.

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

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

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

3.3.7 *A Body of Divinitie* (1645)

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

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

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

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

¹⁵³ Ford, *James Ussher*, 81.

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

¹⁵⁵ Ford, *James Ussher*, 82-3.

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

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

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

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

3.4 Downname’s Theology in Historical Context

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

¹⁵⁷ Ford, *James Ussher*, 81-84.

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

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

3.4.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

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

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

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

¹⁶⁰ Downame, *Guide*, 30.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁶⁶ Downname, *Guide*, 30-35.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁷³ Downname, *Guide*, 30.

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

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

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

3.4.2 Predestination and Assurance

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

¹⁷⁵ Downname, *Guide*, 30-32.

¹⁷⁶ See Downname, *Guide*, 34-36.

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

¹⁷⁸ Beza placed the doctrine of God's eternal decrees at the front of his *Summa totius Christianismi*; the later Synod of Dort made no binding declaration on the orthodoxy of either infralapsarianism or supralapsarianism and allowed for diversity of thought. See J. V. Fesko, "Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 99-123. See also Joel R. Beeke, "The Order of the Divine Decrees at the Genevan Academy: From Bezan Supralapsarianism to Turretinian Infralapsarianism," in *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564-1864*, ed. John B. Roney and Martin I. Klauber (London: Greenwood Press, 1998), 57-76; David Como, "Puritans, Predestination, and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England," in

that the decree to predestinate was logically prior to the decree to create humanity and permit the fall of Adam (and so human beings in the decree are said to be *creabilis et labilis*); the latter taught that the decree to create was logically prior to predestinate and thus the objects of predestination were fallen creatures (*creatus et lapsus*). Though seventeenth-century Reformed scholastics debated the order of the decrees on predestination, creation, and the Fall, this order was always understood in a logical rather than temporal sense, since all knowledge and willing were regarded as simultaneous actions within the divine mind. Both forms were seen as within the bounds of orthodoxy and no one made it a confessional issue, though some more vehement adherents on both sides took great pains to disprove the other, supralapsarianism being seen as compromising God's goodness and infralapsarianism God's sovereignty.¹⁷⁹ Historians sometimes refer to supralapsarianism as double predestination and infralapsarianism as single predestination, but historically, as the decrees were understood in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both supralapsarianism and infralapsarianism were seen as being double or of having two sides, the decree to elect and the decree to reprobate or pass over. Both sides acknowledge elements of mystery to the decrees. Rather interesting, early seventeenth-century debates on Arminianism centered more on the doctrine of predestination than on justification, and, as Muller has well noted, predestination should not be seen as the central dogma of the Reformed; rather, predestination, in conjunction with several other doctrines, formed a system of thought that placed emphasis on "what might be called soteriological determinism."¹⁸⁰

The *Summe* places predestination under "Christ the Redeemer," explains the decree within 23 pages, and defends a rather robust supralapsarianism, thus reaffirming the strong ties to Christology that the Reformed orthodox placed when discussing predestination.¹⁸¹ Predestination is here defined as "one principall branch of Gods purpose, or eternall Decree, concerning the final estate of the most excellent creatures, Angels and Men," which consists of two parts: *election*, which is the bringing of some to salvation; and *reprobation*, which is the bringing of some to damnation. Though the number of God's elect are but few in comparison to the reprobate, the cause of their difference is only God's

Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000).

¹⁷⁹ See, for example, William Twisse's extensive defense of supralapsarianism in *The Riches of Gods Love Unto the Vessells of Mercy, Consistent with His Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the Vessells of Wrath* (Oxford, 1653). Though other prominent theologians, such as Beza, Maccovius, Gomarus, Perkins, Voetius, and Ames were supralapsarian in their views of predestination, various seventeenth-century confessions, such as the Canons of Dort and the Westminster Confession, were more infralapsarian. For clarification of the double/single debates within historic supra/infra discussions, see Muller, *After Calvin*, 11-12. For a thoughtful analysis of predestination in the sixteenth century, see Muller, *Christ and the Decree*; for a challenge to the conventional view that the Westminster Confession condoned infralapsarianism, see Guy M. Richard, "Samuel Rutherford's Supralapsarianism Revealed: A Key to the Lapsarian Position of the Westminster Confession of Faith?," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59 (2008): 27-44.

¹⁸⁰ Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 177-79; cf. John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 66-96. See and compare with Weber's thesis in Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Stephen Kalberg (1920; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 113-38.

¹⁸¹ Finch, *Summe*, 283-309; cf. Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 129-74

free will and pleasure or *decretum beneplaciti*, without any external motive, being first in the nature and order of causes and before all things. Predestination thus manifests God's mercy to those who will be saved and God's justice to those who are condemned.¹⁸² The *Summe* spends much time refuting notions that election and reprobation are moved by any quality within human beings: no foreknowledge of faith or infidelity, no good or evil works (not even the works of Christ), were the *causam efficientem* of the decree but rather are consequences that follow upon it.¹⁸³ *Christian Warfare* notes that the *forma causa* of election is the purpose or counsel of God himself, whereby he determined to elect, though it is silent on the causes of reprobation.¹⁸⁴ In the *Summe*, both election and reprobation are parallel decrees, the former wholly of God's mercy and the latter wholly of God's justice, and both for the displaying of God's glory.¹⁸⁵ The *Summe's* teachings on predestination are harmonious with the earlier English developments of Beza and Perkins and continental formulations seen in Polanus, Junius, Maccovius, and Gomarus.¹⁸⁶ The *Guide* defines election as "God's eternall decree whereby of his free grace, he hath purposed in Christ, to bring some to euerlasting life, and to the vse of the meanes, whereby they may attaine vnto it, to the praise of the glory of his grace;" and, conversely, reprobation is defined as the "eternall decree, whereby he hath purposed in his election to passe by some men, and to leaue them in their sinnes, that they may iustly be contemned, to the praise of the glory of his iustice."¹⁸⁷ Thus, there are differences in nuance between the *Summe* and the *Guide*, and it seems entirely plausible that this is because of their intended audiences. Indeed, *Christian Warfare*, written specifically for those perplexed with doubts, accentuates God's grace in election in stating that "all other causes" such as one's own will, the foreseeing of works, the worthiness or faith, or even the merits of Christ were excluded as grounds for election; the motive being ascribed to God's free grace and mere good will.¹⁸⁸ Downname further distinguishes between the "efficient," "material," and "formal" causes of election, and notes two ends of God's election, the first being God's glory and the second the salvation of the elect.¹⁸⁹

Glosses in the *Summe* on predestination defend the supralapsarian position without naming it; indeed, it is remarkable that throughout the *Summe* few references are made to extra-biblical sources, the majority of the effort being spent on expounding Scripture, a method similar to Downname's *Christian Warfare* and *Guide for Godliness*. The *Summe* also targets the errors of the Arminians, Universalists, Roman Catholics, and those of the "softer-Reformed" variety.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸² Indeed, in the *Guide*, Downname states that reprobation provides material for meditation because it extols God's justice toward the reprobate and God's love for the elect, both of whom are taken from the same mass of humanity. Downname, *Guide*, 567-68.

¹⁸³ Finch, *Summe; Christian Warfare*, Book I, 174-76.

¹⁸⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 176.

¹⁸⁵ Finch, *Summe*, 291-93.

¹⁸⁶ See "Predestination," in *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, 332-38; esp. 336.

¹⁸⁷ Downname, *Guide*, 34.

¹⁸⁸ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 97.

¹⁸⁹ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 98.

¹⁹⁰ Circulating at this time were notions that God merely passed over the reprobate rather than actively willing or decreeing their destruction. The *Summe* rejects Prestonian notions that reprobation becomes active only in time and not from eternity. Cf. and cp. Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical*

The *Summe* ends its discussion on predestination with the inestimable comfort available for the elect because of this doctrine, a subject dealt extensively in *Christian Warfare* (Book I, Ch. 3) and the *Guide*. One can readily see the preoccupation with assurance in these two texts and the great pains that Downname took to address it.

The *Body of Divinitie* places predestination under the kingdom of Christ and contains only a short question and answer on predestination. Election is based only on God's good pleasure and is not caused by anything good within people or by the good works of Christ. Reprobation is likewise an eternal decree or fore-appointment of men and angels to everlasting dishonor and destruction; God "of his own Free-will determining to pass them by, refuse or cast them off, and for sin to condemn and punish them with eternal Death;" and yet sin is not the cause of reprobation, for then all would be reprobate when God foresaw that all would sin; sin is the cause of the *execution* of reprobation, the wicked being justly damned for their own sin and not because God delights to destroy his creation.¹⁹¹ The *Body of Divinitie* seems to use more infralapsarian overtones when it employs the language of God "passing over" the reprobate, but then seems to nullify it by stating that there is no cause in the reprobate for their reprobation other than God's free will and good pleasure.¹⁹²

Typical of Puritanism, the *Summe*, *Body of Divinitie*, *Christian Warfare*, and *Guide to Godliness* address the practical problems associated with the doctrine of predestination and the common abuses against it. Rather than being the chief cause of anxiety, the doctrine brings comfort for the elect (being immutable) but terror to the reprobate (the *decretum horribile*); rather than opening a door to licentiousness, it encourages godliness and gratitude; but one must not peer too deeply into its depths and mysteries or they will fall into error and desperation.¹⁹³ Thus the doctrine of predestination had pedagogical uses and was used by Downname to bring comfort and assurance to the afflicted in conscience, though, says Downname, the devil was active in troubling weak Christians to doubt their election and salvation.¹⁹⁴

In *Christian Warfare*, Downname addresses the assurance problem in an extended and elaborate discussion which may be summated in five ways: First, the child of God who has been converted, justified, and sanctified can be certain of their particular election without any special revelation (thus assurance is *possible*); second, the means and infallible signs to discern election is the possession and fruits of a godly and Christian life,

Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 71-94.

¹⁹¹ Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 80-83.

¹⁹² Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 81. It is difficult to determine whether the text endorses infra- or supralapsarianism as the "passing by" of the reprobate mentioned in the text could reference an eternal negative act in a supralapsarian sense since it does not indicate anything about a fallen mass of humanity. Noteworthy, the editor of Ussher's definitive works accused Downname of authoring the supralapsarianism of the *Body of Divinitie*. See Charles R. Elrington, ed., *The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D.* (Dublin, 1847), 1:249-50.

¹⁹³ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 136-37. Both *Christian Warfare* and *A Guide to Godliness* address the complexity of assurance as it relates to predestination.

¹⁹⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 101-2. That the doctrine of predestination brings comfort to the elect is the central thesis of Nam Kyu Lee's *Die Prædestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen, 1583-1622* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

such as a heart enflamed with love for God and zeal for his glory (thus election has *evidences*); third, the rejection that doubt is somehow virtuous; though faith and doubt are often mixed in the godly, by nature, they are opposed (the papists thus erroneously extol *doubt*); fourth, that the nature of faith is to *believe* (thus faith itself *assures*); and fifth, that testimony of God's Spirit brings assurance by moving believers to love God's Word and work.¹⁹⁵ In characteristic precisianist fashion, Downname clarifies that the Spirit's testimony is not divorced from the diligent and careful use of outward means, as the hearing and reading of the Bible, the receiving of sacraments, and other holy duties in God's service. Thus, the inward testimony of the Spirit is not severed from the outward testimony of the word; further, the assurance of God's love and one's election is not wrought by the Spirit immediately but accompanies the preaching of the word and administration of sacraments.¹⁹⁶

Whether or not this precisianist program for assurance was successful is suggested in the rise of alternatives to this way of discerning marks and inward signs. For many, assurance was elusive and did contribute to many crises of faith, as in the case of Joan Drake, whom Lake wistfully calls "that long-distance puritan melancholic."¹⁹⁷ Numerous Puritan *intelligentsias* tried to resolve her inner conflict in believing that she was among the reprobate, but they largely failed to quiet her conscience. Among those divines who tried were John Dod, Thomas Hooker, John Preston, and James Ussher. It is interesting to note that Drake was often in "several days and nights of visionary ecstasy," followed by deeply depressive episodes. Though Drake suffered for many years, she does seem to have had some relief from her condition with Hooker's counseling, which, in part, resulted in her "peaceful death" in 1625, and which, in turn, contributed to Hooker's fame and preferment as a casuist.¹⁹⁸

Drake's case, and those like hers, is suggestive of the aura of religious despair that many parishioners, and some ministers, went through in the early Stuart era. Given the length that precisianist divines devoted to assurance in their writings, the problem of assurance must have been a constant issue within the parish. However, melancholic cases

¹⁹⁵ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 103-39.

¹⁹⁶ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 118.

¹⁹⁷ Peter Lake, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 609.

¹⁹⁸ John H. Ball, *Chronicling the Soul's Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1992), 13. For more on the Drake affair, and John Hart's chronicle of her story some twenty years after her death, see Charles Whitney, *Early Responses to Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 215-23; Jeremy Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 64-77; Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 91; George H. Williams, "Called by Thy Name, Leave us Not: The Case of Mrs. Joan Drake," *Harvard Library Bulletin* (1968). Cf. Mary Ann Lund, *Melancholy, Medicine and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading "The Anatomy of Melancholy"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 62-76.

Other notable melancholic cases include Thomas Shepard and Michael Wigglesworth. See Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge, Revised and Expanded* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), and Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653-1657: The Conscience of a Puritan* (New York: Harper and Row, 1946).

and crises of assurance were seen as evidences of spiritual conflict, with the devil leading the assault; and by no means were the more extreme cases the most prominent.

3.4.3 *Covenant of Works and Grace*

Covenant theology was a development within late sixteenth and early-mid-seventeenth-century Reformed theology that centers on notions of the covenant (*foedus*) between God and human beings.¹⁹⁹ Though covenant or federal theology was not monolithic in terms of detail, being expressed with various degrees of clarity throughout its evolution, it nonetheless enjoyed significant confessional and ecclesiastical status, being a central teaching in both British and continental symbols.²⁰⁰

The first major articulation of the covenant as such was Zwingli's in the 1520s. Zwingli used the covenant to defend the practice of infant baptism against the Anabaptists. Bullinger, Tyndale, and Hooper would later use the covenant to distinguish between divine sovereignty and human responsibility, though it was Calvin who more clearly detailed the notion of a single covenant of grace between God and the elect.²⁰¹ Later Reformed theologians, such as Caspar Olevianus, Zecharias Ursinus, and Herman Witsius, started to argue for a second covenant, a covenant of creation, nature, or works, which referred to an arrangement between God and Adam in the Garden of Eden prior to the

¹⁹⁹ Scholarship on the covenant in Reformed theology is enormous and complex. For introductions, summaries, and recent contributions, see Jordan J. Ballor, *Covenant, Causality, and Law: A Study in the Theology of Wolfgang Musculus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 43-78; J. Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 19-77; Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 175-90; Willem J. van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603-1669* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1-17, 248-90; Peter A. Lillback, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 28-125; Lyle D. Bierma, *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996); David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 115-52; Jonathan Neil Gerstner, *The Thousand Generation Covenant: Dutch Reformed Covenant Theology and Group Identity in Colonial South Africa, 1652-1814* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 107-35; and the now dated but historically accurate PhD thesis by Andrew A. Woolsey, *Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study of the Reformed Tradition to the Westminster Assembly* (1988; Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 7-160.

For studies on the covenant within Puritanism, see Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 217-320; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 71-100; Won Taek Lim, "The Covenant Theology of Francis Roberts" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2000); David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 128-98; John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1986); and Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), 365-462, 502-6. George Marsden wrote that "The covenant doctrine was emphasized primarily because it was discovered to be a central biblical concept." Quoted in Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract*, 4.

²⁰⁰ See, for instance, the "Westminster Confession of Faith," in *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition: Volume 2, Reformation Era*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 615-16.

²⁰¹ Lillback, *The Binding of God*; Selderhuis, *The Calvin Handbook*, 237-40.

Fall; while details of this second covenant varied it was generally held that life was promised to Adam upon obedience and death upon disobedience; Adam, falling into sin, thus plunged the whole human race into death. Inquiries into the respective roles of God the Father and God the Son in the salvation of the elect produced a third covenant in the mid-1640s—the Covenant of Redemption or *pactum salutis*, which was seen as an eternal agreement within the Trinity to bring about the elect’s salvation and glorification. It is the foundation of the covenant of grace and makes possible the “agreement between God and his elect;” thus, among seventeenth Reformed theologians, the covenant of grace “presupposes” the covenant of redemption.²⁰²

During the seventeenth century, three of the most widely circulated expositions on the covenant were by Puritans: John Ball’s *The Covenant of Grace* (1645); Edward Fisher’s *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (1646); and Francis Roberts’s *Mysterium & Medulla Bibliorum* (1657). Shorter discussions of the covenant frequently made it into the varied bodies of divinity and even within numerous practical expositions of the godly and Christian life. The doctrine of the two covenants (Covenant of Works and Grace) was a popular theme within Stuart Puritanism, especially in discussions of Christology and redemption.²⁰³ In 1646, Downname gave his imprimatur to Edmund Calamy’s *Two Solemne Covenants made Between God and Man*, which attests to the diverse literature on the subject in that it briefly notes the variety of opinions on the Covenant of Works and Grace.²⁰⁴

The doctrine of the two covenants appears with varying degrees of precision throughout *Christian Warfare, Guide, Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*. As expected, discussions of the covenant in the two former works center on the Covenant of Grace and its pedagogical use for bringing comfort and assurance to believers (the Covenant of Works is only mentioned twice by name, and that in the *Guide*).²⁰⁵ The two latter works present the Covenant of Works and Grace with more dogmatic aims to instruct readers in sound doctrine.²⁰⁶

The *Summe* first discusses the covenant of works with the creatures, a covenant of life (or blessedness) to the doers of the Law but of death (or of a curse) to its transgressors, calling it the first covenant that God made with his creatures. This covenant has two parts: the Law of God from which all other laws are streams and shadows and Reward and Punishment, without which there would be neither care to observe nor fear to break it. The reward comes from God’s free and undeserved goodness and punishment from the

²⁰² Muller, *After Calvin*, 187.

²⁰³ McGiffert, “Federal Theology,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 1:395-6; Zaret, *Heavenly Contract*, 133-35.

²⁰⁴ Edmund Calamy, *Two Solemne Covenants made Between God and Man: That is, the Covenant of Workes and the Covenant of Grace* (London, 1647), sig. A2-3. Calamy remarks that Sidrach Simpson presented a case for four covenants (two of Works and two of Grace) before the Westminster Assembly, and that others held to three covenants and still others, such as he, to two. Mark Jones, “The ‘Old’ Covenant,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within British Puritanism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 187.

²⁰⁵ See Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 68-9, 83, 86, 89, 103, 110, 115, 119, 198-9, 209, 245, 276, 297, 305, 319-20, 323, 597, 855, 892; and Downname, *Guide*, 6, 9-10, 21, 28, 36-37, 48-51, 88-90, 94, 107, 170-71, 243, 396, 406, 452-4, 492, 495-9, 530, 565, 582, 602-3, 606, 680, 689-90, 718, 738, 809, 823, 886, 896-7, 904, 923-5, 958, 960.

²⁰⁶ Finch, *Summe*, sig. *2v-3r; 222-26; 282-3, 307-10, 361, 380, 391, 406-9; Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, Heads 8, 11.

sins committed. The covenant requires works done by the strength of nature, and according to the law of creation, the express image being the moral law; the covenant's grounds and foundation is the beautified state of primitive man, who was endowed with holiness and God's Law written on the heart.²⁰⁷ The other covenant in the *Summe* is the conditional covenant between God and the elect, mediated by Christ, for the salvation of elect souls, the condition being faith. The *Summe* does not call this a Covenant of Grace, though substantially that is what it is; all the essential elements of the Covenant of Grace as depicted in Ball's *Treatise* are in the *Summe* in rudiment form, with both treatises emphasizing God's goodness and kindness. Thus, the *Summe* does not contain the more mature expressions of covenant theology typical of mid-to-late seventeenth-century treatises, but it nonetheless contains the seeds to which this thought would develop into. Both *Christian Warfare* and the *Guide* refer to the Covenant of Grace and use this covenant to foster Christian assurance and godly living.²⁰⁸

The *Body of Divinitie* contains a much more elaborate discussion of the Covenant of Works, and reflects the development to 1645: the covenant of works (the first covenant) was given to Adam pre-fall. It was a conditional covenant in that life was promised to Adam upon obedience and death upon disobedience. Adam had the capacity to either obey or disobey (having free will), though the law was written on his heart. The trees of life and of the knowledge of good and evil were seals of the covenant and signified either eternal life or the misery humanity would know by experience. Adam is clearly presented as the federal head of mankind, thus representing all those who should descend from him through natural generation. In a similar way that Adam represented all humanity, in the second covenant, the Covenant of Grace, Christ represents the elect and they receive from him the righteousness of the second Adam; or, as *Christian Warfare* puts it: "Christ's righteousness is our righteousness, his obedience our obedience, his merits our merits, as certainly, perfectly and effectually, euen as if wee our selues had beene most innocent, fulfilled the Law, or made full satisfaction to Gods justice."²⁰⁹

Thus, in sum, both the Covenant of Works and Grace appear throughout Downname's work, whether in those texts which he directly authored or those he edited and published. The Covenant of Grace is more predominately featured than the Covenant of Works, but even in the earlier work of the *Summe* and in the *Guide*, the Covenant of Works is discussed and presented as the broken covenant between God and humanity. The Covenant of Grace, in contrast, is the immutable covenant that God has established with his elect through the mediation of Christ on the condition of faith.

3.4.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

The doctrine of justification (*iustificatio*), the "*articulus standis aut cadentis Ecclesiae*,"²¹⁰ was no less a controversial doctrine in the seventeenth century as it was in

²⁰⁷ Finch, *Summe*, 222-26.

²⁰⁸ See Downname, *Guide*, 9, 689-90. See also Von Rohr, *Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*, 155-92.

²⁰⁹ Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 123-43; Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 270.

²¹⁰ This aphorism on the doctrine of justification, often attributed to Luther by seventeenth-century authors, seems instead to have originated within the Lutheran and Reformed environs of the early

the sixteenth.²¹¹ In fact, the doctrine was enshrined in controversy in the early seventeenth century, in no small part because of debates between the Reformed orthodox and the Arminians, Antinomians, and Roman Catholics, and especially in the proposals by some of eternal justification, which seemed to some to compromise motives for sanctification among the elect.²¹² Given the importance of the doctrine within mainstream Reformed orthodoxy, it is not surprising how much effort was spent on confuting the claims of opponents. Thus, the early seventeenth-century press issued William Bradshaw's *A Treatise of Justification* (1615), Andrew Willet's *Hexapla* (1620), William Pemble's *Vindiciae Fidei* (1629), John Davenant's *Disputatio de Iustitia Habituali et Actuali* (1631), and George Downname's *A Treatise of Justification* (1633); mid-century gave rise to Thomas Goodwin's *Christ Set Forth* (1642), John Goodwin's *Imputatio Fidei* (1642), and Anthony Burgess's *The True Doctrine of Iustification Asserted and Vindicated* (1648); and the late seventeenth century produced John Owen's magisterial *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith through the Imputation of Christ* (1677) and Robert Traill's missive against unjust charges of antinomism, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification* (1692), which sought to discredit, among others, the teaching that justification occurred before faith. Casual glances at these texts confirm the heated environment in which they were written, the importance of the doctrine among the Reformed orthodox, and the inescapable connection between *dogma* and *praxis pietatis*.²¹³

seventeenth century. In 1615, the Lutheran Balthasar Meisner wrote, in what appears to be the phrase's first recorded use: "*Verissimum est illud Luther proverbium, quo saepius fuit usus: 'Justificatio est articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae.'*" Meisner, *Anthopologia sacra*, disputation 24 (Wittenberg: Johannes Gormannus, 1615). Whether Meisner merely paraphrased Luther (e.g. Schamlkald Articles) or had access to some hitherto unknown source is not currently known. What is known is that this "proverb" circulated among Lutheran and Reformed writers in the seventeenth century, and was cited by Johann Heinrich Alsted, William Eyre (who credits Luther), and others. Moreover, though Luther may not have used this exact wording, the concept had definite precursors within Luther, such as his phrase, "*qui isto articulo stante stat Ecclesia, ruente ruit Ecclesia*" (WA 40/3.252.3). Regardless of its origins, the phrase cannot be credited to Valentin Ernst Loscher in 1718. Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Theologia scholastica didacta* (Hanover, 1618), 711; William Eyre, *Vindiciae justificationis gratuita* (London, 1654), 17; Theodor Mahlmann, "Articulus stantis et (vel) cadentis ecclesiae," *Religion Past and Present*, Vol. 1 (2006); Mahlmann, "Zur Geschichte der Formel 'Articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,'" *Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 17 (1993): 197-94; Philip J. Secker, ed., *The Sacred Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions: Selected Writings of Arthur Carl Piepkorn, Volume 2* (Mansfield: CEC Press, 2007), 260; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), vii (fn. 1). Cf. Friedrech Loofs, "Der articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 90 (1917): 323-420.

²¹¹ Standard histories of the doctrine are: James Buchanan, *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of Its History in the Church and of Its Exposition from Scripture* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1867); Albrecht Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1900); and Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

²¹² See Robert J. McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism': Eternal Justification," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 223-62.

²¹³ On the historical contexts of seventeenth-century justification debates, see McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar," 223-262; Brian Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 135-204; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 208-307; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, 101-23; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church*

The doctrine of justification occurs throughout the texts under discussion: *Christian Warfare* (Book II, Chaps. 50-53) contains a lengthy exposition of justification and the *Guide* devotes one chapter to justifying faith; both the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie* likewise devote considerable time to clearing the doctrine from fallacy. The extent to which the doctrine is handled is indicative of its importance within Stuart Puritanism.

Christian Warfare bifurcates justification into two aspects: the remission of sins and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. This justification has two ends: first, it is chiefly toward the glory of God; and second, for the assurance of faith, salvation thus being wholly in the hands of God and grounded in Christ's righteousness and obedience. Further, Christ's active and passive righteousness are both imputed to believers, wherein all the merits of Christ are accounted to believers as if they were their own. Eternal justification is rejected because believers are first justified in time, subsequent to faith, which is brought by the ministry of the Word. *Christian Warfare* then spends considerable time to address Satan's varied temptations concerning the doctrine, which chiefly center on matters of assurance.²¹⁴ The *Guide* discusses justification as the second main ground of a godly life, the first being saving knowledge. Without justifying faith one cannot perform any duty acceptable to God, it being required that one's "person" must first be accepted prior to one's works. This faith is a true, lively, and justifying faith, which is a sanctifying grace infused by God's Spirit into believers, and results in their effectual belief and assent to gospel promises.²¹⁵ Thus, whereas *Christian Warfare* provides more detail to the doctrine of justification in order to subvert the heresies "spawned by Satan," the *Guide* provides the experiential groundwork for understanding the doctrine as it manifests in parish life, though both texts have as their end the growth and maturity of Christians.

The *Summe* contains a brief, though fine-tuned, explanation of the doctrine of justification, and quotes Andreas Osiander on the "essential righteousness" of Christ that is imputed to believers. The parts of imputed righteousness are twofold: first the imputation of the perfect sanctification of Christ's human nature and second the imputation of the thorough and perfect obedience which he performed in the course of his life. Here parallels are drawn between Adam and Christ, both similarly imputing to those who belong to them. Following upon this imputation is justification or God's censure and judgment to accept the elect as holy and righteous and thus being able to stand before him. Flowing from justification are sanctification and redemption, which are given freely to the elect.²¹⁶

The *Body of Divinitie* also defends the doctrine against Roman Catholic notions, and allows for the justification of those who do not yet have assurance of faith, in keeping with the teachings of the Westminster standards. The *Body* distinguishes between justifying faith and the faith that assures; the former precedes the act of justification and

and Dogma, 1300-1700 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 138-54; and Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993), 25-87.

²¹⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 271-80.

²¹⁵ Downname, *Guide*, 40-47.

²¹⁶ Finch, *Summe*, 447-52.

the latter follows it. Those things that accompany justification are adoption and reconciliation.²¹⁷

Typical of the Reformed orthodox, these four books assess the doctrine of justification prior to sanctification and in distinction from it and see the latter as the fruit of the former. This emphasis is without doubt an attempt to impugn the papists and Arminians, who were circulating vying concepts of the doctrine in an increasingly theologically divided country²¹⁸ *Christian Warfare* contains the lengthiest exposition of sanctification, devoting a whole book to it (Part I, Book 3), and the *Guide* omits any formal discussion of the doctrine. Reasons for these choices are speculative. It is possible this method reflects the warfare literature genre, or it could simply be for more pragmatic reasons, such as the size of the book, and possible allusions to their intended audiences.

3.4.5 *Law and Gospel*

While Downname did not write a treatise on the dialectic of law and gospel, as his contemporary Samuel Bolton did,²¹⁹ among others, he nonetheless evidences the precisianist understanding of how the law relates to the gospel, especially when it comes to the matter of assurance and its use in the Christian life. As we will see in Chapter 5, antinomian challenges to the precisianist way centered chiefly on differences in how the law was to be used, both in the church's preaching, and in the private devotion of Christians. For Downname, the law had an important place in guiding the believer's moral conduct in this life, and was to be used as a rule for living. This ideal standard, and the actual experiences of believers, however, did not always seem congruent, but Downname answers, "the Gospell commandeth vs nothing, which it doth not also by the inward and ordinary co-operation of Gods Spirit enable vs to performe." Indeed, Downname distinguishes the law and gospel on this point: the "Law sheweth vs the duties which we should performe, but ministers vnto vs no power whereby we may be enabled to performe them." This powerlessness of the law is in contrast with the "Gospell being assisted with the operation of God's Spirit," which both commands and enables the commandment to be performed. This lively faith, then, becomes another grounds for believing in one's election to grace.²²⁰

3.4.6 *Christian Life and Piety*

Given Downname's status as a pastoral theologian, it is not surprising that the majority of Downname's work is devoted to the Christian life and piety. Indeed, *Christian Warfare* and the *Guide* are replete with advice and counsel on multifarious social issues

²¹⁷ Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 199-201.

²¹⁸ See McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 284-95.

²¹⁹ Samuel Bolton, *The Trve Bovnds of Christian Freedome; Or, A Treaise Wherein the Rights of the Law are Vindicated, the Liberties of Grace Maintained, and the Severall Late Opinions against the Law are Examined and Confuted* (London, 1656).

²²⁰ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 106.

that were common among seventeenth-century parishioners, such as how to know one's calling and election, how to obey the Ten Commandments, how to live the life of prayer and submission, how to love one's neighbors, how to progress towards heaven, how to observe the Sabbath, how to foster godly relationships, how to fast, and how to combat the world, the flesh, and the devil. For Downname, as for the Reformed orthodox, the interplay between *dogma* and *praxis* was of high importance and a common thread within their writings. Correct doctrine, with the Spirit's blessing, would lead to a rather robust godly life; erroneous doctrine, however, would open the door to all manner of lasciviousness and scandal. Further, the Christian in this life was a stranger and a pilgrim; as Bryan W. Ball has observed, the *Guide*, and other works like it, sought to "make the saints aware of [their] direct relationship with Christ, and to bring each one of them into the fullness of its eternal benefits...Religion can scarcely be personal without devotion, and the end of faith was the godly life."²²¹ This lively faith toward heaven is aptly depicted in a short anonymous tract approved by Downname, in which a Christian "knows that he is a pilgrim upon earth, and like one in a strange Countrey here."²²²

3.5 Conclusion

The English Puritan John Downname was a promoter of the precisianist strain within Puritanism, which emphasized rigorous and introspective piety, godly conduct, and theological astuteness in dealing with the practical issues arising from the Christian life. He made a name for himself in the place of the English Bible with his production of a widely used concordance, and had equal fame as a casuist in the tradition of William Perkins and William Ames through his two most popular expositions of the Christian life, *Christian Warfare* and *A Guide to Godlynesse*.

As theological editor, Downname was able to publish and promote Reformed orthodoxy with the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*, two of the most popular English divinity manuals of the period. Downname was a prominent Reformed pastor-theologian who showed preference for the doctrine of predestination, its implications for the Puritan conscience, and biblical exegesis. Downname's theology accents the unities within early seventeenth-century Puritanism: belief in the Triune God who transcends human existence but who became a human being to redeem fallen humanity; belief in the parallel predestination of the elect and the reprobate; belief in God's twofold covenant to bring about the salvation of the elect and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; belief in the unconditional justification of the sinner by grace and their progress in the Christian life. Downname presented and defended divine causality in a mainstream Reformed way, which emphasized God's activity in election and salvation, and recognized the believer's co-operation with the Spirit in their ongoing sanctification.

Downname's social contexts demonstrate the needs of the English Reformed tradition and Stuart Puritanism: the need for a thorough and sound exegesis of the Bible;

²²¹ Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Puritanism to 1660* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 193.

²²² [Anonymous], *A New Anatomie; Or, a Character of a Christian, or Round-head* (London, 1645), 7.

the need to properly apply biblical principles to the Christian life; the need to confute heresy and error; the need to educate and inform the laity, and so create a culture of reading and literacy, and the need to theologically and pastorally address the problem of assurance.

Downname ministered during a time of massive change, engaged in the theological controversies of the period, and contributed to the “ethos” of Puritanism as a style that wove *dogma* and *praxis* in a Reformed experiential predestinarianism that is interwoven within a greater framework of the covenant and the history of redemption. He secured his reputation as an avid and gifted devotional writer whose main source was the Bible. His writings, though wholly theological, had a more practical bent, stand firmly within the earlier casuist Puritan tradition that sought to present precisianist answers to the problems of daily living from the pulpit and press.

In sum, Downname’s social and theological contexts suggest that the continuing Puritan Reformation was “successful” because of its diverse and intricate social networks that furthered the spread and acceptance of a “hotter-sort” or “fiery” Protestantism. Downname’s use of the printing press, his censorship, as well as his many ties to prominent theologians reflect the intricate social networks then in place. Downname was an emblematic and effervescent promoter of the precisianist strain within the Puritan Reformation.