

Brill's Series in Church History • Volume 68

Unity in Diversity

*English Puritans and
the Puritan Reformation, 1603–1689*



By

Randall J. Pederson

Series Editor: Wim Janse

BRILL

Unity in Diversity

Brill's Series in Church History

Edited by

Wim Janse (*VU University Amsterdam*)

In cooperation with

Jan Wim Buisman (*Leiden*)

Paul van Geest (*Amsterdam/Tilburg*)

Alastair Hamilton (*London*)

R. Ward Holder (*Manchester, NH*)

Scott Mandelbrote (*Cambridge, UK*)

Andrew Pettegree (*St. Andrews*)

VOLUME 68

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bsch

Unity in Diversity

*English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation,
1603–1689*

By

Randall J. Pederson



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Frederick Newenham, Francis Rous, Speaker of the House of Commons, 1653 (WOA 2690) is reproduced courtesy of the Palace of Westminster Collection.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Pederson, Randall J., 1975-

Unity in diversity : English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603–1689 / by Randall J. Pederson.
pages cm. — (Brill's series in church history, ISSN 1572-4107 ; VOLUME 68)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-27850-9 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-27851-6 (e-book) 1. Puritans—England—History—17th century. 2. England—Church history—17th century. I. Title.

BX9334.3.P43 2014

285'.9094209032—dc23

2014017967

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1572-4107

ISBN 978 90 04 27850 9 (hardback)

ISBN 978 90 04 27851 6 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

For Sarah, sine amore, nihil est vita

“Marriage love is oftime a secret worke of God, pitching the heart of one party upon another, for no knowne cause; and therefore where this strong lodestone attracts each to other, no further question need to be made, but such a man and such a womans match were made in heaven, and God hath brought them together.”

– Daniel Rogers, Matrimoniall Honour (1642)



Contents

Preface xi

PART 1

Historical Method and Background 1

- 1 **Historiographical Introduction, Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure** 3
 - 1.1 Another Study on English Puritanism? Historiographical Justification 3
 - 1.2 Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure 29
 - 1.2.1 *Narrative and Metanarrative* 33
 - 1.2.2 *Structure* 37
 - 1.3 Summary 38
- 2 **Seventeenth-Century Background** 40
 - 2.1 Introduction 40
 - 2.2 The Political, Religious, Social, and Theological Contexts 41
 - 2.2.1 *The Early English Reformation (1534–53)* 43
 - 2.2.2 *Marian England (1553–58)* 48
 - 2.2.3 *The Elizabethan Period (1558–1603)* 51
 - 2.2.4 *The Early Stuart Period (1603–42)* 56
 - 2.2.5 *The English Revolution (1640–60)* 60
 - 2.2.6 *The Later Stuart Restoration (1660–89)* 63
 - 2.3 Theological Strains within Stuart Puritanism 65
 - 2.3.1 *Precisianist Strain* 68
 - 2.3.2 *Mystical Strain* 72
 - 2.3.3 *Antinomian Strain* 75
 - 2.3.4 *Neonomian Strain* 82
 - 2.4 Conclusion 84

PART 2

Puritans 87

- 3 **John Downname (1571–1652)** 89
 - 3.1 Introduction 89
 - 3.2 Social Contexts 94

3.3	Downname's Writings in Historical Contexts	106
3.3.1	<i>The Christian Warfare</i> (1604–18, 1612, 1634)	109
3.3.2	<i>A Guide to Godlynesse</i> (1622, 1629)	113
3.3.3	<i>Lectvres Vpon the Fovre First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea</i> (1608)	116
3.3.4	<i>A Briefe Concordance of the Bible</i> (1630; repr. 1631–90)	119
3.3.5	<i>Annotations upon All the Books of the Old and New Testament</i> (1645, 1651, 1657–58)	120
3.3.6	<i>The Summe of Sacred Divinitie</i> (c.1620)	123
3.3.7	<i>A Body of Divinitie</i> (1645)	127
3.4	Downname's Theology in Historical Context	129
3.4.1	<i>Doctrine of God and Humanity</i>	130
3.4.2	<i>Predestination and Assurance</i>	135
3.4.3	<i>Covenant of Works and Grace</i>	142
3.4.4	<i>Justification and Sanctification</i>	146
3.4.5	<i>Law and Gospel</i>	149
3.4.6	<i>Christian Life and Piety</i>	150
3.5	Conclusion	151
4	Francis Rous (1580/81–1659)	153
4.1	Introduction	153
4.2	Social Contexts	159
4.3	Rous's Writings in Historical Context	178
4.3.1	<i>The Heavenly Academy</i> (1638, 1656; Latin 1655, 1674)	184
4.3.2	<i>The Great Oracle</i> (1641, 1656; Latin, 1655, 1674)	190
4.3.3	<i>The Mystical Marriage, Or, Experimental Discoveries of the Heavenly Marriage between a Soul and Her Savior</i> (1631, 1635, 1653–56; Latin, 1655, 1674)	192
4.4	Rous's Theology in Historical Context	195
4.4.1	<i>Doctrine of God and Humanity</i>	196
4.4.2	<i>Predestination and Assurance</i>	200
4.4.3	<i>Covenant of Works and Grace</i>	203
4.4.4	<i>Justification and Sanctification</i>	205
4.4.5	<i>Law and Gospel</i>	206
4.4.6	<i>Christian Life and Piety</i>	207
4.5	Conclusion	208
5	Tobias Crisp (1600–42/3)	210
5.1	Introduction	210
5.2	Social Contexts	216
5.3	Crisp's Writings in Historical Context	222

5.3.1	<i>Christ Alone Exalted: Being the Compleat Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D. Containing XLII Sermons on Several Select Texts of Scriptures (1690)</i>	231
5.4	Crisp's Theology in Historical Context	237
5.4.1	<i>Doctrine of God and Humanity</i>	238
5.4.2	<i>Predestination and Assurance</i>	241
5.4.3	<i>Covenant of Works and Grace</i>	244
5.4.4	<i>Justification and Sanctification</i>	248
5.4.5	<i>Law and Gospel</i>	254
5.4.6	<i>Christian Life and Piety</i>	257
5.5	Conclusion	259
PART 3		
	Unity in Diversity	261
6	<i>Unitas within Diversitas: Downname, Rous, and Crisp</i>	263
6.1	Introduction	263
6.2	Reformed Unity and Diversity	265
6.3	Reformed Unity and Diversity within Puritanism	268
6.4	Unity in Society	274
6.5	Unity in Reformed Theology	276
6.5.1	<i>Doctrine of God and Humanity</i>	276
6.5.2	<i>Predestination and Assurance</i>	278
6.5.3	<i>Covenant of Works and Grace</i>	279
6.5.4	<i>Justification and Sanctification</i>	280
6.5.5	<i>Law and Gospel</i>	281
6.5.6	<i>Christian Life and Piety</i>	282
6.6	Conclusion	282
7	Defining Puritans and Puritanism: Narrative and Metanarrative	284
7.1	Introduction	284
7.2	Defining Puritanism	288
7.3	Narrative and Metanarrative	299
7.4	Identifying Puritans	302
7.5	Conclusion	308
8	Conclusion	310
	Bibliography	317
	Index	371

Preface

This book is a revised and expanded version of my doctoral thesis for Leiden University. It reflects on the perennial problem of studying Puritanism, that is, how Puritanism is best understood, classified, and defined. For centuries, historians have been perpetually perplexed over this issue, which has been compounded by vying political, philosophical, and cultural biases. While no historian is ever truly objective, we can and should strive toward objectivity, and learn from and indeed improve upon those who have gone before us. G. R. Elton once quipped that the difference between “real” historians and amateurs is that the latter impose their enthusiasm upon the past, whereas the former wait for the past to suggest its own questions. Quentin Skinner put it this way, “If we approach the past with a willingness to listen, with a commitment to trying to see things their way, we can hope to prevent ourselves from becoming too readily bewitched.” I have strived to be a “real” historian, and, as such, I do not present my work as the last word on Puritanism, but as a possible way to move in more constructive ways. Had I chosen a less difficult topic, I could have been spared much vexation and agony, but much joy and discovery would have been lost; indeed, as Elton said, “The future is dark, the present burdensome; only the past, dead and finished, bears contemplation.”

There are numerous people who have influenced my growth as a scholar, but I would first like to thank God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, for giving me health of body and mind to complete this work. Next, I can scarcely express my debt to my *Doktorväter* Gijsbert van den Brink and Richard Muller, who have confirmed, sharpened, encouraged, and corrected my thinking over the years. Professor Van den Brink, as promoter, has spent countless hours overseeing this project, reading drafts, and making insightful comments on my work since its inception. He is the one who first saw similarities between Wittgenstein’s theory of family resemblance and what I was proposing as a working definition. I am deeply grateful for his willingness to take me on as his PhD student, to share his wisdom, and shepherd me through this five-year journey. I have fond memories of his stay in Princeton, NJ, during 2010–11 as a Houston Witherspoon Fellow. I am grateful for the time he took to meet with me on numerous occasions, and the warm reception offered to my family and me at his home in Woerden, The Netherlands. Prof. Muller, as co-promoter, likewise spent many hours reading through drafts of my text and offered helpful and constructive comments. By far, he knows more about the Reformed orthodoxy of the seventeenth century than anyone I know, and has a near-encyclopedic knowledge of sources; his expertise and eclectic interests have both inspired me and have set a model for my future studies. Both professors have invested much time into my development and maturation as a scholar, and have

modeled a high standard of scholarship. I am deeply thankful for them and look forward to learning more, both personally and intellectually, as time goes on. Without them, this work would never have been completed.

I would also like to thank my professors at Calvin Theological Seminary who have taught me many things about Reformation and Post-Reformation history, and who have also contributed to my growth: I want to thank Professor Muller, again, not only for the many classes that I have had with him, but also for graciously supervising my ThM thesis on Francis Rous, and for suggesting that I expand that work into this book; Lyle Bierma, who was my professor at college and seminary, and who always encouraged me to think critically about whatever subject we were exploring in class; John Bolt, who has likewise encouraged me over the years, and whose work on Bavinck and Kuyper I deeply admire; and Arie Leder, who first suggested that I pursue doctoral studies at Leiden. Little did I know then how deeply intertwined Leiden and Puritanism were in the seventeenth century; it is fitting to conclude my education at the same university where Rous and so many other Puritans studied.

Special thanks are due to Carl Trueman, professor at Westminster Theological Seminary, who kindly asked me to be his teaching assistant back in 2007; he has exemplified the kind of scholarship that I wish to achieve, and has a rare ability to combine wisdom with wit, reminiscent of Chesterton. It was Trueman's pessimism in applying "Puritan" to John Owen that pushed me through the themes explored in this book. I am also grateful for Jeff Jue, who opened up the world of Puritan millenarianism. Prior to his classes, I was not fully aware that Puritans were as fond of setting dates for the end of their world, as evangelicals are for our own. Because of my professors, this book is much better than it would have been otherwise.

I also want to give special thanks to Joel Beeke of Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary for being a constant support and for encouraging me throughout my education. He has taught me many things about true friendship and forgiveness, and has set a standard for productivity to which I aspire. It reminds me of Cotton Mather's renowned aptitude for writing books, but, unlike Mather, he has never written the words "Be short" above his study door. He is one of the most approachable people I know.

Many friends have supported me over the course of my graduate work, and deserve mention: Patrick Severson, pastor of Grace Presbyterian Church, in Lisbon, NY, has been my *amicus optimus* since we were children. Giving the speech at his wedding in 2000 is one the greatest honors I have had. Though we have lived in separate states for so many years, we will always be kindred spirits. Terreth Klaver, Durell Flood, Steve Carr, Brett Schut, Jonathon Beeke, Tom Schwanda, Crawford Gribben, Anthony Gosling, and James Dolezal are all good friends that have enriched my life in so many ways.

My family has been a source of strength and inspiration. Here I must express my love for my wife, Sarah, and our two children, Tyler and Emelie. They have always been

there for me, even when I was absorbed in books, and they have loved and accepted me with all my faults. As this book has come at the cost of family time, I can only hope that it will prove to be of some enduring value. My parents have also been there for me through the years. They were with us in Leiden to witness my public defense; that it occurred on my mother's birthday made it a doubly special occasion.

Finally, I want to thank those at Brill publishers who have made the publication of my PhD dissertation possible. In particular, I extend gratitude to Arjan van Dijk, who, as Brill's Acquisitions Editor for Church History, aptly facilitated this process early on; Ivo Romein, who was bearer of the good news that my work had passed editorial scrutiny and review; Mirjam Elbers, who patiently waited for the final manuscript; Diana Steele, who, as one of Brill's production managers, shepherded the work in its final stages; and Professor Wim Janse, for his enthusiasm for my work, and for deciding to include it in his august Series in Church History. I have long admired Brill's history, production standards, and peer review. For centuries, Brill has contributed to Leiden's world reputation for fine printing, and I consider it a great honor to be published by them.

Randall J. Pederson

Bensalem, March 2014

PART 1

Historical Method and Background



Historiographical Introduction, Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure

1.1 Another Study on English Puritanism? Historiographical Justification

Only in the past sixty-five years has the study of English Puritanism gained serious academic credence.¹ Prior to this, popular perceptions of Puritans ranged from admirable to ignoble. In the *sixteenth century*, John Whitgift, adversary of Elizabethan Puritanism and future Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote that “this name Puritane is very aptely giuen to these men, not because they be pure no more than were the Heretikes called Cathari, but because they think them selues to be *mundiores ceteris*, more pure than others, as Cathari dyd, and separate them selues from all other Churches and congregations

1 Most historians have used “English Puritanism” as a standard reference to this sixteenth- and seventeenth-century movement (or series of movements); however, other historians refer to “British Puritanism,” “Dutch Puritanism,” “Scottish Puritanism,” “American Puritanism,” or even “Irish Puritanism,” to reflect the diversity of thought present within Puritanism and argue for an expansive presence outside England. I refer to “English Puritanism” in its English and British (i.e. international) contexts; that is, I assume that Puritanism was not only an occurrence in England and its colonies but had a strong presence elsewhere, especially in the Netherlands. It is in this sense that I refer to the “Puritan Reformation.” For studies of Puritanism outside of England, see Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982); Willem op’t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1598–1622* (Rotterdam, 1987); David George Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638* (New York, 2000); Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven, 2002), pp. 402–12; Janice Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (New Haven, 1994); and Crawford Gribben, “Puritanism in Ireland and Wales,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 159–173. John Coffey has recently questioned the use of “Scottish Puritanism” in “The Problem of ‘Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638,’” in *Enforcing the Reformation in Ireland and Scotland*, ed. Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 68–90, and Keith Brown has rejected it in “Review of *Scottish Puritanism*,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002), 241–438, there 396. That the term “Puritan” was applied to the Scottish context by early modernists should neither be exaggerated nor disregarded.

as spotted and defiled.”² Thomas Cartwright, the leading Presbyterian of the sixteenth century, rejected “Puritan” and thought that it should be applied only to Anabaptists.³ In the *seventeenth century*, Oliver Ormerod mocked the Puritans in his oft-cited dialogue *The Picture of a Puritane* (1605).⁴ Henry Parker, one of Ormerod’s contemporaries, sought to defend his fellow evangelicals from “this detested odious name of Puritan,” by stating that they upheld godliness and morals in the realm.⁵ Giles Widdowes observed its ambiguity in 1631 and John Yates found it offensive in 1625, calling for a statute to “define it and punish it.”⁶ Gisbertus Voetius criticized those who called Reformed ministers, “*Praecisistis, Puritanis, Rotundis capitibus . . . Morosophis . . . Morosis Humoristis, Melancholicis capitibus.*”⁷ In the *eighteenth century*, David Hume called the Puritans “obstinate reformers” and referred to their “wild fanaticism”

-
- 2 John Whitgift, *An Answere to a Certen Libel Intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1572), p. 18; quoted in Richard L. Greaves, *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England* (Minneapolis, 1981), p. 7. In response to Whitgift, Cartwright denied the imputation of Catharism and asserted that the only purity that concerned Christians was Christ’s innocence and the sanctification he bestows. For Elizabethan Puritan political ideas, see Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *Puritan Political Ideas, 1558–1794* (1965; repr., Indianapolis, 2003), pp. xiii–xlviii, 1–74; and Leonard J. Trinterud, ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York, 1971), pp. 3–16.
 - 3 Thomas Cartwright, *A Second Replie* (London, 1575), p. 38. Richard Hooker, in his episcopal manifesto against the Puritans, targeted Cartwright as his chief opponent. See Arthur Stephen McGrade, “Introduction,” in *Richard Hooker, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: A Critical Edition with Modern Spelling*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 2013), 1:xxv; Lee W. Gibbs, “Life of Hooker,” in *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, ed. Torrance Kirby (Leiden, 2008), pp. 13–4.
 - 4 Oliver Ormerod, “The Picture of a Puritane,” in *Images of English Puritanism: A Collection of Contemporary Sources, 1589–1646*, ed. Lawrence A. Sasek (Baton Rouge, 1989), pp. 238–54.
 - 5 Henry Parker, “A Discourse Concerning Puritans,” in *Images of English Puritanism*, pp. 164, 166–71. For deeper explorations into Parker, see Michael Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public’s “Privado”* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995); and Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 114–5. Parker’s *Discourse* is important because, as Catherine Gimelli Martin has observed, “Parker divided the movement into ecclesiastical Puritans . . . religious Puritans or dogmatic Calvinists; moral Puritans, or scrupulous precisians in conduct; and political Puritans.” Martin, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot, 2010), p. 61.
 - 6 David Scott Kastan, “Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama,” in *Reading, Society, and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), p. 168.
 - 7 Gisbertus Voetius, *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum. Pars Tertia* (Utrecht, 1659), p. 15. Voetius, echoing the concerns of the Puritan Reformation, opposed extravagant dress and long hair in men. Kaspar von Greyerz, *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1800* (New York, 2008), p. 82.

and “gloomy spirit.”⁸ Nineteenth-century Hawthornian biases so predominated Victorian studies that the classic caricature of the English Puritan throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was that of “a gaunt, lank-haired kill-joy, wearing a black steeple-hat, and compounding for sins he was inclined to by damning those to which he had no mind.”⁹ Even the great *nineteenth-century* English poet Matthew Arnold used “Puritan” as “a term of opprobrium and a powerful cultural weapon . . . [in a] campaign to replace Christianity with culture.”¹⁰ H. L. Mencken, a *twentieth-century* satirist, opined that Puritanism was “the haunting fear that someone, somewhere, may be happy.”¹¹ George Orwell reiterated these Victorian sentiments in his essay “The English People.”¹² These popular perceptions trace to early modern anti-Puritan biases in Restoration England.¹³ Consequently, Puritanism continues

8 David Hume, *The History of England*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh, 1754–61), 1:8, 81, 396. See also Milan Zafirovski, *The Destiny of Modern Societies: The Calvinist Predestination of a New Society* (Leiden, 2009), p. 425.

9 Leland S. Person, *The Cambridge Introduction to Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), pp. 16–9; Perry Miller and T. H. Johnson, eds., *The Puritans* (New York, 1938), p. 2. John Netland challenges this view of Victorian sentiment, in part, by stating that contrary to popular perception Victorian England made great strides in “rehabilitating” the Puritans by employing various aspects of their politics and romanticism to justify contemporary opinions. Netland concedes that as Puritanism “signified the accumulated moral capital of a newly valorized past, it also continued to bear social stigma.” Indeed, the typical Victorian mindset was that Puritans were incapable of joy of any kind, whether heavenly or worldly, and pretenses to the contrary were a *pia fraus*. Netland, “Of Philistines and Puritans: Matthew Arnold’s Construction of Puritanism,” in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Cranbury, 2003), pp. 68–9.

10 Laura Lunger Knoppers, “Introduction,” in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Newark, 2003), p. 14; Netland, “Of Philistines and Puritans,” pp. 67–84.

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

12 George Orwell, “The English People,” in *Orwell, As I Please, 1943–45: Essays, Journalism and Letters*, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (Boston, 2000), pp. 10–11.

13 Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640–61* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004), p. 217. For the rise of anti-Puritanism, see Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013), pp. 1–12, 28–59; Peter Lake, *The Anti-Christ’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002), pp. 521–78; Peter Lake, “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 80–97; William Holden, *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572–1642* (New Haven, 1954); and Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000), pp. 1–15, 45–73, 104–23. Poole shows how Puritans were portrayed satirically in

to mystify modern readers and remains a much-misunderstood aspect of British and American lineage.¹⁴

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

the period’s literature as “gluttonous, sexually promiscuous, monstrously procreating, and even as worshipping naked.” This last charge is no doubt a reference to Puritan insistence on the removal of idolatrous pictures, statues, and icons. Gerald R. Cragg, *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660–88* (Cambridge, Eng., 1957), p. 197.

14 Francis J. Bremer, *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York, 2009), p. 1.

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

16 Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (New Haven, 1975), p. 67. For a discussion of Puritans as “the hotter-sort of Protestants,” see Doreen Rosman, *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor England* (New York, 1996), pp. 60–7. Judith Maltby cautions against the Puritan’s monopoly of hot-tempered religion in Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000), pp. 9–10. For Puritan sensibility, see Bernard Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–60* (New York, 2012); Robert von Friedeburg, “Reformation of Manners and the Social Composition of Offenders in an East Anglican Cloth Village: Earls Colne, Essex, 1631–42,” *Journal of British Studies* 29 (1990), 347–85, there 352–6, 373–7; and Leland Ryken, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were* (Grand Rapids, 1990).

17 Patrick Collinson, “A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), 483–8, there 484, 488.

18 G. R. Elton, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), 2:165–6. For similar views, see William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York,

“Anglicanism” into question, citing the religious complexities of one of its chief intellectual architects, Lancelot Andrewes.¹⁹ The “Anglican versus Puritan” thesis, however, still permeates understanding of early modern English religious culture.²⁰ What has supplanted this older consensus is one of a rather robust, early modern “Calvinist consensus” that incorporates a broader spectrum of individuals and thought, including non-Anglicans, which has been aptly dubbed “experimental” Calvinism.²¹ David C. Steinmetz, however, has

1938); Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1958; repr., New York, 1997); and Charles W. A. Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603–25* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005), p. 7.

- 19 See Nicholas Tyacke, “Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (London, 2000), pp. 5–12, 32–3. Tyacke correctly notes that the term “Anglicanism” first appeared in nineteenth-century English print. For Andrewes’s place in English society and religion, see Thomas A. Mason, *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon, 1582–1663, Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England, and Archbishop of Canterbury* (Cranbury, 1985), p. 33; and Peter E. McCullough, ed., *Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Sermons and Lectures* (New York, 2005), pp. xi–lvii.
- 20 For examples, see: J. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan, the Basis of Their Opposition, 1558–1640* (Stanford, 1964); Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, 5 vols. (Princeton, 1961–1975); Greaves, *Society and Religion*; J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620–70* (New Haven, 1976); John Booty, “Anglicanism,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans Hillerbrand, 4 vols. (New York, 1996), 1:38–44. Booty’s article shows how Puritans can still be marginalized from the pre-Restoration Church of England. For a challenge to “Anglican versus Puritan,” see David Underdown, *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, 1992), p. 23. Underdown writes, “Puritans were people within the Church of England who wished to reform it further, not people criticizing the church from without. We can distinguish between Puritans and non-Puritans within the Anglican Church; but we cannot speak of Puritans and Anglicans, because the Puritans *were* Anglicans.” See also Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London, 1988); and Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590–1640* (Stanford, 2011), pp. 47–120.
- 21 Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion, 1558–1603* (New York, 1994), pp. 23–4, 26; Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter-Revolution,” in *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*, ed. Margo Todd (New York, 1995), pp. 53–70. The phrase “experimental Calvinists” seems to have originated with R. T. Kendall’s *Calvinism and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979). The use of “Calvinist” is not without dispute. While historians continue to employ the term, and equate “Puritan” with it, this use often misrepresents the complex relation between the Reformation and Post-Reformation, fails to account for the fact that most “Calvinists” despised its use, and suggests that Calvin was the fountainhead of the English Church.

cautioned against equating Puritanism with Calvinism since “Calvinism was a more pervasive religious and intellectual movement than Puritanism.”²² Whether all Puritans were Calvinists, however, has been contested by John Coffey, and others.²³ So while older models for understanding the Puritan crisis in the Elizabethan church have moved toward more diverse understandings of these Reformed Protestants, questions still linger as to their precise religious identity or for a more reliable taxonomy that incorporates these

22 David C. Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2010), p. 4. Steinmetz allows for Puritanism as a special type of Calvinism but sees Calvinism as much broader and more encompassing than Puritanism, touching anti-Puritans and Puritans, Anglicans and Dissenters, High Churchmen and Low. Depending on one’s definition of Puritanism, however, one may see strong (if not equal) tendencies toward pervasiveness within Puritanism itself. Geoffrey Nuttall, *The Puritan Spirit: Essays and Addresses* (London, 1967), pp. 11–21. I agree with Muller that given diversity within Reformed theology and development, it is more accurate to speak of the “Reformed tradition” than of “Calvinism,” though because of the pervasive use of “Calvinism” in literature, I have, at times, retained its use. Further, use of the “Reformed tradition” is not without its problems and less clearly expresses predestinarian motifs. See Richard A. Muller, “John Calvin and Later Calvinism: The Identity of the Reformed Tradition,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 130–49.

23 While Coffey acknowledges a strong Calvinistic presence among the Puritans, he argues that John Goodwin, a convert to Arminianism, was as firmly within the Puritan tradition as the high Calvinist Samuel Rutherford, with both persons reflecting certain polarities within Puritanism. Perhaps a better taxonomy would be “Reformed,” though it is questionable whether Goodwin was “Reformed orthodox.” William den Boer contends that Arminius’s theology “remain[s] well within the scope of Reformed theology.” This assertion has not gone without challenge, however, and it remains to be seen how Arminianism will eventually be classified. See Den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius, 1559–1609* (Göttingen, 2010), p. 326; Peter Rouwendal, “The Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), p. 568.

Carl R. Trueman has questioned the usefulness of “Puritanism” because of its apparent minimalist criteria (e.g. the “quasi-Arian” John Milton is reputed to be a Puritan). See Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 5. Trueman prefers “Reformed orthodox” to “Puritan” to classify Owen for its more definitive characteristics. I am not opposed to this classification but find it incomplete since it does not adequately describe Owen’s distinctive pietism, which historically has been classified as “Puritan.” Mark Jones also questions the use of “Puritan” in his seminal work on Thomas Goodwin. See John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 1–12; Mark Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of the Puritan Reformed Orthodox Theologian, Thomas Goodwin, 1600–80* (Göttingen, 2010), pp. 52–5.

diversities. Reflecting on the problem of pluralities in early modern religion, Tracy Fessenden, Nicholas F. Radel, and Magdalena J. Zaborowska made the deconstructionist statement that “there are only Puritans, Puritanisms, and Protestantisms.”²⁴ Though this observation accurately identifies diverse systems of thought and practice in the early modern period, it does not assess whether there was a *unitas in diversitate* within Puritanism, nor adequately address confessionality among Puritans.²⁵

Since the rise of English Puritan studies in the mid-twentieth century, nearly every facet of Puritanism has been explored, shedding light on numerous problems associated with its religious culture.²⁶ The most conspicuous result is that we have become more aware of the enormous difficulty and complexity

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

25 Even the most radical and heterodox of writers, such as John Eaton, had a strong *sensus unitatis* with the earlier patristic and Reformation periods as seen in his “Honeycombe” on justification. Reminiscent of medieval florilegia, its margins cite Augustine, Chrysostom, Jerome, Luther, Calvin, Beza, John Foxe, Jerome Zanchi, William Perkins, and William Sclater, all authorities of the “mainstream.”

26 For a critical examination of recent trends in Puritan studies, see Richard L. Greaves, “The Puritan-Nonconformist Tradition in England, 1560–1700: Historiographical Reflections,” *Albion* 17 (1987), 449–86; Michael McGiffert, “American Puritan Studies in the 1960s,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser. 27 (1970), 36–67; and Michael S. Montgomery, *American Puritan Studies: An Annotated Bibliography of Dissertations, 1882–1981* (Westport, 1984). One of the major areas of advance is the impact of English Puritan literature on other societies. See Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London, 2006); Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600–40* (Leiden, 1994); and Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Providence Island, 1630–41: The Other Puritan Colony* (Cambridge, Eng., 1993).

An area of contentious debate within the literature is the rise of Puritanism and its impact on science and capitalism. The “Merton thesis” suggests that aesthetic Protestants were disproportionately represented among a burgeoning seventeenth-century scientific community; the “Weber thesis” argues that the “Protestant ethic” was the foundation of modern capitalist thought. See I. Bernard Cohen, ed., *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis* (New Brunswick, 1990); Robert W. Green, ed., *Protestantism, Capitalism, and Social Science: The Weber Thesis Controversy*, 2nd ed. (Lexington, 1973); Richard L. Greaves, “Puritanism and Science: The Anatomy of a Controversy,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30 (1969), 345–68; John Morgan, “The Puritan Thesis Revisited,” in *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, ed. David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll (New York, 1999), pp. 43–74.

of “Puritanism.”²⁷ This complexity is expressed not only in its broad, trans-Atlantic, and trans-insular identities,²⁸ but also in its theological and ideological kinship, one that dates back through early Reformed Protestantism, through medieval, and even to early Christian times.²⁹ Yet, even with the mass of literature now extant on Puritanism, several core questions continue to mystify researchers: precisely how should “Puritan” and “Puritanism” be defined? What are its chief cultural, historical, political, social, literary, and intellectual characteristics? What do toleration and religious dissent inform us about Puritanism’s diversities? To what degree did Puritanism borrow or

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

28 S. Scott Rohrer wrote, “The Puritans represent the mother lode of American Protestantism: no other early American group has received as much attention from historians.” *Wandering Souls: Protestant Migrations in America, 1630–1865* (Chapel Hill, 2010), p. 299.

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

For the British contexts of Puritan New England, see Joseph A. Conforti, *Saints and Strangers: New England in British North America* (Baltimore, 2006); Walter A. Woodward, *Prospero’s America: John Winthrop, Jr., Alchemy, and the Creation of New England Culture, 1606–76* (Chapel Hill, 2010), pp. 1–13; Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610–92* (Lebanon, 1994), pp. 17–40. Puritanism’s relation to earlier Reformed Protestantism is seen in its affinity to scholasticism. See Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2003), pp. 3–21. For study of the relation between humanism and scholasticism in the Puritan tradition, see Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), pp. 53–95. While some historians have depicted Protestant scholasticism as antithetical to piety, and generally embracing more rationalist strains, this is an improper caricature since Protestant scholastic theologians used reason in order to defend and understand divine revelation and so advance piety. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, “Introduction,” in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle, 1998), pp. xi–ixx; Willem van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603–69* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 94–105; Adriaan C. Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht, 1630–1706: Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety* (Leiden, 2009), pp. 189–202.

exploit Catholic and Lutheran religious expressions?³⁰ How does “Puritan” heresiography inform our understanding of “mainstream” Puritanism?³¹ What about the diverseness of Puritan religion during the English Revolution and its impact on early modern families?³² What about Puritanism’s origins?³³ What about Puritanism’s impact on other societies?³⁴ What impact did fringe beliefs have on the Reformed consensus?³⁵ Who are “Puritans,” and who are

-
- 30 See Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto, 2009), pp. 61–92; and John Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 174–85.
- 31 While heresiographies served to foster a general *sensus unitatis* among mainline Puritans, critics saw them as overblown or Presbyterian propaganda; however, they do attest to the contested borders of orthodoxy. See Nigel Smith, “Non-Conformist Voices and Books,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, ed. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, 6 vols. (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), 4:416; Ann Hughes, *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (New York, 2004).
- 32 Several modern studies probe the “orthodoxies” of religion during the English Revolution: David Little, *Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England* (Chicago, 1969); Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (New York, 1973); Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (New York, 1993); Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2007); Nicholas Tyacke, ed., *The English Revolution, c.1590–1720: Politics, Religion, and Communities* (Manchester, 2008). For the impact of the English Revolution on families, see Christopher Durston, *The Family in the English Revolution* (Oxford and New York, 1989), pp. 160–74.
- 33 As historians continue to refine definitions of Puritanism, its origins will likewise need to be revisited. See Karl Gunther, “The Intellectual Origins of English Puritanism, ca. 1525–72” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2007), pp. 9–30; Gunther, “The Origins of English Puritanism,” *History Compass* 4/2 (2006), 235–40; and Dan G. Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1555–60* (New York, 1999), pp. 1–14.
- 34 Lewis Bayly’s *The Practice of Pietie* (1611) was one of the first English publications to impact German pietism, and had equal popularity in the Netherlands from 1620. See Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany*, pp. 59–70; Jan van de Kamp, “Die Einführung der christlichen Disziplinierung des Alltags in die deutsche evangelische Erbauungsliteratur durch Lewis Baylys *Praxis Pietatis* (1628),” in *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 37, ed. Udo Sträter (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 11–19; Cornelius W. Schoneveld, *Intertraffic of the Mind: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Anglo-Dutch Translation, with a Checklist of Books Translated from English into Dutch, 1600–1700* (Leiden, 1983); Op’t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands*, pp. 169–78.
- 35 Studies of John Preston, John Howe, and John Goodwin have all attested to plasticity within Reformed orthodoxy. See Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2007), pp. 217–29; David P. Field, *Rigide Calvinisme in a Softer Dresse: The Moderate Presbyterianism of*

not?³⁶ Can Puritanism *even* be defined?³⁷ Or is it, as Michael P. Winship has suggested, “unavoidably a contextual, imprecise term, not an objective one, a term to use carefully but not to take too seriously in itself,” that happens to be “an extremely convenient shorthand term”?³⁸

Christopher Hill opined that the term and its cognates are “an admirable refuge from clarity of thought.”³⁹ Leonard J. Trinterud observed that “there was something odd about the English Puritans,” but that “there has not been any agreement about who were Puritans or what was Puritanism.”⁴⁰ In other words, have “Puritan” and “Puritanism” shared the same fate as “evangelical” and “evangelicalism”?⁴¹ J. C. Davis, Basil Hall, C. H. George, Paul Christianson, Michael Finlayson, Conrad Russell, and, at times, Patrick Collinson have rejected it (thus, reiterating Thomas Fuller’s 1655 wish to banish “Puritan” from the historical record),⁴² while John Coffey, Susan Doran, Christopher Durston,

John Howe, 1630–1705 (Edinburgh, 2004), pp. 18–29; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, pp. 291–7.

- 36 Historians continue to question whether Thomas Adams, James Ussher, John Goodwin, Joseph Hall, and others were “Puritans.” Adams, Ussher, and Hall had definite Puritan leanings. Goodwin is an interesting test case in that despite his Arminian leanings he was appointed vicar to a prominent Puritan parish, though soon after became embroiled in controversy and alienated from the “mainstream.” David Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York, 2013), pp. 238–44; Tai Liu, “Goodwin, John,” *ODNB*.
- 37 In *Fire from Heaven*, David Underdown challenges readers who question the historical validity of “Puritan” to read his book and reconsider their opinion. Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, p. 21.
- 38 Michael Winship, “Were there any Puritans in New England?,” *New England Quarterly* 74 (2001), 118–38, there 137–8. Giles Widdowes reflected this same attitude in his 1631 treatise, *The Schysmatical Puritan* (London, 1631), sig. A4r. Five years earlier, John Yates found the term “offensive” in his *Ibis ad Caesarem* (London, 1626), sig. Eeee4v.
- 39 Hill, *Society and Puritanism*, p. 1.
- 40 Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, p. 3.
- 41 For a discussion of the problems related to defining “evangelical” and “evangelicalism,” see Mark A. Noll, “Science, Theology, and Society: From Cotton Mather to William Jennings Bryan,” in *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, ed. David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll (New York, 1999), pp. 120–41; John R. Stone, *On the Boundaries of American Evangelicalism: The Postwar Evangelical Coalition* (New York, 1997), pp. 1–21; and George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, 1991), pp. 1–8. More general questions arise as to how terms are used and how such use affects the reader’s understanding. See Tim Thornton, *Wittgenstein on Language and Thought: The Philosophy of Content* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp. 30–68.
- 42 Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, ed. J. S. Brewer (Oxford, 1845), 6:86–7; J. C. Davis, “Puritanism and Revolution: Themes, Categories, Methods, and Conclusions,”

Jacqueline Eales, Kenneth Fincham, Crawford Gribben, Ann Hughes, Jeffrey K. Jue, Neil Keeble, Mark Kishlansky, Peter Lake, William Lamont, Paul C. H. Lim, Anthony Milton, John Morrill, John Spurr, David C. Steinmetz, Margo Todd, Nicholas Tyacke, David Underdown, Tom Webster, Blair Worden, and Keith Wrightson continue to employ its use.⁴³ “Puritan” and “Puritanism” may be

Historical Journal 33 (1990), 693–704, there 704; Basil Hill, “Puritanism: The Problem of Definition,” in *Studies in Church History*, vol. 2, ed. G. J. Cuming (London, 1965), pp. 283–96; C. H. George, “Puritanism as History and Historiography,” *Past & Present* 41 (1968), 77–104; Paul Christianson, “Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1970), 463–84; Michael Finlayson, “Puritanism and Puritans: Labels or Libels?,” *Canadian Journal of History* 8 (1973), 201–33; Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–29* (New York, 1979), pp. 26–8. Both Hall and Christianson defined their terms so narrowly as to exclude separatists and Baptists from classifications of “Puritanism.” Russell states that “Puritan” connoted “opposition” and “disloyalty,” and embodied a contestation over the claim to orthodoxy; further, since the term came to be applied polemically, and, at times, without merit, it has questionable historical value. Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–42* (New York, 1990), p. xxiv; Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990), p. 84; Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, p. 7. For a critique of George, see Ian Breward, “The Abolition of Puritanism,” *The Journal of Religious History* 7 (1974), 20–34.

- 43 John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997); Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York, 1996), pp. 1–31; Jacqueline Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads*; Eales, *Community and Disunity: Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640–49* (Faversham, 2001); Kenneth Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (London, 1998); Crawford Gribben, *God’s Irishman: Theological Debates in Cromwellian Ireland* (New York, 2007); Ann Hughes, “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), 1–7; Jeffrey K. Jue, *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (New York, 2006); N. H. Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Malden, 2001), ch. 8; Mark A. Kishlansky, *A Monarch Transformed: Britain, 1603–1714* (New York, 1997); William M. Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (Montreal, 1996); Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Puritan Thought, 1600–40* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995); John S. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London, 1994); John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–89* (New York, 1998); David C. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayersberg to Theodore Beza*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2001), pp. 100–5, 168; Margo Todd, *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England* (New York, 1995); Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530–1700* (Manchester, 2001); Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*; Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620–43* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997); Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and*

slippery terms but they are indispensable in historical conversations.⁴⁴ Few historians have produced as promising studies on Puritanism as Peter Lake, who has broadened our understanding of Puritanism's complex identities and social contexts,⁴⁵ yet, even in Lake's work, a sense of pessimism shrouds his conclusions.⁴⁶

Can this discipline be moved forward, at least to the extent that historians can employ the use of "Puritan" and "Puritanism" more confidently and unequivocally? Can historians make sense of this complex, varied intellectual culture and retain their use in writing history? Can one successfully trace Puritan "identities" and bloodlines across its several strains and arrive at a core distinctive?⁴⁷ Or, more likely, can one discern a set or cluster of ideas, attitudes, and expressions that, when woven and fashioned within a particular

the Passions of Posterity (New York, 2002); Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525–1700* (New York, 1995).

- 44 For representative positions, see Basil Hill, "Puritanism: The Problem of Definitions," *Studies in Church History* 2 (1965), 283–96; Peter Lake, "Puritan identities," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1984), 112–23; Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*, pp. 1–14; and Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Palo Alto, 2001), pp. 11–16; Saseck, *Images of English Puritanism*, pp. 1–27. Alan Ford and Crawford Gribben have assessed this issue in an Irish context: Alan Ford, "Church of Ireland, 1558–1641: A Puritan Church?," in *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*, ed. Alan Ford, J. I. McGuire, and Kenneth Milne (Dublin, 1995), ch. 4; and Crawford Gribben, "Puritanism in Ireland and Wales."
- 45 Lake's voluminous writings include *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, Eng., 1988); *Anglicans and Puritans?; The Boxmaker's Revenge; The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat*; and "Defining Puritanism—Again?," in *Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston, 1993), pp. 3–29.
- 46 Lake writes, "The difficulties involved in defining 'puritanism' are easier to identify than solve and I really have nothing original to say on that subject." Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, pp. 10–11. Elsewhere, Lake offers his own definition as "a set of positions on [the English religious] spectrum." Lake's "Introduction" to Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, 2nd ed. (1947; repr., Chicago, 1992), p. xx.
- 47 The issue of "Protestant identities" has been the subject of several recent studies. Peter Lake has analyzed early modern "Puritan" identities in "Reading Clarke's *Lives* in Political and Polemical Context," in *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity, and Representation in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (New York, 2008), pp. 293–318. See also Andrew Cambers, "Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, c.1580–1720," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 796–825; Christopher Haigh, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570–1640* (New York, 2007); Ethan H. Shagan, *Catholics and the "Protestant Nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2005); and Muriel C.

sixteenth- and seventeenth-century context, form something that we can identify as “Puritan,” and “Puritanism”? If so, what are its contents, and what makes it *distinctively* Puritan?⁴⁸ Can historians simply refer to Puritans as “the hotter sort of Protestants,” as Percival Wilburn did, or is this an insufficient rendering of English memory?⁴⁹ Further, as more historians begin to refer to *Puritanisms*, and offer competing definitions focused on single doctrines or practices, is something lost? As the wind continues to blow toward multiple religious identities and pluralisms, which existed at any one time, and across time, how long can one maintain Puritanism’s collective identity?⁵⁰ Winship pointed this out when he said, “It has recently been suggested, somewhat hyperbolically, that it is more useful to talk of ‘puritanisms’ rather than ‘puritanism,’ for there were almost as many puritanisms as there were puritans.”⁵¹ Admittedly, this is an overstatement, but historian Ann Hughes has popularized its reference within the literature, and though “Puritanisms” has more often been associated with studies of American Puritanism, it has broad implications for Puritanism more generally, if for no other reason than that Puritans in the seventeenth century saw themselves as reforming Protestants, “the godly,” a collective of ministers and laypeople that were united in how they lived and expressed their ideas in social communion, and had equal, though sometimes competing visions for a Puritan Reformation, whether to build a “city on a hill” or a “Puritan Commonwealth.”⁵² The idea of *Puritanisms* has been proposed as a possible solution to the definitions problem, in that it attempts to account for the

McClendon, Joseph Ward, and Michael MacDonald, eds., *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England* (Palo Alto, 1999).

48 Scholars have attempted to find the one “defining” feature of Puritanism. However, this practice is misguided because it seeks to find a definitive doctrine or experience where there is none. Rather than see one prominent feature above or to the exclusion of all, scholars should see Puritanism as a cluster of ideas that constitute “Puritan” and “Puritanism.” This is similar to Wittgenstein’s theory of *Familienähnlichkeit*, in which concepts are like members of a family that share physical and character traits without exact replication.

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

50 Ronald Wells, *History and the Christian Historian* (Grand Rapids, 1998), p. 143.

51 Michael Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636–41* (Princeton, 2002), p. 3.

52 See Hughes, “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” pp. 1–7. On congregational communion across the Atlantic, see Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, pp. 17–40, where Bremer discusses the “Cambridge connection,” a hotbed for Puritanism.

fragmenting caused by vying ways of defining Puritanism, but it inadvertently suggests that Puritans were not gathered around a common thread of doctrine and practice.

Historians Theodore D. Bozeman, Janice Knight, and Stephen Foster have all written about early modern “Puritanisms” and “orthodoxies.”⁵³ Some historians have traced this tendency to anti-Perry Miller tendencies in the 1960s. In their attempt to revise Miller’s monolithic “New England mind,” which saw a dominant “mainstream” Puritanism centered around notions of the covenant, revisionists have pointed out, at times convincingly, that Puritanism was much more diverse than what Miller had envisioned.⁵⁴ Thus, more recent studies of American Puritanism now focus on its diversity, and contrast its similarities and differences between the “puritanisms” of old and New England.⁵⁵ Moreover, it

-
- 53 Richard Pointer notes that Foster “is the least inclined towards this tendency but even his final chapter offers some hints.” Pointer, “Selves and Others in Early New England: Refashioning American Puritan Studies,” in *History and the Christian Historian*, ed. Ronald Wells (Grand Rapids, 1998), p. 144, n. 16; Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570–1700* (Chapel Hill, 1991), pp. 286–314; Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, pp. 344–55; Knight *Orthodoxies*, pp. 198–213; and Andrew Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), pp. 224–43.
- 54 Winship, *Making Heretics*, p. 248, n. 13; Pointer, “Selves and Others in Early New England,” p. 143. Cp. Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, Mass., 1956), pp. 48–98, with Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*, pp. 1–12. Perry Miller is known as “the father of American Puritan studies,” and was responsible for revitalizing the academic study of Puritanism in the early-mid twentieth century. Miller’s thesis was that of a unified Puritan theology and “mainstream” orthodoxy embodied by Thomas Hooker, Thomas Shepard, Peter Bulkeley, John Winthrop, William Perkins, and William Ames. Revisionists have challenged Miller’s monolithicism by proposing multiple orthodoxies competing within Puritanism. See David D. Hall, “Narrating Puritanism,” in *New Directions in American Religious History*, ed. Harry S. Stout and D. G. Hart (New York, 1997), pp. 51–83; Stephen Foster, “New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630–60: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 38 (1981), 624–60; and Foster, *Long Argument*, for the argument that Puritan orthodoxy fostered by absorbing its critics. Louise A. Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630–92* (New York, 2001), p. 225, n. 22.
- 55 Philip E. Gura, *A Glimpse of Zion’s Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620–60* (Middletown, 1984), pp. 136–43, 222–4; David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), pp. 191–205; Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, pp. 120–1, 145–6, 150–1, 179–80; Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal*, pp. 184–214; Stephen Fender, *Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), pp. 141–7; Susan Hardman Moore, *New World Settlers: Pilgrims and the Call Home* (New Haven, 2008), pp. 16–35, 123–271; and David D. Hall, *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in*

is possible, even probable, that this deconstruction owes its origins not only to revisionist tendencies, but also to recent interest in the fractured “radical” sects of the English Revolution. But this raises an important historical question: Did these religious radicals emerge *de novo*, without standing in relation to an earlier tradition or contemporary consensus; or, as the evidence suggests, were they reacting to perceived abuses and insufficiencies within the “mainstream,” especially in the way of obtaining assurance of faith? Reflecting on this phenomena, Glenn Burgess observed that historians are far more apt to get caught up with “origins” and “causes,” than with “consequences,” “effects,” and “aftermath.”⁵⁶

These questions illustrate the difficulty involved in this task. That historians continue to debate the precise meaning of these terms shows how important this discussion is. The plethora of unqualified and non-nuanced usage within the literature contributes to this quagmire. The numerous definitions circulating the literature naturally tend toward deconstruction because they give the impression that “distinguishing” characteristics are somehow unique and independent from a greater consensus and narrative. As David R. Como remarked, “Through the centuries, puritans have been made to wear many historical masks.”⁵⁷ For instance, Michael Walzer emphasized the revolutionary spirit of the English Puritans and suggested that radicalism was a core feature

the Seventeenth Century (Chapel Hill, 1972), pp. 21–47. For cross-fertilization within early modern English culture, see Francis J. Bremer and Lynn A. Botelho, eds., *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England, 1588–1649* (Boston, 2005).

56 Glenn Burgess, “Radicalism and the English Revolution,” in *English Radicalism, 1550–1850*, ed. Glenn Burgess and Matthew Festenstein (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), p. 62. Loewenstein distinguishes between “orthodox” and “radical” Puritan clergy. David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 3, 14, 94, 175, 186, 323. Como differentiates between “mainstream” and “antinomian” Puritanism, but states that Nuttall was correct in seeing continuities in style that bridged the radicals and their mainstream counterparts. Como further sees “radical” Puritanism as a natural evolution of inherent tendencies within “the godly.” David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergency of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Palo Alto, 2004), pp. 13–24. Apetrei concurs that, “Both antinomian and Behemist currents represent a ‘spiritist,’ or spiritualizing, tendency in English puritanism towards transcending structures in religion.” Sarah Apetrei, *Women, Feminism, and Religion in Early Enlightenment England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), p. 190. Radical Puritanism emerged from the shadows of “mainstream” or “orthodox” Puritanism, and generally came to its own identity, but nonetheless fostered through shared social networks and visions for a Puritan Reformation. Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, pp. 63–81.

57 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 10.

of the movement, and thus Puritans were political revolutionaries wishing to overthrow the state; William Lamont saw similarities in the “godly rule” of the Puritans; Geoffrey F. Nuttall mused upon the experience of the Holy Spirit as the most vital element within Puritan experience; J. Sears McGee distinguished Puritans by their emphasis on first table duties toward God, “such as avoiding idolatry and the profanation of the Sabbath, more than on second table duties, such as charity”;⁵⁸ Bernard Bailyn referred broadly to the “spirit of Puritanism”; Lake has defined Puritanism as “a set of priorities centered on religious experience,” creating something of a “puritan style”; Peter Iver Kaufman sees Puritanism chiefly within the rubric of self-despair; Patrick Collinson, the patriarch of Puritan studies, portrayed Puritans as “over-enthusiastic evangelical protestants” who reacted to the profane society which surrounded them, and as part of a greater network to reform their church and state; Austin Woolrych defined Puritanism as broadly as possible, as “a strain of piety within the established church”; and Bernard Capp sees Puritanism as a culture war in the reform of “morals and manners,” which focused on swearing, Sabbath observance, parish life, sex, alcohol, dress, music, dancing, art, plays, and sports.⁵⁹

Another popular method has been the attempt to define Puritanism by discussing particular Puritans, such as Richard Baxter, Thomas Shepard, William Prynne, Nehemiah Wallington, TheaurauJohn Tany, Lodowick Muggleton,

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

59 See Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982); William Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60* (New York, 1969); Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*; McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England*, pp. 93–94; Bernard Bailyn, *New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979); Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” pp. 3–29; Peter Iver Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama* (Urbana, 1996), pp. 5–7; Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of the Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (New York, 1982); Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley, 1967); Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625–60* (New York, 2004), p. 76; and Capp, *England’s Culture Wars*.

doomsday poet Michael Wigglesworth, the Harleys, and the Mathers.⁶⁰ Still others have focused chiefly on piety in their approach to Puritanism.⁶¹

As one can see, several abstract concepts have been proposed as a rationale for understanding Puritanism. Yet, as critics of the terms point out, such concepts can equally be applied to other religious groups, and are often too narrow and exclude such “Puritans” as John Bunyan and Henry Ainsworth;⁶² how then can one apply them to Puritanism as defining characteristics? And if one loses the terms altogether, as some historians would wish, would not a complex, vibrant religious culture be abandoned with them? Others argue that

-
- 60 Spurr, *English Puritanism*, p. 3. See Paul C. H. Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden, 2004); Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge*, rev. and exp. (Amherst, 1994); Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60* (New York, 1969); Paul S. Seaver, *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (Palo Alto, 1988); Ariel Hessayon, “Gold Tried in the Fire.” *The Prophet Theaurau John Tary and the English Revolution* (Aldershot, 2007); T. L. Underwood, ed., *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings* (New York, 1999); Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653–57: The Conscience of a Puritan* (Gloucester, 1970); Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads*; Robert Middlekauf, *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596–1728* (Berkeley, 1999).
- 61 See Pieter de Vries, “Die Mij Heft Liefgehad.” *De Betekenis van de Gemeenschap Met Christus in de Theologie van John Owen, 1616–83* (Heerenveen, 1999), p. 63. Trueman questions this last approach in *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 5. While Puritans preached experiential theology and church life, so too did other English Protestants. Limiting Puritanism to expressions of piety does not adequately account for its confessional *sensus unitatis*.
- 62 Within the literature, John Bunyan is unequivocally identified as a “Puritan.” However, those who opt for more narrow definitions, such as Paul Christianson, would exclude the “tinker of Bedford” from the Valhalla. Timothy George suggests, alongside Collinson, that Separatists “advocated a totally alien, select Christian society.” George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition* (Macon, 2005), p. 242, n. 7; and Paul Christianson, “Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1970), 463–84. Christianson attempts to solve the problem of definitions by confining “Puritans” to nonconforming Presbyterians who chose not to obey the bishops but who refused to separate from the English Church. This narrow definition does not account for John Bunyan, William Ames, and Henry Ainsworth. See Christopher Hill, “Bunyan's Contemporary Reputation,” in *John Bunyan and His England, 1628–88*, ed. Anne Laurence, W. R. Owens, and Stuart Sim (London, 2003), pp. 3–16; Hugh Dunthome, *Britain and the Dutch Revolt, 1560–1700* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013), pp. 162–3; cf. Elliot Rose, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans Under Elizabeth I and James I* (Cambridge, Eng., 1975), p. 210.

the terms cannot be defined, and any attempt to do so would prove unfruitful. Hughes opined, “We have learnt from Collinson, Lake, and Tyacke that Puritans cannot be neatly separated from the mass of English Protestants and counted,” and questions any method that would define Puritans “by a number of simple, formal tests,” since the historical facts are too complicated for that.⁶³ Still, such attempts have been made and are so numerous that Primus has suggested, “Some day, no doubt, an entire dissertation will be devoted to the history of the efforts to define Puritanism.”⁶⁴ Indeed, Collinson commented that a “secondary academic industry has arisen, devoted to the search for an acceptable definition.”⁶⁵ Michael Finlayson observed that while many opinions have been proposed, there is still no consensus.⁶⁶ Sasek wrote, “Nearly everyone agrees that there were puritans and that there was a puritan movement in England between 1560 and at least 1640, but just who were puritans and who were not, or what tenets or practices were central to the movement, seems impossible to determine with any precision”;⁶⁷ and, finally, Campbell astutely points out that understanding Puritanism “brings us right back to the thorny problem of religious identity.”⁶⁸ In other words, what *distinguishes* the “Puritan” from the rest of the Post-Reformation world?

This industry of defining Puritans will continue to produce mixed results as long as it focuses on one element as preeminent and superior to another. What is needed is a holistic, and not an atomistic, approach that incorporates insights from multiple fields and arrives at core values and expressions, or clusters of concepts, that, when woven together within an English Reformed context, form what we call “Puritanism”; in other words, one needs to consider the whole *in relation to* its parts. This proposal is similar to Wittgenstein’s theory of *Familienähnlichkeit*, and Norbert Elias’s concept of “configuration.” For Wittgenstein, there was synchronic “family resemblance” in similar and overlapping concepts, but not one defining feature; as members of a particular family share resemblance to one another, and have common features identical to them all (*unitas*), they are nonetheless distinct persons (*diversitas*). For Elias, “configuration” emphasizes that individuals must not be seen in isolation

63 Ann Hughes, *Politics, Society, and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620–60* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), pp. 65–6.

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

65 Patrick Collinson, *English Puritanism*, rev. ed. (London, 1987), p. 6.

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

67 Sasek, *Images of Puritanism*, p. 1.

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

from the society to which they belong, nor as a society in which there is no individuality, but as individuals within a society (*unitas in diversitate*).⁶⁹

Further, one must consider the changing nature of English Puritanism, that is, that the Puritanism of the 1560s was not exactly that of the 1640s, since Puritanism was a protean and evolving movement that adapted to the times in which it flourished. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests a normative tradition that can be traced to the mid-sixteenth century, if not earlier, and which came to maturation in the middle of the seventeenth. Moreover, due consideration has to be given to the fact that “Puritan” and “Puritanism” changed over its long history; so, while “Puritan” initially arose within an Anglican context by the time of the English Revolution, “Puritan” had a much more eclectic meaning and was broadened to incorporate many of the more radical sects of the period, such as the Muggletonians, whose architect had strong ties to mainstream Puritanism, but nonetheless moved beyond it.⁷⁰ Yet, even within this increasing *diversitas*, arguably there was a main line, or “mainstream,” Puritanism, as expressed in the meetings of “the godly” who sat at Westminster Abbey from 1643–52, and which was preached and published since its earliest days.⁷¹ While Parliament admonished the assembly to consider theology as

69 See Michael Forster, “Wittgenstein on Family Resemblance Concepts,” in *Wittgenstein’s Philosophical Investigations: A Critical Guide*, ed. Arif Ahmed (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 66–87. For Elias’s concept of “configuration,” see Elias, *The Society of Individuals* (New York, 1991).

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

71 The “Westminster Assembly,” which derives its name from the historic church where the meetings were held, consisted of 121 Puritan divines, lay assessors, and Scottish delegates, was charged by the Long Parliament, who was then in open conflict with Charles I, to come up with proposals for reform of the English Church. The divines at Westminster sought to codify what was seen as the “mainline” tradition within Puritanism, but also allowed for variance on matters of church order and polity. The theological harmony among its members, between Presbyterians and Independents, and those dissenting Baptists within London is attested to by Laurence Clarkson, founder of the Ranters, who, in his own religious journey, went from the zealous Presbyterians, being “tormented [in] soul, [by reading a book by Thomas Hooker] that I thought it impossible to be saved,” to the Independents, whose, “greatest difference betwixt them, was about baptizing of infants,” to the doctrine of “one Doctor *Crisp* . . . [who] held forth against all the aforesaid Churches, That let his people be in society or no, though walked all alone, yet if he believed that Christ Jesus died for him, God beheld no iniquity in him.” From here he moved onto the more radical “higher and clearer” teachings of Giles Randall and John Simpson, “which was then called *Antinomians*,” and onward from there. Clarkson, *The Lost Sheep Found; Or, The Prodigal Returned to His Fathers House, after Many a Sad and*

a tertiary consideration, their chief concern being ecclesiastical government, it is telling that the majority of their time was caught up with producing a doctrinal consensus, thus confirming the urgency of establishing and codifying a theological identity within Puritanism.⁷² These meetings at Westminster produced several confessional documents and catechisms, which set forth a highly unified system of theoretical and practical divinity, and which became the basis for assessing the bounds of English-Puritan Reformed orthodoxy.⁷³ Sydney E. Ahlstrom observed this point when he said,

Though looking back with thanksgiving to the great confessions of the Reformation era, the Puritans also entered into the making of new confessions with thoroughness and vigor. In Britain, as it happened, their thinking seemed to lead almost inexorably to the doctrinal views so carefully articulated in the Westminster standards and their derivative symbols . . . Puritanism, in short, is generally marked by careful thought; it is an intellectual tradition of great profundity.⁷⁴

Seeing Puritans as generally “Reformed” is not new; A. G. Dickens posited the idea in *The English Reformation*.⁷⁵ Confusion has arisen, in part, because English sectaries were often accustomed to use “Puritan” to describe themselves, even though they had self-consciously departed from its orthodox consensus.⁷⁶

Weary Journey Through Many Religious Countreys (London, 1660), pp. 8–10. In his *Radical Religion in Cromwell's England*, Andrew Bradstock remarks on the fluidity of the radical sects of the English Revolution, which is seen in “the ease with which people moved from one to another.” This itself suggests some degree of *unitas* with the normative tradition, as, presumably, radical departures or conversions would be less fluid. Bradstock, *Radical Religion in Cromwell's England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth* (London, 2011), p. xix.

- 72 John Coffey, “A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution,” in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 114.
- 73 Indeed, Chad van Dixhoorn stated of the divines at Westminster: “It was an hour of glory for the puritan experiment.” Van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–52*, 5 vols. (New York, 2012), 1:81.
- 74 Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, 2004), p. 130.
- 75 A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (University Park, 1989), pp. 367–77.
- 76 This self-conscious moving away from orthodox Puritanism is seen throughout Lodowick Muggleton's posthumous autobiography, *The Acts of the Witnesses* (1699). Muggleton recounts his youthful embrace of the zealous “Puritan religion and practice,” which had such a great impression on him that he chose only to hear the preaching of the “*Puritan*

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

Jacqueline Eales states that part of the difficulty in defining “Puritan” stems from the fact that when contemporaries used the term they did not always agree on what they meant by it, which is further complicated in that as often as the term had any static presence, it soon evolved with new meaning and nuance.⁷⁷ Nonetheless, historians have found artful, if not brilliant, ways to qualify its use or suggest alternatives. Margo Todd, for instance, opines, “The historian who talks about the likes of Laurence Humphrey and John Rainolds as ‘advanced protestants’ need not disturb us. We know what he means by the term because we know of whom he speaks: a puritan by any other name is still a puritan.” Todd makes this observation because, when assessing the beginnings of the terms of abuse, “The people who called themselves ‘the godly,’ ‘professors,’ and even ‘saints’ and were called ‘puritans’ by their foes, were a sufficiently self-conscious and popularly identifiable group in their own day to deserve a name, and the traditional ‘puritan’ seems as good as any.”⁷⁸ Before Todd, Leonard J. Trinterud made this astute observation: “There was something odd about the Puritans. On that, everyone seems to have been in agreement for the last four hundred years.”⁷⁹ Trinterud’s point is that the Puritans comprised

ministers.” However, over time, many of his Puritan acquaintances, having “no Comfort nor Peace of Mind, as to a Life to Come,” became disenfranchised with the Puritan way, and “left that Zeal, and turned Ranters” (a possible reference to his cousin John Reeve, who began as a Puritan but later became a Ranter). Sometime later, after becoming dissatisfied with Puritanism, Muggleton moved beyond its confessional mores and chose “not to mind any Religion more . . . and if there were anything, either of Happiness or Misery after Death, I left it to God, which I knew not, to do what he would with me.” At times, however, fears of hell and damnation would resurface, “as it did formerly, when [I was] a *Puritan*.” T. L. Underwood, ed., *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings* (New York, 1999), pp. 35, 38, 43; William Lamont, “Muggleton, Lodowicke,” *ODNB*; Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*, pp. 27–40.

77 Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads*, p. 12.

78 Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), p. 9.

79 Leonard J. Trinterud, ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York, 1971), p. 1. Trinterud distinguishes between various phases within Elizabethan Puritanism: the “original, anti-vestment party”; the “passive-resistance party”; and the “Presbyterian party.”

a clearly discernable group within the English Church, which set them apart, even though they were not separatist.⁸⁰

The terms “Puritan” and “Puritanism” arose as pejorative labels sometime during the 1560s.⁸¹ Their first printed use dates to the 1572 publication of the anonymous *Admonition to Parliament*, a text Collinson described as “public polemic in the guise of an address to Parliament.”⁸² The *Admonition* appeared at a time “when those English ministers hoping for further reform, especially in the matters of the Prayer Book and ceremonies, were frustrated by the queen’s suppression of parliamentary appeals that dealt with the topics of religion.”⁸³ Those who sought further reform were styled “Puritanes, worse than Donatistes,” and were considered too radical in their reforms; thus ensued a conflict over Puritanism and its ramifications for the English Church.⁸⁴ The authors of the *Admonition* were soon discovered and sentenced to prison in order to suppress their voices; however, as Marcy L. North observes, they defended their publication by stating that in Parliament there “should be a time of speaking and writing freely,” so that various ideas could be expressed without fear of reprisal. Further, their anonymity, says North, suggest that political and religious freedom was not yet possible for these early Puritans, and that attempts for further reform would be suppressed and censored.⁸⁵ Thus, the *Admonition* initiated an academic warfare over Puritanism that spawned numerous anonymous texts.⁸⁶ This is known as the first “Puritan” controversy and moved historians initially to define Puritanism in its negative relation to the more ceremonial Anglicanism, in that it was a clash of motives, interests, and desires.⁸⁷

80 Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, p. 15.

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

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

83 North, *The Anonymous Renaissance*, p. 134.

84 John Field and Thomas Wilcox, *Admonition to Parliament* (1572), p. 2. The text of the *Admonition* can be found in W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes* (London, 1954), pp. 8–19; and Hans J. Hillerbrand, ed., *The Protestant Reformation* (New York, 1968), pp. 257–66.

85 North, *The Anonymous Renaissance*, p. 134.

86 For the circumstances surrounding the *Admonition*, see North, *Anonymous Renaissance*, pp. 134–58; and Antoinina Bevan Zlatar, *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England* (New York, 2011), pp. 153–5.

87 For appraisals of Puritanism as “anti-Anglican,” see Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*; and J. F. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558–1640* (London, 1964); and Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013), pp. 60–82.

Responding to personal charges of favoritism to “Puritans,” Gabriel Harvey, “the noted Puritan man of letters,” wrote of “Puritanism,” or “Precisianism,” in one of his letters, dated 1573; it appears to be the first recorded use of the term.⁸⁸ By the end of Elizabeth’s reign in 1603, “Precisians” and “Puritans” were a common choice of slander to describe overly zealous Protestants who were thought to be too precise in their beliefs and in the way they chose to live.⁸⁹ Thus, even from its inception, there was an irrevocable tie between *dogma* and *praxis*. Based on certain doctrinal formulations and understandings, these “Puritans” deduced that the mainstay of the English Church was sorely wanting, not only in how its members chose to live and conduct their business, but in the way they thought about God and his majesty, and the broad implications this reverence had for doctrine, conducting worship services, observing the Sabbath, guarding one’s mouth, giving to the poor, dying well, cultivating devotion, and many other “planks in the puritan platform.”⁹⁰

By the dawn of the seventeenth century, the terms “Puritan,” “Puritanism,” and “Precisianism” were nearly synonymous terms of reproach. Thus, in a bit of irony, the “theological father” of English Puritanism,⁹¹ William Perkins, reputed to be the most influential Cambridge theologian, moralist, and casuist disregarded “Puritan” as a contemptuous term.⁹² Those who were styled

88 Victor Houlston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Person’s Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 44; Gabriel Harvey, *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573–80*, ed. Edward John Long Scott (London, 1884), p. 30.

89 Underdown, *Fire from Heaven*, p. 20.

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

91 Martin, *Milton among the Puritans*, p. 107. Current literature has made elaborate, albeit justifiable, claims about Perkins: “puritan father of British practical divinity”; “a major English Puritan spokesman”; “the father of Pietism” (which competes, perhaps, with William Teellinck’s designation “father of Continental Pietism”); “father of British reformed casuistry”; “archetypal puritan”; among many others. James F. Keenan, SJ “Jesuit Casuistry or Jesuit Spirituality? The Roots of Seventeenth-Century British Practical Divinity,” in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O’Malley, SJ, et al. (Toronto, 1999), p. 627; Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676–1724* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), p. 186, n. 29; Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany*, p. 110; Christopher P. Vogt, *Patience, Compassion, Hope, and the Christian Art of Dying Well* (Oxford, 2004), p. 25; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 13.

92 William Perkins, *The Workes of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the University of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1616–18), 1:342, 3:15.

“Puritans” generally despised its use because, as with Perkins, they associated the term with the medieval Cathari.⁹³ They preferred more neutral and apropos terms, such as “the godly,” or “saints.” It was not until the early to mid-seventeenth century that “Puritan” would be “owned and acknowledged . . . as an honorable flag under which to sail—‘the good old English Puritans.’”⁹⁴ John Gere’s depiction of the Puritan in his oft-printed tract, *The Character of an Old English Puritan, or Nonconformist* (1646), was one of the first positive portrayals in England, though there were those before Gere who struggled over its representation.⁹⁵ In 1626, the word was still disparaged, evidenced in Francis Rous’s comment that “In the Devil’s language, a Saint is a Puritan.”⁹⁶

What happened between Perkins and Gere to account for this shift? This question is not easily answered, but undoubtedly it has something to do with changing perceptions within early Stuart religion and culture, which indicates that the times were changing.⁹⁷ One possible explanation is implied in Rous’s

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

94 Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays* (New York, 1994), p. 236.

95 Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), p. 172. Michael R. Watts, referring to Gere’s tract, has simplistically stated, “Historians have agonized over the meaning of the term ‘Puritan’ but there is really little need. A brief but comprehensive description was given in the seventeenth century by the Presbyterian minister John Gere.” Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (New York, 1985), p. 15. Before Gere, John Downe published the anonymous *A New Anatomie; Or, Character of a Christian, or Round-head* (1645), which depicts the Puritan “in his most noble right temper,” against the “unjust censures” of “this blind World,” as one who journeys through this worldly wilderness toward heaven, being “Heavens Darling, Earths Paragon, the Worlds onely wonder . . . [and who is] is justly said to be the wonder of God himself.” Typical of positive character literature, Puritans are here depicted as pilgrims traveling to their heavenly home, similar to “Christian” in Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678).

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

97 See David Scott Kastan, “Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama,” in *Reading, Society, and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), pp. 167–84; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, pp. 132–75; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 10–30; David Cressy,

complaint before the Short Parliament that “The word Puritan is an essential engine . . . For this word in the mouth of a drunkard doth mean a sober man, in the mouth of an Arminian, an orthodox man, in the mouth of a Papist, a Protestant. And so it is spoke to shame a man out of all religion.” Thus J. P. Kenyon states: “The most serious complaint in 1640 was that the word ‘Puritan’ was being used by the enemies of Protestants to libel its defenders—the effect being to enhance the prestige of ‘Puritanism’ and enlist on its side a great deal of bi-partisan support which was not ‘Puritan’ at all.”⁹⁸ It is possible, perhaps probable, that the association of “Puritan” with “anti-Catholic” in the 1630s–40s was partially responsible for its switch from derision to banderole. Whatever the cause for this change, it is certain that the religion of the “Puritans” was a clearly identifiable strain within English Protestantism, and which gave rise to the slander in the first place. While their religion changed and evolved with the times, it did not lose its characteristics and identifiability which is attested not only in Neal’s and Brook’s histories, but also in the continued use of these terms, even if only reluctant, within current literature.

The early use and changing perceptions of “Puritan” and “Puritanism” only provide hints to the full nature of its complexity. For instance, Sir Matthew Hale, a prominent seventeenth-century jurist, shared definite “Puritan” sympathies, seeing “religious feeling where others saw ‘enthusiasts’ and knaves, their cloak of irrationalist folly concealing seditious intent,” but, “intellectually had much more in common with . . . ‘moral men’ of younger generations who were hostile to subjective validations of the faith.”⁹⁹ This obfuscating nature of Puritanism since the seventeenth century has contributed to its problem

Agnes Bowker’s Cat: Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England (New York, 2000), pp. 234–50; and Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, “Introducing the 1630s: Questions of Parliaments, Peace, and Pressure Points,” in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester, 2006), pp. 1–27.

98 J. P. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Eng., 1986), p. 177.

99 Alan Cromartie, *Sir Matthew Hale, 1609–76: Law, Religion, and Natural Philosophy* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995), p. 139. Charles M. Gray calls Hale a “psychological” Puritan but not a “programmatically” one. Holly Brewer, however, calls Hale a Puritan throughout his life, if for no other reason than he dressed like one and refused to enforce laws against them. Cp. Sir Matthew Hale, *The History of the Common Law of England*, ed. Charles M. Gray (Chicago, 1971), p. xvi, with Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority* (Chapel Hill, 2005), pp. 176–7.

of definition, and is further compounded by the “Puritan phases” of various English Protestants.¹⁰⁰

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

Numerous historians have recognized Puritanism’s appeal throughout early modern England, spreading like wildfire among English towns and localities, but what was it about Puritanism that made it so appealing in the first place?¹⁰¹ Can one devise a definition that is nuanced and expansive, and allows for such diverse “Puritans” as John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp, and even Richard Baxter and John Goodwin, to co-exist on a “puritan continuum” of English Protestant identity?¹⁰² Moreover, what did it mean for Puritans to be English *and* Reformed?¹⁰³

100 See Chapter 7.

101 For the urban popularity of English Puritanism, see Robert Tittler, *English Urban Experience, 1540–1640* (Palo Alto, 2001), pp. 1–38; Peter Lake, “Puritans, Popularity, and Petitions: Local Politics in National Context, Cheshire, 1641,” in *Politics, Religion, and Popularity: Essays in Honor of Conrad Russell*, ed. Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), pp. 259–89; Patrick Collinson, “Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture,” in *Culture of English Puritanism*, pp. 32–57; Vanessa Harding, “Reformation and Culture, 1540–1700,” in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540–1840*, ed. Peter Clark (Cambridge, Eng., 2000), pp. 263–88.

102 Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, p. 126.

103 Tom Webster allows for a “recast Arminianism,” epitomized in John Goodwin, to coincide with Puritan orthodoxy. Webster, *Godly Clergy*, p. 147. Both Spurr and Coffey affirm Webster’s thesis. For Coffey, Goodwin helps scholars to understand the evolution of English Puritanism in the seventeenth century; for Spurr, Milton and Goodwin reaffirm the existence of Arminians who were “undoubtedly puritan.” Ellen More, however, is more cautious and states that Goodwin’s “theology is more difficult to locate . . . [it] looked back to the Puritanism of the 1620s and forward to the rational theology of the post-Restoration era.” Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, p. 10; Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–89*, p. 68; Ellen More, “John Goodwin and the Origins of the New Arminianism,” *Journal of British Studies* 33 (1982), 50–70, there 70.

1.2 Methodology, Hypothesis, and Structure

This study seeks to shed light on what unites and defines orthodox Stuart Puritans, but more work will need to be done to explore continuities within Elizabethan Puritanism (c.1558–1603), and post-Restoration Puritanism. This study is confined to Stuart Puritanism (1603–89), but has ramifications for the other eras of Puritanism.

While Puritan origins precede the year 1558, are closely tied to the Marian exiles and their networking in Geneva, and could possibly be traced to Lollardy, for the purposes of this study it is best to assess Puritanism in its mature expression and age of codification.¹⁰⁴ Thus, the dates are broadly confined to 1603/4–89/90 or from the coronation of James I to the English throne (1604 being the year in which Downname's *Christian Warfare* was first issued) to the Glorious Revolution (1690 being the year Crisp's *Christ Alone Exalted* was reissued in its definitive and controversial edition).

Seventeenth-century Puritanism in its mainline consensus and context of debate from the calling of the Westminster Assembly to the Great Ejection obligates certain theological issues and boundaries that can be identified as one form of a broadly defined "Reformed orthodoxy." Given size restrictions, it is necessary to limit this discussion to theological identity since "Puritanism," as a non-Anglican and non-ceremonial religious phenomenon, was the dominant religious movement within England. Further, it is the time in which Downname, Rous, and Crisp sought to advance the Puritan Reformation. Although none of these authors wrote systematic works of theology, they nonetheless were

104 The question of the beginning and end of Puritanism is difficult to assess. Coffey and Lim trace its beginnings to c.1564. Thomas Kidd sees the decline of Puritanism from 1689, tying it to the "Glorious Revolution," which fostered "Protestant identities," and questions whether there were any "Puritans" after this political upheaval. However, these parameters fail to account for "seminal" Puritanism before the Elizabethan Settlement, and the Mather dynasty, which lasted well into the eighteenth century. Kidd concedes that attempts to "precisely . . . mark the end of Puritanism as a movement would . . . represent an imposition for narrative's convenience." Coffey and Lim, "Introduction," p. 1; Thomas S. Kidd, *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism* (New Haven, 2004), p. 2; Kidd, "What Happened to the Puritans," in *Recent Themes in Early American History: Historians in Conversation*, ed. Donald A. Yerxa (Columbia, 2008), p. 67; Robert C. Neville, *The Puritan Smile: A Look Toward Moral Reflection* (Albany, 1987), p. 17; David Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven, 1990), pp. 98–9.

acquainted with orthodox structures and boundaries. Threats to orthodoxy, seen in the “specter of heresy,” were taken seriously.¹⁰⁵

The method of this study is to examine three carefully chosen case studies to inquire whether there were common theological interests and confessional sensibilities within writers who did not write a system of divinity akin to William Ames’s *Medulla* or Edward Leigh’s *A Systeme or Body of Divinity*, which may justify use “Puritanism” in the singular, that is, to see whether a greater movement and narrative united Puritans in this central period. This study focuses on theological identity in order to assess a *sensus unitatis* operated across a diverse spectrum of Puritans.¹⁰⁶ The themes examined in these case studies are representative of a theological focus, are characteristic of Puritans understood as “Reformed,” and appear within writers who wrote within different genres of literature. It is suggested that there is significant theological harmony across a wide spectrum of beliefs within Puritanism, which will warrant further studies and investigation. The presence of doctrinal themes within Puritan pietistic writings suggests a *unitas in diversitate*.¹⁰⁷

105 English heresy culture was as complex and varied as its “orthodoxy,” and one cannot minimize the impact of rhetoric and misrepresentation. Further, “heretics” and “heresies” are classifications made by opposing parties; those who were branded as such did not see themselves espousing “heresy.” Indeed, Loewenstein has stated that “in the climate of extreme religious divisiveness, such accusatory terms as ‘error’ and ‘heresy’ had . . . enormous rhetorical power” by inducing fears of all kinds and “fueling ferocious opposition to religious toleration . . .” Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith*, p. 224. Finally, distinctions should be made between “heresy” and “blasphemy,” with the latter being a more willful disregard of the object of Christian religion. See John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration, and Early Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006) and Michael Hunter, “‘Aikenhead the Atheist’: The Context and Consequences of Articulate Irreligion in the Late Seventeenth Century,” in *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*, ed. Michael Hunter and David Wootton (New York, 1992), pp. 221–54; Alasdair Raffe, *The Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660–1714* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp. 57–61.

106 Wim Janse has observed that “The late sixteenth and seventeenth century European churches were confessional churches: they stuck to a creed or confession as an internal and external norm and ‘party statute,’ and monopolized their world view.” Janse, “Church Unity, Territorialism, and State Formation in the Era of Confessionalization,” in *Unity of the Church: A Theological State of Art and Beyond*, ed. Eduardus Van der Borgh (Leiden, 2009), p. 33. The same is true of the Reformed and Puritan parishes within Britain, evidenced in not only their doctrinal statements and confessional mores, but in the precise way Puritans articulated a distinct divinity.

107 On choosing themes for study, Patrick Collinson advised, “If we share with contemporaries a sense of Puritanism which is at once polemical and nominalistic, then far from

This study draws from the published sources of John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp. Much of this corpus consists of sermons revised for print. It will also draw, in part, from other Protestant and Reformed writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, John Calvin, William Perkins, Richard Greenham, Edward Dering, James Ussher, William Ames, Stephen Charnock, William Gouge, Andrew Willet, Thomas Edwards, John Howe, Edward Leigh, John Preston, Samuel Rutherford, John Eaton, John Saltmarsh, Henry Vane, and Thomas Hooker. By ascertaining what sources were read and disseminated, and which ones were censored and suppressed, one can possibly discern the possible influences in one's thought.¹⁰⁸ It will consider, to a limited extent, relevant political, social, cultural, literary, and religious spheres. It will map Downname, Rous, and Crisp into their unique historical and religious contexts, and suggest ways in which they formed an English "Puritan" identity.¹⁰⁹

circumscribing its meaning we should regard the incidence of the term in contemporary discourse as indicative of theological, moral, and social tensions which should be the prime object of our investigations, especially if we wish to understand what followed, in the 1640s and beyond." Collinson, "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 32 (1980), 483–88, there 488. Miller stated, "ideas and purposes shaped the course of events. Human beings could not move without a thought in their heads... and those men and women that moved others did so with well articulated thoughts." Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the Truth about History* (New York, 1994), p. 143. See Thomas Shepard, *The Sincere Convert* (London, 1640), sig. A7r, where "knowledge of Divinity" is a prerequisite to a "sound" conversion and the godly life.

108 For the reading habits of early modern England, see Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York, 2013), pp. 259–97; Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, 2000). On press censorship, see Debora Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 2006), ch. 1; and David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–42* (New York, 2006), pp. 281–309. The phenomenal cross-fertilization that occurred between England and the Continent can be seen in the libraries of English readers. See Peter Clark, "The Ownership of Books in England, 1560–1640: The Example of Some Kentish Townsfolk," in *Schooling and Society*, ed. Lawrence Stone (Baltimore, 1976), pp. 95–111.

109 That Downname, Rous, and Crisp are "common consent" Puritans is well established in the literature. While seventeenth-century classifications are sparse, major influences on this consensus stem from their association with the Westminster Assembly, comments in Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (1691–92), Daniel Neal's *The History of the Puritans* (1732–1738), and Brook's *Lives of the Puritans* (1813). Neal and Brook classify Downname and Crisp as Puritans, but do not mention Rous; however, Calamy identifies Rous as a "Puritan" in his *Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of His Life and Times* (London, 1702), p. 83.

English Puritans did not exist in a vacuum; they inherited a varied and complex religious culture, were receptive of a codified system of ideas that was shaped by countless heresies and heterodoxies dating to the early Christian church. As with Calvin, the Puritans received, used, and transmitted theological ideas, which, in turn they accepted, modified, or rejected. Their heritage was distinct enough to be their own, but it was never only their own; it was a shared expression of ideas that formed a unique style of divinity, including “plain style” preaching, experimental predestinarianism, Sabbath observance, and worship.¹¹⁰ This study, therefore, does not envision Puritanism as an isolated phenomenon but as a contextual movement that received and expressed its ideas in “godly” communion. This unity is suggested in a common ancestry with early Reformed Protestantism, and shared identity as Reformed Catholics.

The precise ways in which these ideas were disseminated are equally complex, and involve the selective use of fiction, church architecture, propaganda, and education, as well as the more traditional venues of the sacraments, the preaching of the Word, and the codification of scholasticism in confessions and catechisms. What emerges is a remarkably diverse and complicated religious culture that was formed by trans-Atlantic, trans-insular, and continental influences that flourished in a variety of social networks.

This study therefore has arisen in response to tendencies toward deconstruction, suggests a more nuanced approach to revisionism of Miller’s monolithicism, and suggests that historians have much to gain by looking at both the narrative of individual Puritans and the metanarrative of the Puritan Reformation. It is hypothesized that *unitas in diversitate* will prove to be important in moving the study of Puritanism forward because it assesses Puritans as individuals and as members of a distinct “godly” society.

Finally, “Reformed,” “Reformed orthodox,” and “Puritan,” are used as overlapping terms, but not identical classifications. There are English Reformed thinkers who can be identified as “Puritan,” but who approved of episcopacy, as well as “Puritans” who were neither strictly Reformed nor “orthodox.” Moreover,

110 Lake, *Boxmaker’s Revenge*, p. 33; Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c.1590–1640* (Aldershot, 2014), ch. 1. Historians have often referred to Puritan “plain-style” preaching, and church architecture that elevated the office of minister and centrality of the preached Word. While the culture of “plain style” was not exclusive to Puritanism, it did stand in contrast to florid forms of rhetorical expression. “Plain style” did not refer to content, but “a simple, direct regard for the truth of their beliefs.” Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty*, p. 41; Bruce C. Daniels, *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England* (New York, 1995), pp. 32–4; and Stephanie Sleeper, “Plain Style,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 2:479–80.

there were numerous Anglican “Calvinists” following the Great Ejection in 1662.

The question of how Puritans relate to a Reformed confessionality is significant, because there was a confessional impetus within Puritanism since its inception, which sought to normalize its doctrine and discipline. While these doctrines were contested, a significant majority agreed that normative belief and practice was essential for an orderly and godly society.¹¹¹

1.2.1 *Narrative and Metanarrative*

Franklin H. Littell observed that in the periodization of history, “The Ocean of facts is infinite. Every writer reveals his presuppositions in several ways but never more clearly than by selecting certain persons to feature, certain reports to highlight, certain events to emphasize in telling the story.”¹¹² This is equally true for studies of English Puritanism. The initial decision to examine one person to the exclusion of another, one facet of their thought or activities independent of another, and to address the evidence of one academic discipline rather than another invariably affects the outcome. To adequately approach history one must be cognizant of one’s fallibility and work with fairness to relate things as they were, and not as one thinks they may have been.

Fernand Braudel wrote, “All thought draws life from contacts and exchanges.”¹¹³ This study, therefore, attempts to take into consideration the proliferation of books and articles from the social and intellectual sciences. Its limitations have been determined to the extent these studies have been utilized.

It is hypothesized that by looking at three diverse Puritans, who promoted vying streams within a “normative” and “orthodox” tradition, that the concept of unity in diversity will play an integral role in understanding Puritanism. In order to test this hypothesis, this book will assess the similarities and disparities of three Puritans who broadly represent specific strains of what has been identified as “Puritanism.” By ascertaining what binds and unites them, it will

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

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

113 Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, 3 vols. (1981; repr. Berkeley, 1992), 1:401; cited in Webster, *Godly Clergy*, p. 1.

surface common religious motifs and place unities and diversities within their social and intellectual contexts. Due to size restraints, this study focuses only on Downname, Rous, and Crisp. It is believed that further studies of Richard Baxter, John Goodwin, and Peter Sterry, among others, will confirm unity in diversity within Puritanism.¹¹⁴

The first of the three-divines in this study, the “harshly anti-Catholic” John Downname (1571–1652),¹¹⁵ has a revered place in the history of the English Bible, largely for having produced a succession of popular concordances. As a representative of the precisianist strain, his theology and spirituality serves as a litmus test for Rous and Crisp. A prolific author, Downname published nineteen treatises, most famous of which is his two-part, *The Christian Warfare* (1608–11). Downname was renowned for his practical divinity, pietism, and status as a “theologian of experience.”¹¹⁶ Downname’s service as parliamentary censor sheds insight on the acceptable religious parameters of Stuart England.¹¹⁷

The second Puritan, pro-Scottish, anti-Arminian, anti-Catholic, parliamentary, Sir Francis Rous (1580/81–1659), represents the mystical strain within Puritanism. Called the “first Puritan mystic,” Rous was renowned as a writer of godly prose that sought to unite the English Reformed in a cosmic battle against the Antichrist.¹¹⁸ His vehement opposition to Arminianism throughout

114 Baxter’s importance derives from his status as an “elite” Puritan, and author of *A Christian Directory* (1673), the “longest, most ambitious influential guide,” which outlines the “Puritan” paradigm for social behavior. Goodwin is significant because he reflects the milieu of Puritanism, and its ongoing debates over intellectual change within the seventeenth century. Peter Sterry contrasts a specific mysticism, which starts from the “understanding,” to that of florid emotionalism. See Lamont, “R. H. Tawney, ‘Who Did Not Write a Single Work Which Can Be Trusted?’” in *Historical Controversies and Historians*, ed. William Lamont (New York, 1998), p. 114; Hill, *World Turned Upside Down*, p. 330; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, pp. vii, 1–12, 291–7; Vivian De Sola Pinto, *Peter Sterry Platonist and Puritan, 1613–72: A Biographical and Critical Study with Passages Selected from His Writings* (Cambridge, Eng., 1934), p. 114.

115 Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, p. 177.

116 John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1988), pp. 59–60. I have borrowed Calvin’s epithet of “theologian of experience” from Thomas J. Davis, “The Death of Adam, the Resurrection of Calvin: Marilynne Robinson’s Alternative to an American Ideograph,” in *Sober, Strict, and Scriptural: Collective Memories of John Calvin, 1800–2000*, ed. Johan de Niet, Herman Paul, and Bart Wallet (Leiden, 2009), p. 379.

117 Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (New York, 2000), pp. 344–5.

118 Jerald C. Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic, 1579–1659: An Introduction to the Study of the Mystical Element in Puritanism” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1948); Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” 53–6. Brauer distinguishes two types of mystics within Puritanism:

the 1620s–30s, along with his stepbrother John Pym, reportedly the most powerful man in England,¹¹⁹ was tied to constant fears of Catholicism.¹²⁰ Rous was unique because of his close ties to mainstream divines and parleying with late-medieval mystical streams, which would not have been as popularized without Rous.¹²¹ Rous had ties to powerful personas, including James Ussher and Oliver Cromwell.¹²² Rous typifies the pressing of religious bounds, and has

“classical mystics” like Rous were entrenched in medievalism, and “Spirit mystics” like John Saltmarsh and William Dell who were at the extreme ends of the “radical spectrum.” Tom Schwanda, *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative-Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene, 2012), pp. 12–3.

- 119 As a testament to Pym's greatness, Morrill remarks that Pym's funeral “was the grandest . . . ever given to a commoner in the early modern period, and if the procession did not match the formal splendors of the funeral arrangements for the 3rd early of Essex, his resting place within [Westminster] Abbey was the more striking.” John S. Morrill, “The Unweariability of Mr. Pym: Influence and Eloquence in the Long Parliament,” in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown* (Manchester, 1995), p. 19; see also Vanessa Harding, *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500–1670* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), p. 257, where Pym is said to have had “a heraldic funeral.”
- 120 Tyacke places Rous at the center of parliamentary debates on Arminianism. Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Cabbinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (New York, 1987). See also L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), p. 74; C. A. Patrides, “The Experience of Otherness: Theology as a Means of Life,” in *The Age of Milton: Backgrounds to Seventeenth-Century Literature*, ed. C. A. Patrides and Raymond B. Waddington (Manchester, 1980), p. 189; Peter White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), p. 308; Duffin, *Faction and Faith: Politics and Religion of the Cornish Gentry Before the Civil War* (Exeter, 1996), pp. 42–3. Muller, Stanglin, and McCall place Arminius within the context of medieval scholasticism. Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids, 1991), pp. 31–51; Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (Oxford, 2012), 10–12; cf. Mark A. Ellis, “Introduction,” in Simon Episcopius, *The Arminian Confession of 1621*, trans. Mark A. Ellis (Eugene, 2005), p. vii.
- 121 Johannes van den Berg writes, “More clearly than with many others, various seemingly disparate aspects of the Puritan movement [extraverted and introverted] are reflected in [Rous] as we know him from his activities and his publications.” Van den Berg, “The English Puritan Francis Rous and the Influence of His Works in the Netherlands,” in *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents: Essays on Early Modern Protestantism and the Protestant Enlightenment*, ed. Jan de Bruijn, Pieter Holtrop, and Ernestine van der Wall (Leiden, 1999), p. 25.
- 122 Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and the Politics of Early-Modern Ireland and England* (New York, 2007), p. 100; Patrick Little, ed., *Oliver Cromwell: New Perspectives* (New

been called “a broadly tolerant puritan.”¹²³ That Rous was a lay educator, provost, and politician, shows that Puritanism was not confined to the clergy, but spread through all social classes.¹²⁴

The third Puritan, Tobias Crisp (1600–42/3), a former Arminian from wealthy nobility and one of the few Puritans to earn a Doctor of Divinity degree, represents the antinomian strain within Puritanism, along with William Dell, Paul Hobson, John Eaton, and John Saltmarsh. Crisp was called “a controversial divine” and “the great champion of antinomianism” because many accused him of transgressing the borders of Reformed orthodoxy.¹²⁵ However, Crisp was revered for his godly conduct; none of the charges brought against him were for an illicit lifestyle, but for theological deviation from the precisianists. His life and work illustrate the tensions between law and gospel within Puritanism, and attest to variants in common doctrinal themes.¹²⁶

It is theorized that these three Puritans, when considered together, will give “Puritan” and “Puritanism” more stability as they elucidate the unities and diversities within Stuart Puritanism. This book’s overarching thesis is that Puritanism, as a construct and term, should not be abandoned in historical conversations; nor should one minimize the differences between Puritans and their various manifestations in the English-speaking world. It is hypothesized that narrative and metanarrative can help advance this proposition. It is suggested that English Puritans, bound by a common language and heritage, formed a cohesive historical movement on both sides of the Atlantic, the Puritan Reformation, which expressed itself in diverse ways, but which always envisaged the further reform of religion and society.¹²⁷ As John Donne, dean of Saint Paul’s, once put it, “No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a

York, 2009), p. 33; Blair Worden, “Oliver Cromwell and the Council,” in *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, ed. Patrick Little (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 85.

123 Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, p. 543.

124 Amanda Porterfield, *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism* (New York, 1992), 18–9.

125 See entry on Crisp in Stephen Jones, *A New Biographical Dictionary: Containing a Brief Account of the Lives and Writings of the Most Eminent Persons and Remarkable Characters in Every Age and Nation*, 3rd ed. (London, 1799).

126 Robert Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 30–3.

127 Indeed, Woodward observed: “The larger Atlantic world connections of colonization are now transforming Puritan studies. Colonial historians are rediscovering, although in new ways, something that Perry Miller noted more than two generations ago: New England’s Puritans were continuing participants in a complex culture whose intellectual roots extended throughout Protestant Europe.” Walter W. Woodward, *Prospero’s America: John*

piece of the continent, a part of the main . . . The *Church* is *Catholike, universall*, so are all her *Actions*; All that she does, belongs to *all*;¹²⁸ no manifestation of Puritanism is truly independent, having borrowed from others.

1.2.2 *Structure*

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

Part I (Chapters 3–5) introduces the representative Puritans, their life, theology, culture, major works, and influence, followed by Part II (Chapters 6–8), which investigates *unitas* within *diversitas*, narrative and metanarrative, and then concludes the work.

In Chapter 3, John Downname will be introduced as a progeny of precisianist Puritanism. His chief works of edited theology and piety, *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (c.1620), *A Guide to Godlynesse* (1622), and his peerless summa of English affectionate divinity, the four-part *Christian Warfare* (1604–18), will be presented and discussed. Due consideration will also be given to the influence Downname's corpus (nineteen treatises, including biblical concordances, and collections of sermons) had on codifying Puritan divinity within the seventeenth century. Downname's role as public censor and editor of James Ussher's *A Body of Divinity* (1648) will also be examined.

Chapter 4 will introduce Sir Francis Rous and his *The Mystical Marriage* (1635), which advances the mystical union of all souls with Christ, reflects the atmosphere of mid-century mystical piety, and develops notions of subjective experience of the divine.

Chapter 5 will place Tobias Crisp among seventeenth-century antinomian controversies, and assess whether he should be considered as a "mainstream" divine, or a "radical" who departed from the more confessionally minded.¹²⁹ It suggests that Crisp is not antinomian in a "rigid" sense; that is, he did not preach

Winthrop, Jr., Alchemy, and the Creation of New England Culture, 1606–76 (Chapel Hill, 2010), p. 1.

128 John Donne, *The Works of John Donne, D.D., Dean of Saint Paul's 1621–41*, 6 vols. (London: John W. Parker, 1839), 3:575.

129 Miller states that Crisp began his ministry "as an orthodox federalist . . . [but] he came to the conclusion, as did Anne Hutchinson, that the Covenant of Grace had nothing to do with moral behavior, and that therefore no ethical duty could be imposed upon or any response expected from mankind"; and thus, "in New England eyes, Crisp figured as an arrant Antinomian." Miller, *New England Mind: From Colony to Province*, p. 219.

doctrinal *and* practical antinomism. That he is counted among the “orthodox” within the seventeenth century by influential divines should not be ignored. Other English antinomians shared some of Crisp’s beliefs, but none were as revered and defended by precisianists. This evidence suggests that there was a distinct form of antinomism among the “mainstream,” seen, perhaps, in its variant doctrine of eternal justification.

Part II will consider the unities and diversities among these Puritans. Chapter 6 will coalesce the three prior chapters and discuss unity in diversity. It will put forward identifiable theological foci, and assess ways in which continuity exist. Chapter 7 will propose a definition for Puritanism moving forward, centered on narrative and metanarrative, and suggest how individual Puritans might better be identified. Chapter 8 will summarize the book’s contents, and conclude the work.

1.3 Summary

Since the sixteenth century, there have been diverse beliefs about the Puritans. Mis-caricatures and satires have made jest of the seriousness with which they viewed the godly life. Though the study of English Puritanism has gained serious academic credence within the past sixty-five years, there have been few significant advances in how Puritanism should be defined and understood. This lacuna within literature is due to preference for neat classifications, often based on single themes, which can be applied across a spectrum of belief and practice. However, this preference does not coincide with the massive body of evidence on the subject, or with the complex nature of human beings who interact and interrelate within a society. As such, there is a need for revisiting this “thorny problem” of identity to assess whether *unitas* and *diversitas* are appropriate concepts to employ when referring to Puritans, and whether these concepts can, in the end, illuminate the very meaning and definition of Puritanism. It is suggested that narrative and metanarrative attenuate the definitions problem by seeing English Puritans not only in their immediate contexts, but also as part of a greater reform movement, which can be called the Puritan Reformation.

It is proposed that current winds toward deconstruction result in an insufficient rendering of Puritanism, and lead to useless terminology. As such, the subject of Puritan identity, especially as it relates to Reformed confessionality, attests to a *sensus unitatis* within Puritanism, which is seen its general theological harmony, and affinity and longing for the past.

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

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

Seventeenth-Century Background

2.1 Introduction

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

1 See Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (New York, 1975). For the seventeenth century as a century of crisis, see Jenny Wormald, ed., *The Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2008); David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–42* (New York, 2006); Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625–60* (New York, 2003); Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000); Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000); Christopher Hill, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, Volume 2: Religion and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst, 1986); J. S. Morrill, *Seventeenth-Century Britain, 1603–1714* (Connecticut, 1980); S. R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603–42*, 10 vols. (London, 1883–84).

2 Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603–1714* (New York, 1982), p. 1.

3 Barry H. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: The Question of Orthodoxy Regarding Hanswerd Knollys, c.1599–1691* (Leiden, 2000), p. 17; Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews,*

Of these changes, the most important for this study involve political and religious developments. Further, the seventeenth century, as with any other century, did not exist in a vacuum; its major political movements and religious controversies were deeply rooted in the earlier English and Continental Reformations. We will thus give a brief survey of the political, religious, and theological events of the sixteenth century which pertain to Puritanism, and which serve as a precursor to the later events of the seventeenth century, as well as of the relevant events of the seventeenth century which John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp would have been familiar with. We will also introduce the major religious currents dealt with in their works, precisianism, mysticism, antinomism, and briefly, neonomism. This survey will be divided into six distinct time periods: the Early English Reformation (1534–53); Marian England (1553–58); the Elizabethan period (1558–1603); the Early Stuart period (1603–42); the English Revolution (1640–60); and the later Stuart Restoration (1660–88).

2.2 The Political, Religious, Social, and Theological Contexts

While the timeline for the seventeenth century—the “short seventeenth century” (1603–89)—is firmly established, the century remains historically and historiographically a mess.⁴ Even after nearly a century of robust scholarship, questions still linger as to the precise nature of “radical” religion during this period, its inner cohesiveness, orthodoxies and heresies, and the relationship between the English Reformation and the continental Reformations.⁵ Radical religion arose chiefly as an alternative to established mores and often as perceived correctives to conventional wisdom, as is the case with both first-wave

and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England (New York, 2010), pp. 89–159, 186–219; Jeffrey K. Jue, *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (New York, 2006), pp. 1–6, 141–74; and Austin Woolrych, *England without a King, 1649–60* (New York, 1983), p. 16. See also S. A. Lloyd, ed., *Hobbes Today: Insights for the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013).

4 Jenny Wormald, “Introduction,” in *The Seventeenth Century*, ed. Jenny Wormald (New York, 2008), p. 1. See also Geoffrey Parker and Lesley M. Smith, eds., *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1997).

5 There is a shift in recent scholarship toward more holistic portraits of the British Reformation and its reception of continental Reformed thought. See, for instance, Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, eds., *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain* (New York, 2010); and Carl R. Trueman, “Reformed Orthodoxy in Britain,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), pp. 261–3.

and second-wave Antinomism.⁶ The complex interworking of politics and religion during the English Revolution, for instance, shows how fractured established religion had become by the mid-1650s. In many ways, the Protestantism of the mid-seventeenth century, as with that of the sixteenth century, “was a novel, defiant and infectious phenomenon,” one that allured those of religious sensitivity, captivated the higher classes, and produced a wide spectrum of “revolutionary” Puritans.⁷ That such radical writers as John Saltmarsh, William Dell, and William Erbery could not only be tolerated but also flourish reveals the laxity of Cromwell’s government toward “radical” thought, its social appeal, and political impetus toward toleration.

Within the seventeenth century, there was an established network of “godly” correspondence and theological dissemination between British and continental universities; established schools, such as those at Oxford, Cambridge, and Leiden, fostered tutor-student relationships which forged bonds that would follow individuals throughout their ministerial careers.⁸ These bonds helped to curve religious heterodoxy, and served to spread the Puritan “ethos” in both lands, though, at times, it spun aberrant beliefs and elevated reason.⁹

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

7 Alexandra Walsham, “Afterword,” in *Pieties in Transition: Religious Practices and Experiences, c.1400–1640*, ed. by Robert Lutton and Elisabeth Salter (Aldershot, 2007), p. 181.

8 See Ole Peter Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011); Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610–92* (Lebanon, 1993), pp. 17–40; and Sarah Bendall, Christopher Brooke, and Patrick Collinson, *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 177–226; see also, for example, the lasting impact of George Gifford’s education in Timothy Scott McGinnis, *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort: Puritan Priorities in Elizabethan Religious Life* (Kirkville, 2004), pp. 26–9. For Latitudinarianism in the seventeenth-century, see Lila Freedman, ed., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden, 1992). In 1594, Trinity College Dublin was founded and modeled on Emmanuel College, Cambridge, with a particular “puritan” ethos. John McCafferty, *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633–41* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), p. 61.

9 For instance, by 1660 Christ’s Church, Cambridge, once the citadel of Puritan dons, had become the center stage for Cambridge Platonism; by century’s end, the university had given way to the “new philosophy.” See Arthur Quinn, *The Confidence of British Philosophers: An Essay in Historical Narrative* (Leiden, 1977), p. 11; G. R. Evans, *The University of Cambridge: A New History* (London, 2010), pp. 185–254; and C. A. Patrides, *The Cambridge Platonists* (Cambridge, Eng., 1969). In the seventeenth century, Leiden University, a “seminary for ministers,” drew

Regardless how one perceives the seventeenth century, whether in its political or religious contexts, academic attention given to the late medieval and early modern periods is the result of a “thriving scholarly industry that shows little sign of declining in vitality or losing momentum or steam.”¹⁰

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

While Elizabeth I (1558–1603) is often credited with being the monarch most associated with the rise of English Puritanism, more recent historians have traced its origins to the early English Reformation and the disputes between Henry VIII and his religious program with the more conservative “evangelicals.”¹¹ Some historians see this early reformist wing within the English Church to represent the earliest threads of Puritanism.¹² Accepted historical wisdom has traditionally held that the last decade of Henry VIII’s reign was the most conducive to the budding evangelical cause, so much so that by the time Edward VI succeeded his father as king in 1547 the evangelical movement pervaded the whole of English society.¹³ A. G. Dickens, one of the most revered historians of the English Reformation, proposed this thesis in his 1964 book *The English Reformation*;¹⁴ since the 1960s, however, more

foreign theology students *en masse* because of its world-renowned learning, scholarship, and toleration. Esther Mijers, “News from the Republic of Letters”: *Scottish Students, Charles Mackie, and the United Provinces, 1650–1750* (Leiden, 2012), p. 34; Yosef Kaplan, *An Alternative Path to Modernity: The Sephardi Diaspora in Western Europe* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 197–8; and Peter T. Van Rooden, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship, and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century* (Leiden, 1989), p. 185.

10 Walsham, “Afterword,” p. 181.

11 See D. G. Newcombe, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (New York, 1995), pp. 52–75; and, more generally, J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (New Haven, 1968), pp. 384–423. There is some confusion as to how to refer to “evangelicals” in the early English Reformation. Strictly speaking, “conservatives” would refer to those wishing to retain the older order of strict “Catholicism” (from *conservare*, “to save”). Current convention dictates the newer definition of Henrican evangelicals as “religiously Protestant.” However, both those of the “old faith” and the new viewed themselves as “Catholic,” and, as Peter Marshall wrote, “the word ‘Catholic’ [was] a contented trophy between opponents and supporters of the royal supremacy.” Peter Marshall, *Religious Identities in Henry VIII’s England* (Aldershot, 2006), p. 187.

12 Thus, Karl Gunther, “The Intellectual Origins of English Puritanism, ca.1525–72” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2007), pp. 9–30; Gunther, “The Origins of English Puritanism,” *History Compass* 4/2 (2006), 235–40.

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

14 See A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (University Park, 1964); Dickens, *Reformation Studies* (London, 1982).

recent scholarship has disputed this claim. Christopher Haigh, for instance, responded to Dickens in his “Introduction” and “The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation,” in his edited work *The English Reformation Revised*, and argued, among other things, that the early English Reformation was more of a disaster or an unpredictable and deeply-contested process than an actual “success,” one with chiefly political motivations and little allure among parishioners.¹⁵ J. J. Scarisbrick, Eamon Duffy, and Alec Ryrie have followed suit.¹⁶ But, as Tyacke argues, “The concept of a Reformation from below, which we are asked to reject, is something of a revisionist straw man.”¹⁷ Scarisbrick, Duffy, and Ryrie, have all pointed out that there were pockets of resistance to the Reformation.¹⁸ But their revisionism does not explain why, if there was such a vast cultural and social resistance, that there was not a “lay” revolution; or why those who tried to garner support for such a cause, as those who were involved in the Gun Powder Plot of 1605, failed in their attempts to establish a national English Catholicism.¹⁹

-
- 15 Christopher Haigh, “Introduction,” and “The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation,” in *The English Reformation Revised*, ed. Christopher Haigh (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), pp. 1–18, 19–33.
- 16 See J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford, 1984); Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, 2005), pp. 1–8; 377–523; Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, eds., *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), pp. 1–13; Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII*, pp. 5–12.
- 17 Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, p. 39. I concur with Tyacke that at the popular level the English Reformation was largely a success, and though Haigh and Duffy present compelling evidence in support of their claims, they have not adequately accounted for strong English disdain for “popery.” See Peter Marshall, *The Catholic Priesthood and the English Reformation* (New York, 1994); Marshall, *The Impact of the English Reformation, 1500–1640* (London, 1997); cf. Ian Hazlett, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (London, 2003), pp. 29–36, esp. 34, where Hazlett states that “it was possible and indeed common to be a Calvinist in the broad sense without having to be a puritan, a Presbyterian, a Congregationalist, or a militant biblicist.”
- 18 See Michael Questier, “Conformity, Catholicism, and the Law,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 238–44; and Peter Marshall and Geoffrey Scott, “Introduction: The Catholic Gentry in English Society,” in *Catholic Gentry in English Society: The Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation*, ed. Peter Marshall and Geoffrey Scott (Aldershot, 2009), pp. 2–3.
- 19 Questier states that “movement between the Churches [of Rome and the Reformation] cannot be understood just as the function of an academic debate.” Indeed, there were multifarious factors involved when someone converted to the Reformation, such as political preferment, family and social pressures, and the experience of conversion. Michael C. Questier, *Conversion, Politics, and Religion in England, 1580–1625* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), p. 41. Walsham sees Catholic recusancy, especially among women, as a

This revisionism further suffers in that it cannot account for how the English Reformation came to be a “howling success” in making England into a Protestant nation.²⁰ That the England of the Stuarts (1603–1714) was thoroughly Protestantized is evident in the popularity of Protestant print in the seventeenth century, and especially in the burgeoning “anti-popery” genre.²¹ This fact alone brings into question some of the revisionist rendering of the English Reformation. What is essential for the purposes of this study, however, is the evangelical dissent from the *status quo* of Henrican reform, or, put another way, the strict conservatism of such early English evangelicals as Nicholas Partridge, a man with strong connections on the continent.²² The man perhaps most important in the advance and progress of English reform, especially in the move toward conservatism, was Thomas Cranmer, whose continental allies have been well noted in the literature.²³ The major feats of early English reform

challenge to “Protestant” England; but MacCulloch sees overwhelming evidence for English Protestantization across the classes. Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993); Diarmaid MacCulloch, “The Impact of the English Reformation,” *Historical Journal* 38 (1995), 151–3; MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2001), pp. 105–19.

- 20 MacCulloch, “Impact of the English Reformation,” 152. See also Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, “Introduction: Protestantisms and Their Beginnings,” in *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, ed. Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), p. 3; Jeremy Gregory, “The Making of a Protestant Nation: ‘Success’ and ‘Failure’ in England’s Long Reformation,” in *England’s Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (New York, 1997), p. 307.
- 21 There is an alternate view in the literature, which proposes that anti-popery was a political device or “expression of irrational paranoia,” which sought to exploit lay fears in order to advance “Puritan” causes in Parliament. Lake, however, has challenged this view, in part, by seeing anti-popery as an “ideology” and “complex entity composed of different strands of argument and narrative.” That such tracts as Andrew Willet’s *Synopsis papismi* went through numerous and ever-thicker editions show that the crown of catholicity captured the public imagination. Peter Lake, “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 81; cf. Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops’ Wars: Charles I’s Campaigns against Scotland, 1638–40* (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), p. 278, who sees anti-popery as the “common political currency of Englishmen,” and evidence of mass hysteria. On Willet’s *Synopsis papismi*, see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–40* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995), pp. 13–9; Stefania Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570–1625* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 92–101.
- 22 Partridge, for instance, kept correspondence with Heinrich Bullinger, one of Europe’s most energetic Protestant networkers. Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII*, p. 21.
- 23 See Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, 1996), pp. 351–516.

were greater than turning the English tides away from Rome and towards Zurich or Geneva. They were successful in establishing a system of networking and communication with the reformers on the continent and in making great strides in pastoring the English toward more “Protestant” virtues.²⁴ Another neglected but important aspect of the “success” of English Protestantism, even as early as the 1520s, was the entrance of Lutheranism into England. Henry VIII’s bishops, devout followers of Rome, mimicked Roman Catholic practices across Europe in 1521 and publicly burned Luther’s works in Oxford, Cambridge, and at St. Paul’s Cross, London, all places that would become bastions of Reformed theology. Yet, even amid rhetorical attacks by the clergy, Luther’s Latin works and Tyndale’s English New Testament continued to be smuggled into the country in a clandestine Protestant trade.²⁵ In fact, David Daniell questions the claims of revisionism based chiefly on the popularity of Tyndale’s New Testament.²⁶

While tracing the origins of Puritanism to the early English Reformation continues to bear fruit, some historians have entertained the possibility of finding embryonic Puritanism in English Lollardy: David Zaret, for instance, notes that “Lollardy had anticipated many crucial doctrinal tenets of Puritanism, and much of its lay initiative”;²⁷ Patrick Collinson calls Lollardy a “tributary stream of English Protestant development”;²⁸ Christopher Hill credits Lollardy with making Puritanism “a Trojan horse with a bellyful of sects”;²⁹ Stephen Foster believes that the Lollards deserve a place in the prehistory of Puritanism because of their persistence and popularity for generations after authoritative suppression and for the simple fact that most former southeast English Lollard centers became Puritan strongholds;³⁰ and Amanda Porterfield traces

24 See Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530–1700* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 37–60.

25 Susan Doran and Christopher Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People: The Church and Religion in England, 1500–1700*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2003), pp. 115–6.

26 David Daniell, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven, 2003), pp. 123–5.

27 David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago, 1985), p. 47; Patrick Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft* (New York, 2006), pp. 133–5.

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

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

30 Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570–1700* (Chapel Hill, 1991), p. 7; see also Durston and Doran, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, pp. 112–5.

female Puritan spirituality to that of Lollardy.³¹ Whatever merits there are in probing Lollardy as “prehistory” to Puritanism, and to date the beginnings of Puritanism to the fourteenth century, within the literature historians have generally mentioned this possibility only in passing,³² and no systematic comparison has ever been published.³³ Margaret Aston has observed, however, that the Lollards’s “careers and achievements [were] commemorated and immortalized in that great valhalla of the English Reformation,” John Foxe’s *Actes and monuments* (1563), thus suggesting that Lollardy was used for more rhetorical purposes than as an intellectual source.³⁴

When Henry VIII died on January 28, 1547, the throne fell to the then nine-year-old boy-king Edward VI.³⁵ The new king was too young to rule on his own and as his father had appointed advisors to the boy, the future of English politics and religion lay in their counsels. Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset, one of Edward’s chief counselors, guardian, and lord protector, was a zealous Protestant and promoted such clergy as Hugh Latimer, Bishop John Hooper,

31 Amanda Porterfield, *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism* (New York, 1992), pp. 33–5. See also, more generally, Johanna Harris and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, eds., *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558–1680* (New York, 2011).

32 Lollardy can be seen as “prehistory” to Puritanism in that it affected the course of the early English Reformation in some way. Lollardy’s influence is contested in the literature, however, and warrants further study. See Donald D. Smeaton, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale* (Kirksville, 1986), pp. 75–7, 251–5; and cf. Carl R. Trueman, *Luther’s Legacy: Salvation and the English Reformers, 1525–56* (New York, 1994), pp. 41–2, who cautions against Smeaton’s assertion that Tyndale was influenced by Lollardy by noting that Smeaton’s arguments are based on similarities rather than documented connections.

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

34 Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (New York, 1984), pp. 219–20. See also Christopher W. Marsh, *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550–1630* (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), pp. 29–31, who sees Lollardy’s more “sociological rather than theological” influences.

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

and Nicholas Ridley. He worked with Thomas Cranmer, bishop of Canterbury, to move England beyond the Henrican “half-Reformation.” Cranmer made significant progress during Edward’s reign to advance the Reformation. He wrote the first two editions of the Book of Common Prayer and developed doctrinal clarity on the Eucharist, clerical celibacy, the role of images in public worship, and the veneration of saints. Along with John Dudley, William Parr, William Padget, Nicholas Ridley, and Thomas Goodrich, the early evangelical movement was more solidified and its proponents were determined to banish the English world of Catholic devotion.³⁶

During Edward VI’s reign there was more freedom for the expression of Reformed ideas and confluence with the Reformed religion of the continent. Cranmer not only embraced many of the latest ideas coming out of Germany and Switzerland, evident in his theology of the Eucharist, but also invited many of the reformers to visit England, such as Peter Martyr Vermigli and Martin Bucer, in order to realize his dream of domesticating continental Reformed religion and “Luther’s legacy.”³⁷

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

2.2.2 *Marian England (1553–58)*

Mary was proclaimed Queen of England in London on July 19, 1553, and in most of the north by St. Mary Magdalene’s Day, July 22, 1553. As soon as it was clear that Catholicism would be restored, some communities moved toward Counter-Reformation. Two of Mary I’s first acts as queen was to re-legitimize

36 MacCulloch, *The Boy King*, p. 8; Ian Hazlett, “Calvin and the British Isles,” in *The Calvin Handbook*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Grand Rapids, 2009), pp. 118–25; John A. Taylor, *British Monarchy, English Church Establishment, and Civil Liberty* (Westport, 1996), pp. 68–9.

37 Thus Carl R. Trueman writes, “While England never produced an organized Lutheran movement of any significance, it is simply impossible to understand the nature of English Reformation thought without reference to the theology of Martin Luther.” Trueman, *Luther’s Legacy*, p. 54.

Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order to undo the annulment which could provide legal grounds for opposition to her reign, and to rescind Edward's "Protestant" reforms. Mary further began to banish Protestants and burn them at the stake, which earned her the epithet "Bloody Mary." It is estimated that almost 800 Protestants were exiled or emigrated to the continent.³⁸ Those who remained went into hiding or were executed in often-sensational displays of royal supremacy. Cranmer was charged with heresy, tried, and executed on March 21, 1556, the scene of which is preserved in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1563).³⁹ In addition to exiling close to 1,000 Protestants, Mary ordered English-language Bibles to be removed from churches, and outlawed the works of English translators.⁴⁰ Hundreds of Protestants were burned alive at London's famed execution site at Smithfield, including Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley.⁴¹

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

38 Andrew Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 3–4; Dale Walden Johnson, "Marginal at Best: John Knox's Contribution to the Geneva Bible, 1560," in *Adaptations of Calvinism in Reformation Europe: Essays in Honor of Brian G. Armstrong*, ed. Mack P. Holt (Aldershot, 2007), p. 242; Leo F. Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509–1640* (New York, 1990), pp. 63–6.

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

40 Dorothy Auchter, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Westport, 2001), p. 248. The foundational study on the Marian exiles is Christina Hallowell Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (1938; repr., Cambridge, 2010). For more recent discussion of Protestantism during the reign of Mary I, see Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism*, pp. 1–7, 86–117, 129–50. For a study that examines the impact of exile on English Puritanism, see Dan G. Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1555–60* (New York, 1999).

41 Janette Dillon, *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400–1625* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), p. 133; George Fisher, *The Reformation* (New York, 1873), p. 324; *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. Frank Leslie Cross (New York, 1974), pp. 752–3, 1051.

Wood, a prominent Elizabethan Puritan.⁴² Leo F. Solt writes, “The Marian exiles emigrated to those Calvinist and Zwinglian centers in western Germany and Switzerland controlled by Reformed Church leaders. Bullinger was at Zurich; Calvin was at Geneva; Martyr was at Strassburg; Poullain was at Frankfort; and some of a Lasco’s London congregation were at Emden.”⁴³ Whereas England had once been home for the Protestant exiles from France and Holland, it was now among persecuted lands for disbanded Protestants. Consequently, these English reformers were welcomed into the major Reformed centers within Europe, such as Geneva, Switzerland, which became an “incubator” for the Reformed theology which later flourished during the Elizabethan Settlement, and is attested in the popularity of the Geneva Bible with its copious annotations, which incidentally criticized the “divine right” of monarchs.⁴⁴

In his 2000 monograph *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, Dan G. Danner argues that most of the English in Geneva from 1555–60 had already solidified their theology indigenously and only borrowed Genevan polity and ecclesiology. Danner goes so far as to suggest that these early English Puritans were not Calvinists *per se* and only a later generation of Puritans would enthrone Calvin within English Protestantism.⁴⁵ While Danner’s thesis should be assessed sympathetically, being the first major attempt to disentangle the theology of the exiled English in Geneva, there are noticeable gaps in his argumentation and analysis. For instance, the work of John a Lasco, who spent time both in England and in exile and who exerted a profound influence over London Protestantism and the Marian exiles is noticeably absent.⁴⁶ Further, it is better to classify the exiles as broadly “Reformed” over “Calvinist.”⁴⁷ Still further, Bucer and Vermigli had spent prolonged periods in England, and Bullinger’s *Decades* had been in use by the English Reformed since the time of Edward VI. Calvin was known

42 Solt, *Church and State*, p. 63. Solt mistakenly counts the named-exiles to 427; cf. Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, pp. 32, 41. On the Cambridge exiles in particular, see H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, Eng., 1958), pp. 74–100.

43 Solt, *Church and State*, p. 63

44 Solt, *Church and State*, pp. 63–4; Avihu Zakai, *Exile and Kingdom: History and the Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), p. 38; Crawford Gribben, “Introduction,” in *Literature and the Scottish Reformation*, ed. Crawford Gribben and David George Mullan (Aldershot, 2009), p. 12.

45 Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*.

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

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

to have corresponded with the English-Protestant communities at Frankfurt am Main, and the community of John Knox was desirous to know whether it was to have “an English Church or Christ’s Church?”⁴⁸ However significant Calvin’s direct influence on English theology might have been, the Continental Reformation had a lasting impact on its course and development.⁴⁹

In sum, while in Geneva the English reformers were exposed to Calvin’s teachings and that of other continental reformers. What Mary I had attempted to debar had the opposite effect. Seventeenth-century English Reformed theology and its scholasticism can be credited to some extent to the greater networking of the Reformed during their exile in Geneva. Mary had thus unwittingly solidified the religion that she so much despised.⁵⁰ As Solt put it, “It is an ironic twist that the English sovereign who achieved the reputation of being the greatest enemy to Protestantism should have inadvertently caused Englishmen to carry out religious experiments in continental laboratories that would inspire succeeding Puritan generations.”⁵¹

When Mary died in 1558, her half-sister, Elizabeth, succeeded her and restored Protestantism in England. Through the so-called “Elizabethan Settlement,” the new queen paved the way for English Puritanism and religious dissent, even though she would implement measures to hinder the reformist wing in the English Church.

2.2.3 *The Elizabethan Period (1558–1603)*

Soon after Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, the Marian exiles were allowed to return. Those involved in the earlier reforms under Edward VI had hopes of continuing their “evangelical” cause. Though Elizabeth appointed some of the exiles to positions of influence, such as that of bishop, many felt that her Act of Uniformity (1559), which sought to unify English Protestantism, left the church only “half-reformed.” Further, for many, the Acts were believed to be a compromise between the more moderate Protestants and the still strong Catholic

48 Hazlett, “Calvin and the British Isles,” p. 122; Diarmaid MacCulloch, “The Latitude of the Church of England,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 53–9.

49 Ian P. Hazlett, “Calvin and the British Isles,” pp. 122–3. For the possible impact of Calvin’s Genevan Academy on British religion and society, see Karin Maag, *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560–1620* (Aldershot, 1995), p. 30.

50 For an alternative assessment of Mary Tudor’s reforms, see Eamon Duffy and D. M. Loades, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor: Catholic Christendom, 1300–1700* (Aldershot, 2006).

51 Solt, *Church and State*, p. 65.

liturgy, in a *via media* or “middle way.”⁵² Initially, the first Puritans found nothing more intolerable than demands to wear “popish” garments. As time went on, however, Puritan preachers who had not been found guilty of any specific offence were nevertheless ejected from their pulpits on rather vague charges under the Act of Uniformity; by the mid-to-late 1550s, the emerging reformist faction was more polarized and targeted by the establishment in the “Vestiarian,” or “Vestments” controversy, though few Puritans were actually deprived of their living.⁵³ The clash between bishop and “Puritan” only intensified with time, culminating in Richard Hooker’s defense of Anglicanism with his *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594–97), which was specifically written against “Puritan” reformers.⁵⁴

Within the literature, some have questioned how influential and formative these early Puritans were. Bernard Capp answers, “If puritan teaching attracted only a minority, it was a substantial and influential minority. Puritan scholars secured a powerful presence in the universities, especially Cambridge, shaping the values of successive generations of undergraduates.”⁵⁵ Thus, while Elizabethan Puritanism began as a minor movement for reform, its seeds were strategically planted within English universities, which would, in time, mature into a powerful cultural, political, and theological *coup d’état*.

Elizabethan Puritan concerns centered on the establishment’s endorsement of an essentially Catholic liturgy, an insurmountable barrier to the budding Puritan movement. This seeming compromise with Rome was evident to the Elizabethan Puritan in the required clerical surplice, which was made from white linen, and became the “standard attire” for all English clergy; moreover,

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

53 Solt, *Church and State*, pp. 83–5; Michael Zell, “The Establishment of a Protestant Church,” in *Early Modern Kent, 1540–1640*, ed. Michael Zell (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 239.

54 See Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: A Critical Edition with Modern Spelling*, ed. Arthur Stephen McGrade, 3 vols. (New York, 2013), 1:1–xxx1.

55 Bernard Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–60* (New York, 2012), p. 4.

they detested the sign of the cross in baptism, the giving of the ring in marriage, among other concerns.⁵⁶

That Puritans would often choose to be deprived of their livings, and forbidden to preach, rather than to conform to the bishops, shows how seriously they believed these matters to be. Indeed, wearing “Catholic dress” was associated with the elaborate attire of priestly hierarchy in Romish churches. Consequently, the reforming clergy sought support from such continental reformers as Peter Martyr Vermigli, Heinrich Bullinger, and Martin Bucer, and asked for advice on controversies then plaguing the English Church.⁵⁷ For instance, Laurence Humphrey, president of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Thomas Sampson, dean of Christ Church, sought counsel from Bullinger. However, Bullinger supported clerical dress and other settlement positions because he believed them to be *adiaphorous*, and not worth fighting over. So while the English Reformed borrowed from their continental counterparts, they often rejected any advice that did not coincide with their Puritan Reformation.⁵⁸

56 Related to the Vestiarian controversy was the “iconoclast” controversies, which coincided with more radical attempts at Reformation, and which ebbed and flowed according to those in power. David Cressy has also observed that Puritan opposition to the Establishment was focused more on the Book of Common Prayer than other ceremonial aspects, such as burial of the dead. Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York, 1997), pp. 403–9. See also Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (New York, 2007); and Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, 2003).

57 See Carrie Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel: England and Zurich, 1531–58* (Zürich, 2006), pp. 189–90.

58 Collinson, *Elizabethans*, pp. 238–9; R. Tudor Jones, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds., *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Volume 1: 1550–1700* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 20–1; David Englander, Diana Norman, Rosemary O’Day, and W. R. Owens, eds., *Culture and Belief in Europe, 1450–1600: An Anthology of Sources* (Malden, 1990), pp. 448–50; and Judith H. Anderson, *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England* (Bronx, 2005), pp. 90–7. Anderson states “Bucer wrote that he would prefer to see vestments abolished, since they are a source of superstitious belief, but that he does not ‘believe . . . there is anything about them which in itself is wicked,’” and “that unless and until the people are properly taught, ‘the use and removal of vestments will do equal damage’” (95). Calvin also weighed in on the controversy when he wrote to John Hooper that “his opposition to vestments was not worth it.” Cited in E. W. Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c.1500–55): Bishop of Gloucester* (Lewiston, 1992), p. 136. Within the literature, Hooper has been called a “proto-Puritan,” who struggled over the implications of the doctrine of predestination. See Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain*

Puritan ministers either “conformed,” preached moderation, as did Richard Greenham, or were deprived of the living, as was Thomas Cartwright.⁵⁹ Some Puritans wanted more than a further cleansing of the church and insisted on a systematic and thorough rebuilding of it. This motif is clear in Edward Dering’s sermon before Queen Elizabeth in 1569. Dering, a young Cambridge scholar, was invited by the queen to preach at court.⁶⁰ He began his sermon by expressing his own gratitude that the English had been freed from the spiritual bondage of the previous reign, and that the preaching of God’s word was more free and available to the people. This change was the result of God’s Spirit at work in the queen’s life, who had herself lived in great danger, but now enjoyed safety. Dering likened England’s deliverance to the liberation of Israel from Egypt. It was now the queen’s duty to feed God’s people and the magistrate’s to “maintain Religion and to supresse superstition.”⁶¹ If she failed, however, the Lord would bring judgment to the nation. Now that the word of God could be proclaimed widely and freely, greater numbers of well-trained ministers were needed.

Dering addressed the queen with unprecedented boldness: “you at whose hands God will require it, you sit stil, and are careless, and let men do as they list. It toucheth not belike your commonwealth, and therefore you are wel contented to let it alone.”⁶² When Dering later dedicated his *Works* (1597) to Elizabeth, he said that he had so angered her that she forbade him to preach further, and censured him from speaking publicly. Remarkably, however, Dering’s sermon was so popular that it went through sixteen editions by 1603, and was the most oft-printed sermon in Elizabethan England.⁶³

This period of conflict is often associated with the rise of such divines as William Perkins, Richard Greenham, John Udall, Thomas Cartwright, William

and Ireland (New York, 2003), pp. 331–2; and Peter Marshall, “England,” in *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*, ed. David M. Whitford (Kirkville, 2008), p. 257.

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

60 W. Brown Patterson, “Elizabethan Theological Polemics,” in *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, ed. Torrance Kirby (Leiden, 2008), pp. 99–100.

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

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

63 Patterson, “Elizabethan Theological Polemics,” p. 100; Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998), pp. 36–7; Collinson, *Godly People*, pp. 302–4.

Whitaker, William Bradshaw, George Gifford, Arthur Golding, John Field, Laurence Chaderton, Walter Travers, and Arthur Dent, who laid the theological groundwork for subsequent generations. Elizabethan Puritans thus stood within the earlier Reformed evangelical tradition, were part of Tudor Puritanism more generally, and promoted a distinct experimental theology that came to identify the movement.⁶⁴ Puritanism stood at the center of a Reformed synthesis of late medieval Catholicism, and the later theology of the post-Reformation; as M. M. Knappen argues, “Puritanism was a transitional movement linking the medieval with the modern. Only recently have students begun to notice the strength and importance of its medieval ties.”⁶⁵

Another central feature of Puritanism was a preference for the spoken over the printed word of Scripture. Though Puritan ministers urged their congregants to be conversant in the Bible, private devotional exercise was never to supplant hearing the word preached. In fact, Arnold Hunt argues that this preference was a distinctive feature of Puritan culture, much, perhaps, in the way the *viva vox Evangelii* was to the Lutheran.⁶⁶ The hallmark characteristic of the movement, however, was its formative piety and casuistry,⁶⁷ which consisted

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

65 Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p. ix.

66 Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 30–59; Paul S. Chung, *The Spirit of God Transforming Life: The Reformation and Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York, 2009), p. 113. See also Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Raleigh, 1986).

67 Margaret Sampson, “Laxity and Liberty in Seventeenth-Century English Political Thought,” in *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Edmund Leites (Cambridge, Eng., 1988), p. 99. Sampson states that Puritan preachers lamented the lack of practical treatises, and urged their fellow ministers to preach and publish, but makes too much of their “proneness to despair . . .” See Benjamin T. G. Mayes, *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning after the Reformation* (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 18–21; and Nam Kyu Lee, *Die Prädestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen, 1593–1622* (Göttingen, 2009), pp. 11–6.

of a well-pitched effort to address the whole spectrum of human need, and correct the “oversense” of unworthiness.⁶⁸

Whatever the Puritans were, they were pitched as “the godly,” those who characterized their lives by their pursuit for further reform.⁶⁹ Though Elizabethan Puritan theologians generally thrived, even under more strict acts of conformity, the movement itself suffered tremendous censure after some of its more “radical” authors penned, published, and distributed the controversial and satirical *Martin Marprelate Tracts* in 1588–89.⁷⁰

2.2.4 *The Early Stuart Period (1603–42)*

When Queen Elizabeth I died in 1603, James VI of Scotland became James I of England and ruled over both nations.⁷¹ Though raised under Presbyterianism, and professing to be a Calvinist, James soon adopted English Church government because he believed it to be the best form that accorded with the monarchy.⁷² Over one thousand ministers signed what was known as *The Millenary Petition* (1603), a tract that requested changes in the administration of baptism and the use of vestments as well as several other liturgical adjustments.⁷³ In 1604, at the Hampton Court Conference, James considered these requests but ultimately sided with his bishops.⁷⁴ While some concessions were made, the

68 See, for instance, William Perkins, *Whole Treatises of Cases of Conscience* (London, 1606), and William Ames, *De Conscientia* (London, 1603). Puritan casuistry was distinct from Jesuit casuistry, and had more ties to Jesuit devotional texts. See James F. Keenan, “Jesuit Casuistry or Jesuit Spirituality? The Roots of Seventeenth-Century British Practical Divinity,” in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O’Malley, et al. (Toronto, 2000), pp. 627–40. See also James F. Keenan and Thomas A. Shannon, eds., *The Context of Casuistry* (Washington, D. C., 1995); Leites, *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*; Albert R. Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning* (Berkeley, 1988); and Elliot Rose, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans Under Elizabeth I and James I* (Cambridge, Eng., 1973).

69 See Collinson, *Godly People*, pp. 1–18.

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

71 For historical issues and revisionist ideas on the Stuart era, see Ronald Hutton, *Debates in Stuart History* (New York, 2004); see also John S. Morrill, *Seventeenth-Century Britain, 1603–1714* (Kent, 1980).

72 Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, p. 18.

73 Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritan Politicians and King James VI and I, 1587–1604,” in *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), p. 41.

74 Jones, *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Vol. 1: 1550–1700*, p. 103.

reformist wing in the church feared persecution, as their efforts were continually suppressed.

In these early years, the House of Commons and the king clashed over various issues, primarily because of James's high view of royal authority. He fully believed in the "divine right of kings," and sought to control both church and state. Some have seen this monopolizing in his commissioning of a new English translation of the Bible, which became known as the *Authorized Version* (1611), and in his specific request that it contain no annotations in its margins.⁷⁵ The Hampton Court Conference in 1604, in which Puritans had great hopes for a reformed liturgy, was a major defeat for the Puritan Reformation.⁷⁶

Within the Stuart Church there were generally four types of Christians: "radical Puritans, moderate Puritans, conformist Calvinists, and anti-Calvinists"; James I tended to favor those conforming Calvinists, but made concessions to so-called "anti-Calvinists."⁷⁷

Jacobean Puritan fears escalated when Charles I, James's second son, took the throne in 1625.⁷⁸ Charles's marriage to Henrietta Maria, a devout French Catholic, sparked fears among Puritan ministers and "the godly" in Parliament

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

76 Alan Cromartie, "King James and the Hampton Court Conference," in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot, 2006), p. 61.

77 See Kenneth Fincham, "Introduction," in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–42*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford, 1993), pp. 6–10; John S. Morrill, *Stuart Britain: A Very Short Introduction* (New York, 2000), pp. 77–87; Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (New York, 1987), pp. 1–8. Fincham provides a helpful introduction to the historiography of the field, especially as it relates to the "Anglican-Puritan" question. In some ways, "Anti-Calvinist" is a misnomer because opposition to the Reformed doctrines associated with Calvin, such a strict predestinarianism, were not always associated with Calvin himself. See Borden W. Painter, "Anglican Terminology in Recent Tudor and Stuart historiography," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 56 (1987), 237–49.

78 On Caroline Puritanism, see Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, 1620–43* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997).

that the new king intended to restore Catholicism to England.⁷⁹ Intense fears of the bloody persecutions during Mary I's reign were still of recent memory, being enshrined by numerous Stuart reprints of Foxe's martyrology. These worries escalated when Charles appointed his trusted advisor and "anti-Puritan," William Laud, as the Bishop of London in 1628. Laud restored elements of the Catholic liturgy and promoted the Arminianism that the Synod of Dort had invalidated a decade earlier.⁸⁰ In fact, much historical controversy centers on the precise beginnings of English Arminianism.⁸¹ For historian Nicholas Tyacke, Arminianism was an innovation in the English Church that upset the "Calvinist consensus" that had existed prior to the 1590s, and, ultimately, contributed to the civil war. For Peter White, Arminianism had deeper roots in earlier English theology, being representative of a wider spectrum of ideas within the Established Church, and was not so much a disruption as it was a natural progression of the *via media*.⁸² More recently, Gregory D. Dodds has argued

-
- 79 White recounts the story Edward Bilton, who so despised the prospect of Maria's return to England at the Restoration that he said, "she was a traytour and had been the cause of all his mischief (meaning the late wars in England)." White. Michelle Anne White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Ashgate, 2006), p. 1.
- 80 An interesting and little explored "focal point" of the Arminian-Puritan debates center on the use of illustrations in seventeenth-century print. Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), p. 160. For reassessment of Arminius's "deviation" from mainstream Reformed theology, see William den Boer, "Defense or Deviation: A Re-examination of Arminius's Motives to Deviate from the 'Mainstream' Reformed Theology," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dort (1618–19)*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Brill, 2011), pp. 23–48.
- 81 See Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c.1560–1643* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 1–36; Margo Todd, "All One with Tom Thumb: Arminianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge," *Church History* 64 (1995), 553–79, there 563–5, 575–9.
- 82 Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto, 2009), p. 172. Cp. Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640*, rev. ed. (Oxford, 1990), with Peter White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992). Their debate predates their respective books. See Nicholas Tyacke, "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered," and Peter White, "Rejoinder," both in *Past & Present* 115 (1987), 201–29. See also the effort to sort out the issues in Peter Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635," *Past & Present* 114 (1987), 32–76. On Peter Baro's understanding of the predestinarian question, see Keith D. Stanglin, "Arminius Avant la Lettre: Peter Baro, Jacob Arminius, and the Bond of Predestinarian Polemic," *Westminster Theological Journal* 67 (2005), 51–74. Baro recognizes three schools of predestinarian thought within the English Church: the first was held by Calvin and Beza, which Baro depicts in "supralapsarian" terms; the second was held by Augustine, George Sohn of Heidelberg, Zanchi, and Bellarmine, depicted in "infralapsarian"

that Jacobean Arminianism should be seen as a progression and legacy of Erasmianism, evidenced, in part, by the “Englishing” of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases on the New Testament* (1517–24), and the popularity of his humanist ideas.⁸³ However one chooses to disentangle the emergence of English Arminianism, it is certain that mainstream Puritanism was always “anti-papal,” and generally “anti-Arminian,” though such English preachers as John Goodwin remain anomalous.⁸⁴ Indeed, anti-Arminianism was little more than a cloaked fear of international Roman Catholicism.⁸⁵ Popular rhetoric against Arminianism would increasingly become laced with anti-popish sentiments. For instance, Hobbes wrote that Arminian beliefs, “acting as a stalking horse,” prepared the way for popery, and he was not alone in his suspicions.⁸⁶

The late-1620s also witnessed the great “Puritan” migration to the New World, when Puritans *en masse* left Britain for safe haven from persecution and freedom to worship, a movement that arose out of continuing tensions between Puritans and the Established Church. While there were numerous reasons for the exodus, both secular and religious, the main reason for “the godly” centered on religious themes, and the promise of establishing a new Christian commonwealth.⁸⁷

The 1630s were equally a time of growing frustration for Puritan and Parliament. In 1633, when the king introduced his “Book of Sports,” which

terms; and a proposed third way in which God is neither seen as the author of sin nor of condemnation; here Baro claims support from Melancthon, Hemmingius, and Snecanus. William den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius, 1559–1609* (Göttingen, 2010), pp. 319–20.

- 83 Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus*, pp. 3–4, 159–200. Dodds makes the astute observation that “prior to the rise of English Arminianism, [Andrew] Willet and other Puritan divines chose to defend predestination by addressing and refuting Erasmian readings of Romans” (147–8).
- 84 In a book published in 1628, *An Appeal to the Parliament, or Sion’s Plea against the Prelacy*, Alexander Leighton had made the point that “Arminianism was merely old Popery in new guise.” In 1629, William Prynne fumed “This infernal monster . . . is but an old condemned heresy, raised up from hell of late.” Cited in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 162; White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic*, p. 3.
- 85 Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 1–30, 35–41, 426–34; and Milton, “The Church of England, Rome, and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus,” in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–42*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Palo Alto, 1993), pp. 187–210; John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–89* (New York, 1999), pp. 168–9.
- 86 Nicholas D. Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall, and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity: A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), p. 93.
- 87 David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication Between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), pp. 74–106; Susan Hardman Moore, *Pilgrims: New World Settlers and the Call Home* (New Haven, 2007), pp. 16–34.

legalized “cultural relaxation” on the Sabbath after church services, the Puritans were furious. It was seen as a direct affront to God’s word, and an insult to “the godly.”⁸⁸ Stuart Puritanism continued to fashion its own identity within a theologically divided country, and advanced its own brand of pietism in contrast to what was seen as freer or more libertarian approaches to the Christian life.

While the causes for the English Revolution are too multifarious to discuss here, it is perhaps sufficient to say that there was a strong confluence of competing political, cultural, social, and religious ideals, which elicited war between king and Parliament.⁸⁹

2.2.5 *The English Revolution (1640–60)*

Perhaps the most important change politically was the change from rule by king to rule by Parliament; then, to the removal of the king by execution and the establishment of the Protectorate; and then to the fall of the Protectorate and the re-establishment of the monarchy, to religious persecution and then to religious toleration.⁹⁰ These major political crises had a direct affect on the religious culture of the period; the power play between king and Parliament, between Royalist and Roundhead, would not only cement the fate of the nation as a political power and entity, but the fate of English religion. That Puritanism was at the forefront of English political and religious crisis in the mid-seventeenth century is undisputed; the precise ways in which Puritanism fostered the Revolution, however, continue to be debated as well as Cromwell’s role in nurturing the more “radical” sects and millenarian fervor.⁹¹

88 The king’s edict allowed various “sports,” such as bear-baiting, bowling, bull-baiting, carding, coursing, loggats, and throwing at cocks. See Alistair Dougall, *The Devil’s Book: Charles I, the Book of Sports and Puritanism in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (Exeter, 2011).

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

90 Major William Rainsborough, an alleged Ranter and Leveller, had a “flag device” which depicted the bloody execution of the king, with the phrase “salus populi suprema lex.” See Dr. Williams’s Library MS 12.7, fo. 115, which is graphically depicted on the cover of Nicholas Tyacke’s *The English Revolution, c.1590–1720: Politics, Religion, and Communities* (Manchester, 2007).

91 As, for instance, in his proposed readmission of the Jews to England in 1656. See Christopher Hill, “Till the Conversion of the Jews,” in *Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650–1800*, ed. Richard H. Popkin (Leiden, 1988), pp. 30–1. The literature on Cromwell is enormous. See J. C. Davis, *Oliver Cromwell*

While a few historians continue to refer to a “Puritan Revolution,” most have discarded the phrase as a product of Whiggish historiography.⁹² Carla Pestana notes that in the two decades before 1661, Britain witnessed “civil wars, invasions, regicide, religious radicalism, experiments in non-monarchical forms of government, and, in the end, the restoration of the Stuart monarchy.”⁹³ The English Revolution, while successful in contributing to modern notions of religious toleration, was ill fated in that it was unable to sustain itself.⁹⁴ By the time Cromwell’s son, Richard, succeeded as Lord Protector in 1658, the realm was anxious for a restoration of the Stuart monarchy.⁹⁵

During the revolution, Parliament consisting chiefly of elite members of Puritan society, such as John Pym, Sir Francis Rous, William Prynne, and others, officially abolished episcopacy in January 1643, and ordered the meeting of an assembly of “the godly” to be held at Westminster Abby, to advise on a national church settlement. The king had refused an earlier measure for the assembly in 1642, because of the overwhelming “Puritan” bias within Long Parliament, which sought to discredit episcopacy.

The published 1643 parliamentary statute stated that there was “no blessing . . . more dear than the purity of religion,” and admonished the assembly to

(New York, 2001); Christopher Durston, *Cromwell’s Major-Generals: Godly Government During the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2001); John S. Morrill, ed., *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (New York, 1990); Christopher Hill, *God’s Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (New York, 1990); and William Lamont, “Pamphleteering, the Protestant Consensus and the English Revolution,” in *Freedom and the English Revolution: Essays in History and Literature* (Manchester, 1986), pp. 72–92; on Cromwell and the Jews, see David S. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England, 1485–1850* (New York, 1996), pp. 107–44; and Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603–55* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 158–89.

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

93 Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640–61* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004), p. 1.

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

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

a threefold revision of the English Church: ceremonial and liturgical reform, proposals for a new church government, and vindication of its doctrine from misconstructions.⁹⁶ Parliament's goal was to promote a "further and more perfect reformation" of the English Church based chiefly on God's word, and to solidify its *sensus unitatis* with the Scottish and Reformed churches abroad. Thus, members were chosen and invited from the "godly and learned divines" then ministering in England and New England, as well as Members of Parliament, and invites were given to potential delegates in other parts of the kingdom, in what could be seen as a distinctively English way of solidifying a British Reformed and Puritan establishment and divinity. The "consensus" of "the godly" at Westminster was within the trajectories of earlier Reformed and Puritan exigencies operating within Tudor and Elizabethan Puritanism, as, for instance, in its anticlericalism, but which came into its own confessional status in the documents produced at Westminster.⁹⁷

In recent years, much has been written about the religion of the English Revolution, its diversity, and fostering of various sects and heresies.⁹⁸ Perhaps the greatest threat to "orthodox" Puritanism during the 1640–50s was that of Socinianism.⁹⁹ While Socinian writing proved a serious threat to orthodoxy, it was not the only challenge to Trinitarian faith in these years; there were many "homegrown" heterodoxies: John Everard, Roger Brearley, and Peter Shaw wanted to "minimize the significance of the historical Christ," and "emphasize that all believers could be human and divine in the way that Christ had been";¹⁰⁰

96 Chad van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–52*, 5 vols. (New York, 2012), 1:7–9.

97 While not all members of the assembly could be identified as "Puritan," such as the royalist Daniel Featley, the majority could be, and the inclusion of limited "non-Puritans" may have been politically motivated to give the assembly "credibility and some sense of fairness." Van Dixhoorn, *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, 1:3.

98 See Nicholas McDowell, *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630–60* (New York, 2003); Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000); and J. F. McGregor and B. Reay, eds., *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (New York, 1984).

99 See Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 1–12, 39–62, 88–118, 177–204; Martin Mulso and Jan Rohls, eds., *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (Leiden, 2005). See also, more generally, R. C. Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution* (Manchester, 1998), pp. 184–202; and Michael Hunter, *Robert Boyle, 1627–91: Scrupulosity and Science* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 51–7.

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

John Eaton, author of *Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (1646) taught that Christ's true followers were without sin, or that God saw no sin in his elect; and William Erbery denied the divinity of Christ altogether.¹⁰¹ As John Coffey points out, "the godly were often at odds with each other in matters theological and such doctrinal consensus as existed did not come easily."¹⁰²

The English Revolution brought all the internal tensions within Puritanism to the fore.¹⁰³ The printing presses were overwhelmed with "disruptive" tracts and treatises, to the extent that Cressy called it, "the press overpressed."¹⁰⁴ Indeed, in 1646, John Benbrigge complained that the reformation of the sectaries was but nothing more than "a greater *Deformation*," that would burst open the gates to their heresies and errors.¹⁰⁵ The Puritan clergyman Stephen Marshall, in his sermon before the Long Parliament, warned MP's that "future chroniclers" would remember their behavior, and so they should act that their time would be remembered for its "piety and reformation."¹⁰⁶

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

Richard Cromwell's failed attempt to succeed his father as Lord Protector created a complex political crisis that led to the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660. While Charles II promised "a liberty to tender consciences,"

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

102 John Coffey, "A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution," in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), p. 108; Christopher Hill, "Freethinking and Libertinism: The Legacy of the English Revolution," in *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660–1750*, ed. Roger D. Lund (Cambridge, Eng., 1995), p. 56.

103 On the perception of "orthodoxy" in the English Church, see Peter Lake and Michael Questier, "Introduction," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. ix–xx.

104 Cressy, *England on Edge*, pp. 281–309.

105 John Benbrigge, *Gods Fury, Englands Fire. Or A Plain Discovery of Those Spiritual Incendaries, which Have Set Church and State on Fire* (London, 1646), sig. A2. Quoted in Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton*, p. 1. Kristen Poole states that, "Benbrigge was far from alone in his assertion that religious radicalism had perverted the English Reformation."

106 Stephen Marshall, *A Sermon Preached to the Honorable House of Commons*, 26 January 1648 (London, 1647/8), pp. 15–6. Cited in D. R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000), p. 23.

Anglican royalists pressured the king to restore religious conformity through a series of acts known as the Clarendon Code. Thus began a period of dissent that resulted in the persecution and imprisonment of many Puritan pastors, including John Bunyan and Richard Baxter.¹⁰⁷ The Act of Uniformity (1662) required Puritan ministers to renounce their ordinations and subscription to the Solemn League and Covenant, and be re-ordained in what appears to have been a political repudiation of their ministerial credentials. Nearly 2,000 ministers refused to comply with these stipulations and were ejected from their pulpits on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1662.¹⁰⁸ Two more acts of conformity were issued: The Conventicle Act (1664), which banned nonconformists from preaching in the fields or conducting services in homes; and the Five Mile Act (1665), which prohibited ejected ministers from coming within five miles of their former parishes or any city or town.¹⁰⁹ Though oppressed, many Puritans produced some of the more memorable pieces of devotional literature during this period, such as Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678–9). When William and Mary ascended to the English throne in 1689, an Act of Toleration was passed that granted freedom for all dissenters. It was the “first statutory grant of toleration in English history,” and “inaugurated a decisive change in the intellectual and cultural life of English-speaking peoples.”¹¹⁰ From here, English dissent moved in many directions and cannot be contained in an “-ism.”¹¹¹

In summary, when the Reformation made its way to England, it “turned the world upside down.” But, as Tyacke, Collinson, and other have demonstrated,

-
- 107 Blair Worden, *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (New York, 2012), p. 324; Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton, 1986), p. 22.
- 108 See David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic, and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2008); Barrie White, “John Bunyan and the Context of Persecution, 1660–88,” in *John Bunyan and His England, 1628–88*, ed. Anne Laurence, W. R. Owens, and Stuart Sim (London, 1990), pp. 51–62.
- 109 Newton E. Key, “Clarendon Code,” in *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603–89*, ed. Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison (Westport, 1996), pp. 98–9.
- 110 Andrew R. Murphy, *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (University Park, 2001), p. 158; Dale Hoak, “The Anglo-Dutch Revolution of 1688–89” in *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution, 1688–89*, ed. Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold (Palo Alto, 1996), p. 11.
- 111 Erik Routley, *English Religious Dissent* (Cambridge, Eng., 1960), pp. 133–4. See also James E. Bradley, *Religion, Revolution, and English Radicals: Non-conformity in Eighteenth-Century Politics and Society* (Cambridge, Eng., 1990).

the process of English Protestantization was a “Long Reformation” in that it did not occur over night, but through many decades of progress, regress, and solidification.¹¹² Notable for the purposes of our study is the Calvinist networking that began during the English Reformation, and grew over the course of its existence. This international gathering of Calvinist brethren forged a “canon” of standard works that contributed to the rise and ethos of English Puritanism. Catholic persecutions in the time of Mary Tudor, as depicted in Foxe, left an indelible mark on English national, social, and religious identity. Conflicts between the king and his vision for England, and the Puritans and their Reformation, erupted into a protracted conflict in the English Revolution, and, ultimately, in the king’s execution and rule of “godly” government.¹¹³ The Protectorate, which ushered in a new time of toleration for dissenting voices, failed to gain widespread support in England and Wales, and eventually led to the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660.

While the English Puritanism of the seventeenth century had a robust and varied existence, it is possible to discern three or four “strains” within it, which characterized to varying degrees the lives of Downname, Rous, and Crisp. We will now consider these strains within Stuart Puritanism, and though they often overlap, they nonetheless reflect distinct pastoral, edificational, and doctrinal tendencies inherent within Puritanism since the sixteenth century, and evince diversity within the movement.¹¹⁴

2.3 Theological Strains within Stuart Puritanism

Historians have often used the term “mainstream” to denote those Puritans who were Reformed orthodox and “precisianist” as distinct from those who were not.¹¹⁵ Mainstream Puritanism, however, was as varied and complex as

112 Patrick Collinson, “Comment on Eamon Duffy’s Neale Lecture and the Colloquium,” in *England’s Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (New York, 1998), p. 71.

113 John Morrill, “A Liberation Theology? Aspects of Puritanism in the English Revolution,” in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Newark, 2003), pp. 44–5.

114 On diversity within Puritanism, see Richard A. Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 11–30.

115 See, for instance, Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 352, where Como distinguishes between “antinomians” and precisianist “mainstream” puritans. In contrast, Bozeman does not use the term “mainstream” Puritan, but refers to a “precisianist strain” within Puritanism. Both historians present contrasting views of the relationship between precisianists and

Reformed orthodoxy, though there is some question as to the status of “Puritan” converts to Arminianism. This relates, of course, to an ongoing debate whether Arminius and Arminianism should be classified as “Reformed,” or “anti-Reformed,” and to what degree confessional boundaries should be considered when classifying thinkers.¹¹⁶

Mainstream Puritanism was an eclectic range of ideas within broad consensus on most confessional topics. It generally consisted of overlapping emphases, and though there were various nuances within the “mainstream,” the four prominent strains can be identified as precisianist, mystical, antinomian, and neonomian.¹¹⁷ Whatever variances there were, there was a general *sensus*

antinomians; Bozeman sees spiritual duty and moral discipline as inseparable from the Puritan ethos, and antinomians thus turning that world upside down. Como conceives of Puritanism as a “fractured landscape” susceptible to fragmentation. Both historians are nuanced in their approach, and both are correct: antinomians upset the pietist status quo, but they also continued to participate in godly social networks, shared key beliefs, and fought for legitimacy. The question is not whether there was an “antinomian strain” in Puritanism, but to what extent did it ebb and flow, and, along with the mystical strain, how often it, at times, pushed past confessional mores and the Puritan pale. See Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill, 2004), pp. 63–182; Bozeman, “The Glory of the ‘Third Time’: John Eaton as Contra-Puritan,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996), 638–54, there 643, 646.

Christopher Hill equates “mainstream” Puritanism with William Perkins, John Preston, Thomas Taylor, William Gouge, Thomas Goodwin, Richard Baxter, and Richard Sibbes. Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (Madison, 1980), p. 62; and Hill, *Society and Puritanism*, p. 15. Numerous historians employ the term without qualifying or defining it. See, for instance, David Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603–60* (New York, 1987), p. 99; and David Parnham, *Sir Henry Vane, Theologian: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Religious and Political Discourse* (Madison, 1997), p. 74.

- 116 See Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603–09* (Leiden, 2007), pp. 242–4. For Arminius’s discussion of doctrines characteristic of Reformed theology, see William den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius, 1559–1609* (Göttingen, 2010), pp. 197–210; Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacobus Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic-Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids, 1991); and Aza Goudriaan, “Justification by Faith and the Early Arminian Controversy,” in *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt*, ed. Maartin Wisse, et al. (Leiden, 2010), pp. 155–78.
- 117 Most of these strains or tendencies can be seen in Edward Fisher’s *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (London, 1645), which consists of a dialogue between evangelista, nomista, antinomista, and neophytus. While they doubtless overlapped to varying degrees, the

unitatis and experience that bound Puritans together.¹¹⁸ Thus, it is possible to see both an intellectual and pietistic continuity in Puritans of diverse persuasions, even as they fought over the legitimacy of their views. By defining mainstream Puritanism more broadly to consist of various strains rather than confine it to precisianism allows for a deeper understanding of elasticity and variance within confessionalism. It also allow for more certainty in applying the term “Puritan” to such uncontested Puritans as John Owen, in that it affirms the affinity between orthodox Reformed structures and the mainstream of Puritan thought, while, at the same time, conceding to multiple strains within Puritanism, which had both the potential to and at times did cross confessional bounds.¹¹⁹

Though Puritanism is more complex than the four streams, this study will only examine the first three: precisianism, which is embodied in the earlier theologies of Richard Greenham, Richard Rogers, and William Perkins, and which was carried into the seventeenth century by William Ames, John Downame, Isaac Ambrose, Thomas Taylor, William Gouge, and others; mysticism, which variegated in degree and complexity, with such types as the word-centered mysticism of Richard Sibbes, or the more spirit-centered mysticism of Francis Rous, John Saltmarsh, and Peter Sterry; antinomism, which intensified the tensions between law and gospel within precisianism, as seen in the

strains can be identified as emphases toward grace or law, with the mystical strain usually being tied to the former.

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

119 For instance, Trueman does not deny that Owen was a “Puritan” theologian, but he finds the term unhelpful given the broad sweep of “Puritan” in current literature. However, identifying Owen as a precisianist alleviates this concern since it identifies both elements of experimental piety and Reformed orthodoxy. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, pp. 5–12.

pastoral theology of Tobias Crisp and John Cotton, but which also spawned the “familist heresy” of John Eaton;¹²⁰ and neonomism, Baxter’s restatement and re-emphasis on the moral law, which arose in response to alleged antinomism and theologically high Calvinism during the English Revolution.¹²¹

While the precisianists had the majority opinion within Puritanism, and though historians have long equated it with the “mainstream,” and confessionally orthodox, it is better to see precisianism as a variant within Puritanism, rather than to identify it exclusively as such. Indeed, that such thinkers as Crisp and Cotton were ultimately vindicated of heterodoxy by godly consensus, and Eaton vilified, indicates that parallel strains within Puritanism had both orthodox and unorthodox expressions, and should not be excluded from the Puritan pale, except, perhaps, in those cases where its members self-consciously seceded from it.¹²²

We will now turn to an overview of the four strains, and conclude the chapter.

2.3.1 *Precisianist Strain*

The core beliefs of precisianism, the central strand within Puritanism, and from which the others grew, centered on six major themes: (1) God and man, (2) predestination, (3) covenant theology, (4) practical divinity, (5) providence and the devil, and (6) biblical exegesis.¹²³ Most historians recognize at least two

120 John McWilliams, *New England's Crises and Cultural Memory: Literature, Politics, History, Religion, 1620–1860* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), p. 76. Other noted antinomians were John Traske, Roger Brearley, Robert Towne, John Everard, William Dell, Henry Denne, Paul Hobson, Walter Cradock, and John Saltmarsh.

121 For discussion of Baxter’s theology and reactions to it, see Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter’s Doctrine of Justification in its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer, 1993); and Tim Cooper, *Fear Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot, 2011).

122 Gregory Allen Selmon, “John Cotton: The Antinomian Calvinist” (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 2008), pp. 212–3. Given the sheer number of precisianists, it is not surprising that they wrote most of the divinity books within the movement. Those “mainstream” Puritans who diverged from precisianism, either in the degree of mysticism, or in challenging its basic assumptions on law and gospel, did not pitch entirely different theologies, but competing interpretations and emphases. For Cotton’s life and ideas, see Larzer Ziff, *Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience* (Princeton, 1962). Ziff stresses the need to understand Cotton in his historical context since Cotton was “medieval.”

123 The word “precisianism” to denote Puritanism dates to the mid-sixteenth century as a term of derision. Soon after its introduction, however, it was often employed by Puritans to describe their way of life. One person was said to have commented to Richard Rogers

“founders” of precisianism: Richard Greenham, and the “father of European pietism,” William Perkins.¹²⁴ Both Greenham and Perkins endorsed what can be called Reformed “experiential predestinarianism,”¹²⁵ which emphasized living an exemplary life, intense self-examination, and one’s ability to know their standing before God.¹²⁶ Predestinarians stood in the line of Reformed trajectories, were generally in agreement on its categories, and should not be seen as a departure from the earlier Reformed tradition.¹²⁷

First, the Puritans embraced classical Christian theism that conceded to the limits of human understanding in comprehending God.¹²⁸ In this sense, the precisianists mirrored the metaphysical thought of Thomas Aquinas, who, via the patristics, upheld the belief that God was both grasped in the sense that one could know him, love him, and be loved by him in the Incarnation, but that it was impossible, given the limits of human finitude and reason, to comprehend him in his essence. Precisianists also believed in the Augustinian doctrine of Original Sin and, in keeping with the Reformation, the inability of the human will to turn toward God. Though more radical sects would push the bounds with what the will was able to do, there was an early consensus that God’s grace would have to empower the human will to choose good.

-
- (1550–1618), “I like you and your company very well, but you are so precise.” Rogers replied, “O Sir, I serve a precise God.” Quoted in Bendall, *A History of Emmanuel College*, p. 186.
- 124 Heiko A. Oberman argues that “in the larger European perspective William Perkins . . . may well hold the best claim to the title ‘Father of Pietism.’” Heiko A. Oberman, preface to Johann Arndt, *True Christianity*, trans. Peter Erb (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1979), p. xiii, n. 6. See also August Lang, *Puritanismus und Pietismus. Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung von M. Butzer bis zum Methodismus* (Neukirchen, 1941), pp. 101–31.
- 125 Kendall conceived of “experimental predestinarianism” as distinct from “creedal predestinarianism.” R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York, 1979), pp. 8, 80. While Lake and Hughes endorse the distinction, Tyacke and Schaefer reject it. See Peter Lake, “Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635,” *P&P* 114 (1987), 39, 58; Sean F. Hughes, “The Problem of ‘Calvinism’: English Theologies of Predestination, c.1580–1630,” in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, ed. Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 235, 247; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. ix; Schaefer, “The Spiritual Brotherhood,” p. 247.
- 126 Francis J. Bremer, *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York, 2009), pp. 34–47, 49–54; Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison, eds., *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603–89* (Westport, 1996), p. 483; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, pp. 1–13.
- 127 See Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2003), pp. 63–104; and Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c.1590–1640* (Aldershot, 2014), ch. 1.
- 128 Peter J. Thuesen, *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (New York, 2009), pp. 34–7.

Second, following Beza, Perkins developed a strong double-predestinarian doctrine that emphasized God's absolute sovereignty in the *ordo salutis*: election, justification, conversion, sanctification, and the final glorification of sinners. Though believers cooperated with grace in sanctification, God was the efficient cause of all.¹²⁹ Greenham likewise emphasized the supremacy of grace in predestination and the Christian life, though Perkins's influence over later English Puritanism seems to have surpassed that of his contemporary, giving Perkins the reputation of being the most important Elizabethan writer of technical and practical theology.¹³⁰ Perkins is credited as the premier Elizabethan scholastic theologian, an epithet Greenham seems to have avoided;¹³¹ remarkably, of the 210 books printed in Cambridge between 1590 and 1618, more than fifty were by Perkins.¹³²

Third, both Greenham and Perkins developed a strong experimental theology, which emphasized the covenant and covenantal duties. Perkins spoke of a

129 William Perkins, *A Golden Chaine; or, The Description of Theologie Containing the Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, According to Gods Word: A View of the Order Whereof, Is to Be Seene in the Table Annexed* (London, 1591), originally published in Latin as *Armillæ Aurea* (1590). On Perkins's table and its relationship to Beza's, see Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (1986; repr., Grand Rapids, 2008); Muller, "Perkins' *A Golden Chaine*: Predestinarian System or Schematized *Ordo Salutis*?", *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 9 (1978), 68–81; and Muller, "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula Praedestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle, 1999), pp. 33–61. Ellis states that Maccovius approved of Perkins's "pithy encapsulation" in his debates with Arminius, thus reaffirming the inter-continental dialogue of the time. Brannon Ellis, *Calvin, Classical Trinitarianism, and the Aseity of the Son* (New York, 2012), p. 190.

130 Thuesen, *Predestination*, p. 34; Primus, *Richard Greenham*, pp. 126–7. On the practical and technical aspects of Perkins's work, see Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, pp. 55–61. Regarding Perkins's influence, Haller has claimed that no author was found more often on the shelves of later generations of Puritans. William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism; or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570–1643* (1938; repr., New York, 1957), p. 65. Though sometimes technical, Greenham's major contribution was in pastoral theology. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, p. 126; Kenneth L. Parker and Eric J. Carlson, eds., *Practical Divinity: The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 116–7.

131 Muller, *After Calvin*, pp. 74–5. Compare Paul R. Schaefer, "Protestant 'Scholasticism' at Elizabethan Cambridge: William Perkins and a Reformed Theology of the Heart," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle, 1999), pp. 147–64, with Primus, *Richard Greenham*, pp. 88–9.

132 Michael H. Black, *Cambridge University Press, 1584–1984* (Cambridge, Eng., 1984), p. 55.

“Covenant of Works,” and a “Covenant of Grace” to make sense of the relationship between God and humanity.¹³³ Though it would not mature until the mid-seventeenth century, historians have credited Perkins with the rise of federal theology because he emphasized Adam’s legal role as head of all humanity, and Christ’s sacrificial role in serving as the “second Adam.”¹³⁴ Late-Elizabethan federal theology had organic ties to Calvin, Beza, and Bullinger, even though these magisterial reformers did not formally develop such a theology. John Morgan has stated that English Puritan covenant theology, and “its emphasis on the pastoral side . . . were . . . not innovations after 1590, but rather continuing adjustments to the requirements of a modified context”; as times changed, so too did mainstream theological expressions and pastoral requirements; they were, however, continuous with the earlier, even though there were noted departures.¹³⁵

Fourth, Puritanism’s emphasis on practical divinity and the reform of “morals and manners” has been well noted.¹³⁶ It was common to see such manuals

133 Primus states that Greenham would not be a good example to prove Miller’s thesis that Puritans were obsessed with the “covenant” because Greenham scarcely discusses it at all. Instead, Greenham’s primary contributions centered on building the worldview of the Puritan Reformation, which emphasized doctrine, experience, and godly conduct. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, p. 126.

From a philological perspective, there is little difference between “covenant theology” and “federal theology.” Indeed, as Glenn A. Moots point out, “The root of the word ‘federal’ comes from the Latin *foedus*, which was often translated from the Hebrew *berith* or Greek *diatheke* (testament).” He further suggests that a more nuanced understanding would “use the term ‘federal theology’ to refer to the later theological innovation of the ‘covenant of works,’ for federal theology argues that there were two covenants in Scripture.” Thus, in this schema, there is a “Covenant of Works,” which refers to the pre-lapsarian covenant made with Adam in the Garden of Eden, and a “Covenant of Grace,” in which Jesus Christ, the “second Adam,” agrees to perfectly keep the covenant of works in Adam’s stead, and incurs its penalty in his place. Moots, *Politics Reformed: The Anglo-American Legacy of Covenant Theology* (Columbia, 2010), p. 178, n. 66.

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

135 John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986), p. 20.

136 See, for instance, Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, “Practical Divinity and Spirituality,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008); and Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety*, pp. 23–53.

issue from press, and there seems to have been a distinct culture of reading.¹³⁷ In fact, the three most popular treatises, Arthur Dent's *A Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* (1601), Lewis Bayly's *The Practice of Pietie* (1613), and Henry Scudder's *The Christian's Daily Walke* (1627), were commonly read within godly households well into the eighteenth century.¹³⁸

Fifth, what has been less commonly observed is how this applied theology was enveloped within a strong millenarian rubric that emphasized God's absolute providence in ordering all events to the final consummation; the true church was constantly waged in a cosmic battle against the devil, and the troublers of Zion.¹³⁹

Sixth, while it is less common among historians to see a distinct exegetical tradition within Puritanism, nonetheless the historical evidence warrants investigation of what Perkins called "the *Opening* of the words and sentences of the Scripture."¹⁴⁰ This possible avenue is suggested in the distinct way in which the Bible was interpreted in the Puritan parish.

2.3.2 *Mystical Strain*

While much has been written about the mystical element in Protestant spirituality,¹⁴¹ little overall attention has been given to mysticism within

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

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

139 For Puritan millenarian thought, see Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550–1682*, 2nd ed. (London, 2008); Jeffrey K. Jue, "Puritan Millenarianism in Old and New England," in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 259–76; Jue, *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (New York, 2006); Howard Hotson, *Paradise Postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism* (Dordrecht, 2000); Avihu Zakai, *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), pp. 12–55; and Peter Toon, ed., *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600–60* (London, 1970); on the devil in English religious culture, see Nathan Johnstone, *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 1–26, 107–41.

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

141 See, for instance, Edward Howells, "Early Modern Reformations," in *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Mysticism*, ed. Amy Hollywood and Patricia Z. Beckman (Cambridge, Eng., 2012), pp. 114–36.

English Puritanism.¹⁴² While “mysticism” is a relatively loose term, and historians are divided as to its precise meaning, it is possible to identify the main tenet of mysticism within Puritanism as *unio mystica* with Christ. This married union consists of two aspects: actual mystical union (*unio Christi*), and the saint’s ongoing communion with God (*communio Deo*), which leads to final beatific *visio* and *raptus*. Indeed, mystical Puritans often wrote of marriage with Christ in this life as betrothal, in which its joys and rapture were only partially conferred; it is only at one’s death that the promised marriage is consummated, and one gets the beatific vision.¹⁴³ Those of the mystical bent have also been called “affectionate” theologians because of their emphasis on an affective piety that encompass one’s feeling and attitudes.¹⁴⁴ Richard Sibbes, Isaac Ambrose, and Samuel Rutherford, have all been described as “affectionate,” but doubtless reflect the mystical strain within Puritanism.¹⁴⁵ However, some religious writers forayed into deeper mystical waters, as did Vavasor Powell, Walter Cradock, and Morgan Llwyd, and others spawned

142 Four noted exceptions are G. F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, 2nd ed. (1947; repr., Chicago, 1992), Nuttall, *The Puritan Spirit: Essays and Addresses* (London, 1967); Gordon S. Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety* (London, 1957); and Tom Schwanda, *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative-Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene, 2012). See also J. C. Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” *Church History* 56 (1987), 39–58.

143 See Francis Rous, *The Mystical Marriage* (1635). For Rous’s view, see also Elizabeth Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 2011), pp. 53–4; and Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 47–50.

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

145 Both Dever and Coffey hesitate to apply “mystical” to Sibbes and Rutherford. However, Schwanda finds resolution in “contemplative-mystical.” See Schwanda, *Soul Recreation*, pp. 15–7. While Dever and Coffey’s concerns have some warrant, the issue is not whether Sibbes, Rutherford, Ambrose, or others were mystical (they undoubtedly were), but how far and to what extent their mysticism manifested itself. All Puritan mystics stood in the line of earlier medieval mysticism, and adopted many of its emphases and patterns, but subjected it to their further reformation and theological milieu. See Arie de Reuver, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation* (Grand Rapids, 2007), pp. 15–26; Simon Chan, “The Puritan Meditative Tradition, 1599–1691: A Study in Ascetical Piety” (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 1986); and Schwanda, *Soul Recreation*, pp. 72–4.

various heresies and heterodoxies, such as Behmenism, all the while on the fringes of the Puritan continuum.¹⁴⁶

The study of mysticism is further complicated in that medieval mysticism and its later manifestations were more eclectic and expansive than one might expect; thus, as Denys Turner has persuasively shown, there is more than one mystical tradition within Western Christianity, which contained both apophatic and cataphatic strains, but which are difficult to trace because of anachronism and modern reading into medieval texts.¹⁴⁷ That said, one of the major characteristics of English mysticism was its ability to cross social barriers and, as with Puritanism, influence all classes, from the illiterate to the intelligentsia, with the more noted English mystics being George Herbert, John Everard, Sir Henry Vane, Rous, Giles Randall, George Fox, Peter Sterry, and Jane Leade.¹⁴⁸

While emphasizing mystical union with Christ, mystics disagreed on how far one could experience the divine in this life; one thing they agreed on was Christ's intrinsic beauty and power to transform believers into his own likeness.¹⁴⁹ Thus, while most mystics pushed for a further spiritual reformation, they disagreed about the way in which inner faith should take external form. The rise of the Quakers and of George Fox in particular suggests the vying spiritualities present in the seventeenth century; indeed, by the time Fox came to prominence, there was "such an international confluence of mystical ideas that it was possible for a writer such as John Everard to translate and make accessible the ideas of a whole range of Christian mystics, ranging from Christian appropriations of Plato to Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite to Tauler to Hans Denk."¹⁵⁰ By the latter half of the seventeenth century, religious enthusiasm was both popular and feared; as often as it was attacked, it was embraced.¹⁵¹

146 See B. J. Gibbons, *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought: Behmenism and Its Development in England* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), pp. 103–19; Dewey D. Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660–1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (New York, 2011), pp. 79–81.

147 Denys Turner, *The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), pp. 7–8, 19–22.

148 While Turner cautions against seeing too much continuity between medieval and modern notions of mysticism, seventeenth century mystics had direct ties to medieval mysticism, which is seen their reading and imitation of medieval and continental mystical sources. Turner, *The Darkness of God*, p. 7.

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

150 Linda Woodhead, *An Introduction to Christianity* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 225–6.

151 For the theological critique of enthusiasm from the Reformation to the mid-seventeenth century, see Michael Heyd, *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the*

What of Puritan mysticism? Within the literature, there has been some contention over the term, and a general hesitation to tie the two concepts together.¹⁵² However, as Nuttall, Wallace, and Schwanda have persuasively shown, not only was it possible to be a “Calvinist mystic,” but “Puritan” mysticism can be seen as a variant within Puritan spirituality, in that it “brought to fruition the mystical potential of many elements in that spirituality.” Indeed, there were many mystics within the Puritan Reformation who either advanced their own brand of mysticism, or were inspired by the “Puritan impulse,” especially in their focus on the indwelling power of the Holy Spirit, and the various benefits and experiences it bestowed.¹⁵³ Though there were differences between mysticism within the Puritan tradition and the Catholic, both forms sought for “an immediate, intimate union with God.”¹⁵⁴

2.3.3 *Antinomian Strain*

While English antinomism had affinities to the earlier controversies on the continent,¹⁵⁵ it became its own entity with its own patterns and directions.¹⁵⁶ “Antinomism,” literally means “against the law” (*anti-nóμος*), and can be defined within the Christian context as “teaching that the moral law is

Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries (Leiden, 1995), pp. 11–43. Of course, religious enthusiasm had much more than theological criticism from the mainstream; virulent attacks were often political in nature and laced with suspicions of anarchy.

152 Gordon Wakefield has called the term “ethereal and imprecise,” but sees warrant for the term given Puritan proclivity toward the Song of Songs and the art of meditation. Wakefield, “The Puritans,” in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, SJ (New York, 1986), p. 443. See also Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety*, pp. 165–7.

153 Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, pp. 1–19; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, pp. 74–5; Schwanda, *Soul Recreation*, pp. 11–20.

154 Ariel Hessayon, “Gold Tried in the Fire.” *The Prophet Theaurau/John Tany and the English Revolution* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 91.

155 According to Theodor Mahlmann, Luther minted the German noun “Antinomer” in 1537 to describe John Agricola’s rejection of the law. Both “antinomism” and “antinomianism” have English precedent: in 1643, John Milton, in his *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, referred to the “fanatick dreams” of “antinomianism”; and in 1658, Thomas Manton wrote that “antinomism is but sin licensed and privileged.” Within seventeenth-century English literature, antinomians were called “Antinomists” and “Libertines.” Mahlmann, “Antinomism,” *Religion Past and Present*, Vol. 1 (2006); OED, s.v.; David Como, “Antinomianism,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara, 2006), pp. 305–7.

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

not relevant to the believer's life [since] the believer is under grace and not law; she is not bound by the law as a rule of life," instead having the inner witness of the Spirit guiding her actions.¹⁵⁷ The doctrine teaches that living in accordance with the law is unnecessary for New Testament believers since justification not only declares but actually makes the sinner perfectly righteous, which contests need for the third use of the law as a moral compass to teach piety, which the Reformed had borrowed from Melanchthon's 1535/6 *Loci communes*.¹⁵⁸ Moreover, it argued that assurance should be gained by reflection upon one's justification, rather than on the ebb and flow of the marks of sanctification.¹⁵⁹ Reformed theology had sought to balance Christian liberty with responsibility for moral conduct by emphasizing both liberty and responsibility; in fact, much of Calvin's rhetoric when writing on the law was constructed to avoid the extremes of the Libertines.¹⁶⁰ Lutheran and Reformed responses to antinomism usually centered on claims that the doctrine led to immorality, even though there is little historical evidence that antinomism in England did, in fact, cause godless living.¹⁶¹

English antinomism arose in the wake of perceived abuses within precisianism, in its seeming inability to provide adequate grounds for assurance, and

-
- 157 Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, p. 79, n. 1. See also Ernest F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law: A Study in Puritan Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1976), pp. 17–45.
- 158 John Eaton, *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (London, 1642), pp. 22–3. See Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, pp. 22–5, 195–7; John Witte, Jr., *The Reformation of Rights: Law, Religion, and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 59–62; Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2000), p. 129. The earlier German "Antinomian Controversies" involved disputes between John Agricola and "orthodox" Lutherans in the first controversy, and between the Philippists and the Gnesio-Lutherans in the second. Ernest Koch, "Antinomian Controversy." *Religion Past and Present*, Vol. 1 (2006); Timothy J. Wengert, "Antinomianism," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand, 4 vols. (New York, 1996), 1:51–3.
- 159 Louise A. Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630–92* (New York, 2001), p. 30; cf. the attitude of other Puritans who believed that "while the state of assurance was considered normative, for New England Christians, it was by no means normal." Richard Lovelace, *The American Pietism of Cotton Mather: Origins of American Evangelicalism* (Washington, D.C., 1979), p. 95.
- 160 Witte, *The Reformation of Rights*, pp. 4–6, 43, 62.
- 161 Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, pp. 24–5. For Lutheran antinomism, see Klaus Ganzer and Brunto Steimer, eds., *Dictionary of the Reformation* (New York, 2002), pp. 10–2; Timothy J. Wengert, *Law and Gospel: Philip Melanchthon's Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben Over Poenitentia* (Grand Rapids, 1997); and Mark U. Edwards, *Luther and the False Brethren* (Palo Alto, 1975), pp. 156–79.

critiqued what was seen as a reintroduction of legalism into English religion.¹⁶² In response, the precisianists reduced antinomian views to implications for the moral life, and alleged that antinomism threatened the moral and social order by providing intellectual justification for impiety. Indeed, contemporary heresiographies focused on the moral implications of the doctrine, as seen in Ephraim Pagitt's *Heresiography* (1645), and Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena* (1646).¹⁶³ Though their complaint proved dubious in that none of the English antinomians actually lived immoral lives,¹⁶⁴ the common caricature of the antinomian was that of an anarchist who with chisel and hammer broke the Ten Commandments in an act of social, moral, and religious defiance. Thus, the precisianist's main critique lay on theoretical grounds, and not on any actual observation of illicit behavior.¹⁶⁵ Further, conflict with antinomism was as often a battle of the press as it was of the pulpit, and few precisianists were willing to concede to antinomian contentions that their doctrines could be seen within the standard or orthodox divines.¹⁶⁶

162 Indeed, antinomian criticisms of precisianism centered on the claim that the precisianists were merely reintroducing salvation by works into English theology.

163 See Thomas Edwards, *The First and Second Part of Gangraena: Or, A Catalogue and Discovery of Many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of This Time, Vented and Acted in England in These Four Last Years* (London, 1646); and Ephraim Pagitt, *Heresiography: Or, A Description of the Heretickes and Sectaries of These Latter Times* (London, 1645), pp. 88–9. See also Anthony Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis; Or a Vindication of the Moral Law and the Covenants* (London, 1646); and Thomas Gataker, *Antinomianism Discovered and Confuted* (London, 1652).

164 Crisp, for instance, was renowned for his godliness as were antinomians living in London. See Thomas Beverley, *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp's Sermons* (London, 1690); Hananiel Philalethes, *Christ Exalted and Dr. Crisp Vindicated in Several Points called Antinomian* (London, 1698), sig. Alv; John Gill, *Truth Defended in Sermons and Tracts, by the late Reverend and Learned John Gill, D.D.*, 3 vols. (London, 1778), 3:191; and Robert Traill, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine concerning Justification, and of its Preachers and Professors, from the Unjust Charge of Antinomianism* (London, 1692), pp. 3–4.

165 For possible precisianist misrepresentations of the antinomian position, see J. Wayne Baker, "Sola fide, Sola Gratia: The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985), 115–33; Tim Cooper, "The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the 'Radical' from Mid-Seventeenth Century English Religion," *The Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000), 247–62; and, more generally, Ann Hughes, "Print, Persecution, and Polemic: Thomas Edwards' *Gangraena* (1646) and Civil War Sectarianism," in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700*, ed. Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 255–74.

166 See Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist*, sig. A4. However, Saltmarsh was apt to argue that everything he said could be seen in the writings of the orthodox, including Preston, Perkins, Sibbes, Calvin, Augustine, Goodwin, Bolton, Rogers, and Palmer. See

Curt Daniel has suggested that Reformed antinomism first arose “in Geneva with the tensions between those who agreed with John Calvin . . . and those who agreed with the Anabaptist radicals who are sometimes referred to as the Libertines of Geneva”; only when the Libertines were either expelled or executed was there a resolution to this crisis.¹⁶⁷ The next Reformed rupture was between precisianists and antinomians in the Massachusetts Bay Colony of the 1630s, when Anne Hutchinson challenged the wisdom of the New England elders on the role of the Spirit in the life of the justified.¹⁶⁸ The third and final controversy broke out during the English Revolution, when the “antinomian underground” emerged from the shadows to disrupt precisianist notions of piety.¹⁶⁹

Historians sometimes refer to a first and second wave of English antinomism, which can be marked as pre- and post-civil war antinomism, the former consisting of an underground network of pastors and unlicensed printers, and

John Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace; Or, The Flowings of Christs Blood Freely to Sinners* (London, 1646), pp. 202–16.

- 167 Curt Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” in *The Life and Thought of John Gill, 1697–1771: A Tercentennial Appreciation*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin (Leiden, 1997), p. 171; Selderhuis, *The Calvin Handbook*, pp. 67–8. Van den Belt clarifies that, for Calvin, there is a distinction between the Anabaptists, who generally acknowledged the Bible’s authority, and the “Spiritual Libertines,” who did not. Thus, while the two are often equated in current literature, there is need for finer distinction. Henk van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden, 2008), pp. 29–30.
- 168 Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” p. 171. Stephen Strehle calls it, “The most important controversy concerning antinomianism and the doctrine of assurance . . .” Strehle, *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounter Between the Middle Ages and the Reformation* (Leiden, 1995), p. 47. For discussion of this second controversy, see David D. Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636–38: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. (Durham, 1999), pp. 3–22; Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts* (Princeton, 2002), pp. 188–210; Winship, *Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson: Puritans Divided* (Lawrence, 2005); William K. B. Stoever, “A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven”: *Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown, 1988); and Norman Pettit, *Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven, 1966).
- 169 See Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” pp. 171–2; Hill, *Religion and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*, pp. 163–4. Daniel claims that the continental controversies had little influence on the course of the English controversy of the 1640s. However, this assertion is countermanded in that English antinomians had direct access to the literature of the continent, and used these texts to support their own positions. It could be argued that both German and English antinomism arose from misreading Luther.

the latter of those who publicized their views with the relaxing of the press.¹⁷⁰ Regardless, antinomism was as an organic entity with continuity across its many expressions that flourished or diminished according to various political and religious factors.¹⁷¹ Indeed, Lake and Como have shown that Puritanism was not a “monolithic ‘homogenous ideology,’” in that an antinomian underground was constantly at odds with the “orthodox mainstream.” Guibbory has also shown that within the orthodox there were “tensions and contradictions between conservative and radical elements.”¹⁷² While more recent scholarship has taken a sympathetic stance towards English antinomism, and weeds through precisianist rhetoric when assessing antinomian contributions to theology and society, more work remains to be done.¹⁷³

English antinomism had ties to earlier German antinomism, in that both fought over how to interpret Luther, but had its own distinct priorities as it sought to comfort the disenfranchised; nonetheless continental sources played an integral role in its development, articulation, and defense, especially as it vied for orthodox status.¹⁷⁴ That Eaton often cited Luther’s Galatians

170 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, pp. 3–9.

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

172 Aschah Guibbory, “Israel and English Protestant Nationalism: ‘Fast Sermons’ During the English Revolution,” *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton’s England* (Toronto, 2008), p. 128. The antinomians monopolized these contradicting elements within the standard corpus, and used their orthodox status to give credibility to their own opinions. See Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, pp. 10–32; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, pp. 3–10; and Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge: “Orthodoxy,” “Heterodoxy,” and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Palo Alto, 2001), pp. 389–413.

173 See, for instance, Tim Cooper, “The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the ‘Radical’ from Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Religion,” *Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000), 247–62; Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot, 2006). Cooper argues that the definition of antinomism broadened after 1645 to the point where the label was far more powerful as a rhetorical device to discredit opposition than the actual doctrinal statements of “antinomians.” See Anne Dunan-Page, *Grace Overwhelming: John Bunyan, The Pilgrim’s Progress, and the Extremes of the Baptist Mind* (New York, 2006), p. 34, n. 43. Some historians question whether antinomism in New England had any organic ties to antinomism in England, or whether they evolved in different ways; their possible connections warrant further investigation. See Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, ch. 12.

174 For instance, John Eaton, “the first antinomian among us,” cited Luther some 106 times in his manuscript *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (1642). Eaton’s main source of inspiration is John Foxe’s English edition of Luther’s commentary upon Galatians (1535). In 1631, Thomas Taylor defended the precisianist interpretation of Luther by citing

commentary for support of his views, which Rutherford was compelled to contest, suggests that the continent was a source of inspiration for the English controversies.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, both Luther and Calvin were used by English antinomians to support their cause, and precisianist rebuttals equally employed continental sources; and yet, as Luther and Calvin were used, they were often altered to support positions contrary to the overall work of the reformers.¹⁷⁶ As Bozeman put it, “even as Eaton used Luther, he changed him . . . the Luther who saw the Decalogue as an indispensable guide to Christian conduct, who required severe self-discipline, denounced libertine misconstructions of sola fides, and warned congregations that they must obey the law or go to hell, he knew, grasped, or regarded little.” Eaton’s Luther was no more than an espouser of “free justification, or pardon,” who had no use for the law.¹⁷⁷ Eaton thus relied on the early Luther, but largely ignored the mature Luther who attacked Agricola’s misrepresentations of his theology of grace.¹⁷⁸ Similar claims could

-
- William Whitaker’s work on Luther at Cambridge. Moreover, Taylor enlists Calvin, Beza, Zanchi, Perkins, Willem Hessels van Est, George Downame, Polanus, Ames, Davenant, and Cooper in the “orthodox” cause. See Taylor, *Regula Vitae: The Rvle of the Law Vnder the Gospel* (London, 1631), pp. 201–23, esp. pp. 207–8. See also Pagitt, *Heresiography*, p. 89; Norman B. Graebner, “Protestants and Dissenters: An Examination of the Seventeenth-Century Eatonist and New England Controversies in Reformation Perspective” (PhD diss., Duke University, 1984), pp. vi, 154, 167, 182; and Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, p. 190.
- 175 See Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist* (London, 1648), pp. 68–163. Rutherford distinguishes between the “old Antinomians” in Germany, and the new ones in England. Both, he claims, misinterpret Luther on the law and the necessity of good works. See John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), pp. 4, 138–42. Pettit argued that the Reformation, with its emphasis on the absolute and unalterable power of God, paradoxically evoked the question of the need for human works and preparation for grace. While antinomians generally focused on this power of God, especially in transforming sinners into righteous saints, precisianists focused on the necessity for good works to live in accord with God’s commands, for an orderly and godly society. Pettit, *The Heart Prepared*.
- 176 See G. A. van den Brink, “Calvin, Witsius (1636–1708), and the English Antinomians,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011), 229–40, there 239–40.
- 177 Pagitt, *Heresiography*, p. 90; Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, pp. 190–1. In the sixteenth century, Luther repudiated Agricola’s antinomism, and believed it to be motivated by self-grandeur. See Mark U. Edwards, Jr., *Luther and the False Brethren* (Stanford, 1975), pp. 167–9.
- 178 Robert J. McKelvey, “‘That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism’: Eternal Justification,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 228–9; Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther’s Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development* (Minneapolis, 2006), pp. 178–84.

be made about Saltmarsh and other antinomians that over emphasized grace to the possible exclusion of the moral law, though Saltmarsh did clarify:

Luther I could quote, but he is now lookt on by some as one that is both over-quoted, and over-writ Free-grace, and bending himself against works, which was the *Poperly* and *Antichristianism* of those times. He raised up *grace*, rather in *opposition* (as some think, to whom I dare not so fully agree) to the *excesse* of works, then to the just *advantage* of *grace* . . . Thus we can pick and chuse from a *Reformer* what fits to the *standard* of our own *Light* and *Reformation*, and cast the other by . . .¹⁷⁹

However, antinomism was more than a battle for Luther, and involved the contested borders for normative expression and belief. Saltmarsh complained that the lack of peace among the godly was due to name calling and purposeful misrepresentation; indeed, reconciliation would be possible “if the names of *Antinomian*, and *legal Teacher*, and the rest, might be laid down, and no mark or name to know one another by, but that of *believers* that hold *thus* and *thus* for distinction.”¹⁸⁰ But suspicions ran deep, with each party customarily accusing the other of positions that neither held to, twisting expressions into “something too uncomely for both.”¹⁸¹ Those who vehemently defended Crisp, for instance, focused on how his detractors twisted his sayings into something that he never intended.¹⁸² Further, Crisp’s views were, at times, misrepresented and used to counterclaim positions that he had actually held, as seen in Rutherford’s criticism of Crisp’s doctrine of the double imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the sinner, and the sinner’s sin to Christ.¹⁸³ Both sides used each other’s work to fuel provocation, and both equally misconstrued original sources for their own polemical purposes, though there were those who wanted a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

179 Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace*, p. 210.

180 Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace*, sig. A4r.

181 Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace*, sig. A5v.

182 The cornerstone of precisianist criticism was not in how Crisp lived his life, but in how many of his statements could be taken and interpreted as a license for sin; however, those precisianists who defended Crisp argued that these statements were taken out of context and exaggerated to mean something that Crisp never intended. Had he meant to teach lawlessness, he would have lived it.

183 McKelvey, “Eternal Justification,” p. 233. McKelvey cites Daniel, who says that Crisp “is in perfect accord with mainstream Reformed theology” in his doctrine of double imputation. The reference is to Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” p. 184.

Regardless of misstatements on either side, fears of antinomism were very real, and prompted the Westminster Assembly to consider its possible threats to Christian conduct and the welfare of the English Church, especially given the tumultuous times at hand. Not all members believed antinomism to be equally dangerous, however, and doubtless precisianist censures had both political and theological motivations.¹⁸⁴

2.3.4 *Neonomian Strain*

The fourth strain under consideration is neonomism, or the belief that the gospel constituted a “new law” for believers, with its own moral requirements being fulfilled through faith and repentance. The doctrine is sometimes referred to as “Baxterianism” after the 1690s, and emerged as a response to theologically high Calvinism, specifically in its doctrine of justification from eternity, and as a corrective to English antinomism.¹⁸⁵ While there were several proponents of “neonomian” theology, the most famous are Richard Baxter, and his disciple, Daniel Williams.¹⁸⁶ Baxter had reasserted the necessity of good works and obedience in the justification of the sinner, and argued for a “laborious holynesse,” which he thought was threatened by antinomism.¹⁸⁷ He believed that by the Holy Spirit’s enabling the elect are able to fulfill the law inaugurated by Christ, and saw the gospel as a “new law” that supplanted the “old” or Mosaic Law. This teaching had specific implications for the Protestant doctrine of justification, and was challenged in the court of orthodoxy by Traill, Edwards, John Owen, John Crandon, and William Eyre, all who believed that this new legal strain tended toward “popish” salvation by works.¹⁸⁸

The Presbyterian Daniel Williams, “a moderate Calvinist who carried the torch after Baxter’s [death],” more explicitly developed a neonomian scheme in

184 See Robert S. Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the “Great Debate”* (Edinburgh, 1985), pp. 176–82; Carl R. Trueman, “Reformed Orthodoxy in Britain,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), pp. 284–5; and Robert Letham, *The Westminster Assembly: Reading Its Theology in Historical Context* (Philipsburg, 2009).

185 Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, pp. 250–1.

186 For recent studies on neonomism in its historical context, see Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter’s Doctrine of Justification in His Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer, 1993), pp. 166–94; Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England*, pp. 15–45; J. I. Packer, “The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1954), pp. 212–308.

187 Paul Chang-Ha Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter’s Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden, 2004), p. 184.

188 Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, p. 47, n. 154.

his *Gospel-Truth Stated and Vindicated* (1692), which, in turn, provoked numerous rebuttals.¹⁸⁹ For instance, Isaac Chauncy published the first response to Williams with his *Neonomianism Unmasked* (1692), which was the first to give the new emphasis a name. In fact, Chauncy referred to Baxter as “a certain zealous Neonomian,” and opined that “after . . . [he] had taken his leave of us, there was a great deal of Probability this Controversie would have fell to the ground,” had Williams not tried to “make [himself] the Head of a Party.”¹⁹⁰ In 1693, Williams responded with the short pamphlet *A Defense of Gospel Truth*, in which he sought to garrison orthodox support for his theology.¹⁹¹ However, for Eyre and others, the doctrine jeopardized the gracious nature of justification, and came too close to popery by introducing “conditions” into an unconditional doctrine of justification.¹⁹² Thus, while neonomism was an attempt to correct the antinomism of the English Revolution, the pendulum, for many, swung too far in the opposite direction and threatened the very essence of the Protestant doctrine.¹⁹³

Baxter’s views on justification were published in his *Aphorisms of Justification* (1649), *Confession of His Faith* (1655), and *Catholick Theologie* (1675). Because of striking similarities with the teachings of Amyraut, Baxter has been called Amyraut’s “only proselyte in England,” though the epithet is hardly accurate.¹⁹⁴ While Baxter did believe that believers participate in their salvation, he

189 Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, 158–9.

190 Chauncey, *Neonomianism Unmasked*, p. 10.

191 For example, Williams criticizes Crisp’s supporters by appealing to the teachings of the Westminster Assembly and “all our Orthodox.” Williams, *A Defense of Gospel Truth* (London, 1693), pp. 42–3.

192 See William Eyre, *Vindiciae Justificationis Gratiae: Justification without Conditions; or the Free Justification of a Sinner* (London, 1653). Eyre criticizes Baxter for holding John Goodwin in too high esteem, and disparaging “Twise, and all our Protestant Divines that differ from him” (sig. A3r).

193 See Traill, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification*, p. 9, where he complains that one cannot preach the freeness of justification without being accused of antinomism.

194 Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, p. 47, n. 154. On Amyraut’s influence on Richard Baxter, see William M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (London, 1979), pp. 129, 138, 146–7, 152–3; N. H. Keeble, “Richard Baxter,” *ODNB*, and Matthew Kadane, “Les bibliothèques de deux théologiens réformés du XVIIe siècle, l’un puritan anglais, l’autre pasteur Huguenot,” *Bulletin Société de l’Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 147 (2001), 67–100. Baxter kept six of Amyraut’s books in his library, and often recommended them for healing divisions among Protestants. See Anne Dunan-Page, “Introduction,” in *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots, 1660–1750*, ed. Anne Dunan-Page (Aldershot, 2006), p. 11; and Dunan-Page,

minimized the extent of their involvement, and upheld forensic notions of justification, but nonetheless drew ire for compromising the graciousness of justification.¹⁹⁵ Trueman has stated that Baxter's dogmatic works "demonstrate extensive appropriation and interaction with all manner of theological streams and philosophical trajectories."¹⁹⁶ It was Baxter's eclecticism with dubious sources that brought his dogmatic writings into disfavor. As critical of antinomism as many Puritans were, their sharpest assaults were targeted against Baxter for compromising the gracious nature of justification;¹⁹⁷ indeed, many feared the direction that English religion was moving in, and yet Baxter retained an admirable reputation as a writer of godly conduct books.¹⁹⁸ This paradoxical reception of Baxter reflects the plasticity within confessional discussions, and the greater aims of the Puritan Reformation. Moreover, it raises questions as to what it meant to be "orthodox" in the seventeenth century, even to those who generally subscribed to a confessional standard.¹⁹⁹

2.4 Conclusion

The seventeenth century was a "short century" in the sense that its major political moments occurred between 1603–89. This chapter has shown that

Grace Overwhelming: John Buryan, The Pilgrim's Progress, and the Extremes of the Baptist Mind (New York, 2006), p. 21, n. 13.

- 195 Michael Bryson, *The Tyranny of Heaven: Milton's Rejection of God as King* (Cranbury, 2004), p. 120. On Baxter's eclectic use of scholastic sources and Scotist influence, see Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic*, pp. 339–40.
- 196 Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 32. See also Trueman, "A Small Step Towards Rationalism: The Impact of the Metaphysics of Tommaso Campanella on the Theology of Richard Baxter," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark (Cumbria, 1999), pp. 181–95.
- 197 See, for instance, Joseph Caryl's apologetical imprimatur to John Crandon's *Mr. Baxters Aphorisms Exorized and Authorized* (London, 1654), sig. A1r, where he wishes that Crandon had set aside personal aspersions and considered only Baxter's opinions; nonetheless, given the seriousness of the topic, Caryl allowed it to be printed.
- 198 For Baxter's international reputation, see Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty*, p. 23; and Helen Wilcox, "Herbert and Donne," in *The Oxford Handbook of English Literature and Theology*, ed. Andrew W. Hass, David Jasper, and Elisabeth Jay (New York, 2007), p. 402.
- 199 For Baxter, there was a difference between being and being reputed to be "orthodox." See Baxter, *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter*, ed. William Orme, 23 vols. (London, 1830), 11:289–91. See also N. H. Keeble, "'Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposing on Others': Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition," in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 282–305.

seventeenth-century Puritanism has a greater prehistory than the century in which it existed. We can successfully trace the origins of Puritanism to the early English Reformation, thus predating the rise of Puritanism in the Elizabethan period, and it is possible to date it earlier to Lollardy. While historians continue to debate the origins of Puritanism, the evangelical elements within early English Protestantism gave rise to the “the Puritan spirit.” The “social” Reformation which occurred in the sixteenth century, and which affected the popular mindset and behavior of “the godly,” continued into the seventeenth century.

While Protestantism gained massive impetus during the reign of the boy-king Edward VI, it was not until the Elizabethan period that Puritanism became a serious force in English religious life. This establishment was in no small part due to the return of hundreds of exiles to England, many of whom made important theological connections on the continent; it is estimated that of the almost 800 exiles about one quarter to one fifth of the exiles eventually made their way to Geneva. This explains the strong Genevan flavor of early Elizabethan Protestantism and the rise of English Presbyterianism.

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

Any study of the seventeenth century, whether in its political, social, or religious thought, must take into consideration the cultural forces then converging, authoritative sources among specific groups, and the internal trajectories and unintended consequences of vying opinions. Thus, English Puritanism can be seen as a broad and eclectic group of Christians who borrowed from continental sources, and used them as they best served their purposes. While it is not necessary to examine every book or idea that Puritans may have come in contact with and utilized for their Puritan Reformation, due consideration

should be given to the theological currents and patterns that affected their received tradition, and altered any sense of “orthodox” status.

The Reformed theology of Stuart Puritans was fluid in the sense that there was room for variance, flexibility, or “varieties,” but it nonetheless stood in relation to a normative and mainstream confessional and orthodox tradition as seen at Westminster. While reasons for diversity will be explored later, among Puritans there were variations as to hypothetical universalism, covenant, justification, and predestination. Puritanism was broadly Reformed orthodox, but allowed for degrees of deviation, as attested in Baxter’s doctrine of justification, so long as one’s overall theology was seen to be in harmony with the Puritan ethos. This understanding of Reformed orthodoxy concedes to the paradoxical reception of Baxter as orthodox, even though his doctrine of justification threatened the very foundation of the English Church, as most Puritans saw it.

The four strains within Puritanism, rather than evidencing contrary orthodoxies, suggest parallel, contrasting, and reacting emphases within the Reformed orthodox tradition. These internal tensions were expressed to varying degrees, and at times progressed beyond confessional boundaries, but at the same time were interwoven and connected to the mainstream of Puritan thought and practice.

We will now turn to Part II and consider the lives and theologies of Downname, Rous, and Crisp, as they attest to both unity and diversity within the Puritan Reformation, and further illumine its precisianist, mystical, and antinomian strains.

PART 2

Puritans



John Downname (1571–1652)

3.1 Introduction

John Downname (or “Downham”) was an exponent of the precisianist strain within Puritanism during the pre-revolutionary years of the seventeenth century, a prominent member of London Puritanism, and a 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 lesser-known *A Guide to Godlynesse* (1622), a shorter, though still copious, manual for Christian living. Downname was also known for his role in publishing two popular theological manuals: Sir Henry Finch’s *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie* (c.1620), which consisted of a much more expanded version of Finch’s earlier *Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie* (1590; rev. ed. 1613),² and

1 Historians from the seventeenth century to the present have spelled Downname’s name differently, either as “Downname” or “Downham.” However, since the majority of early modern printed works 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, 2011), pp. 19–20; and cf. James F. Keenan, who differentiates between Jesuit casuistry and the “practical divinity” of Richard Greenham, Edmund Bunny, Richard Rogers, William Perkins, Arthur Dent, Henry Smith, William Gouge, John Dod, and John Downname. Keenan, “Jesuit Casuistry or Jesuit Spirituality? The Roots of Seventeenth-Century British Puritan Practical Divinity,” in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O’Malley, SJ, et al. (Toronto, 1999), p. 628. Thomas F. Merrill states that “the most unique feature of Puritan casuistry [at the turn of the seventeenth century was] its preoccupation with the problem of assurance and election.” Merrill, ed., *William Perkins, 1558–1602, English Puritanist, His Pioneer Works on Casuistry* (Nieuwkoop, 1966), p. xiv; cited in Margaret Sampson, “Laxity and Liberty in Seventeenth-Century English Political Thought,” in *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Edmund Leites (Cambridge, Eng., 1988), p. 99.

2 There is some debate in the literature over the authorship of the *Summe*. Ian Green, Michael McGiffert, and Wilfred Prest credit authorship to Finch, whereas Richard Muller has cited authorship to Downname. In private correspondence, however, Muller concedes to Finchian authorship, and has published his revised view. See 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), 397–425, there 398; Michael McGiffert, “God’s Controversy with Jacobean England,” *The American Historical Review* 88 (1984), 1151–75, there 1158; Wilfred R. Prest, “The Art of Law and the Law of God: Sir Henry

James Ussher's *A Body of Divinitie* (1645), which was published from rough manuscripts and without Ussher's consent, Ussher having intended it for private use.³ Downname also had a role in compiling the *Westminster Annotations* on the Bible, being one of a few city ministers to work on the project, though he never personally sat at the assembly.⁴ Downname's older brother, George, had the reputation of being the most famous Ramist in Christ's College, Cambridge,⁵ engaging in public controversy, and publishing various famed treatises, all in which Downname followed suit.⁶ Given John Downname's extensive influence within Stuart Puritanism and his legacy as a popular devotional writer and biblical exegete, it is surprising little work has been done on him.⁷

Finch (1558–1625),” in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*, ed. Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford, 1978), p. 106; Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids, 2008), p. 97; Richard A. Muller, “Covenant and Conscience in English Reformed Theology: Three Variations on a Seventeenth-Century Theme,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 42 (1980), 312–20; and Muller's revised position in Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, 2012), p. 224, n. 176.

- 3 Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), pp. 81–3. See also Crawford Gribben, “Rhetoric, Fiction, and Theology: James Ussher and the Death of Jesus Christ,” *The Seventeenth Century* 20 (2005), 53–75, there 64.
- 4 Helen Thornton incorrectly calls Downname a “member” of the Westminster Assembly. Rather, Downname's association with the assembly seems to have been confined to preparing the 1645 *Annotations* in conference with various ministers of the assembly, and serving in an adjunctive capacity in the ordination of ministers. See Helen Thornton, *State of Nature or Eden? Thomas Hobbes and His Contemporaries on the Natural Condition of Human Beings* (Rochester, 2005), p. 35; and cf. William Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (Edinburgh, 1843), p. 182; Brigitte Klosterberg and Guido Naschert, *Friedrich Breckling (1629–1711): Prediger, “Wahrheitszeuge” und Vermittler des Pietismus im niederländischen Exil* (Halle, 2011), pp. 122–4; Chad van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–52*, 5 vols. (New York, 2012), 5:80.
- 5 George Downname's handwritten manuscript *Expositionis Georgii Dounami: in Petri Rami Dialecticam Catechismus* was found in Jonathan Edwards's library, apparently handed down through the generations. Peter J. Thuesen, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards, Vol. 26: Catalogues of Books* (New Haven, 2008), p. 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* 14 (1983), 457–67.
- 6 Donald Lemen Clark, “John Milton and William Chappell,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 18 (1955), 329–50, there 337. Downname credits his desire to attend university and pursue the ministry to George. See John Downname, *The Christian Warfare* (London, 1634), sig. A3.
- 7 This may partly be due to the immensity of his work. For example, the combined page count of *Christian Warfare* and *Guide to Godlynesse*, just two of his works, is over 2,000.

Those who have given attention to him have generally focused on a single aspect of his thought, such as the covenant, or various themes in his prose, such as the warfare motif, as opposed to a broader assessment of his divinity within social and historical context.⁸

Since Downname's practical divinity represents an English synthesis of continental Reformed thought, an examination of his social and intellectual milieu are indispensable to understanding precisionism within Stuart Puritanism, and specifically how essential the preached and published word were for the promotion of the good life and the Puritan Reformation.⁹

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 and theological helps to understand it, and put it into practice.¹⁰ This experiential emphasis on reading was indispensable to the Puritan "ethos," in that it was one of many spiritual disciplines; and though Puritans often favored the spoken to the written word, as Arnold Hunt has demonstrated,¹¹

8 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* (Apeldoorn, 2010), pp. 101–19; McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," 1151–74; and Muller, "Covenant and Conscience." De Koeijer's work deals primarily with Downname's view of Christian warfare, and the latter two articles are now dated, with the last presuming Downnamean authorship of the *Summe*.

9 John Morgan writes that 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, Eng., 1986), p. 18.

10 Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript, and Puritanism in England, 1580–1720* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011), p. 259. See also Lisa M. Gordis, *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* (Chicago, 2003), pp. 73–96; and John R. Knott, Jr., *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible* (Chicago, 1980), pp. 13–41.

11 Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), p. 30; Cambers, *Godly Reading*, pp. 80–1. Many Puritans preferred oral and extemporaneous prayer to "form prayer," especially of the Book of Common Prayer variety. However, there are Puritan texts, such as the posthumous *Certaine Devout Prayers of Mr. Bolton* (1631), collected and prefaced by William Gouge, which speak favorably of form prayers and their ability to "enflame" and "quicken" the spirits of readers. Robert Bolton, *Certaine Devout Prayers of Mr. Bolton* (London, 1631), sig. A8v, A9r–10v; cf. Lauren F. Winner, who states that Puritans viewed written prayers as "merely performative, artificial, boring, repetitious," and that "free-form prayer was authentic and bespoke the heart's true desire." Winner, *A Cheerful and Comfortable Faith: Anglican Religious Practice in the Elite Households of Eighteenth-Century Virginia* (New Haven, 2010), p. 96.

there was nonetheless a vibrant and flourishing culture of “godly reading” and learning.¹²

William K. B. Stoever has stated that just as there was a literary canon of continental systematic theology, there was a standard corpus within Puritanism, which comprised various works of theological, practical, and controversial importance.¹³ More recently, Andrew Cambers has explored English Puritan “book culture” from a social and cultural perspective.¹⁴ At least three of Downname’s works, *Christian Warfare*, *Annotations*, and *Guide to Godlynesse*, were part of this greater devotional corpus, and have appeared in such diverse libraries as those of Richard Baxter, Lady Anne Clifford, and Samuel Jeake of Rye.¹⁵ It is not known to what extent Downname’s work was translated into other languages, although Willem op’t Hof has found at least one Dutch edition of Downname’s *Spiritual Physicke* (1600).¹⁶

-
- 12 Downname writes that though some are so taken up by religious writings that they have little time for the Bible, Christians are not to neglect the writings of “learned and godly men”; indeed, care must be taken when selecting the “most profitable for our edification.” John Downname, *A Guide to Godlynesse: Or, A Treatise of a Christian Life* (London, 1622), pp. 631, 636–8. See also Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 142–3, for Downname’s view of the family as “the Seminary of the Church and Common-wealth . . .”
- 13 William K. B. Stoever, *“A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven”: Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middleton, 1978), pp. 15–6.
- 14 See Cambers, *Godly Reading*. While Cambers work is monumental, it is mainly concerned with social and cultural history rather than textual and intellectual. For instance, Cambers mentions the Puritan “canon of devotional literature” (pp. 246–7), but does not clearly identify its contents. 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, 2007), pp. 68–105; and Hugh Amory, “Printing and Bookselling in New England, 1638–1713,” in *A History of the Book in America*, ed. Hugh Amory and David D. Hall, 4 vols. (Chapel Hill, 2007), 1:83–116. See also Stoever, “A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven,” p. 16; Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill, 1982), pp. 157–61.
- 15 Richard Baxter, *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter*, ed. William Orne, 23 vols. (London, 1830), 5:587; Julie Crawford, “Lady Anne Clifford and the Uses of Christian Warfare,” in *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500–1625*, ed. Micheline White (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 104–5; Michael Hunter, et al., *A Radical’s Books: The Library of Samuel Jeake of Rye, 1623–90* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 9.
- 16 Willem op’t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1598–1622* (Rotterdam, 1987), p. 254. See also Renate Jürgensen, *Bibliotheca Norica: Patrizier und Gelehrtenbibliotheken in Nürnberg zwischen Mittelalter und Aufklärung* (Wiesbaden, 2002), p. 583.

Given Downname's extensive role as a codifier of the precisianist strain within Puritanism, his life and work demonstrate the major motifs and doctrinal unities associated with the Puritan Reformation, as well as its diversity and freedom in expression, and serve as an excellent basis for comparison to Rous and Crisp.¹⁷ This unity in diversity is seen not only in shared social experiences, such as Sabbath observance, disdain for the theater and plays, church attendance, and more theological concerns in articulating a robust Reformed theology, combating Arminianism and Socinianism, and in being members of an international Calvinist network, but also in common concerns for the devotional welfare of laity and their instruction in godly living.¹⁸ Indeed, the Puritan Reformation was an intensely social and theological movement, fueled by the quest for certainty, intimate awareness of the divine, religious conversion, and doctrinal clarity.¹⁹

In this chapter, we will focus on Downname as a representative of the precisianist strain with a view to establishing his doctrinal stance, and work to place him into the broader stream of Puritan and Reformed thought. To do this, we will first consider Downname's social contexts, and his involvement in various controversies in the Stuart period. We will also consider his work as licenser of the press, and his prominence as a Puritan 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

17 Indeed, as Stoever commented, "Despite internal variety... Reformed orthodoxy, except in extreme cases, comprised widespread consensus regarding the substance of doctrine that defined the Reformed position, even while allowing considerable latitude for individuality in ordering the theological system and in the treatment of particular elements of it. English Puritans shared both the doctrinal consensus and the theological individualism of Reformed orthodoxy." Stoever, "A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven," p. 15. See also Emidio Campi, *Shifting Patters of Reformed Tradition* (Göttingen, 2014); Willem J. van Asselt, "Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), pp. 22–4.

18 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 1–4.

19 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, 1986), pp. 14–6; and Durston and Eales write, "Scholars of puritanism have only relatively recently come to realise that in its active expression puritanism was a social experience which placed great emphasis on 'the communal aspects of the Christian experience.'" Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, "Introduction," in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York, 1996), p. 20. See also Tai Liu, *Puritan London: A Study in Religion and Society in the City Parishes* (Cranbury, 1986), pp. 162–5; and Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1958; repr. New York, 1997), ch. 14.

works of theology, *Summe of Sacred Divinitie* and *Body of Divinitie*. Finally, we will look at Downname's theology in its historical context, and then conclude with some observatory remarks as we next turn to the mystical strain in Rous. By looking at Downname within context, we will better see the "ethos" of the precisianist strain, the urgency placed upon biblical exegesis, the weaving of doctrine with practice, and adherence to strict orthodoxy.²⁰

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 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 other topic, being intended for those who were overly burdened with the "sight and sense" of their sin.²¹ Moreover, Downname's *Guide* was written to "devout Christians" to foster piety through doctrinal clarity and practical inference.²²

20 The concept of a "strict" orthodoxy is a partial misnomer in that it suggests little variance in how doctrines could be stated, restated, and defended in an orthodox sense; "strict" orthodoxy can, however, be generally associated with the teachings of what Baxter called the "over-Orthodox Doctors," who, in turn, stood in contrast to the less scholastically inclined. Further, post-Nicene vocabulary and the use of language "was indispensable as a test for orthodoxy." Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2009), p. 262. See also John Coffey, "A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution," in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 127.

21 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, sig. A1r-a1v; see also pp. 85–96, 106–38, 236–62; 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* 70 (2001), 462–81; C. Scott Dixon, *Contesting the Reformation* (Malden, 2012), 190–1.

22 Downname thus exhorts his readers to study those books that "soundly informe the iudgment, and worke powerfully vpon the heart and affections," and to avoid books that contain "little but idle eloquence, and frothy conceits of wit." Devout Christians are to favor "experimentall Diuinity" over "learning" and "speculative knowledge," but Downname concedes a place for the latter, but only for the "extraordinarily confirmed and strengthened" in faith. Downname, *Guide*, pp. 637–8.

John Downname was born in Chester, the younger son of William Downname, bishop of Chester.²³ 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.²⁴ As far back as the 1560s and 1570s, Christ's had its reputation as "a puritan seminary in all but name."²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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 at Cambridge helped him to become an elite member of London Puritanism, and lecturer at Allhallows the Great.²⁷

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.²⁸ It is not clear whether Downname conformed to the dictates of the bishops afterwards, or whether his eminent patrons shadowed any

23 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, 1970), pp. 158, 175, 199, esp. 273–4, 325–6, 362.

24 Much of Christ's fame came from Laurence Chaderton, the "pope of Cambridge Puritanism," who "made Christ's College a virtual Puritan seminary." J. David Hoeveler, *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges* (Lanham, 2002), p. 7; Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, Eng., 1982), pp. 25–54; Catherine Gimelli Martin, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case of Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot, 2010), p. 108.

25 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 122.

26 Hoeveler, *Creating the American Mind*, p. 7.

27 See Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550–1653* (Princeton, 1993), p. 296; Liu, *Puritan London*, pp. 51–102, 149–71; and Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford, 2001), pp. 170–261.

28 Paul S. Seaver, "Downham, John (1571–1652)," *ODNB*.

nonconformity.²⁹ He was, however, active in parish life at St. Margaret's, and had the Puritan Daniel Dyke as an assistant.³⁰

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, 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.³¹ 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.³² Those supporting Walker were

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

30 Dyke (d.1614) was author of the popular *The mystery of selfe-deceiuing* (London, 1614). While little is known as Dyke's clerical career, he did belong to a prominent family of Puritan ministers, including his brother Jeremiah Dyke. Patrick Collinson, "Dyke, Daniel (d.1614)," *ODNB*. Collinson seems to be unaware of Dyke's tenure at St. Margaret's. See Downname, *Guide*, p. 637, where Downname writes, "...and of my late worthy assistant, Master Daniel Dike, who shall be euer vnto me of happy memory..."

31 Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998), pp. 232–4.

32 The Walker-Wotton affair demonstrates how quick the clergy were to publicize their views, and suggests that the press was as often used for political pressure as for moral instruction. For the practice of "pamphleteering" in the period, see Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), esp. pp. 132–62; Joao Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), ch. 1; and, more generally, Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English News Books, 1641–49* (New York, 1996), and his edited *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660* (New York, 2011).

For an overview of the Walker-Wotton affair, see Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge*, pp. 221–42; Lake, "Puritanism, Familism, and Heresy in Early Stuart England: The Case of John Etherington Revisited," in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 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, 1620–43* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), pp. 56–7. Webster's account is partially inaccurate in that he refers to "Wooton" instead of "Wotton," and states that the "Downham" involved in the affair was George Downham (d.1634), which is impossible since Gataker states that of Walker's supporters only Richard Stock had died as of 1641.

Richard Stock, John Downname, Thomas Westfield, and William Gouge; those defending Wotton were Thomas Gataker, James Balmford, William Hickes, and John Randall.³³ 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.³⁴ But the first conference proved fruitless, 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.³⁵

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 international reputation suffered among European Protestants.³⁶ Walker thus gained a reputation as a “doctrinal attack dog of quite outstanding tenacity and viciousness,” and continued to campaign on the issue for years to come. 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.³⁷ 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.³⁸ Wotton’s “subtle

-
- 33 Samuel Wotton, *Mr. Anthony Wotton’s Defence Against Mr. George Walker’s Charge, Accusing Him of Socinian Heresie and Blasphemie* (Cambridge, Eng., 1641), p. 8; John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 55.
- 34 Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*, p. 215; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 109.
- 35 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.
- 36 Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, p. 55; David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Palo Alto, 2004), p. 23, n. 25.
- 37 Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*, p. 200.
- 38 See Anthony Burgess, *The True Doctrine of Justification Asserted and Vindicated* (London, 1644), p. 214, where Piscator and Wotton are mentioned together. It is possible that Wotton had read Piscator’s book on justification (an English edition appeared in 1599). Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 104. See also Heber Carlos de Campos, Jr., “Johannes Piscator (1546–1625) and the Consequent Development of the Doctrine of the Imputation of Christ’s Active Obedience” (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2009), esp. chs. 2–3; Richard Snoddy, *The Soteriology of James Ussher: The Act and Saving Object of Faith* (New York, 2014), p. 110.

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 affair, would aid Goodwin and, at times, expressed sympathy for Baxter.³⁹

Downame’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.⁴⁰ 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).⁴¹ Though Downame never sat at the Westminster Assembly, he nonetheless endorsed its theological consensus. By the time the meetings were held at Westminster, Downame had established himself as an influential member of “the godly” in London.⁴²

On February 1, 1615, the Haberdashers’ Company appointed Downame, already a popular preacher in the city, the first William Jones lecturer at St. Bartholomew Exchange.⁴³ His inaugural lecture, published as *The Plea of the Poore; Or, A Treatise of 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. Downame admonished that Christians should strive to increase their estate so that they may be more plentiful in

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

40 There was significant diversity over the doctrine of justification and the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the believer, and Downame, as we shall see, took the dominant position within Reformed orthodoxy that justification occurred within time at the moment of faith, and involved the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the believer (see 3.4.4 below).

41 Lake, *Boxmaker’s Revenge*, pp. 215, 221–41.

42 Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (New York, 1999), pp. 315–6; 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, 2009), p. 37.

43 The William Jones lectureship was but one example of prominent English merchants funding “Puritan” lectureships. Hill, *Society and Puritanism*, pp. 70–4; William Meyler Warlow, *A History of the Charities of William Jones at Monmouth and Newland* (Bristol, 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, 1998), p. 227; and Dorothy Williams Whitney, “London Puritanism: The Haberdashers’ Company,” *Church History* 32 (1963), 298–321.

good works toward others.⁴⁴ Downame continued to teach at the “Golden Lectureship” after he retired in 1650, and was followed in the lectureship by George Griffiths.⁴⁵ Within two years of his initial appointment Downame became an adviser to the Haberdashers’ Company, and was consulted in its ecclesiastical patronage.⁴⁶

Little is known about Downame’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, who was known as the “scourge of the Jesuits” and a foe of the theatre.⁴⁷ Sutton had been lecturer at St. Savior’s, Southwark, from 1615–23, and his *Lectures Vpon The Eleventh Chapter to the Romanes* Downame subsequently edited and published in 1632. While Sutton benefited from the lectureship, he did not hesitate to criticize the politics surrounding it, specifically how some “must bee pleased onely by length, some by lowdnesse, some by squeezing of zeale, some by pushing at a Father, some by declaiming against a Latine sentence, others by betraying their sillinesse in squibbing authoritie. If he doe none of these, hee shall finde the love of many burning Professors as cold as snow water.”⁴⁸ That Downame was a frequent and popular lecturer indicates that he was able to appease a crowd accustomed to expect the cream of English Puritan clergy.

Downame 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

44 John Downame, *The Plea of the Poore; Or, A Treatise of Beneficence and Alms-Deeds* (London, 1616), p. 23.

45 Richard L. Greaves, “Griffith, George,” *ODNB*. It was called “The Golden Lectureship” because of its immense endowment (worthy nearly £500 p.a. by 1850), though there may also be some hinting at the quality of the lectureships (e.g. χρυσόστομος, or “golden-mouthed”). Warlow, *Charities of William Jones*, pp. 27, 240, 321; Warlow, *History of the Charities of William Jones*, p. 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, 2006), p. 133; Martin Hewitt, “Preaching from the Platform,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689–1901*, ed. Keith a Francis, et al. (New York, 2012), p. 81.

46 Seaver, *Puritan Lectureships*, p. 158. Upon his retirement, the Haberdashers’ Company paid Downame a pension of £80 for the first year of his retirement, and £70 yearly thereafter.

47 Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 116–8; Michael C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage, and Religion, c.1550–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 518.

48 Thomas Sutton, *Lectures Vpon the Eleventh Chapter to the Romanes* (London, 1632), sig. D3r. Quoted in Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, pp. 225–6.

contribution to John Dury's project for the preparation of an ecumenical "Body of Divinity," outlined in *The Earnest Breathings of Forreign Protestants* (1658).⁴⁹ The ecumenical divinity manual was pitched to James Ussher in the 1620s–30s in a letter signed by numerous London Puritans: William Gouge, John Stoughton, John Downname, Henry Burton, George Walker, Nicolas Morton, Sidrach Simpson, Adoniram Byfield, Richard Culverwell, Obadiah Sedgwick, George Hughes, and Joseph Symonds.⁵⁰ These ministers did not just seek Ussher's approval, 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." 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."⁵¹ Thus, the letter provides evidence that in the years prior to Downname's editing and publishing of Ussher's *Body of Divinitie* in 1645, plans for a similar work had already been pitched to Ussher.⁵² Dury's vision for an ecumenical divinity text, which Downname sought to realize, is more evidence for a *sensus unitatis* among English Puritans, and, as they sought to find common ground across Protestant Europe, for a broadly defined Reformed orthodoxy.

49 John Dury, a member of the Westminster Assembly, aimed for the "ecclesiastical pacification" of Protestant churches, which, he thought, could be united in "the life of God set awake by the rules of Practicall divinity." Dury pursued his vision of Protestant unity in travels across Europe until his death in 1680. His strong connections throughout Protestant Europe, including support from Puritans Simeon Ashe, Edmund Calamy, Joseph Caryl, William Spurstowe, William Gouge, George Walker, Daniel Rogers, and John Downname, helped to advance his cause, but the enterprise received sharp criticism from William Twisse, who believed differences between Bishops and Puritans "wholly irreconcilable." Anthony Milton, "The Unchanged Peacemaker? John Dury and the Politics of Irenicism in England, 1628–43," in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, ed. Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), p. 113; Webster, *Godly Clergy*, pp. 258–60.

50 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, 1658), pp. 47–8.

51 Dury, *Earnest Breathings*, pp. 47–9.

52 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, 1996), pp. 78–84; Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), p. 143.

There are other curiosities surrounding the publishing of Ussher's *Body of Divinitie*. It is not known how Downname came across the fragments for the 1645 manuscript. It seems plausible that he gathered them directly from Ussher, through his brother, George, who, as bishop of Derry, was pegged to take the brunt of the work for Dury's project (cut short by his death in 1634), or, as intimated by Ussher, by gathering pieces that were "lent abroad to divers in scattered sheets."⁵³ That Ussher had no knowledge of his work being published until after the fact raises questions as to why Downname did not pursue Ussher's approval. Regardless, upon hearing of its publication, Ussher immediately expressed his disdain, but, as Ussher's biographer notes in a 1656 elegy, the archbishop softened his disapproval after hearing of its popularity.⁵⁴

Whether Downname conceived of the 1645 publication 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, 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. Ford has cautioned, however, that even though Downname's publication was popular and gained Ussher's belated "approval," it cannot strictly be described as Ussher's work. It consists of extracts from other published works that Ussher had compiled in his youth.⁵⁵ Indeed, Ussher wrote to Downname to disclaim ownership by stating that it had been transcribed chiefly from the writings of others and composed into a commonplace book.⁵⁶ However, even with its checkered history,

53 Dury, *Earnest Breathing*s, pp. 48–9; 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*, 18 vols. (Dublin, 1897), 1:248–9.

54 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, 1656), pp. 41–2. Bernard mentions that the publication was praised "by a stranger . . . desiring some English man would translate it into Latine." The reference is to Ludwig Crocius, "De ratione Studii Theologici" in *H. Grotii et aliorum Dissertationes de Studiis Instituendis* (Amsterdam, 1645), pp. 530–1. For the study of sacred theology, Crocius commends the work of "orthodox theologians": Fenner, Perkins, Ames (English); Trelcatius, Polanus, Beumler, Jodocus Nahum, Ludwig Lucius, Wollebius, Waucquier, Alsted, and Wendelin (Continental—Dutch, German, Swiss).

55 Alan Ford, "Making Dead Men Speak": Manipulating the Memory of James Ussher," in *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History, 1600–1800* (Woodbridge, 2010), p. 51; Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (New York, 2007), pp. 81–3.

56 Ussher, *Works*, 1:248–9.

the *Body of Divinitie* reached diverse readers and was used as a catechetical text for training in the fundamentals of sacred theology.⁵⁷

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 clergy to swear that they will never pursue altercation of established church government. Laud's "oath" infuriated the Puritans who had opposing ideas on how church hierarchy should be structured.⁵⁸ Laud's actions to suppress opposition to episcopacy eventually led Parliament to impeach him for high treason. In 1641, he was confined to the Tower of London, and executed on January 10, 1644/5, in a sensational fare.⁵⁹

In June 1643, more than a dozen men were appointed to replace Laud's remaining licensers for the press.⁶⁰ While Thomas White continued to serve as

-
- 57 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*, 2 vols. (New Haven, 2003), 1:384. On May 7, 1663, Samuel Pepys also sat for several hours "reading at Playford's in Dr Ushers *Body of Divinity* his discourse of the Scripture . . ." Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (Berkeley, 2000), 4:127.
- 58 See *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical* (London, 1640); Charles W. A. Prior, *A Confusion of Tongues: Britain's Wars of Reformation, 1625–42* (New York, 2012), pp. 167–8; Dagmar Freist, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion, and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637–45* (London, 1997), pp. 138–9; Jason Peacey, "The Paranoid Prelate: Archbishop Laud and the Puritan Plot," in *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern England: From the Waldensians to the French Revolution*, ed. Barry Coward and Julian Swann (Aldershot, 2004), p. 117; Webster, *Godly Clergy*, p. 231.
- 59 Laud carefully planned his final hour and left a ms of his "last speech" with John Hinde, who used it, and his own observation at the execution to produce an addition to English martyrology. Laud identified himself with Christ's suffering, and was determined to vindicate his legacy for future chroniclers. His speech was printed as *The Archbishop of Canterbury's Speech: or His Funerall Sermon, Preacht by Himself on the Scaffold on Tower-Hill, on Friday the 10. of January, 1644* (London, 1644/5). See Elizabeth Sauer, "Paper-constentations" and *Textual Communities in England, 1640–75* (Toronto, 2005), ch. 2; and Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, 2000).
- 60 The "authorized" royal press ran to July 1641, at which time the Star Chamber and High Commission were abolished, leaving no formal oversight and vetting by established clergy. However, clandestine presses overseas, as in Leiden, often curtailed censorship when it was enforceable. Recent advances in early modern press censorship are reflected in Cyndia S. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997); *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001); *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), esp. pp. 123–86. See also Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print, and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (London, 1997); S. Mutchow Towers,

occasional licenser, the bulk of licensing divinity books fell to well-connected and eminent divines: Thomas Gataker, Calybutte Downing, Thomas Temple, Joseph Caryl, Edmund Calamy, John Carter, Charles Herle, James Cranford, Obadiah Sedgwick, John Bachelor, and John Ellis.⁶¹

Downname was also appointed as licenser, and while he generally used his influence to approve “mainstream” texts,⁶² he was known to license controversial treatises which drew the ire of Parliament, as when he approved the purported spiritual autobiography of Charles I, printed as *Eikon Basilike* ten days after the king was beheaded in 1648/9. Peacey has called *Eikon* “the touchstone for disgruntled Englishmen” who opposed the new regime.⁶³ The book went through 35 editions in the first year, and, as a carefully crafted defense of Charles’s royal image, it so worried Parliament that Milton was enlisted to write a rejoinder.⁶⁴ Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*, which sought to discredit the image of Charles as a “godly king,” itself went through numerous editions and printings before finally being confiscated and publicly burned at the Stuart Restoration in 1660.⁶⁵ That Downname had licensed *Apophthegmata Aurea, Regia, Carolina* shortly after the Milton’s rejoinder suggests that the decision was a more deliberate testing of the waters than actual oversight.⁶⁶

Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England (London, 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, 1992), pp. 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, 1961), pp. 96–100.

- 61 Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 144–5.
- 62 For instance, amidst Laud’s vigorous censorship in London, Downname chose Cambridge for the publication of his brother’s *Godly and Learned Treatise of Prayer* (1640). He also licensed works by Thomas Sutton, Thomas Heath, John Cotton, John Graunt, Sir Thomas Browne, Immanuel Bourne, Samuel Hartlib, Edmund Porter, and John Hart.
- 63 Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 157.
- 64 See Elizabeth Skerpan Wheeler, “*Eikon Basilike* and the Rhetoric of Self-Representation,” in *The Royal Image’ Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge, Eng., 1999), ch. 6.
- 65 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, Eng., 1966), pp. 138–60.
- 66 Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 157. Licensing of such politically-controversial texts moved the Independent minister John Price, states Peacey, “to bemoan ‘that bountiful and liberal imprimatur, donor to any lying, scurrilous and scandalous pamphlets against the Parliament and army.’”

Downname's lax licensing was cause for controversy on a few occasions, as when he licensed Milton's *Bucer* tract (1644), Thomas Tany's *Theauraujohn His Aurora in Tranlagorum in Salem Gloria* (1651), and the anonymous *The Expiation of a Sinner, in a Commentary Vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes*, a sizeable text promoting Socinian views of the Trinity. The Hebrews commentary, likely a liberal paraphrase of Jonas Schlichting's *Commentaria in epistolam ad Hebraeos* (1634), was prefaced by a "G. M.,"⁶⁷ who stated that the work "hath received a singular approbation from a most learned and revered Divine" for its learning and profitableness.⁶⁸ The work received sharp criticism from Edmund Porter, who accused the author of "un-Godding Jesus Christ, and blasphemously denying his grand, and most gracious Work of Redemption."⁶⁹ Porter further criticized the author with the "crime of Plagiarism," and contributing to the skeptical and zetetic times.⁷⁰

-
- 67 "G. M." was the pseudonym used by Thomas Lushington, a controversial theologian and doctor of divinity, who probably began to read Socinian texts after he lost his living during the civil war. The English commentary made its way to the major English research libraries, including Cambridge, as well as the private libraries of noted divines, such as Lazarus Seaman, whose library, incidentally, was the first to be sold in England by auction. Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York, 2012), p. 300; Herbert McLachlan, *Essays and Addresses* (Manchester, 1950), p. 329. See also Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans*, 5 vols. (Boston, 1817), 4:391. See also H. J. McLachlan, "Lushington, Thomas," *ODNB*; McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford, 1951).
- 68 [Thomas Lushington], *The Expiation of a Sinner in a Commentary Vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes* (London, 1646), sig. B1v. Schlichting stated that the work was assisted by Johann Crell, who seems to have had "an essential share in the work," and it remains one of the few Socinian commentaries on Hebrews. Bruce Demarest, *A History of the Interpretation of Hebrews 7, 1–10, from the Reformation to the Present* (Tübingen, 1976), p. 22; Stephen David Snobelen, "Isaac Newton, Socinianism, and 'the One Supreme God,'" in *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists, and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. Martin Mulso and Jan Rohls (Leiden, 2005), p. 296. See also Randy Robertson, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (University Park, 2009), p. 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, Eng., 2006), p. 218; Peter G. Bietenholz, *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus: Erasmus' Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe* (Toronto, 2009), p. 175.
- 69 Edmund Porter, *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος; or, God Incarnate, Shewing that Jesus Christ is the Onely and the Most High God* (London, 1655), sig. A4r.
- 70 Porter, *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος*, sig. A6r, B1r.

Downname's imprimatur to Porter's rejoinder provides the historical circumstances surrounding his initial approval of the Hebrews commentary: (1) the anonymous text was brought to him, which he read and was impressed with; (2) there were certain passages which he took "just exception, as disagreeing with the Scriptures, and the Received Doctrine of Our and all other Reformed Churches"; (3) he wrote letters to the author for clarification, and was pleased to learn that the author "did not at all maintain those errors, but let me to my liberty to expunge what I misliked; the which I also accordingly did as I thought fit." The redacted text was prepared for press and printed by Thomas Harper soon thereafter. However, Downname clarifies that because of the size of the commentary and "my time but short," that various errors had escaped his attention, the author not being known to him; had he known the author to be heterodox in their beliefs, he would have been more vigilant in censoring the text. Thus, though he had approved the Hebrews commentary in 1646, he revoked that approval in 1655, blaming, in part, his "old age and infirmities."⁷¹

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. His remaining years were filled with relative quietude, and he appears to have given his pulpit over to peculiar causes, such as that of the Fifth Monarchists, though his actual involvement with the millenarian sect are obscure and inferential.⁷²

When Downname drafted his will on February 26, 1651/2, 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 from 1637–39, had died. In the will, Downname bequeathed a Greek New Testament and a Latin-Greek Bible to his stepson, Thomas Sutton, Jr. Downname died in his house prior to September 13, 1652, as a "venerable and celebrated divine"; at his request, he was buried near his pew door at All Hallows-the-Great.⁷³

71 See Downname's letter in Porter, *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος*, sig. A1v. As early as 1640, Downname had sated that he was too "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.

72 For instance, Walter Cradock accepted a lectureship at All-Hallows in 1643, and whenever Welsh Independents visited London they worshipped in Downname's "moderate Presbyterian" church. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, p. 286; Liu, *Puritan London*, pp. 118–9, 190, n. 12. See also Bernard S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism* (London, 1972).

73 Seaver, "Downham, John."

Downname's social contexts show his prominence as an English divine, the international contexts of Reformed orthodoxy, and a "Calvinist network" among "the godly."⁷⁴ He used his connections and reputation to promote the precisianist strain, which, for a time, dominated Cambridge. He was an integral part of a vibrant intellectual community, and advanced the Puritan Reformation through his sermons, divinity books, and censorship of the press. We will now turn to Downname's published corpus, and examine those texts that furthered the "ethos" of the Puritan Reformation.

3.3 Downname's Writings in Historical Context

That Downname's authored corpus consists of *theologiae practica* suggests that the primary goal of the Puritan Reformation was for the *praxis pietatis*, which, in itself, was drawn from a vibrant theological stream. Downname should be seen as a practical theologian who interacted with and promoted the orthodox Reformed "precisianist" consensus. This intent to instruct readers to pursue godliness is confirmed in the opening pages of many divinity manuals.⁷⁵ Downname's *Guide*, reflective of the Puritan "ethos," praises godly living above speculation over various doctrinal and theoretical matters,⁷⁶ but, as we shall

74 For a recent social reassessment of the "Calvinist network," see Ole Peter Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013), esp. ch. 2. Grell affirms Philip Benedict's recent work on social Calvinism that contests Weberian notions that predestination was the "single driving force behind Reformed worldly activity" (p. 17). See Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven, 2002), pp. xix–xx.

75 For instance, 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* states, "Logick is an art of disputing well, Rhetorick of speaking well, Divinity of living well." Cocceius's *Summa Theologia* also defines doctrine as piety. 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." Hall, *Resolutions and Decisions*, sig. A3.

76 See Downname, *Guide*, p. 635, where he writes, "But though a Christian is to studie and read the holy Scriptures chiefly, that he may out of them, as out of the fountaine, know God and all the duties of a godly life, in which respect their practice is to absolutely be condemned, who are so wholly taken vp in reading the Fathers, Schoolemen, and late Writers, that they can fine little time to reade and meditate in the Booke of God, and so are greatest strangers where they should be best acquainted, and like ill merchants who buy all their wares at the second or third hand . . ."

see, the “good life” was subservient to correct doctrine, and it was the minister’s duty, as the anti-pariah, to give the community the necessary theological foundation upon which to build a godly life.⁷⁷ While Reformed theologians, at times, engaged in speculation in their theologizing, their two ends were integrity of doctrine and the *praxis pietatis*.⁷⁸ Indeed, this twofold enterprise is implicit throughout Downname’s published corpus. In his *Guide*, for instance, in which he lays down a program for Christian conduct, he cautions against theoretical over practical knowledge, but soon after devotes considerable time to discussing the covenant of grace, saving faith, God’s attributes, and justifying faith, among many other loci.⁷⁹ That Downname employs theological language throughout as presumptions and prerequisites to a correct understanding of Christian conduct is not really surprising since theological education and erudition were foremost for training the Puritan minister.⁸⁰ What Downname wanted to prevent in his criticism of “lesser” knowledge was the idea that intellectual assent was enough for a saving conversion, and that one need not pursue a rigorous “precisionist” lifestyle.⁸¹

Downname stands out as an active, successful, and effervescent promoter of orthodox Reformed piety. His writings, which reflect a rigorous affective theology, were reprinted numerous times in the seventeenth century, such as his *Briefe Concordance*, which went through more than twenty-five printings and supplanted older concordances based on the Geneva Bible. It outsold Clement Cotton’s massive *A Complete Concordance to the Bible of the Last Translation* (OT, 1627; NT, 1631; comb. 1635), presumably because of its smaller size, usefulness, and affordability, but it never achieved the status of Samuel Newman’s

77 Downname, *Guide*, p. 4. Downname also states that divinity books are to be used “vnto this end, that wee should vse them for the clearing of those places that are obscure, and for the inforing and applying of those poynts that are more plaine, for the discussing of doubtfull cases, and for the laying open of many poynts of doctrine, necessary for our direction in the course of a godly life . . .” Downname, *Guide*, p. 636.

78 Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety*, pp. 286–7. Even Turretin’s foray into the question of whether angels could digest food had seeming practical ends. See Francis Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1847), 1:494–5.

79 See Downname, *Guide*, pp. 25–50.

80 See Morgan, *Godly Learning*.

81 Indeed, Downname anticipated that his work would be critiqued for setting forth a standard that even he could not attain, to which he responded, “the worke must be fitted to the rule, and not the rule to the worke, and that this must be straight and perfect, although by reason of the crookednesse of the matter or stuffe, no worke-man is able to frame it so, but that it will in many places decline and swarue from it.” Downname, *Guide*, sig. A5–6.

“Cambridge Concordance.”⁸² Downname’s works seem to have had some success on the continent, and possibly influenced the Dutch precisianist movement.⁸³

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 concordances (*Lectures on Hosea, Concordance, Annotations*);⁸⁴ 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, they reveal how theological instruction, piety, and the godly life were the chief motives of the Puritan Reformation.

-
- 82 See Richard Baxter, *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter*, ed. William Orme, 23 vols. (London, 1830), 5:587. Various editions of Downname’s concordance, based on the King James Version, appeared in 1630–33, 1635, 1639, 1642, 1646, 1652, 1654, 1659, 1663, 1671, 1688–90, 1726, 1732, 1739, 1752, 1757, 1762, 1767, 1773–74. While Downname’s work was based on Cotton’s, it was quite condensed (the enlarged 1635 edition came to just over 120 pages), but made the immediate context much clearer. William Gouge criticized the Cotton concordance because it included too many “common words” (such as “God” and “Lord”), and further stated that Cotton was not skilled Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, but was nonetheless “of great understanding” and “unwearied industry.” Cotton was, after all, the quintessential English translator of Calvin. I. M. Green, *Print and Protestantism*, pp. 125–6; Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), p. 362.
- 83 Ian Maclean, *Learning and the Market Place: Essays in the History of the Early Modern Book* (Leiden, 2009), p. 355. See also, more generally, Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London, 2006), pp. 63–70.
- 84 While common parlance attributes the 1645 *Annotations* to the Westminster Assembly, which sat from 1643–49, in truth, the Bible commentary, or as it was published, the *Annotations Upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament* was commissioned by Parliament as an English counterpart to the Geneva Bible’s notes and to the annotations of the Dutch *Statenvertaling*. Though Downname did not attend the Westminster Assembly, at least six of the compilers did (William Gouge, Thomas Gataker, John Ley, Francis Taylor, Daniel Featley, and John Reading). A second edition of the *Annotations* was published in 1651 and 1657; and a third edition, with additional annotations, in 1658. See Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, 2004), 2:91; Dean George Lampros, “A New Set of Spectacles: The Assembly’s Annotations, 1645–57,” 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, Eng., 1974), p. 1884. On annotating Scripture and the practice of reading in Downname, see William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008), pp. 71–86; and Downname, *Guide*, pp. 638–53.

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.⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶ The work epitomizes what William Haller saw as a major element within Puritanism: “The spiritual attitude . . . of active struggle on the part of the individual against his own weakness.”⁸⁷ Published in four parts from 1604–18, 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 and an elaborate index. In addition, there is an opening poem written by Downname, a graphic front piece depicting a Christian in warfare, a new dedicatory epistle to his brother, a new preface to the Christian Reader, and several expansions and emendations to the text.⁸⁸

85 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. The front piece of Haller’s influential *Rise of Puritanism* (1938) contains a reproduction of the title page to the 1634 edition of *Christian Warfare*.

86 Downname’s book is similar to other Puritan books on spiritual warfare, such as William Gouge’s *The Whole Armour of God* (1616) and John Bunyan’s *Holy War* (1682). See Andreas Pecar, “On the Path of the Maccabees? The Rhetoric of ‘Holy War’ in the Sermons and Pamphlets of ‘Puritans’ in the Run-up to the English Civil War, 1620–42,” in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors, 1 and 2 Maccabees in Historical Perspective*, ed. Gabriela Signori (Leiden, 2012), p. 247; McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, pp. 184–91; Beth Lynch, *John Bunyan and the Language of Conviction* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 137–64; Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2003), p. 228, n. 81.

87 William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1938), p. 150.

88 The title-page engraving, ascribed to John Payne, 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 *omnia hac tibi dabo* (“All this I will give to you”). Payne was often commissioned for similar works and likenesses, including the title page

Downname, lavish in his praise, acknowledges his brother's tutelage at Cambridge and his continued influence on his ministry, even though "separated by Land and Water."⁸⁹ Downname also anticipates complaints to be levied against him for the many editions that *Christian Warfare* had gone through, cultivating in this last and definitive issue of 1634, which may "make the Booke too charge-able to such buyers as desire to haue the best." His response is that since its subject matter is no mere academic exercise, it had to be born through years of "conference, obseruation and experience," that is, through pastoral ministry and personal acquaintance. For those unable to acquire the new edition, he says, the former printings were still useful and "not . . . worse than they were before."⁹⁰

The work that likely began in the final decade of the sixteenth century, and took nearly thirty years to mature is doubtless the largest English exposition of the Christian's warfare "with the flesh, the world, and the devil." It reflects both the "personal nature" of religion in the Stuart era, and shows how important the subject of assurance had become for the English Church at the dawn of the seventeenth century, and well into the 1630s.⁹¹ Though *Christian Warfare* was not as popular as other English best-sellers, such as Foxe's martyrology or many biblical concordances, both having broader appeal on the Protestant market, Downname's "enchiridia" still ranks as one of the most read and cited books of

of *The Workes of John Boys* (1622), and portraits of Robert Bolton and Thomas Hobson. See Anthony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603–89* (London, 1998), p. 72.

- 89 See Downname, *Christian Warfare*, sig. A1–4, esp. A3, where he writes, "You were my chiefest helpe to direct me in my studies of Diuinitie, and afterwards my principall, if not only, pattern and precedent in the exercise of my Ministerie, whom I propounded for imitation, though in a great distance, being neuer able with my beset endeauours to attaine vnto the least part of Your perfections . . . I . . . doe gratefully dedicate vnto you these fruits of my Labours . . . earnestly desiring of our gracious and good God the long continuance of your happie daies . . ." As George Downname died in April 1634, the preface seems to have been written prior to news reaching London.
- 90 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, sig. C1–2. Indeed, prior editions of *Christian Warfare* had been popular for some time, attested to in the "commonplace book" of Robert Saxby. The manuscript contains extracts and summaries of several sermons, chapters of the Bible, prayers, and meditations. At various dates in 1627, Saxby copied by hand three chapters from *Christian Warfare*, 3rd ed. (1612). Cambridge University Library, Add. MS 3117, Fos. 94v–105v. See also John Craig's comments on the MS in his "Sermon Reception," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan (New York, 2011), pp. 189–93.
- 91 Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden, 1975), p. 193.

the Puritan Reformation. It was among those titles of “good taste” that John Harvard had bequeathed to Harvard College upon his death in 1638.⁹²

That the warfare genre was popular within Puritan devotion is attested to by such influential works on the subject as those by Thomas Brooks, William Gurnall, William Spurstowe, and Richard Gilpin.⁹³ However, within this corpus, the *Christian Warfare* was the largest and most successful publication, and has long been recognized for its role in advancing Puritanism in the Stuart period.⁹⁴ The work was frequently reprinted, became a classic text just a few years after being printed, and was to be found in the libraries of noted intellectuals well into the eighteenth century.⁹⁵

Consisting of a rather free and elaborate exposition of Ephesians 6:11, Downname engages the major topics of the *ordo salutis*, and articulates a *systema theologiae practica* 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. 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. Thus, it contrasts, as we will see, with the more dogmatic exposition of the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*, which aims to instruct readers in the Christian fundamentals.

92 Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited*, p. 160; Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), p. 266. See also John N. King, *Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 1–20, 157–61.

93 See Thomas Brooks, *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices* (London, 1652); William Gurnall, *The Christian in Compleat Armour* (London, 1655–62); William Spurstowe, *Satana Noemata* (London, 1666); and Richard Gilpin, *Daemonologia Sacra* (London, 1677). Of these, Gurnall's opus is closest in size to Downname, and was similarly composed and published in separate parts.

94 See William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism; or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570–1643* (New York, 1938), pp. 92, 155–58; Robert J. McKelvey, *Histories That Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan's Holy War* (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 188–9. See also R. W. de Koeijer's examination of Downname in his *Geestelijke strijd bij de puriteinen*, pp. 101–19.

95 See, for instance, William Chase, *A Catalogue of a Very Valuable Collection of Books* (Norwich, 1753), p. 11. The third edition of *Christian Warfare* was also listed among rare and valuable quartos in William Ash's *Divinity Catalogue* (London, 1788).

Downname's reasons for writing the *Christian Warfare* were primarily to comfort those who were afflicted with the "sight and sense" of their sins, to lead them into the haven of assurance and eternal happiness, and to prevent presumption and despair.⁹⁶ He sought to do this by deriving consolations from a careful exposition of God's word. Downname clarifies that his book was written for those children of God who doubt their eternal safety, but who have been humbled by their sins, and who seek remedies in the Bible.⁹⁷ He would later see *Christian Warfare* as the first half of a greater project in that it dealt with the Christian in conflict, whereas his *Guide*, for instance, was written for those in comfort.⁹⁸

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 shows the malice, power, and stratagems of the spiritual enemies of salvation (Satan and his assistants, the world and the flesh), and the means whereby Christians may withstand and defeat them.⁹⁹ The Second Part, "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 world and its vanities pale in comparison to God's spiritual graces and heavenly joys.¹⁰⁰ The Third Part, "Consolations for the Afflicted," shows how Christians may be strengthened while under affliction, and cultivate patience while suffering.¹⁰¹ The Fourth Part details the combat between the flesh and the spirit in life of the Christian, and provides instructions on how to successfully subdue the flesh. The work concludes with various means that Christians may be strengthened in the battle.¹⁰²

Downname uses the warfare motif throughout *Christian Warfare* to depict the Christian's ongoing struggle against Satan's stratagems. While the topics covered by Downname are consistent with the genre, he employs a more specific and nuanced exposé of Satan's attacks on various theological loci, thus weaving systematic theology with pastoral care, and implicitly showing the

96 Indeed, on an October 8, 1645, session at the Westminster Assembly, the *Christian Warfare* was mentioned to prove that God does not "call us to any morose and superstitious selfe denyall—not to enjoy the things that God gives." Chad B. Van Dixhoorn, *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–53*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 2012), 3:674.

97 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, sig. A1–4.

98 Downname, *Guide*, sig. A5.

99 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 1–356.

100 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 357–750.

101 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 751–1014.

102 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 1015–67.

close connection between the two.¹⁰³ Its sheer size and elaborate discussion of the *ordo salutis* suggest the irrevocable bond between *dogma* and *praxis* within the Puritan mind, as well as the persistent nature of doubt within the Puritan parish. Downname's pastoral wisdom, born from his own experience, cautions readers against "playing with religion" in difficult matters of theology, such as predestination, as though one could continue the life of sin and believe they are elected to eternal life, or peer into the secret mind of God and be wholly convinced of one's eternal damnation.¹⁰⁴

In sum, Downname's opus combines pastoral sensitivity with attention to the Christian's social world; its focus and ever-expanding text grew with the times, and provides insight into Downname's broader social community, how he conceived of the Christian's place within it, and the importance of consoling the "weak Christian." As De Koeijer summarizes, "Door zijn voortdurende en uitgebreide pastorale aandacht voor de geestelijke positie van de 'weake christians' heeft hij niet alleen de puriteinse spirituele agenda maar ook de textuur van de puriteinse spiritualiteit duidelijker vorm gegeven."¹⁰⁵

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

Downname's *Guide* was published in 1622 and 1629, and consists of a thorough exposition of the Christian life. Downname distinguishes between speculative and experimental knowledge, the latter being attained only through continued experience.¹⁰⁶ Throughout the *Guide* there is an implicit emphasis on what can be called the "experiential knowing" of Christian doctrine, that is, utilizing correct doctrine for the achievement of godliness. While Downname recognizes the place for polemics and doctrinal precision, he argues that such knowledge does not make "devout Christians" wise unto salvation. This fact, he says, is evident in the many "Doctours of the world," who are "commonly poorest in grace and godlinesse, hauing no sense and feeling of those things, whereof in their learned discourses they make a great shew, and are well able to teach others that way which themselues neuer trauelled."¹⁰⁷

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); and Book VI (Impediments). In total, the work contains 147 chapters within 961 octavo

103 De Koeijer, *Geestelijke strijd bij de puriteinen*, pp. 117–8.

104 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 99–101.

105 De Koeijer, *Geestelijke strijd bij de puriteinen*, p. 119.

106 Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 59; Downname, *Guide*, p. 624.

107 Downname, *Guide*, p. 626.

pages. Similar to *Christian Warfare*, glosses throughout the text provide marginal summaries and citations.

The *Guide's* title page contains a graphic portrayal of devout women who represent the four virtues "Charity," "Humility," "Faith," and "Repentance."¹⁰⁸ 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 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," which would, in turn, give grounds for "backlash" from the antinomians.¹⁰⁹ It is indeed interesting that a nun depicts "Faith," especially given the *Guide's* disregard for Roman Catholic doctrine, but such images were not always closely aligned with a book's contents, being commissioned by the printer and often without the author's consent.¹¹⁰

Though the *Guide* was not as popular as *Christian Warfare* or Perkins's *Salve for a Sick Man* (1595, six editions to 1635), it was nevertheless an important contribution to the swelling corpus of *theologiae practica*. As an inspiring manual for the "good life," the *Guide* sought to promote godliness and stir devotion; it had broad appeal across party lines, though its strict precisianist paradigm no doubt hindered its reception among certain readers.¹¹¹ Indeed, in his dedication to Archbishop George Abbot, Downname provides four reasons for writing the *Guide* instead of a dogmatic work: (1) the world was already full of books that "fully handle the Doctrine of Diuinity"; and there are numerous "learned controuersies wherein the truth is sufficiently defended"; (2) the *Guide* was necessary because national peace and security have "cooled and quenched" the English Church's devotion; (3) there are those who have received "no

108 The engraving is also the work of John Payne.

109 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 130. The image is also discussed and reproduced in Hambrick-Stowe, *Practice of Piety*, pp. 40–1. See also Michael Hunter, *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation* (Aldershot, 2010), 78–9.

110 See, for instance, the title-page graphic to *Alle de werken van Wr. Wilhelm Perkins vermaarde Ghodgheleerde. T' Weede Deel* (Amsterdam, 1662), which depicts an image of Jesus with halo, and compare with Perkins's caution against images of the divine in his *Reformed Catholicke*. See also David J. Davis, *Seeing Faith, Printing Pictures* (Brill, 2013), pp. 159–60.

111 Graham Parry states that such practical treatises had the "function of consolidating community among those on the Puritan wing of the Church." 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, 2009), p. 245.

shadow of peace and comfort in the Doctrine of the Truth,” and are returning to “popish dispensations, and absolutions”; and (4) the *Guide* is a corrective to those who only have knowledge of doctrine “seated in their braynes, and haue no feeling of the power and efficacy of it, for the sanctifying of their hearts, and the reforming of their liues. . . .”¹¹²

The *Guide* was thus pitched as a work to educate readers in the paths of godliness, and ground them within precisianism. It had an integral part in the growing body of domestic literature, and invites readers to see the family and domestic life as the “seminary” of the English Church and commonwealth, where “children and servants are fitted for the public assemblies . . . to perform . . . all religious duties of Gods worship and service.”¹¹³ The *Guide* contributed to what Ian Breward called “a common fund of ideas” that moved toward the status of “moral orthodoxy,” in that furnished Christians with advice on all sorts of topics, including how to conduct oneself during recreation, how to engage in meditation, how to read the Bible for profit, and how to cultivate a lively faith by continuing to draw from the wellspring of fortitude. Downname also comments on the central role of the ministry in advancing the spiritual life, and the urgency of the sacraments, which confirm and strengthen faith.¹¹⁴ Further, of the many subjects fit for mediation, Downname includes the decrees of election and reprobation, which provide “plentifull matter,” which contrasts with his method in *Christian Warfare*.¹¹⁵ For doctrine and piety, the *Guide* suggests reading many other books of the Puritan Reformation.¹¹⁶

112 Downname, *Guide*, sig. A3–4. Many Puritans studied practical divinity before theoretical dogmas, as, for instance, Richard Baxter: “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), 1.1.5.

113 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 329–30.

114 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 262–72, 533–604, 631–52, 823–47; Ian Breward, ed., *The Work of William Perkins* (Appleford, 1970), p. 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, Eng., 2001), p. 244.

115 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 565–8; cf. Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 97–133.

116 For instance, 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 for the godly life. Downname, *Guide*, pp. 636–7.

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, is Downname's commentary on Hosea 1–4, 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.¹¹⁷ Though it covers only the first four chapters of Hosea, the quarto consists of 347 pages, signified the “coming of age in English biblical scholarship,” and became a “foundation” for later commentaries and sermons of the “Hosead” or “Jeremiad” type.¹¹⁸

The *Lectvres* addressed the need for English Bible commentaries, which prior to 1608, had 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 (Udall, Perkins, Cartwright).¹¹⁹ Downname's reason for writing his commentary on Hosea was to fill this lacuna in English bookstores, there being so few “which containe sound expositions of the books of holie Scriptures . . .”¹²⁰ While English pastors had lectured from the Bible since the English Reformation, the London presses did not overflow with biblical commentaries until after 1608, with the publication of works by Thomas Taylor, Henry Airay, Paul Baynes, Thomas Adams, William Greenhill, William Jenkyn, and William Gouge.¹²¹

117 McGiffert, “God's Controversy with Jacobean England,” 1151; Edwards, “Varieties of Sermon,” p. 37. 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.

118 McGiffert, “God's Controversy with Jacobean England,” 1151–74, esp. 1171. Downname had planned a sequel to cover Hosea 5–14 pending the positive reception of the first, and demand for the second. Downname, *Lectures*, sig. A6r–B1v. The “Hosead” has similarities to the later American “Jeremiad.” See Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison, 1978), pp. 3–30; Michael P. Winship, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment* (Baltimore, 1996), pp. 9–29, 74–92.

119 See, for instance, John Udall, *A Commentarie Vpon the Lamentations of Jeremie* (London, 1593); William Perkins, *A Commentarie or Exposition Vpon the Fiue First Chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians* (London, 1604); and Thomas Cartwright, *A Commentary Vpon the Epistle of Saint Paule Written to the Colossians* (London, 1612).

120 John Downname, *Lectvres Vpon the Fovre First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea* (London, 1608), sig. A6–7.

121 See Thomas Taylor, *A Commentarie Vpon the Epistle of S. Paul written to Titus* (London, 1612); Richard Rogers, *A Commentary Vpon the Whole Book of Iudges* (London, 1615); Henry

Downname's commentary was dedicated to James Montague, newly bishop of Bath and Wells, and a renowned moderate Calvinist credited with having influenced King James I against the Arminians. Montague was the editor of James's published *Works*, dean of the Chapel Royal, head of a "Puritan college" (Sidney Sussex), and a prominent member of a Puritan family. Further, he was patron to William Perkins, Thomas Gataker, and Arthur Hildersham; he even preached Perkins's funeral sermon in 1602. It is little wonder, then, why Downname dedicated his *Lectvres* to Montague, imploring both patronage and protection.¹²²

In the dedication, Downname criticizes "the Popish crew" who "disswade all the common people from reading" the English Bible, lest they should pervert the Scriptures, and spawn various "heresies and errors." However, this suppression deprives "Gods familie of their allowance," since only the Bible makes one "wise vnto saluation." Downname further praises Montague for promoting a "godly, learned and faithful" ministry, and prays that his continued patronage would continue to foster "the true religion of Iesus Christ," against "wicked Atheists, prophane worldlings, and idolatrous Papists."¹²³

The structure of the commentary is as follows: after a brief exposition of the main text, Downname draws conclusions or "doctrines," and proposes various "uses," in which readers can practically understand how the text could be applied to their own context. It is similar to the method employed by other Puritan commentators, but does not engage any philological examination of the Hebrew or Greek Septuagint, which suggests it was not intended for the learned world. In fact, Downname explicitly states that the project began with his own private reflections on the prophet, and was not meant for public consumption until the full commentary was finished, but the printer persuaded him to "publish my reading upon these Chapters first, for a taste of the rest."¹²⁴ That Downname's work was never completed, and apparently never reprinted, indicates that its influence on the burgeoning genre is somewhat overblown, at least in the sense that there was not a continuing demand for its production.

Airay, *Lectures Upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians* (London, 1618); Paul Baynes, *A Commentarie Vpon the First Chapter of the Epistle of Saint Paul, Written to the Ephesians* (London, 1618); Thomas Adams, *A Commentary or Exposition Vpon the Diuine Second Epistle Generall, Written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter* (London, 1633); William Greenhill, *An Exposition of the Five First Chapters of the Prophet Ezekiel* (London, 1645); William Jenkyn, *An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude* (London, 1652); and William Gouge, *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1655).

122 Downname, *Lectvres*, sig. A2r–6v.

123 Downname, *Lectvres*, sig. A3r–4v.

124 Downname, *Lectvres*, sig. B1.

Michael McGiffert notes ways in which Downname's commentary is unique: First, it is the first major English attempt to establish a paradigm shift that identifies a "divine anglophilia" for England through a "covenant of works." McGiffert calls this new literary endeavor a "Hosead."¹²⁵ Second, it invented the Jacobean version of the "Jeremiah," and "expressed the broad reforming mind of the church . . . [which] was ecclesiastically unitive, and, although it promoted reform, it did not dream of revolution." 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 the nation if it failed to heed his word and listen to his counsel. Finally, and more generally, the "Hosead" represents a shift in how God's relationship with the nation was portrayed; whereas older generations had focused on the covenant of grace, Downname sought to present "God's controversy" in terms of the twofold covenant of grace and works.¹²⁶ While McGiffert sees the notion of a "covenanted nation" in Downname's commentary, Greaves has challenged this view by arguing that Downname here means "Israel" as the elect church, as a chosen people, and not as "a nation in a political or ethnic sense." Thus, for Greaves, Downname did not see the Hosead as God's voice to a beloved nation, but to the elect within that nation.¹²⁷

While two great historians have debated Downname's intention with his Hosead, and have presented somewhat competing viewpoints, whether his intent was to address only God's elect, or the nation more broadly, as a beloved land with special privileges, they are both essentially correct: Downname does address the visible community of saints, as God's chosen people, but he also sees the prophet addressing the nation more generally, as a warning to the land, that "all with one accord, both by Gods sweete promises, and seure threatenings, might bee brought vnto true repentance."¹²⁸ Whatever his ultimate intent, the commentary addressed the social and religious concerns of the age and helped redefine a genre of literature that, with some qualifications, 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 Church continued to disregard God's laws they would also share

125 McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," 1151–2.

126 McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," 1152–70.

127 *American Historical Review* 89 (1984), 1217. See also Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, pp. 325–6.

128 Downname, *Lectvres*, p. 20.

in Israel's fate; however, should the visible community renounce its idols and superstition, God would yet show mercy, forgive their sins, and heal their land.¹²⁹

Downname's commentary resembles the many sermons before Parliament, where the England/Israel motif was commonly used as a political device for national obedience. It tied God's blessings to public and private obedience, become a common theme during the English Revolution, and was used as a strategy for a continuing Puritan Reformation.¹³⁰

3.3.4 *A Briefe Concordance of the Bible (1630; repr. 1631–90)*

An early modern English bestseller and arguably the bestselling concordance of the seventeenth century, Downname's *A Briefe Concordance of the Bible of the Last Translation* went through more than twenty-four printings from 1630–90. Authorized to print with the Bible, the concordance was undertaken at Clement Cotton's request, whose earlier concordance Downname drew on.¹³¹ 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 compilation reflects the concerns of his other writings, such as his emphasis on assurance in *Christian Warfare*, and that its concision kept its Calvinist tendencies within bounds, which meant it could appeal to a wider Protestant audience. But not all were satisfied with the production, and efforts were made to supplant it.¹³²

129 Downname, *Lectvres*, pp. 342–7; Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions*, p. 231; McGiffert, "God's Controversy with Jacobean England," 1151–74; Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England*, pp. 21–2; 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, Eng., 1997), pp. 15–45.

130 See Barbara Shapiro, *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558–1688* (Stanford, 2012), pp. 167–70, 176–9, 183–4. 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, 2000), pp. 43–58; and 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, 2011), pp. 366–86.

131 For instance, 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, 2003), p. 599.

132 Green, *Print and Protestantism*, p. 126.

Regardless, the popularity of Downname's concordance reveals the urgency placed upon Bible study within Puritan devotion. Indeed, William Gouge stated 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." Further, use of a concordance was ubiquitous among Bible commentators, scholars, and theologians, in writing their own books, and was a favorite of the laity for use in family worship, as long as the work met criteria for "completeness, ease of use, and price."¹³³ By the mid-seventeenth century, concordances had become entrenched in popular devotion.¹³⁴

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 to displace the annotated Geneva Bible, which had gained "popular preference and half a century of market dominance."¹³⁵ Over time, however, the KJB would supplant its heavily annotated competitor, but there was still demand for the annotations, especially for domestic use.¹³⁶ The English laity had a strong desire for brief expositions of the biblical text, and the KJB, as it was printed in 1611, did not meet this need.¹³⁷ Therefore, attempts were made to combine the two, as seen in the

133 Green, *Print and Protestantism*, p. 126.

134 The prominent place the concordance had in English Puritanism is seen in John Bunyan's comment that "my Bible and my concordance [are] my only library in my writings." 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, 1989), p. 9.

135 David Norton, *The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011), p. 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, 1997), p. 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, 2011), p. 31.

136 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, 2011), p. 26.

137 The new KJB very purposely had no annotations, not because of the extra cost but to avoid controversy. In this sense, the KJB could be seen as an "ecumenically Protestant"

“hybrid” Amsterdam edition of 1642, which printed the KJB with the Genevan annotations. Publication of Junius’s comments on the Book of Revelation, and the commissioning of the *Annotations* were further efforts to meet the increasing demand.¹³⁸ The success of annotations on the Bible, and of Protestant commentaries more generally, can partially be attributed to the earlier success of the Geneva Bible, in that it primed the public to expect more than a bare-bones translation of the Bible. Still, even with its success, the new English commentary is largely neglected within current scholarship, possibly, as Trueman intimates, because the seventeenth century continues to be seen as an era of dogma and not one of exegesis.¹³⁹

The *Annotations* first arose as a project to revise and update the Genevan annotations. Those in charge of the project petitioned the House of Commons for the Genevan notes to be updated and corrected, and formally published as marginal notes for the KJB, which the House approved and commissioned as the first edition of the *Annotations*.¹⁴⁰ The second edition, which was further enlarged, corrected, and printed in two volumes (1651), became more of a commentary on the whole Bible, and offered elaborate explanations of difficult texts. It also alleviated continental disquietude over the first edition.¹⁴¹ The third and definitive edition was completed in 1657–58.

Though the *Annotations* were dubbed the “Westminster Annotations,” the assembly was not officially involved in its production. The work was separate from the assembly’s formal deliberations and commissioned by Parliament

Bible. Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton, 2005), p. 22.

- 138 Lampros, “A New Set of Spectacles,” 33–46; 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, Eng., 2004), p. 91.
- 139 Trueman wrote, “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.” Carl R. 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, 2011), p. 62. See also Norton, *The King James Bible*, pp. 135–7.
- 140 Downname, ed., *Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament* (London, 1645), sig. B4v.
- 141 *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.

to be carried out by various divines, a majority of which sat at Westminster.¹⁴² Even though the assembly had no official part in the “English Annotations,” or “Great Annotations,” as they were called, it was nonetheless done in the spirit of the assembly, and confirmed explanations and interpretations generally settled at Westminster.¹⁴³

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).¹⁴⁴ Ley, Gouge, Taylor, Reynolds, Gataker, and Featley were members of the Westminster Assembly. The commentators drew from standard theological books, including earlier works by Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, and other contemporary continental and English sources. It was a monumental achievement and the first collaborative English commentary of its kind.¹⁴⁵ The *Annotations* were reprinted several times, made their way into

142 Robert Baillie, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637–62*, ed. David Laing, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1841), 2:188. Cornelius Burgess, a member of the assembly, wrote that, “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 *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.” Burgess, *No Sacrilege Nor Sinne To Aliene or Purchase the Lands of Bishops or Others, Whose Offices are Abolished* (London, 1659), pp. 87–8.

143 George Watson, ed., *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, Volume 1: 600–1660* (Cambridge, Eng., 1974), p. 1857.

144 Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, 2008), 2:91. If one were to allow Downnamean authorship of the glosses in the *Summe*, it is plausible that Downname was at least partially responsible for glosses in the *Annotations*. Richard Baxter suggests that Downname 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., 2 vols. (London, 1713), 1:86.

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

many Nonconformist libraries, including that of the “radical” Samuel Jeake, and paved the way for numerous texts within the genre.

The success of the *Annotations* reflects the desire among the English for explanatory texts and commentaries; what has been said of Protestantism more generally is equally true of Puritanism: it was first and foremost a “religion of the word.” The commentary also reflects the dominance of Reformed theology at the time (e.g. the *Annotations* often defer to Beza), and are suggestive of a shift within popular religion, from preference for oral to printed forms of speech, and from corporate to personal worship. Indeed, the commentary is emblematic of the growing English Reformed commentative tradition that was targeted toward lay consumption, and its numerous reprints contributed to a thriving London book trade. As John Barnard said, “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.”¹⁴⁶

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 *Summe of Sacred Divinitie*. As noted before (see n. 2), Downname did not write the anonymous *Summe*.¹⁴⁷ There has been some confusion in recent literature concerning its authorship, with some historians citing Downname as author, and others Sir Henry Finch. There are even older references to John Gordon, author of the preface to the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie*.

146 John Barnard, “London Publishing, 1640–60: Crisis, Continuity, and Innovation,” in *Book History, Volume 4*, ed. Ezra Greenspan and Jonathan Rose (University Park, 2001), pp. 6–7. See, for instance, John Lightfoot, *The Harmony, Chronicle and Order, of the Old Testament* (London, 1647), John Trapp, *A Commentary or Exposition upon all the Epistles, and the Revelation of John the Divine* (London, 1647), and his *A Clavis to the Bible, or, A New Comment upon the Pentateuch* (London, 1650); Edward Leigh, *Annotations upon all the New Testament* (London, 1650), and his *Annotations on Five Poetical Books of the Old Testament* (London, 1657); Henry Hammond, *A Paraphrase, and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament* (London, 1653); John Richardson, *Choice Observations and Explanations upon the Old Testament* (a supplement); John White, *A Commentary upon the Three First Chapters of the First Book of Moses Called Genesis* (London, 1656); and Matthew Poole, *Annotations upon the Holy Bible* (1683–85).

147 At least two seventeenth-century sources mistakenly cite Downname as author: *Walwyns Just Defence Against the Cast upon Him* (London, 1649), p. 9; and *The Leveller Tracts, 1647–53* (New York, 1944), p. 362.

Since the authorship issue has been addressed before, we will only outline the main points against Downamean authorship: (1) It is unlikely that Downame 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;¹⁴⁸ (2) Downame was not known to publish anonymously and would have no need to; (3) There is nothing scandalous in the contents of the *Summe*, which would warrant anonymity from a minister of Downame’s standing, nor need to give the impression that the work belonged to another; (4) William Gouge, a close friend of Finch and publisher of many of his works, including Finch’s last opus, *The Worlds Great Restauration* (1621), cites Finch as author of both the *Sacred Doctrine* and the *Summe*;¹⁴⁹ (5) Finchian authorship of the anonymous 1589/90 *Sacred Doctrine* is nearly universally accepted, as is its subsequent condensed republication in 1613; (6) The title-page of the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine* envisions two volumes of the work: the first being the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine*, and the second, which was not as yet written, but which would contain a larger and more elaborate exposition of the first;¹⁵⁰ (7) Downame explicitly states that his role in the production of the *Summe* was as “an unworthy God-father,” who published it “with the weake thread of my censure”;¹⁵¹ (8) Finch, a layman, prominent member of London’s Gray’s Inn, and serjeant-at-law for James I, would have had reason to publish anonymously given his standing at court, especially works of a more theological and millenarian flavor.¹⁵² It is little wonder, then, that the only books

148 Indeed, Downame states that the author had composed the work “with such learning, iudgement, and pietie, that had he herin respected the prayses of men, hee might well haue graced his Name with his Worke, euen as his Worke would haue bene 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...” Henry Finch, *The Summe of Sacred Divinitie: Briefly & Methodically Propounded, [and then] More Largely & Cleerely Handled and Explained* (London, 1620), sig. A4.

149 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.

150 See and compare the title pages to the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine* and the c.1620 *Summe*. The later and expanded *Summe* is doubtless the realization of the envisioned work proposed in 1613.

151 Finch, *Summe*, sig. A4v.

152 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. Further, it is likely that Downame edited out any controversial millenarian ideas from the *Summe*, as, for instance, there is no definite date for the

published under Finch's name during his lifetime were those on the law. His religious writings, including a commentary on the Song of Solomon, were all published anonymously from private manuscripts.¹⁵³

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,¹⁵⁴ it would seem plausible that the fuller and 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 able, having been educated at Cambridge; indeed, both Gouge and Downname praise Finch for his ability to handle doctrine; second, Gouge was aware of and references the *Summe* in his preface to Finch's *Worlds Restauration*, which definitively places publication of the *Summe* before 1621. This coincides with Downname's comment that the author was still alive at the time of publication.

Given Finchian authorship of the *Summe*, the book merits little discussion beyond some comments as to its organization, glosses, and general content. Were the work more intimately annotated by Downname, as presumably Nichols did to the earlier *Sacred Doctrine*, it would bear more weight in assessing Downname's own methods and aims, he thus assuming the role of *auctor intellectualis*. Though Downname did not write the main text of the *Summe*, he nonetheless purposefully endorsed its contents, prepared the text for publication, and published it on his own initiative. It is not known how Downname came into possession of the text, but presumably it was either directly from Finch himself, or possibly through Gouge. Regardless, Downname was more

gathering of the Jews. See Victoria Clark, *Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism* (New Haven, 2007), pp. 27–38; J. C. Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1516–1700* (Cambridge, Eng., 1981), p. 147.

153 In his note prefaced to Finch's *An Exposition of the Song of Solomon* (London, 1615), sig. A2, Gouge states, "It pleased you as a testimonie of your loue, to bestow these your labours on me written with your owne hand: they being mine by a free donation of on your part, I think I haue the power to doe with them what I will. Wherefore I haue been bold to publish them, knowing that they are wel worth the publishing . . ."

154 McGiffert argues that Josias Nichols (1553–1639) was author of both the preface to and the glosses in the 1589/90 *Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie*. See McGiffert, "Who Wrote the Preface and Notes for Henry Finch's 'The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie,' 1590?," *Albion* 18 (1986), 247–51.

aware of its contents than with many other books under his *imprimatur*, and it seems to have been well received upon publication.

While it is tempting to see the work's anonymity as intending a more universal or ecumenical reception, as in the absence of "predestination" in the Heidelberg Catechism, the real cause seems to be the Finch's political circumstances and expectations at court. Further, Finch was known to have had perpetual financial problems, and a lengthy battle over his estate, which soon after was marred by litigation and bankruptcy c.1620. It is plausible that a public primed against the insolvent would have frowned upon any religious composition from an author in such circumstances.¹⁵⁵

The *Summe* thus has its roots in the earlier *Sacred Doctrine*, but expands to text to 551 pages. It reaffirms standard Reformed doctrines on God, predestination, justification, sanctification, and the covenant. The work is organized into two main parts: the first consisting of a skeletal reprint of the 1613 *Sacred Doctrine*, which appears without the expanded discussion of the Old Testament's promise, and a second annotated and enlarged exposition, which often follows the form and content of the first.¹⁵⁶

The larger *Summe* is divided into two main "Books." The first deals with the doctrine of God, creation of humanity, providence, giving of the law, and the fall into sin. The second introduces Christ as the end of the law, the covenant of grace, predestination, the priesthood, kingdom, and prophetic office of Christ, the church, salvation, and the consummation of all things. In continuity with sixteenth-century developments, the *Summe* emphasizes the centrality of Christ within Reformed doctrine with its overall structure. As intimated before, the *Summe* does not present any innovative doctrine or schema. It reiterates the same emphasis on the covenant of works, which the earlier 1589/90 *Sacred Doctrine* had done, but overall its contents are concise expressions of standard theological positions within the English Church. While one could possibly see the ordering of the loci as something unique, in that it does

155 For instance, Neal states that while bankruptcy was scarce among the Puritans, when it did occur, the "bankrupt had a mark of infamy set upon him that he could never wipe off." Moreover, the insolvent were often barred from the Lord's Table until satisfaction had been made. See Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans*, 5 vols. (Boston, 1817), 4:293; Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches in the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982), p. 326. See also, Lendol Calder, "Saving and Spending," in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Consumption*, ed. Frank Trentmann (Oxford, 2012), pp. 363–4.

156 See and compare Finch, *Summe*, sig. '1r-A4v and pp. 1–551. The marginalia consists of elaborate citation of biblical sources, explanatory notes, and references to errors and heresies.

not follow Perkins's *Golden Chain*, it does, however, 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)

James Ussher's *A Body of Divinitie* was a bestseller well into the eighteenth century, and was often used as a catechetical text to teach the essentials of Reformed doctrine.¹⁵⁷ Alan Ford has called it “that curious book” because of its strange pedigree.¹⁵⁸ Though the book was first published in 1645, with several impressions thereafter, its origins were much earlier. According to Downname, the work was “written and finished about twenty years since” (a statement repeated in the 1658 and 1680 editions), which would place it sometime c.1625; however, the 1647 edition makes it thirty years, implying c.1617, a date confirmed in the most careful edition of 1677. According to Ussher's biographer, its origins were in public catechetical lectures given at Trinity College when Ussher was twenty years old, he having been chosen college catechist, and then in private comments for his family, whom he customarily instructed twice a week. Copies were then made and dispersed abroad for the benefit of others; however, since the work was something of a commonplace book, consisting of extracts from the writings of others, Ussher was displeased when he heard that Downname published it, though in time, after its widespread “success,” he came to approve it.¹⁵⁹

Downname commends the work “under a two-fold notion”: the first being its 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 *prima inter pares* for catechesis.¹⁶⁰

157 Green, *Print and Protestantism*, Appendix 1; Andrew Marvell, *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Martin Dzelzaninis and Annabel M. Patterson, 2 vols. (New Haven, 2003), 1:384.

158 Ford, *James Ussher*, p. 81.

159 Ford, *James Ussher*, p. 82; *Eighteen Sermons Preached in Oxford in 1640* (London, 1660), sig. A3; Bernard, *Life and Death*, pp. 34, 41–2.

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

The text is organized around fifty-two doctrinal heads, which encompass the doctrine of God, creation, covenants, sacraments, and the *ordo salutis*.

Ford has criticized those who cite the book as Ussher's since Ussher did not strictly author the work, but transcribed it from other sources, including Thomas Cartwright's *Catechisme*. However, the *Body of Divinitie* bears little resemblance to Cartwright's short catechism, the former consisting of only fifteen pages, though there is some continuity in how topics are discussed.¹⁶¹ Indeed, as Richard Snoddy observed, "The work exhibits a literary and theological unity quite unlike the commonplaces found in Ussher's manuscripts, though the extent to which this reflects the editorial intervention of Downname cannot be ascertained."¹⁶² While this is technically true, Ussher's initial disavowal of the work provides some insight into Downname's possible involvement. Ussher accused Downname of tearing apart the work, expanding the text, and organizing it according to his own interests, and from this, it would seem that Downname did more editing, expanding, and arranging of the text than merely collating its leaves and publishing them.¹⁶³

That Ussher had once used the material for catechesis does not necessitate authorship since, as Ussher intimated, they were merely the sayings of others. However, "J. D.," who wrote the new preface to the 1677 edition of *Body of Divinitie*, argued from "eyewitness" accounts that the catechetical method and materials were Ussher's, and that Downname's involvement was minimal.¹⁶⁴ Regardless, Ford is correct that it should be removed from the Ussher corpus, even though it seems that Downname was more connected to its production than he was with the *Summe*, perhaps fitting it to reflect a more supralapsarian schema, but there is not enough evidence to ascribe the totality of the work to Downname.¹⁶⁵

161 Ford, *James Ussher*, pp. 82–3. However, the *Body of Divinitie* bears little resemblance to Cartwright's short catechism, the former consisting of only fifteen pages, though arguably there is some theological continuity. On the question, "What is predestination?", Cartwright answers, "It is the decree of God touching the euerlasting estate of men and Angels." The *Body of Divinitie* has, "It is the special decree of God, whereby he hath from everlasting freely and for his own glory fore-ordained all reasonable creatures to a certain and everlasting estate of glory in heaven, or shame in hell." See Thomas Cartwright, *A Methodicall Short Catechisme: Containing Briefly all the Principle Grounds of Christian Religion* (London, 1623), sig. A4; and *Body of Divinitie*, p. 91.

162 Richard Snoddy, *The Soteriology of James Ussher: The Act and Object of Saving Faith* (New York, 2014), p. 36.

163 Ussher, *Works*, 1:249; 13 May 1645.

164 *Body of Divinitie* (London, 1677), sig. A3–4. "J. D." is most likely John Dury.

165 Ford, *James Ussher*, pp. 81–4; Snoddy, *The Soteriology of James Ussher*, p. 36.

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 their historical context. We will now consider Downname's theology as it reflects the beliefs and doctrines of the English and Reformed precisianists within Puritanism. In short, we will consider the major themes of (1) Doctrine of God and Humanity; (2) Predestination and Assurance; (3) Covenant of Works and Grace; (4) Justification and Sanctification; (5) Law and Gospel; and (6) Christian Life and Piety. These loci will serve as a basis for comparison with Rous and Crisp. As we have seen, Downname spent most of his time preaching and writing practical divinity.¹⁶⁶ This form of divinity was such that it drew practical deductions from major doctrines, through a reasoned exposition of the Bible; indeed, the Bible takes a primary place in Downname's argumentation, and he constantly gives deference to it above received tradition, simply because he believed it to be the self-attesting and inerrant word of God to humanity, and, as such, had tremendous import on what to believe, and how to conduct one's life.¹⁶⁷

166 The precisianist mystic Isaac Ambrose also favored this type of divinity: "Were I to advise against any Error, Heresie, I had rather bid my Adversaries read some Books of Positive, Practical Divinity, wherein Truth and Religion is laid out in its life and power, then all the voluminous Controversies that ever I could write, or ever have been writ by any other Sons of men." Ambrose, *Media: The Middle Things, in Reference to the First and Last Things* (London, 1649), sig. A4r.

167 Harry Stout has noted the irony that although 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, 1986), p. 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 (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, 1980) and John S. Coolidge, *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (London, 1970). On *αυτοπιστος* within the Reformed tradition, see Henk van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden, 2008).

3.4.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

Downname stood firmly within the Reformed tradition in his understanding of the *summum bonum*, the Triune God who actively works among humanity.¹⁶⁸ Downname's writings reflect the more finely tuned theological categories of seventeenth-century development, and the eclectic nature of the English Reformed tradition, as it sought to mold consensus on God's nature, being, attributes, and activity.¹⁶⁹

168 Downname, *Guide*, p. 30; Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden, 1975), p. 126. For the doctrine of God within Reformed orthodoxy, 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, 2008), pp. 29–46; Andreas J. Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre* (Göttingen, 2007), pp. 207–425; Richard A. Muller, *Post Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, 2003), 3:153–590, 4:143–381; John Platt, *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575–1650* (Leiden, 1982), pp. 3–49; J. A. van Ruler, *The Crisis of Causality: Voetius and Descartes on God, Nature, and Change* (Leiden, 1995); and Simon J. G. Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's Modus Theologiae* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 201–324.

169 Various aspects of the doctrine of God, as, for instance, divine efficiency and sufficiency, have been elucidated 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, 2013), pp. 19–255; Sebastian Rehnman, "The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), pp. 353–401; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, pp. 35–66; Trueman, *The Claims of Truth*, pp. 102–50; Harm Goris, "Thomism in Zanchi's Doctrine of God," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem van Asselt and Eef Decker (Grand Rapids, 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*, pp. 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, in that theologians recognized that knowledge of the divine could only go so far, but illuminative in that it greatly expanded on the simple credo of the Apostle's Creed. It reaffirmed the earlier medieval cataphatic and apophatic notions, and embraced Thomist and Scotist strains in an eclectic use of the past. See Rehnman, "Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy," pp. 353–401; Richard A. Muller, "The 'Reception of Calvin' in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91

When examining Downname's understanding of who God is, as well as his thoughts on the other loci, we must not ignore the wider historical contexts with which his life and work were interwoven. One such context is the wider confessional heritage, which Downname would have been familiar with, and which is reflected in the period's divinity manuals.¹⁷⁰ Though Downname is best known for his contribution to the doctrine of assurance, his editorial work on the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie* should not be ignored. Though it is uncertain to what extent Downname was involved with their glosses on the doctrine of God, he gave his assent to their general contents; therefore, minimally, these texts provide a window into his own theological leanings. Moreover, both his *Guide* and *Christian Warfare* either use or assume the orthodox Reformed doctrine of God as a foundation for the godly life, evident in that the Christian's holiness is a mirror of the divine, however imperfect.

It is evident that discussions of God in the *Summe*, *Body of Divinitie*, *Guide*, and *Christian Warfare* reflect centuries of theological development and continuity. 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.¹⁷¹ Downname's *Guide* devotes a short section to God's essence, attributes, word, and works.¹⁷² The *Christian Warfare* does not contain any formal discussion of God's essence or attributes, but bases many of its arguments on them, as, for instance, in grounding assurance in the unchangeable nature of God's love.¹⁷³

(2011), 258–60. See also John F. Wippel, *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas: From Finite Being to Uncreated Being* (Washington, D.C., 2000); Richard Cross, *The Metaphysics of the Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus* (New York, 2002).

170 Often, though not always, confessional descriptions were used as starting points for the doctrine of God.

171 For instance, Leigh prefaces his work with prolegomena, and then discusses the doctrine of Scripture prior to the doctrine of God, thus emphasizing the importance of how knowledge is attained. Leigh, *Systeme*, pp. 1–143.

172 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 30–5.

173 See Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 85–6, where he writes, “But the loue of God is not grounded vpon our worthinesse which is nothing, but vpon his own good will and pleasure, which is infinite as himself is infinite; and therefore though in our selues wee are

This addressing of God first and prior to discussions of the creation of humanity and Christology is similar to other Reformed scholastic texts, in that logical priority is given to generally brief descriptions of who God is, his essence and power.¹⁷⁴ Unlike other contested issues of the Reformation, the doctrine of God was more of a unifying theme than Reformed rhetoric might suggest. Indeed, the many descriptions of God found within the confessions and catechisms of the seventeenth century could equally, with few exceptions, be subscribed to by Reformed and Roman Catholic alike, both relying on patristic witness regarding the doctrine of the Trinity of God, mediated through, with some variance, Lombard, Scotus, and Aquinas.¹⁷⁵ Within English universities, Lombard's *Sententiarum libri quatuor* and Aquinas's *Summa theologia* had long been used as pedagogical texts for training theologians.¹⁷⁶ The "catholicity" of

most miserable and wretched, yet this is no reason why wee should distrust or in the least degree doubt of Gods loue, seeing it ariseth not from any thing in vs, but form himself who is vnchangeable."

174 See, for instance, Dudley Fenner, *Sacra theologia, sive Veritas qua est secundam pietatem* (Geneva, 1586), book 1; Johannes Wollebius, *Compendium theologiae Christianae, accurate method sic adornatum* (Amsterdam, 1655), book 1; and William Ames, *Medulla theologica* (Amsterdam, 1635), pp. 1–33. Fenner has been called, "the closest that early Presbyterians came to a systematic theologian." 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*, ed. John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas (Aldershot, 2004), p. 282.

175 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, 2008), p. 221; see also pp. 221–65.

The synthesizers of a "Reformed Thomism," 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, 2009), pp. 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, 2001), pp. 121–39; John Patrick Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden, 1976); and Otto Gründler's more dogmatic appraisal in his "Thomism and Calvinism in the Theology of Girolamo Zanchi (1516–90)" (Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1961); and, more generally, for "Reformed Thomism" within Puritanism, Christopher Cleveland, *John Owen and Thomism* (Aldershot, 2013).

176 Alan Cobban, *English University Life in the Middle Ages* (London, 1999), p. 165; Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional*

the doctrine meant significant harmony across the confessional divide, with variations emerging in how to understand God's will, the logical priority of the decrees, and the nature of the covenant; more broadly, divisions between the Reformed and Lutheran would surface over God's knowledge of future contingencies, but even here Molinist notions and contentions for a "conditional" decree did not suggest that human beings had the power to "undermine, change, or over power the electing will of God."¹⁷⁷

Given the substantial agreements on the doctrine within the Reformed tradition, it is not necessary to fully explain the teachings of the *Summe*, *Body of Divinitie*, *Guide*, and *Christian Warfare* on this locus, other than to note some distinct points as to their layout, method, and content:

First, all four texts are heavily influenced by Ramism, which is not surprising given Ramus's overall influence on Puritanism.¹⁷⁸ This is seen not only in the Ramist charts throughout the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*, for instance, but also in the direct quoting of Ramus's work on theology, where God's self-knowledge is said to infinitely exceed the comprehension of human beings, thus making a "perfect" definition of God impossible. The attempt to do so is "madness and folly," and constitutes "extreme vngodlinesse." That both texts refer to Ramus, and specifically quote the phrase, "Gods own Logick," suggests the popularity of the phrase, or, possibly, Downname's editorial hand.¹⁷⁹ Other influences are seen in the pedagogical nature of theology itself, in that theology is continually

Identity in the Seventeenth Century (New York, 2009), p. 86; Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (New York, 2004), p. 4.

177 Katherine Sonderegger, "Election," in *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*, ed. John Webster, Kathryn Tanner, and Iain Torrance (New York, 2007), p. 112.

178 Downname, Finch, and Ussher, were all immersed in the method of Peter Ramus (Pierre de la Ramée, 1515–72). Downname learned Ramism at Cambridge, Finch had been a student of Laurence Chaderton ("England's first and leading exponent of Ramist logic"), and Ussher's "weekdays [while at Trinity College, Dublin] were spent studying Ramus and rhetoric." See 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, 1991), p. 76; H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558–1640* (New York, 1996), p. 209; Ford, *James Ussher*, pp. 39–40. See also James Veazie Skalnik, *Ramus and Reform: University and Church at the End of the Renaissance* (Kirksville, 2002).

179 See Finch, *Summe*, p. 7; Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, p. 31. Ramus wrote, "ad accurate autem definiendum Deum, Dei ipsius logica fuerit opus." Peter Ramus, *Commentariorum de religione christiana libri quatuor* (Frankfurt am Main, 1576), p. 15.

portrayed as the means to living well.¹⁸⁰ As Willem Frijhoff wrote, Ramus's "practical, highly didactic definition of theology . . . was refined by William Perkins [and] trenchantly reformulated by his pupil William Ames . . . what mattered in the final analysis was life, not doctrine. Not the mind, but the will was for Ramus the most important instrument of religion."¹⁸¹

Second, the *Summe* distinguishes 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 and settled terms.¹⁸² 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 the *primum ens* who breathed life into his creation.¹⁸³

Third, the *Summe*, *Body of Divinitie*, and *Guide* provide careful descriptions of divine simplicity and eternity, as well as a nuanced Trinitarianism.¹⁸⁴ They further distinguish between God's incommunicable and communicable attributes.¹⁸⁵

Fourth, though the *Summe* contains a more elaborate discussion than the briefer and more catechetical *Body of Divinitie*, there are no substantial disagreements over the doctrine of God, which again reflects the general doctrinal harmony among the Reformed on this locus.

180 See Ramus, *Commentariorum*, p. 6, where he writes, "Theologia est doctrina bene vivendi." See also Ames, *Medulla*, p. 1, where he adds "to God" to Ramus's classic definition: "Theologia est doctrina Deo vivendi." But cf. Fenner, *Sacra theologia*, p. 1, where, "Theologia est scientia veritatis quae est de Deo, ad recte beateque viuendum."

181 Willem Frijhoff, *Fulfilling God's Mission: The Two Worlds of Dominie Everardus Bogardus, 1607–47*, trans. Myra Heerspink Scholz (Leiden, 2007), p. 186.

182 Finch, *Summe*, p. 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. The first recorded use of "Christology" seems to be Thomas Jackson, *Works*, 3 vols. (London, 1673), 1:27.

183 Downname, *Guide*, p. 30.

184 The *Guide* states that, "The Eternity of God is an essential attribute, which signifieth that he is infinite and uncircumscribed by time, first and last, without beginning or ending, absolute without succession, wholly all, alwaies and at once." Downname, *Guide*, p. 31. On divine eternity, see Paul Helm, *Eternal God: A Study of God Without Time*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2011); Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 3:325–64; Trueman, "Reason and Rhetoric," pp. 29–46.

185 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 30–2.

Further consensus is seen on the doctrine of creation and humanity, its fall into sin, and the nature of the divine covenants.¹⁸⁶ As Muller has argued, the doctrine of God within Reformed orthodoxy was based on biblical exegesis and a careful use of tradition.¹⁸⁷ Its aim, within a British Puritan context, was to instruct and to move Christians to godly conduct; as the *Summe* stated, the end of the “doctrine of divinity” is to glorify God. Therefore, a correct and foundational understanding of who God is, and how humanity relates to him, was logically prior to living the godly life.¹⁸⁸

3.4.2 *Predestination and Assurance*

The doctrine of predestination was contested in the seventeenth century, and made it into nearly every theology manual, catechism, and confessional statement of the time, having been expressed in different ways for centuries.¹⁸⁹ It is the doctrine that God from eternity has chosen from the mass of humanity some persons for salvation (*electi*) and others for damnation (*reprobi*), and has become synonymous with “Puritanism,” because of the high esteem that Puritans generally placed upon it, especially in their polemical works against Arminianism,¹⁹⁰ and because of its association within the literature with the problem of assurance.¹⁹¹ The doctrine emphasized God’s sovereignty in salvation, and refuted any teaching that would find merit within human beings as a cause for salvation; thus, it was a way to emphasize divine

186 See Downname, *Guide*, pp. 34–6.

187 Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 3:213–4.

188 Finch, *Summe*, pp. 1–3.

189 See Matthew Levering, *Predestination: Biblical and Theological Paths* (New York, 2011), pp. 36–98.

190 Quantin states that the “Arminian crisis had a major impact in England, where it exposed fault-lines which had previously been buried under the dominant Reformed consensus,” and the battleground over the “orthodox doctrine of grace and predestination” centered over who could rightfully claim Augustine. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, p. 176, see also pp. 176–91. See also Arnoud S. Q. Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500–1620* (New York, 2011), pp. 126–33.

191 See Jeremy Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 53–5; Ann Thompson, *The Art of Suffering and the Impact of Seventeenth-Century Anti-Providential Thought* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 10–1; Robert Middlekauff, *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596–1728* (Berkeley, 1999), p. 4. Thuesen refers to the “ecstatic agony” of Puritan in that “the less assured he felt, the more assurance he actually had.” Thuesen, *Predestination*, pp. 68–71.

causality, undermine the authority of church hierarchy, and provide the theological grounds for assurance.¹⁹²

While Puritans generally agreed on the doctrine of predestination, they did dispute the *order decretorum* and came to positions that came to be known as supra- and infralapsarianism. While there were heated arguments on both sides, there was more in common than their rhetoric might suggest, both agreeing that the decrees were from eternity, and differed only in how they were executed in time.¹⁹³ The supralapsarians taught that the decree to predestinate was prior to the decree to create humanity and permit Adam's fall into sin, and saw human beings as *creabilis et labilis*, whereas infralapsarians believed that the decree to create was prior to the decree to predestinate, and thus the objects of predestination were *creatus et lapsus*.¹⁹⁴ Both positions were allowed within Reformed orthodoxy, and the order of the decrees was never made a confessional issue, even though the Reformed confessions generally followed the infralapsarian schema.¹⁹⁵

Within the literature, historians sometimes refer to supralapsarianism as "double" predestination and infralapsarianism as "single" predestination, but

192 Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., "Predestination," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 2:491–3. See also Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982).

193 Twisse, for instance, accused John Cotton of compromising Calvinist orthodoxy in his view of predestination, arguing that, "In all this wee have as pure Arminianisme tendred unto us, as could drop from the pen of *Arminius* himselfe." See William Twisse, *A Treatise of Mr. Cottons, Clearing certaine Doubts Concerning Predestination. Together with an Examination Thereof* (London, 1646); and cf. Sargent Bush, Jr., ed., *The Correspondence of John Cotton* (Chapel Hill, 2001), pp. 109–13. On the Twisse-Cotton debate, see Coolidge, *The Pauline Renaissance in England*, pp. 111–26; and Como, "Puritans, Predestination, and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England," pp. 64–6.

194 The most influential supralapsarians were Beza, Maccovius, Gomarus, Perkins, Ames, Twisse, Rutherford, and Voetius. Though Reformed scholastics debated the order of the decrees to predestinate, create, and fall, all the decrees were always understood to be ordered logically since all knowledge and willing were simultaneous actions within the divine mind.

195 Guy Richard has challenged 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. Regardless, as Jaroslav Pelikan has noted, diversity of opinion did not mean an "automatic threat to orthodoxy," only those that "publicly and perniciously contradict the official teaching of the church . . ." Pelikan, *The Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, 4 vols. (New Haven, 2003), 4:78.

historically, as the decrees were understood in the seventeenth century, both supra- and infralapsarianism were believed to be “double,” in their decree to elect, and to reprobate or pass over, the main difference being how God perceived the objects of predestination.¹⁹⁶

The doctrine of predestination is featured throughout the *Summe, Body of Divinitie, Guide, and Christian Warfare*, and there is broad consensus within them on the nature of the decree, its order, and pedagogical use for comforting God’s elect.

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. Here predestination is defined as the principal branch of God’s purpose concerning the final estate of men and angels. This branch consists of two parts: election, which is the bringing of some to salvation, and reprobation, which is the bringing of some to damnation. Though God’s elect are few in number when compared to the reprobate, the *forma causa* of the difference is God’s will and pleasure (*decretum beneplaciti*), without any eternal motive, the decree being first in the nature and order of all 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 damned. The *Summe* refutes notions that election and reprobation are motivated by anything within human beings; there is no foreseen faith or infidelity that is the *causam efficientem* of the decree, not even the works of Christ; rather they are the consequences that follow upon it.¹⁹⁷ Similar to arguments laid out in the *Christian Warfare*, the *Summe* states that predestination is “the foundation of all our comfort, that our Election being grounded vpon this brazen Hill of Gods eternal loue, can neuer be shaken, but remayneth fast for euer. If it stood in our selues to bee the cause of our owne, either Saluation or Damnation, we should all undoubtedly perish.”¹⁹⁸

In the *Christian Warfare*, the *forma causa* of election is the purpose of God himself, whereby he determined to elect; however, presumably given its

196 See Muller, *After Calvin*, pp. 11–2. Augustine, Isidore of Seville, Gottschalk, Calvin, Beza, and Perkins had all expressed the idea of a “double” predestination.

197 Finch, *Summe*, pp. 285–97. Twisse once challenged “all the nation of Arminians” to answer his contention that God’s decrees are solely by God’s act of willing, and “can have no cause in man.” William Twisse, *The Doctrine of the Synod of Dort and Arles, Reduced to the Practice* (London, 1631), pp. 12–3.

198 Finch, *Summe*, p. 297.

intended audience, it is silent on the causes of reprobation, stating that one's afflictions are sign of adoption.¹⁹⁹ 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.²⁰⁰ The *Summe's* teachings on predestination are in keeping with the earlier developments of Beza, Perkins, Polanus, Junius, Maccovius, and Gomarus.²⁰¹ 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."²⁰²

Overall, there are subtle differences between the *Summe* and *Christian Warfare*, in that the latter accents God's grace in election, stating that "all other causes," such as one's own will, foreseen works, the worthiness of faith, and even the merits of Christ are excluded as grounds for election.²⁰³ Downname distinguishes between the "efficient," "material," and "formal" causes of election, which all work toward God's glory and salvation of the elect.²⁰⁴

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 *Christian Warfare* and *Guide*. The *Summe* also targets the errors of the Arminians, Universalists, Roman Catholics, and those of the "softer-Reformed" variety.²⁰⁵

The *Summe* ends its discussion on the doctrine of 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 *Guide*. One can readily see the preoccupation with assurance in these two texts, and the great pains that Downname took to address it; it would be no leap to suggest that

199 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 90, 174–6.

200 Finch, *Summe*, pp. 291–3.

201 See "Predestination," in *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, pp. 332–38; esp. p. 336.

202 Downname, *Guide*, p. 34.

203 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, p. 97.

204 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, p. 98.

205 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. See Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2007), pp. 71–94.

the foremost problem within Puritan divinity had to do with the attainment of assurance, especially as it related to theorems about God's eternal decrees. Indeed, Puritan ministers had to "adjust their theology" to this increasing problem within their churches.²⁰⁶

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.²⁰⁷

The *Body of Divinitie* seems to use more infralapsarian overtones when it employs the language of God "passing over" the reprobate, but possibly nullifies it by stating that there is no cause in the reprobate for their reprobation other than God's free will and good pleasure.²⁰⁸

Typical of Puritanism, the *Summe*, *Body of Divinitie*, *Christian Warfare*, and *Guide* address the difficulties associated with the doctrine of predestination, and the common abuses of it. Rather than being a cause for anxiety, the doctrine brings comfort for the elect, being immutable, but terror to the reprobate (*decretum horrible*); rather than opening a door to licentiousness, it encourages godliness and gratitude. But one must not peer too deeply into its

206 Winship, "Assurance and Puritan Practical Divinity," 470. That the subject of assurance was not a peculiar "Puritan" problem has been demonstrated in Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603–09* (Leiden, 2007).

207 Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, pp. 80–3.

208 Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, p. 81. It is difficult to determine whether the text endorses infra- or supralapsarianism since the "passing by" of the reprobate could possibly refer to an eternal negative act in a supralapsarian sense, since it does not indicate anything about a fallen mass of humanity. The editor of Ussher's *Works* accused Downname of authoring the supralapsarian tendencies of the *Body of Divinitie*. See James Ussher, *The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D.*, ed. Charles R. Elrington, 18 vols. (Dublin, 1847), 1:249–50.

depths or they will soon fall into error and desperation.²⁰⁹ Thus, the doctrine, as Downname conceived it, was pedagogically used for edifying “the godly,” by nurtur-ing comfort and assurance. The devil was the one who troubled the citizens of Zion, and caused them to doubt their safety and future estate.²¹⁰

In *Christian Warfare*, Downname elucidated the doctrine of assurance in five ways: First, there is the *possibility* of assurance in that the child of God can have some sense of certainty in this life, without any special revelation. Second, election has *evidences* in that the means and infallible signs to discern it reside in fruits of a godly and Christian life. Third, the doctrine rejects the idea that doubt is somehow virtuous, and though faith and doubt are often mixed in the godly, by nature, they are opposed. Fourth, the nature of faith is to *believe*, and thus faith itself assures the believer; and fifth, the testimony of God’s Spirit brings assurance by moving believers to love God’s word and work.²¹¹

In precisianist fashion, Downname clarifies that the Spirit’s testimony is not divorced from the diligent and careful use of outward means. Hearing and reading the Bible, receiving the sacraments, and other holy duties in God’s service all contribute to Christian assurance. The inward testimony of the Spirit is not severed from the outward testimony of the word; thus, assurance of God’s love and one’s election is not wrought by the Spirit immediately but through preaching and the administration of sacraments.²¹²

Though the precisianist program for acquiring assurance was well thought out, and sought to address and adapt to shifting patterns and cultural issues, it remained a serious problem within the Puritan wing of the English Church. Alternative solutions were invented and proposed, since, for many, the assurance of faith continued to be elusive, as seen in the well-publicized case of Joan Drake.²¹³

209 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 136–7. Both *Christian Warfare* and *Guide* address assurance as it relates to predestination.

210 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 101–2. That the German Reformed used the doctrine of predestination for comfort and consolation has been demonstrated in Nam Kyu Lee, *Die Prædestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen, 1583–1622: Georg Sohn, 1551–89, Herman Rennecherus, 1550–?, Jacob Kimedoncius, 1554–96, Daniel Tossanus, 1541–1602* (Göttingen, 2009).

211 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 103–39.

212 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, p. 118.

213 For the Drake affair, see Michelle Wolfe, “Drake, Joan,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:77–8; Charles Whitney, *Early Responses to Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 215–23; Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, pp. 64–77; Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley, 1992), p. 91; George

Aptly called, “that long-distance puritan melancholic,” Drake, who evinced suicidal tendencies, was convinced that she was a reprobate, and beyond all hope of salvation.²¹⁴ Various Puritan pastors tried to resolve her doubt through their counsels, but failed to quiet her conscience.²¹⁵ Prone to “several days and nights of visionary ecstasy,” followed by deeply depressive episodes, Drake’s spiritual depression “manifested an acutely Calvinist symptomology.” She was convinced that she had committed the unpardonable sin, and could see no signs that could point to God’s regenerative work. John Dod had spent much time in trying to counter her doubts with his theological instruction, but after failing to produce results, he commended Thomas Hooker, who, in his turn, was able to satisfy and resolve her doubts through his essentially Ramist “answering methode,” analogous to William Perkins and William Ames.²¹⁶ Though she had suffered for years, she does seem to have finally gained relief from her plight, and had a “peaceful death” in 1625.²¹⁷

Drake’s case, and those like hers, shows the aura of religious despair that many Calvinist parishioners found themselves in, and the efforts of “the godly” to address it. Given the length that precisianists spent in their writings to quell depressive tendencies intimates that the problem of assurance was a constant thorn in the Puritan parish, and an opportunity to tailor theological instruction to its needs. Drake’s final resolution shows that Puritanism continued to adapt to new challenges and pressures from within, seen, perhaps, in the way it developed a culture of spiritual conflict, with the pastor as the primary agonist.²¹⁸

H. Williams, “Called by Thy Name, Leave us Not: The Case of Mrs. Joan Drake,” *Harvard Library Bulletin* (1968). See also Mary Ann Lund, *Melancholy, Medicine, and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading “The Anatomy of Melancholy”* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 62–76.

214 Peter Lake, *The Anti-Christ’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002), p. 609.

215 Those interested in her case were John Dod, Thomas Hooker, John Preston, and James Ussher.

216 Meredith Marie Neuman, *Jeremiah’s Scribes: Creating Sermon Literature in Puritan New England* (Philadelphia, 2013), pp. 108–9.

217 John H. Ball, *Chronicling the Soul’s Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion* (Lanham, 1992), p. 13.

218 See George H. Williams, *First Light: The Formation of Harvard College in 1636 and Evolution of a Republic of Letters in Cambridge*, ed. Rodney L. Petersen (Göttingen, 2014), p. 44, for possible parallels between the Drake affair and the Hutchinson.

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.²¹⁹ 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 a significant confessional and ecclesiastical status, and was a central tenet in both British and continental symbols.²²⁰

The first major articulation of the covenant 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 most clearly detailed the notion of a single covenant of grace

219 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, 2012), pp. 43–78; J. Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace* (Göttingen, 2007), pp. 19–77; Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2003), pp. 175–90; Willem J. van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603–69* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 1–17, 248–90; Peter A. Lillback, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2001), pp. 28–125; Lyle D. Bierma, *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus* (Grand Rapids, 1996); David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 115–52; Jonathan Neil Gerstner, *The Thousand Generation Covenant: Dutch Reformed Covenant Theology and Group Identity in Colonial South Africa, 1652–1814* (Leiden, 1991), pp. 107–35; and Andrew A. Woolsey, *Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study of the Reformed Tradition to the Westminster Assembly* (1988; Grand Rapids, 2012), pp. 7–160.

For studies on the covenant within Puritanism, see Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids, 2012), pp. 217–320; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 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, 1985), pp. 128–98; John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Eugene, 1986); and Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), pp. 365–462, 502–6. George Marsden wrote, “The covenant doctrine was emphasized primarily because it was discovered to be a central biblical concept.” Quoted in Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract*, p. 4.

220 See, for instance, the “Westminster Confession of Faith,” in *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, 4 vols. (New Haven, 2003), 2:615–6.

between God and the elect.²²¹ 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 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, plunged the whole human race into death. Inquiries into the respective roles of God the Father and God the Son in salvation lead to the idea of a third covenant of redemption in the mid-1640s; the so-called *pactum salutis* was 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 the agreement between God and his elect possible. The covenant of grace thus "presupposes" the covenant of redemption.²²²

During the seventeenth century, three of the most widely circulated expositions of 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 practical expositions of Christian life. The doctrine of the two covenants, or the covenant of works and grace, was a popular theme within Stuart Puritanism, especially in its discussions of Christology and redemption.²²³ In 1646, for instance, Downname gave his imprimatur to Edmund Calamy's *Two Solemne Covenants made Between God and Man*, a relatively short treatise that highlighted tensions in the literature on how the covenants were perceived.²²⁴

The doctrine of the two covenants appears with regularity in *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

221 Lillback, *The Binding of God*; Selderhuis, *The Calvin Handbook*, pp. 237–40.

222 Muller, *After Calvin*, p. 187.

223 McGiffert, "Federal Theology," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:395–6; Zaret, *Heavenly Contract*, pp. 133–5.

224 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, that others held to three covenants, and still others to two. See Mark Jones, "The 'Old' Covenant," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within British Puritanism* (Göttingen, 2011), p. 187.

pedagogical use for bringing consolation to believers (the covenant of works is only mentioned twice by name, and that in the *Guide*).²²⁵ The two latter works present the covenant of works and grace with the more dogmatic aim to instruct readers in sound doctrine, and refute Arminian theology.²²⁶

The *Summe* first discusses the covenant of works as a “covenant of life,” or “blessedness.” The covenant, given to Adam in his primitive condition, upheld the promise of life and blessing for obeying the law, but death and a curse for transgressing it. The covenant of works is the first covenant that God made with human beings, and, at the moment of their creation, they were endowed with the ability to keep the law, having “the light of Gods Law written in their heart . . .” Had this not been the case, it would never have “stood with the Iustice of God to require these things at their hands, vnless the Law of God had been stamped and signed in them, and their nature made holy and pure, able by Creation to doe the same.”²²⁷

Overall, the covenant consists of two essential components: reward and punishment. The reward comes from God’s free and undeserved goodness, and the punishment from God’s just penalty for sin; “guilt” is tied to an “estate,” in which sinners are under the wrath of God, and defiled by an “euill conscience.” But there are degrees of reward and punishment among human beings, with some experiencing more than others; the reward is “Life, the greatest good that can possibly come vnto the Creature, the full blessednesse and perfection of his nature,” with a perpetual increase “in all Holiness, Happiness, Honour and immortalitie.”²²⁸ The punishment is “death,” the reward of sin, both spiritual and real. The covenant of works, in the end, threatens the total destruction of human beings, leaving them in their sin and misery, separated from God’s presence, and enslaved to their own sins and Satan.²²⁹

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 *Summe* does not call this a covenant of grace, even though it has the rudimentary

225 See Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 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, 36–7, 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.

226 Finch, *Summe*, sig. *2v–3r; 222–6; 282–3, 307–10, 361, 380, 391, 406–9; Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, Head 8.11.

227 Finch, *Summe*, p. 223.

228 Finch, *Summe*, pp. 224–6.

229 Finch, *Summe*, p. 226.

components of the one laid out in Ball's work on the subject. Thus, while the *Summe* does not contain the more mature expression of covenant theology typical of later treatises, it nonetheless contains the seeds from which such thought would develop. Both *Christian Warfare* and *Guide* refer to a covenant of grace, and use it to foster Christian assurance and godly living.²³⁰

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 was given to Adam before his fall into sin. It was a conditional covenant in that life was promised to Adam upon his obedience, and death threatened upon disobedience. Adam had the innate capacity to either obey or disobey, his will being free, even though the law was naturally written on his heart. The trees of life and the knowledge of good and evil were "seals of the covenant," and symbolized either eternal life, or the misery that humanity would know by experience. Adam is clearly presented as the federal head of humanity, who represents all who would later descend from him. Similarly, Christ is the head of the elect in the covenant of grace, and all those who descend spiritually through faith receive his righteousness. Christ is thus the "Second Adam," and his "righteousnesse is our righteousnesse, 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."²³¹

Both the covenant of works and the covenant of grace appear throughout Downname's corpus, whether in texts that he directly authored, or in those he edited and published. The covenant of grace is featured more than the covenant of works, but even in the earlier *Summe* and *Guide*, the covenant of works is presented as the broken covenant between God and humanity. The covenant of grace, in contrast, is immutable and unchanging, and has been established with the elect from eternity through the mediation of Christ, and on the condition of faith. The rise of covenant theology within Puritanism, in consonance with the casuistic tradition of Perkins, Ames, and Hooker, was to remove any sense of self-contribution to one's eternal security, and so solidify the Reformed response to Arminianism. Michael McGiffert adds that:

First and last, federal development was driven by desire to enhance believers' confidence in the all-sufficiency of God and their own state of

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

231 Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, 123–43; Downname, *Christian Warfare*, 270.

grace by restricting or vitiating their active role in meeting the terms of salvation. Pursuing this purpose, the high federal theology of the later seventeenth century appropriated and elaborated as its signature idea the concept of an eternal, foundational pact among the Persons of the Trinity. British federalists such as Thomas Goodwin, Francis Roberts, and Patrick Gillespie used this doctrine to undergird believers' trust by excluding them from any role in making and managing the federal means of grace.²³²

3.4.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

The doctrine of justification (*iustificatio*), the "*articulus standis aut cadentis Ecclesiae*,"²³³ was no less a controversial doctrine in the seventeenth century as it was in the sixteenth.²³⁴ In fact, the doctrine was enshrined in controversy in

232 Michael McGiffert, "Federal Theology," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:395–6.

233 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 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, 1615). Whether Meisner merely paraphrased Luther (e.g. Schmalkald Articles), or had access to some hitherto unknown source is not known. What is known is that this "proverb" circulated among Lutheran and Reformed writers in the seventeenth century, and was cited by such diverse authors as Johann Heinrich Alsted, and William Eyre (who credits Luther). 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. See Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Theologia scholastica didacta* (Hanover, 1618), p. 711; William Eyre, *Vindiciae justificationis gratuitaee* (London, 1654), p. 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), 194–7; Philip J. Secker, ed., *The Sacred Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions: Selected Writings of Arthur Carl Piepkorn* (Mansfield, 2007), 2:260; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, Eng., 2005), p. vii, n. 1; and cf. Friedrech Loofs, "Der articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 90 (1917), 323–420.

234 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, 1867);

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 compromise the moral imperative for sanctification among the elect.²³⁵ Given the importance of the doctrine within Reformed orthodoxy, it is not surprising that much effort was spent confuting opponents. In fact, the doctrine received wide press throughout the seventeenth century: the early century witnessed 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, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification* (1692), which sought to redeem the doctrine of justification from allegations of antinomism. Casual glances at these texts confirm the heated environment in which they were written, the importance of the doctrine for Reformed orthodoxy, and the inescapable connection between *dogma* and *praxis*.²³⁶

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 indicates its

Albrecht Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinburgh, 1900); and Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, Eng., 2005).

235 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, 2011), pp. 223–62.

236 On the historical context of seventeenth-century justification debates, see McKelvey, "That Error and Pillar," pp. 223–62; Brian Lugoio, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism* (New York, 2010), pp. 135–204; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 208–307; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, pp. 101–23; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma, 1300–1700* (Chicago, 1985), pp. 138–54; and Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer, 1993), pp. 25–87.

importance within Stuart Puritanism, as clergy fought over who could rightfully claim the ancients, schoolmen, and reformers.²³⁷

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, showing that salvation belongs wholly in the hands of God, and is 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. Downname rejects the belief that justification occurred from eternity because those who believe are first justified in time, subsequent to faith, through the preaching of the gospel. *Christian Warfare* then spends considerable time addressing the various temptations that Satan troubles the elect with, and again, focuses chiefly on matters of assurance.²³⁸ The *Guide* discusses justification as the second ground of a godly life, the first being saving knowledge. Without justifying faith one cannot perform any duty acceptable to God, since one's "person" must first be accepted as just before God will accept one's works as pleasing. True faith is a lively and justifying faith, which is infused into believers by the Spirit, and results in effectual belief and assent to gospel promises.²³⁹ Whereas *Christian Warfare* provides more detail on the doctrine of justification, to confute the heresies "spawned by Satan," the *Guide* provides the experiential groundwork for understanding the doctrine as it commonly manifests in parish life.

The *Summe* contains a brief, though fine-tuned, explanation of the doctrine of justification, and quotes Osiander on the "essential righteousness" of Christ that is given to believers. The twofold parts of imputation are the perfect sanctification of Christ's human nature, and the perfect obedience that he performed in the course of his life. Parallels are drawn between Adam and Christ, both imputing to those who belong to them. Following this imputation is God's decision to accept the elect as holy, so that they are able to stand before him untarnished, with the further effects of sanctification and redemption.²⁴⁰

The *Body of Divinitie* defends the doctrine against Roman Catholicism, and in keeping with Westminster allows for the justification of those who have yet to receive assurance of faith. The *Body* distinguishes between justifying faith, and the faith that assures; the former precedes the act of justification, and the

237 John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 72.

238 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 271–80.

239 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 40–7.

240 Finch, *Summe*, pp. 447–52.

latter follows it. Those things that accompany justification are adoption and reconciliation.²⁴¹

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 competing concepts of the doctrine in an increasingly theologically divided country²⁴² *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 an exhaustive treatise on the law and gospel, he nonetheless evinces the precisianist understanding of how the law relates to the gospel, especially as it pertains to the *praxis pietatis* and Christian assurance.²⁴³ In *Christian Warfare*, for instance, Downname argued that while the law demanded perfect obedience, it was unable to empower believers to keep it. But the gospel, in contrast, not only had the power to motivate believers to live godly lives, it had, through the inner workings of the Spirit, the power to enable the performance of good works.²⁴⁴

In the *Guide*, Downname wrote that though Christians are commanded to walk by the “rule” of the law, especially as laid out in the Ten Commandments, and strive with “holy ambition” to keep it perfectly, they cannot “reach vnto this Sunne of perfection.” Indeed, “the godly” should “be sorry and ashamed” of their falling short, and redouble their efforts to labor for “Christian perfection.” Those who continue to press toward the mark, and who do not waiver, God will

²⁴¹ Ussher, *Body of Divinitie*, pp. 199–201.

²⁴² See McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 284–95.

²⁴³ While the law and the gospel were enshrined in antinomian controversy, standard precisianist expositions include: John Preston, *The Law out Lawed* (Edinburgh, 1631); Anthony Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis, Or a Vindication of the Moral Law and the Covenants* (London, 1646); and 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). See also Ernest F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law: A Study in Puritan Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1976).

²⁴⁴ Downname, *Christian Warfare*, pp. 103, 106, 288.

accept . . . in Christ, and *remember our sinnes no more*, but *will spare us*, as *a man spareth his sonne who serueth him*, *accept of the will for the deede*, and couering the imperfections of our obedience with Christs perfect righteousness, and washing away the pollution and corruption of it, in his most precious blood, he will be well pleased with vs, and approue of vs, as though we had attained to perfect reighteousnesse.²⁴⁵

Within Downname's corpus, there is a tension between the duty to live perfectly, and the realities of Christian experience. As we saw before, Downname adapted his message to the particular contexts of his readers. Both *Christian Warfare* and *Guide* thus discuss the law and the gospel, but have different readerships in mind; indeed, it is not surprising that the latter, being written for those living in comfort and relative security, is more strict and idealistic with its moral imperative than in *Christian Warfare*, where the audience is downcast and overwhelmed with imperfections and doubts.²⁴⁶

3.4.6 *Christian Life and Piety*

Given Downname's status as a pastoral theologian, it is not surprising that the majority of his work was devoted to Christian life and piety. Indeed, *Christian Warfare* and the *Guide*, just two his works, are replete with advice on multifarious social issues afflicting the English Church, such as how to know one's calling and election, how to obey the Ten Commandments, how to live a life of prayer and gratitude, how to love one's neighbors, how to progress toward 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. The interplay between *dogma* and *praxis*, and how the former informed the latter, was essential to his conception of the Christian life, and formed the basis for a robust system of practical divinity. Correct doctrine, with the Spirit's blessing, would lead to a vigorous godly life; erroneous doctrine, however, would open the door to lasciviousness, heresy, and scandal.²⁴⁷

For Downname, Christians must strive toward a consistent use of the means of grace, which include sanctifying the Sabbath by resting from one's secular labors, hearing the word of God preached, reading the Bible privately, and catechesis,²⁴⁸ otherwise, "we haue just cause to feare that Satan will . . . hereby cause vs to forget God." Downname adds:

²⁴⁵ Downname, *Guide*, p. 5.

²⁴⁶ See *Guide*, pp. 205–7, 417, 607–8, 666.

²⁴⁷ Downname, *Guide*, sig. A3r.

²⁴⁸ Downname, *Guide*, pp. 131–3, 482.

when wee are tempted to neglect the hearing of Gods Word on the Lords Sabbath, we are the more diligently to heare it, not only then, being bound hereunto by Gods commandment, as being one of the chiefe means of sanctifying this day consecrated to Gods service; but also on the weake dayes, if the Lord giue vs fit opportunitie, when as we might lawfully be exercised in the duties of our callings. In a word, when wee are tempted to any vice, we are to take occasion thereby of doing the contrary vertue . . . carefully auoiding the policie of Satan . . . whereby he laboureth to draw vs from one vice to his contrary extreame.²⁴⁹

But further, one must “heare the Word preached, not as the word of mortall man, but as the Word of the euerliuing God.” Indeed, one should “with all feare and reuerence, with all diligence and attention, with alacrity and cheerfulness, humility and a good conscience auoiding (as much as lieth in vs) all distractions, wandering thoughts, priuate reading, dulnesse, drowsiness and carnal weariness.” Christians, then, must be attentive to the preached word, receive it with gladness, and make use of its teachings.²⁵⁰

In *Guide*, first among the means was private prayer, which, properly cultivated, would lead to a “lively faith.”²⁵¹ As with other “Puritans,” Downname saw a Christian as a stranger and pilgrim in the world;²⁵² he sought to make saints aware of their relationship with Christ, and bring them into the fullness of Christ’s benefits; as such, the end of devotion was a godly life, which often ebbed and flowed, but always sought to establish itself on the rock of assurance.²⁵³

3.5 Conclusion

John Downname was a pioneer of the precisianist strain within early Stuart Puritanism, contributed to the “canon” of Puritan devotional literature, and built a system of *theologia practica* that emphasized rigorous and introspective piety, and theological astuteness in dealing with various issues arising from the Christian life. He established his reputation with the publication of

249 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, p. 48.

250 Downname, *Guide*, p. 126.

251 Downname, *Guide*, pp. 47, 124.

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

253 Downname, *Christian Warfare*, p. 734.

several popular works of piety, which firmly set him as a casuist in the line of Perkins and Ames, but it was his English concordance that was most used by a wider body of English Protestants.

Downname ministered during a time of massive change in the English Church, engaged in theological controversies, and contributed to the “ethos” of Puritanism as a distinct style of experimental predestinarianism. His social contexts show that the English Reformed had need for a thorough and orthodox exegesis of the Bible, and an enchiridion of advice on the problems of the parish; they further show that for the orthodox, heresy and error were a real threat to their public welfare, and so they sought to educate the laity in doctrine and life. This culture of learning, in turn, fostered literacy, and lay acumen, all within a Calvinist atmosphere where doubt and anxiety over eternal felicity loomed large in the hearts and minds of “the godly.”

Downname was able to publish and disseminate Reformed doctrine with two immensely popular English divinity manuals, the *Summe* and *Body of Divinitie*. As a Puritan, Downname showed preference for the doctrine of predestination, and its implications for alleviating a distressed conscience. His theology accents the unities within precisianist Puritanism: belief in the Triune God who transcends human existence, but who, through an act of divine love, became human to redeem fallen humanity; belief in parallel predestination of the elect and the reprobate; belief in God’s twofold covenant to bring about salvation for the elect, and to impute Christ’s righteousness to them; belief in the unconditional justification of sinners, and their progress in Christian life.

Downname’s life and work indicate that the continuing Puritan Reformation thrived, in part, because of its diverse social and theological networks. Through Downname, the ethos of Puritanism as a “hotter-sort” of “fiery” Protestantism continued to ignite its embers across a Reformed and Puritan spectrum. His selective use of the printing press, and fluency in the Reformed loci, suggest the sort of theological education that was demanded of famed clergy. In the end, Downname was an emblematic and effervescent promoter of the precisianist strain.

Overall, it is not surprising, as will become clear in what follows, that, at times, precisianism served as a referent to the other strains within Puritanism, in that they exaggerated and often pressed its mainline consensus, but nonetheless retained abiding similarities and points of *unitas* with its own orthodoxy.

Francis Rous (1580/81–1659)

4.1 Introduction

In the last chapter, we saw how John Downname promoted the precisianist strain within Puritanism. In this chapter, we will see how Francis Rous, who has been called, “the first Puritan mystic,” articulated the more mystical side of Puritan spirituality.¹ This study of Rous will show how the life of piety and communion with God were central to the seventeenth-century Reformed; and yet, even with this general consensus, Rous is unique in pressing for a more mystical experience with the divine than many of his Reformed brethren would have done, all the while retaining “orthodoxy,” and a favorable reputation among the godly.² As a mystic, Rous’s contributions lie in *unio mystica* and *pietas*, and specifically in articulating a kind of mysticism that wove both apophatic and cataphatic threads. This mystical piety taught that Christians could really come to know God in this life, being betrothed to Jesus Christ, and sharing in his ineffable joy, through a mystical ascent to the beatific vision, where the “drops and dews of grace . . . shall bring . . . to the sight and fruition

-
- 1 Jerald C. Brauer, “Puritan Mysticism and the Development of Liberalism,” *Church History* 19 (1950), 151–70, there 152. Belden Lane sees two “strains of spirituality that weave in and out of the Reformed tradition.” The one “beings with a sense of awe at God’s majesty, the other with a delight in God’s beauty.” Lane, *Ravished by Beauty: The Surprising Legacy of Reformed Spirituality* (New York, 2011), p. 27.
 - 2 F. Ernest Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism* (Leiden, 1965), p. 85. Stoeffler writes that among “pietistic” Puritans, Rous “was most unreservedly committed to mysticism.” Within the literature, there is some confusion as to whether Rous should be classified as a “mainstream” or “radical” Puritan. Both Nuttall and Van den Berg see Rous as a proponent of “radical” Puritanism, while Wallace identifies Rous as “mainstream.” This confusion rests, in part, in the overlapping categories historians use to classify English Puritanism. My own sense is that Rous reflects both “mainstream” and “radical” Puritanism, and reveals an internal trajectory concerning bridal mysticism within the confessional tradition. See, for instance, Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (1947; repr. Chicago, 1992); Johannes van den Berg, “The English Puritan Francis Rous and the Influence of His Works in the Netherlands,” in his *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents: Essays on Early Modern Protestantism*, ed. Jan de Bruijn, Pieter Holtrop, and Ernestine van der Wall (Leiden, 2001), p. 26; Dewey D. Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660–1714* (New York, 2011), p. 74. We will return to the issue of “orthodox” and “radical” Puritanism in Chapter 7.

of the Teacher himself, who is an ever-flowing Fountain, and boundless Ocean of light, wisdom, grace, and glory.”³

Rous further contributed to the social issues then troubling Stuart Puritanism, and similar to Downname sought to advance the Puritan Reformation through the published and spoken word, but as a politician was uniquely situated to advance his own vision for the commonwealth. Indeed, Rous was an influential statesman, devotional writer, and controversialist. He was known for being a pamphleteer and critic of Arminianism, with ties to both John Pym⁴

3 Francis Rous, *Treatises and Meditations Dedicated to the Saints, and to the Excellent Throughout the Three Nations* (London, 1657), p. 647; Brian J. Gibbons, *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought: Behmenism and Its Development in England* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), p. 67; Thomas F. Healy, *Richard Crashaw* (Leiden, 1986), p. 33. For historiographical questions on Puritans as mystics, see Tom Schwanda, *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene, 2012), pp. 1–34; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660–1714*, pp. 51–86; Ariel Hessayon, “Gold Tried in the Fire:” *The Prophet TheaurauJohn Tany and the English Revolution* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 91–107; Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart Puritanism* (Macon, 2000), pp. 135–60; Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, pp. ix–xxv, 1–19; Jerald C. Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” *Church History* 56 (1987), 39–58; Brauer, “Puritan Mysticism and the Development of Liberalism,” 151–70; Charles Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill, 1982), pp. 278–87; Gordon S. Wakefield, “The Puritans,” in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, SJ (New York, 1986), pp. 437–44; Wakefield, “Mysticism and Its Puritan Types,” *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, Vol. XCXI, 6th series, XXXV (1966), 34ff; and James F. Maclear, “The Heart of New England Rent’: The Mystical Element in Early Puritan History,” *The Mississippi Historical Review* 42 (1956), 621–52.

Hessayon remarks that Puritan mysticism “embodied the tensions between two diametrically opposed paths to God.” The first was through “justification, sanctification, and glorification,” and the second through “purgation, illumination, and union.” Still, there was consonance between the two in that the “puritan mystic . . . sought as much as his Catholic mystic counterpart an immediate, intimate union with God” (Hessayon, *Gold Tried in the Fire*, p. 91). Brauer distinguishes between five “types” of Puritan piety: nomism, evangelicalism, rationalism, mysticism, and Spirit mysticism. While Brauer’s classifications are useful, it must be remembered that these are not rigid categories; the types are reflective of individual tendencies and preferences and are not categories “into which figures are squarely placed and labeled.” Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” 42.

4 McGee has argued that Rous was Pym’s “politico-religious alter ego.” See J. Sears McGee, “A ‘Carkass’ of ‘Mere Dead Paper’: The Polemical Career of Francis Rous, Puritan MP,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72 (2009), 347–71, there 347.

and Oliver Cromwell, at the time, the two most powerful men in England.⁵ He established his reputation with his *Testis Veritatis*, a defense of James I's Calvinism, and his many speeches before Parliament; he also had a long political career, and "sat in every Parliament from 1625–1657."⁶ He was an active critic

5 J. H. M. Salmon, "Precept, Example, and Truth: Degory Where and the *Ars Historica*," in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500–1800*, ed. Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), p. 19; L. H. Roper and B. van Ruymbek, eds., *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500–1750* (Leiden, 2007), p. 195; Hughes Oliphant Old, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture* (Louisville, 2002), p. 47; Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), p. 51; Edward Watkin, *Poets & Mystics* (North Stratford, 1953), p. 174.

To date, no full biography of Rous exists. Fragments can be found in the histories of Cornwall, Eton, and the House of Commons. See, for instance, Colin Burrow, "Rous, Francis (1580/81–1659), Religious Writer and Politician," in *ODNB*; J. Sears McGee, "Rous, Francis (1579–1659)," in *Puritans and Puritanism in America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (New York, 2006), 1:221–2; Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, pp. 25–42; Henry Charles Maxwell Lyte, *A History of Eton College, 1440–1884* (London, 1889), pp. 227–9; Wasey Sterry, *Annals of the King's College of Our Lady of Eton Beside Windsor* (London, 1898), 126–36; James Alexander Manning, *The Lives of the Speakers of the House of Commons, from the Time of King Edward III to Queen Victoria, Comprising the Biographies of Upwards of One Hundred Distinguished Persons, and Copious Details of the Parliamentary History of England, from the Most Authentic Documents* (London, 1851), pp. 328–31; George Clement Boase and William Prideaux Courtney, *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis: A Catalogue of the Writings, Both Manuscript and Printed, of Cornishmen, and of Works Relating to the County of Cornwall*, 3 vols. (London, 1882), 3:1329; and Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford*, ed. Philip Bliss, 4 vols. (London, 1817), 3:466–9.

Several portraits of Rous still exist: in the Provost's Lodge at Eaton College; a watercolor attributed to Thomas Athow at the National Portrait Gallery in London; a painting by an unknown artist housed at Pembroke College, Oxford; and Frederick Newenham's oil painting of Rous as Speaker of the House at the Palace of Westminster.

6 Salmon, "Precept, Example, and Truth," p. 19. For Rous, Arminianism was the "spawn of the papist," a perception that reflected English consensus on Roman Catholicism in the seventeenth century. Indeed, J. R. Jones commented, "Anti-popery was the strongest, most widespread and most persistent ideology in the life and thought of seventeenth-century Britain." Francis Rous, *A Discovery of the Grounds both Natural and Politick of Arminianisme*; J. R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (New York, 1972), p. 75. For the conflict between Romish and Protestant churches, and political conflict in Stuart England, see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–40* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995); Conrad Russell, *King James I/VI and His English Parliaments* (New York, 2011), pp. 140–53; and Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–29* (New York, 1979).

of Charles I, and questioned the king's imposing taxation without consent from Parliament.⁷ Rous was a lay member of the Westminster Assembly, produced a popular psalter, *Psalms of David in English Meeter* (1643),⁸ and generally fought for toleration of dissident religious groups, with the exception of Arminians and Roman Catholics, who, he believed, were a threat to English stability and true religion.⁹ Though he held high positions in society, shaped a generation of students at Pembroke College, and wrote extensively on the social issues of the day, his fame rests in being the first and foremost "Puritan" mystic.¹⁰ Indeed, Rous's most famous work, *The Mystical Marriage* (1635), a blend of Reformed and medieval spirituality, has been the subject of several

-
- 7 John Coffey, "England's Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance," in *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. Charles W. A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (Aldershot, 2011), p. 258. Coffey cites Rous's speech before Parliament: "there hath not such a thing been done since Israell came from Egypt of Roome." For the political and cultural ambiance of 1630s-Stuart England, see Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, eds., *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester, 2006).
- 8 The Westminster Assembly formally adopted Rous's version of the psalter on September 12, 1645, and ordered that it be "profitably sung in the churches, as being useful and profitable to the Church." David Mullan, "Westminster Catechisms," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 2:579; W. K. Jordan, *Development of Religious Toleration in England*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), 2:125; John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration, and Early Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 284; Sharon Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), p. 218; Amy M. E. Morris, *Popular Measures: Poetry and Church Order in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts* (Cranbury, 2005), p. 81. See also John Coffey, "European Multiconfessionalism and the English Toleration Controversy, 1640–60," in *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, ed. Thomas Max Safley (Leiden, 2011), pp. 341–68.
- 9 Sarah Barber calls Rous a "Parliamentary *de facto*ist," a term for those who fought for "liberty of conscience and an end to religious persecution." Barber, "Power in the English Caribbean: The Proprietorship of Lord Willoughby of Parham," in *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500–1750*, ed. L. H. Roper and B. Van Ruymbeke (Leiden, 2007), p. 195. See also Peter Elmer, *The Miraculous Conformist: Valentine Greatrakes, the Body Politic, and the Politics of Healing in Restoration Britain* (New York, 2013), p. 98.
- 10 Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, pp. 85–7. Wallace prefers "Calvinist mystic" to describe this brand of Puritan. See Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, pp. 74–9.

recent studies.¹¹ Yet, even with renewed interest, Rous remains an obscure and “most unjustly neglected” figure.¹²

What is especially lacking in studies of Rous are his ties to the earlier medieval mystics, and his reliance, in particular, upon Pseudo-Dionysius, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas à Kempis, Thomas Aquinas, and John Tauler.¹³ More attention needs to be given to Rous’s mystical theology in its historical and intellectual contexts, and especially how it shaped his view of education. That Rous was a writer of mystical piety, and flourished within an orthodox Reformed context, requires a broadening of our understanding of seventeenth-century orthodoxy; moreover, it strongly suggests that this kind of Reformed spirituality had a direct line to the medieval mystical tradition.¹⁴ However, tracing influences among subsequent generations of mystics, from the pre-Reformation

11 See, for example, Belden C. Lane, *Ravished by Beauty: The Surprising Legacy of Reformed Spirituality* (New York, 2011), pp. 97–169; Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 18–58; and Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, pp. 25–42.

12 Stanley Stewart, *The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry* (Madison, 1966), p. 26. Prior to my ThM thesis (“Francis Rous (1580/81–1659) and the Mystical Element in English Puritanism,” Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, 2008), the last major assessment of Rous’s mysticism was Jerald C. Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic, 1579–1659: An Introduction to the Study of the Mystical Element in Puritanism” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1948). In contrast, Peter Sterry and John Saltmarsh have seen a resurgence of interest. See, for instance, Nicholas McDowell, “The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism: Richard Crashaw, John Saltmarsh, and the Language of Religious Radicalism in the 1640s,” in *Varieties of Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*, ed. Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 31–50; and Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, pp. 51–86.

13 Rufus M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1914), p. 267. See also Fran O’Rourke, *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas* (Notre Dame, 1992); Douglas J. Elwood, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 1960), p. 145. Indeed, various aspects of Reformed spirituality can be traced to Bernard’s mysticism. See Arie de Reuver, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation* (Grand Rapids, 2007), pp. 27–62; Gordon S. Wakefield, “The Puritans,” in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, SJ (New York, 1986), p. 444.

14 Of particular continuity is the “sensuous language” employed by Rous and other Puritan mystics, as well as “the lush, warm flow of mystical piety and devotion, the bride-mysticism, the rich, highly involved allegorical interpretation of the Bible, especially the Song of Songs, the preaching of penitence, the love of pilgrimages and the pilgrim motif...” Leonard J. Trinterud, “The Origins of Puritanism,” *Church History* 20 (1951), 37–57, there 50. See also Wallace, *Spirituality of the Later English Puritans*, p. xviii; William J. Wainwright, “Jonathan Edwards and His Puritan Predecessors” in *The Spiritual*

through to the post-Reformation, is tenuous and wrought with difficulty. This is especially the case with the “mystical marriage traditions,” and how such narratives as that of Christ and his Bride were understood; nonetheless Puritan mystics often drew from earlier mystical springs as best served their purpose and context.¹⁵ More facets for study include Rous’s model for education, and his notions of a utopian society, both being integral to his mysticism.¹⁶

In this chapter, we will see how Rous simultaneously foraged the mystical tradition and retained orthodox convictions about the role of the Bible within spirituality. While his venture into mysticism was more thorough than many others in the Reformed community, in that he employs extravagant and sensuous language, he nonetheless adhered to the Bible and its language, and unabashedly drew from the Song of Songs to describe the Christian’s marriage with Christ, often in sensuous terms.¹⁷ We will see how Rous could believe in toleration, but at the same time censure Arminians and Roman Catholics.¹⁸ That Rous’s peers received him favorably is evident in his long-standing position in the House of Commons, his invitation to attend the Westminster Assembly, the popularity of his psalter, and the favorable reception of his work and political speeches.¹⁹ To assess Rous and place him in the greater narrative of the Puritan Reformation, we will first discuss Rous’s social contexts, then examine his major writings in their historical context, and finally consider Rous’s overall

Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity, ed. Paul L. Gavrilyuk and Sarah Coakley (Cambridge, Eng., 2011), pp. 224–40.

- 15 Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, pp. 14–5.
- 16 Mordechai Feingold, *History of Universities*, XVII, 2001–02 (New York, 2002), pp. 27–9; Charles Webster, ed., *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 6; James Holstun, *A Rational Millennium: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America* (New York, 1987), p. 147. Rous was one of Hartlib’s patrons. See, for instance, the dedication to Rous in Samuel Hartlib, *The True and Readie Way to Learne the Latin Tongue* (London, 1654).
- 17 Elizabeth Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 2011), p. 58; Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, p. 84.
- 18 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, pp. 50–1; Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648–53* (Cambridge, 1974), p. 127. Both Clarke and Worden quote Rous’s utopian dreams. The former cites Rous in 1623 looking forward to the time “wherein every man shall bee seated in his right place, even according to true, reall, and inward excellence”; and the latter cites Rous in 1648, pleading, “let true Christians seriously consider that union in Christ their head is a stronger root of love and unity than lesser differences can be of division.” See Rous, *The Balm of Love* (London, 1648), p. 10.
- 19 Old, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*, p. 47; Hannibal Hamil, *Psalm Culture and Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 51; Miller Patrick, *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody* (London, 1949), pp. 79–104.

theology, especially its orthodox categories and discussions. We will see that even as Puritans differed in their emphases, they nonetheless shared a strong *sensus unitatis* in their theology and pursuit for a godly reformation.

4.2 Social Contexts

Francis Rous was born into a Puritan family at Dittisham in Devon, Cornwall, in 1580/81. He studied at Broadgates Hall in Oxford (B.A., 1597), Leiden University (1599), and the Middle Temple in London (admitted 1601). He was the son of Sir Anthony Rous of Hilton, in the parish of St. Dominick, and his first wife, Elizabeth.²⁰

While much has been written on the theological education at Oxford and Cambridge,²¹ relatively little exists on Leiden University, and its role in educating the sons of “disaffected Englishmen.”²² Indeed, such well-known

20 Rous's father would later marry the widow of Alexander Pym; her son, John Pym, came to live with the Rous's at Hilton, and thus began a close relationship that would foster throughout dual Parliamentary careers. Conrad Russell suggests that John Pym should be known as “John Rous,” because of his closeness to the Rous family. Conrad Russell, “Pym, John (1584–1643),” *ODNB*; Salmon, “Precept, Example, and Truth,” pp. 11–36; J. Sears McGee, “John Pym,” in *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603–89*, ed. Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison (Westport, 1996), pp. 440–1; Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–42* (London, 1990), p. 149; David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–42* (New York, 2006), p. 285. For the Rous household, see Anne Duffin, *Faction and Faith: Politics and Religion of the Cornish Gentry Before the Civil War* (Exeter, 1996), pp. 47–53.

21 For Oxford, see Nicholas Tyacke, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (New York, 1997), pp. 1–24, 569–620; for Cambridge, see G. R. Evans, *The University of Cambridge: A New History* (London, 2010), pp. 185–254; and James Heywood and Thomas Wright, eds., *Cambridge University Transaction During the Puritan Controversies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 2 vols. (1854; repr., Cambridge, Eng., 2009).

22 Hill writes, “No one, I believe, has so far properly investigated the extent to which Englishmen dissatisfied with Oxford and Cambridge sent their sons to Leiden University, or what Leiden's influence on English thought was.” Christopher Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited* (New York, 1997), pp. 251–2. For a reassessment of the 831 English students who studied at Leiden between 1575–1650, see Daniela Prögler, *English Students at Leiden University, 1575–1650: “Advancing Your Abilities in Learning and Bettering Your Understanding of the World and State Affairs”* (Aldershot, 2013). See also Ole Peter Grell, “The Attraction of Leiden University for English Students of Medicine and Theology, 1590–1642,” in *The Great Emporium: The Lowe Countries as a Cultural Crossroads in the Renaissance and Eighteenth Century*, ed. C. C. Barfoot and Richard Todd

theologians and writers as Thomas Cartwright, William Ames, Theodore Haak, John Dury, William Bridge, and Thomas Browne, all attended Leiden, as did Arminius. During the seventeenth century, Leiden was a haven for those pursuing a wide variety of theological and other interests: 825 Englishmen matriculated between 1575 and 1659, and 300 of those were from 1642–51.²³ While Holland was a “safe haven” for disgruntled Englishmen during times of censorship at home, it was equally open to the royalists during the English Revolution.²⁴ The subject of Rous’s studies at Leiden are not known, other than generally being the “liberal arts,” but it would seem that while a student there, Rous was introduced to the continental mystics, and this might possibly explain the absence of English mystics in his writings.²⁵ Indeed, as the 1702-publisher of his *Academia Coelestis* states, “the ancient Writers and Doctors . . . were not despised by him” but rather “advanced [him] into an

(Amsterdam, 1992), pp. 83–104. Grell states that English students were drawn to Leiden because of its international reputation in the field of theology, as well as its diversity and quality of education, but since foreign degrees could not easily be transferred to Oxford or Cambridge, “the number of English Theology students at Leiden remained fairly modest and constant throughout the period” (p. 91). Regardless, Keith L. Sprunger states that English students travelling to Holland for education “went as first choice to Leiden University,” and then “occasionally to Franeker University.” Springer, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982), p. 8.

For the thriving and sometimes clandestine book trade in Leiden, see Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600–40* (Leiden, 1993), pp. 125–55. Indeed, Leiden had “gained a world reputation” for its production standards and bookshops (p. 125).

- 23 Hill, *Intellectual Origins*, p. 252. Cartwright was offered the chair of divinity at Leiden University in 1580, but he declined, preferring the pastorate. Hill, *Intellectual Origins*, p. 252; Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism*, p. 23. On the conflict over Cartesianism among Leiden’s theology faculty, see Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650–1750* (New York, 2002), pp. 25–34; Theo Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch: Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy, 1637–50* (Carbondale, 1992).
- 24 For instance, Timothy George relates the story of how “Ralph Winwood, English Ambassador of King James I at the Hague . . . protested the action at [Leiden] in allowing the disaffected Englishmen to settle there.” George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition* (Macon, 2005), pp. 88–9. During the English Revolution, when Charles II was in exile, an edition of his father’s writings, *Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinae* (1651), was published in The Hague by the royalist printer Samuel Browne.
- 25 Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, pp. 86–7.

Higher University.”²⁶ As we will see, Rous believed formal education to be the first step toward enlightenment.

In 1601, Rous began study for a career in law at the Middle Temple, in London, “until a storme from heaven chased mee away to the studie of Eternitie, wherein I have found so much comfort and assistance from above.”²⁷ The precise circumstances surrounding his conversion are not known; presumably his religious experience came from reading the mystics, which would explain his lifelong fascination with them. Jacobus Koelman, the Dutch translator of two of Rous’s mystical writings, states that Rous, “in a specific way had been taught by God, though . . . according to our common usage he was not a theologian, as in his youth he had only studied Law . . . [he prepared himself] to have a heart above all [for] the work of the Soul.” Rous elsewhere describes “how the Lord had touched and driven him to these Studies.”²⁸ From this time on, the mystical ascent would characterize his work.²⁹

Anthony Wood wrote that some place Rous as a minister in Saltash, but more recent scholarship has brought this into question, and it seems unlikely that Rous was ever ordained.³⁰ That Rous was a layman is substantiated in that he sat as a lay member at the Westminster Assembly, did not have any formal theological education, and had no official role in the ordination of ministers.³¹ Moreover, his published works never made the claim that Rous was ordained, and were Rous a minister, this doubtless would have been well known among contemporaries, and a selling point for his writings, though it is curious that records at Eton and Oxford have Rous as a minister.³²

Throughout the 1620s, Rous spent considerable time in solitude writing the books that would bring him fame, and he seems to have delved further into

26 Francis Rous, *Academia Coelestis* (London, 1702), sig. A3.

27 Francis Rous, “Epistle Dedicatory,” in *The Arte of Happiness* (1619), sig. A3. See Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, p. 267; Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 26.

28 Francis Rous, *Het Binnenste van Godts Koninkrijk* (Amsterdam, 1678), p. 2. Quoted in Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 26. The two books reprinted in Dutch in 1678 were *The Mystical Marriage* and *The Heavenly Academie*. See Martin Brecht, ed., *Geschichte Des Pietismus* (Göttingen, 1993), p. 77.

29 Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic,” pp. 50–1.

30 Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, p. 466; cf. Old, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*, p. 47.

31 Chad van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–52*, 5 vols. (New York, 2012), 1:14.

32 John C. Street and C. Douglas Peters, *A Genealogy of the Rouses of Devon* (Madison, 2002), p. 83. See also Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 26. It seems likely that Rous preached at Saltash, possibly serving as an assistant, without ever being formally ordained.

mystical theology, and the writings of the scholastics. Two of his more popular works in this era were his *Diseases of the Time Attended by Their Remedies* (1622), a sharp criticism of corrupt clergy and “antidote” for social malevolence, and his *Oyl of Scorpions* (1623), a staunch Jeremiad, in which Rous saw the plague and harvest failures as divine punishments for such “social ills” as drunkenness and the theater.³³

Rous served in the early Caroline Parliaments, in 1626 for Truro, and in 1628–29 for Tregon; his career in politics, which began in 1625, would last until his death in 1659 (in 1657, Cromwell had made him a lord). He was active in the House of Commons, and tried to fuse his mystical religion with governing the Commonwealth.³⁴ Theologically he was a Puritan, and began as a Presbyterian, but ended up among the Independents, possibly due to the influence of Jeremiah Burroughs.³⁵ That Rous was well connected throughout his career, being stepbrother to Pym and lay chaplain to Cromwell, meant that he could more freely spread his religious ideas, and though he was generally tolerant of dissenting positions, he loathed Arminianism, calling it “a Trojan horse,” and blamed it the sufferings of the English; indeed, he was persuaded that Arminianism would usher in a new age of Roman Catholicism, and return England to former times of persecution:

33 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 215–80. See also Martin Wiggins, *Drama and the Transfer of Power in Renaissance England* (New York, 2012), pp. 93–6, 100, 110–2; *Commons Debates, 1628*, 4:320–1; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 139; Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration, and Early Enlightenment Culture*, p. 284; Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, pp. 205–31; Joseph A. Conforti, *Saints and Strangers: New England in British North America* (Baltimore, 2006), pp. 102–7. While Puritans generally criticized the theatre and plays, as did Rous, there were notable exceptions. See Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre* (Cambridge, Eng., 1980), pp. 21–2; Martin Butler, *Theater and Crisis, 1632–42* (Cambridge, Eng., 1984), pp. 84–5, 88; and, more generally, see Colin Rise, *Ungodly Delights: Puritan Opposition to the Theatre, 1576–1633* (Alessandria, 1997); Peter Lake, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002).

34 See, for instance, the oil painting of Rous by Frederick Newenham, which depicts the Speaker of House in full attire, with scepter and a copy of his *Mystical Marriage* in hand. Indeed, Longfellow calls Rous “a vocal politician and reformer.” Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*, p. 47.

35 Most historians place Rous as an Independent from 1649 because of his *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government*. This is corroborated in Robert Baillie's letter to Robert Douglass on April 17, 1649, that “Mr. Rous, my good friend, hes complied with the Sectaries, and is a member of their republick.” Baillie, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1842), 3:97. See also Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), 3:271; and Salmon, “Precept, Example, and Truth,” p. 19.

I desire, that we consider the increase of *Arminianisme*, and *Error*, that maketh the grace of *God*, looke after the will of men: that maketh the sheepe to keepe the shepherd, and make a mortall seed an immortal God, I desire, that we may looke into the belly, and bowels of this *Trojan Horse*, to see if there be no man in it, ready to open the gate of *Romish tyranny*, and *Spanish Monarchy*; for *Arminianisme* is the span of a papist, and if there come the warmth of favour, you shall see him turne into one of those *frogs*, that ariseth out of the *bottomlesse pit*. And if you marke it well, you shall see an *Arminian*, reaching one hand to a papist, a papist to a Iesuit, a Iesuit one hand to the Pope, and the other to the King of *Spaine*: and these men having kindled fire in our Neighbor-countries, now they brought some of it over hither, to set on flame this Kingdome also. Yea let us consider, and search, whether these be not the men, that breake in upon the goods, and *liberties* of this *Common-wealth*; for by this means, they may make way, for the taking away of our Religion.³⁶

Thus Rous, along with Pym, spent much time combating the Arminian clergy and dogmas then circulating the English Church. Like Pym, Rous believed that the restoration of the papacy would overthrow political liberty and religious truth, and consequently he spent considerable time fencing the press, and engaging Parliament in debate over the seriousness of the Arminian threat.³⁷ Throughout the 1620s, Rous believed that popery was gaining ground in England, and with Pym and William Prynne, pressed the House of Commons to oppose the “Arminian assault.” He feared that superstition and the public conscience would be destroyed were Arminianism allowed to flourish.³⁸

When Rous wrote his *Testis Veritatis* on the topics of predestination, free will, justification, and perseverance, he identified with “the godly” in their struggle to reform the English Church. He criticized those who stood with Arminius for political reasons, and argued that no one can have friendship with God unless

36 Francis Rous, *A Religious and Worthy Speech Spoken by Mr. Rovse in Parliament* (London, 1641), sig. A3. See also L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, Eng., 1989), p. 74; Clarke, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England*, p. 51.

37 S. Mutchow Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 183.

38 Marc L. Schwartz, “Some Thoughts on the Development of a Lay Religious Consciousness in Pre-Civil-War England,” in *Popular Belief and Practice*, ed. G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker (Cambridge, Eng., 1972), pp. 173–4.

he believes as the godly do, and is counted among their society.³⁹ Though Rous did not have an ecclesiastical living, he identified with those ministers who were troubled with the way some clergy sought advancement for political ends, and ultimately challenged the “Calvinist line” for preferment. Thus, Rous used his wealth and influence to protect Puritan clergy and their Puritan Reformation wherever possible.⁴⁰

In the Long Parliament, Rous, as “the ideological spokesman of the Calvinist gentry,” actively led the drive against Laudian bishops;⁴¹ in 1643, his fellow MP’s appointed him provost of Eton College,⁴² and lay member of the Westminster Assembly, where he was “honoured by all,” doubtless in recognition of his talent as a religious writer, controversialist, and amateur theologian.⁴³ Indeed, Rous’s *Testis Veritatis* defended the popular Reformed doctrine of double predestination against the accused Arminian Richard Montagu, a protégé of William Laud; Rous’s *Catholick Charity* sought to stave Catholicism by responding to Edward Knott’s polemical work, *Charity Mistaken*.⁴⁴ Meshed between these two controversies was a debate in the House of Commons, led by Rous, on the sermons of Roger Manwaring, one of Charles I’s chaplains, who, in 1627, had preached two controversial sermons on the power of the king over the

39 Francis Rous, *Testis Veritatis: The Doctrine of King James, Our Late Sovereign of Famous Memory, of the Church of England, of the Catholic Church, Plainly Shewed to Be One in the Points of Predestination, Free Will, and Certainty of Salvation* (London, 1626), pp. 95–6.

40 Kevin P. Laam, “Borrowed Heaven: Early Modern Devotion and the Art of Happiness” (PhD thesis, University of Southern California, 2006), pp. 83–4.

41 Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 183. Cited in Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England*, p. 51.

42 In 1660, another lay theologian, Robert Boyle, was offered the provostship of Eton College on the condition that he be ordained. Boyle denied the provostship, however, believing that his religious writings had more weight coming from a layperson. See “Robert Boyle,” in Herbert Jaumann, *Handbuch Gelehrtenkultur der Fruhen Neuzeit: Band 1: Bibliographisches Repertorium* (Berlin, 2004), pp. 125–6.

43 William Beveridge, *A Short History of the Westminster Assembly* (Edinburgh, 1904), pp. 100–1.

44 The full title reads *Charity Mistaken, with the Want Whereof Catholickes Are Vniustly Charged: for Affirming, as They Do with Grief, that Protestancy Vnreprented Destroys Salvation* (1630). “Edward Knott” was a pseudonym for “Matthew Wilson.” McGee cites the author as Sir Toby Matthew. See J. Sears McGee, “Francis Rous and the ‘Scabby or Itchy Children’: The Problem of Toleration in 1645,” *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 67 (2004), 401–23.

state.⁴⁵ Joshua Scodel comments, “In 1628 the parliamentary leader John Pym had reported to an alarmed Parliament that Manwaring had asserted that the king had absolute power and that subjects had to submit to illegal commands against their conscience.”⁴⁶ In essence, this was Manwaring’s attempt to secure favor and preferment, but Parliament was furious and had Manwaring censured, imprisoned, and suspended. In addition, he had to pay £1,000 for preaching “seditious” sermons, and though the king initially upheld the sentence, wanting to appease Parliament, he soon after restored Manwaring to the ministry, made him a royal chaplain, and granted him preferment.⁴⁷

Rous’s role in the Montagu and Knott controversies can be highlighted as follows:

The Montagu affair elicited with controversy over Montagu’s anti-Calvinist tract, *Appello Caesarem*, which had so offended the dominantly Reformed House of Commons, which they believed to be a popish conspiracy to subvert true religion, that they fought to censure, fine, and imprison him.⁴⁸ The tract itself was a formal defense against allegations of doctrinal infelicity, initiated by an earlier controversy with the Catholic John Heigham, who, in 1623, had published an attack on the Church of England on the grounds that its doctrines were chiefly Reformed. In his short book, Heigham disputed fifty-two

45 N. H. Keeble, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001), p. 42; Jürgen Overhoff, *Hobbes’s Theory of Will: Ideological Reasons and Historical Circumstances* (Lanham, 2000), p. 105.

46 Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Johnson to Wordsworth* (New York, 1991), p. 152. See also James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes, eds., *Stuart Royal Proclamations* (Oxford, 1973–83), 2:198, n. 2.

47 Though Manwaring was not an Arminian in theology, he was branded because he supported the royal court. For example, in 1628, Henry Burton accused the Arminians of arguing that kings are partakers of God’s omnipotence, thus reflecting the fact that “Arminianism” was a politically charged term in the 1620–30s. Burton, *Israel’s Fast* (1628), as cited in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 158. See also Michael B. Young, *Charles I* (New York, 1997), 62–5; Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph*, pp. 151–2; W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), pp. 289–90; Louis Edward Ingelhart, ed., *Press and Speech Freedoms in the World, from Antiquity until 1998* (Westport, 1998), p. 47. For Rous’s speech against Manwaring, see Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, p. 585.

48 J. W. Allen, *English Political Thought, 1603–60* (London, 1938), 1:161–5; Dorothy Auchter, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Westport, 2001), p. 28.

doctrines, which he believed he could refute, “by express texts from their own approved English Bible.”⁴⁹

In 1624, Richard Montagu, bishop of Norwich, published a response to Heigham’s work with his *A Gag for the New Gospel? No. A New Gag for an Old Goose*. Montagu’s rebuttal tried to show that Catholic doctrine was actually closer to that of the English Church than Heigham had depicted. Indeed, Anthony Milton has stated that Montagu’s work exposed “the theological weaknesses in the alliance between Calvinist conformists and Puritans,” which, to date, had solidified the English Church, and given it some sense of stability.⁵⁰ For the House of Commons, the favor that Montagu had received from the royal court suggested that the king was moving into an Arminian direction.⁵¹ Though Montagu’s tract was written to refute Catholic charges, and defend Protestantism more generally, “the text was surprisingly sympathetic to Catholic doctrine,” in that it “refused to condemn the Pope as a man of sin,” a long-standing belief within English Protestantism since Henry VIII, and proposed a form of modified transubstantiation.⁵² Further, Montagu argued that “holy pictures and images served a useful purpose in the church,” as did the signing of the cross, thus exposing internal conflicts over “boundaries of acceptability” between the bishops and reformers.⁵³ What caused so much scandal and irritation was that Montagu saw differences between Rome and the English Church as matters *de minimis*. The Reformed wing in Parliament, including Rous, had grown accustomed to distancing themselves from Rome, and for Montagu to make such a brazen claim was thought to undermine the fabric of English Reformation.⁵⁴ In fact, Montagu’s book not only roused

49 See John Heigham, *The Gag of the Reformed Gospel*, 2nd ed. (Douai, 1623).

50 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, p. 49; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 353–76.

51 See White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic*, ch. 11.

52 Auchter, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England*, p. 31; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, ch. 2. Indeed, the rejection of the pope as Antichrist, “cut across theological boundaries, and embraced all the Protestant archbishops of Canterbury from Thomas Cranmer through to George Abbot.” Furthermore, the “doctrine was also regularly defended in the Universities” (Milton, p. 93).

53 Auchter, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England*, p. 31; David J. Davis, *Seeing Faith, Printing Pictures: Religious Identity during the English Reformation* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 52–8.

54 While the Reformed generally favored Catholics for their metaphysics, they distanced themselves from contemporary Catholic theologians, such as Bellarmine. See Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius* (Grand Rapids, 1991), p. 37.

the chagrin of Parliament, who saw the text as “Catholic-inspired,” but also international Protestants who feared that it compromised the English *sensus unitatis* with the continental Reformed churches.⁵⁵

Rous and other Calvinist MP’s were prepared to fight for their church, as it was then constituted, by showing that there was little in common with the Roman hierarchy, and that English Protestants had long distanced themselves from the papacy. They censured Montagu for espousing Arminianism and Catholicism, and for publishing a “seditious” text.⁵⁶ But Montagu had favor with the king, and was allowed to publically defend himself. Moreover, to make a point and send a clear message to the House of Commons, the king appointed Francis White, dean of Carlisle, to preside over Montagu’s defense. White, a prominent member of Durham House, a group of churchmen from an “anti-Calvinist stable,” had made a name for himself in his early disputations against Catholicism.⁵⁷

In 1625, Montagu’s defense was published as *Appello Caesarem*.⁵⁸ Throughout the book, Montagu claims the backing of King James I, and the English Church, for his opposition to the Reformed doctrines of predestination and perseverance, and for his view of the doctrine of free will. He disregarded the Synod of Dort, as being of no significance to the English.⁵⁹ His attitude towards the synod was offensive to the House of Commons, even though the Canons of Dort had never officially been ratified in England.⁶⁰ Thus, a major controversy ensued with Arminianism as a focal point within Parliamentary debate, until its dissolution in 1629.⁶¹

In *Appello Caesarem*, Montagu wrote, “I am not, nor would be accounted willingly Arminian, Calvinist or Lutheran, names of division, but a Christian.”⁶²

55 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, p. 49; Simon L. Adams, “The Protestant Cause: Religious Alliance in the West European Calvinist Communities as a Political Issue in England, 1585–1630,” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1973), p. 12.

56 Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–42* (London, 1990), pp. 223–4.

57 Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c.1560–1643* (Woodbridge, 2005), p. 159; Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), p. 47.

58 Richard Montagu, *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers* (London, 1625).

59 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, p. 50.

60 See Anthony Milton, ed., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort, 1618–19* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. xlix, 381.

61 See Stella Lambert, “Richard Montagu, Arminianism, and Censorship,” *Past & Present* 124 (1989), 36–68.

62 Montagu, *Appello Caesarem*, p. 10.

He discusses the contested points between Calvinists and Arminians, such as the fall of man, the nature of sin, justification, and predestination. He argues that it is better to rely on the study of the Bible, than on the opinions of theologians who seek preferment. Montagu questions whether the Church of England had ever taught the Reformed doctrine of predestination, and denies that the doctrine consists of an absolute decree; he further denies the doctrine of perseverance and claims that true faith may be lost, and believers ultimately damned.⁶³ Montagu claims that the English Church has historically been a moderating force, never rendering sweeping judgments about the mind of God, and rejects speculative doctrine.⁶⁴ He criticizes Dortian influence in the English Church, but rejects notions of *meritum ex condigno*, as being false and presumptuous.⁶⁵

In 1625, in response to this cavalier attitude, the House of Commons sought to adopt and ratify the Canons of Dort into the English constitution, and a committee was convened to investigate the claims of *Appello Caesarem*.⁶⁶ On July 7, 1625, the committee declared the work, “a factious and seditious book,” and deplored its slighting of Dort as a threat to true religion and stability.⁶⁷

In 1626, Rous, representing Truro in the House of Commons, took it on himself to respond to Montagu, with his *Testis Veritatis*, a “testament of truth,” which comprised a short defense of Calvinism, and the “Reformedness” of King James I.⁶⁸ Rous had already shown support for the “Calvinist consensus” with his “religiously-motivated” *Diseases of the Time Attended by Their Remedies* (1622), a book “committed to godly Protestantism at home and the support of the international Protestant cause abroad.”⁶⁹

63 Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, pp. 165–6.

64 Montagu, *Appello Caesarem*, pp. 55–74.

65 Thus, Montagu wrote, “the Synod of Dort is not my rule.” See Montagu, *Appello Caesarem*, pp. 105–8, 200–5.

66 Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism*, p. 296.

67 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, p. 50; Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, p. 233.

68 While Rous prefers “Catholic” to “Calvinist” as a designation for true Protestantism, White mistakenly infers that Rous was moving more towards the Establishment and away from the Calvinist consensus. Tyacke has clarified that, for Rous, the two terms were synonymous. Rous showed that as late as 1619 James had publicly supported the Reformed doctrines of election and absolute reprobation. Cp. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. 232, with Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, p. 166. See also Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, p. 166; Ivo Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), p. 160.

69 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, p. 50.

Rous had two aims with *Testis Veritatis*: first, to show how theologically erroneous Arminianism was; and second, to set forth the political dangers associated with it. He likened Arminianism's entrance into the English Church to that of "a flying fish." Rous portrays the king as reformer and Calvinist, adhering to such historically Reformed doctrines as predestination, free will, and the certainty of salvation. In an eclectic defense of predestination, Rous quotes from a variety of sources: King James's declaration against Vorstius (1612), his *A Meditation Upon the Lord's Prayer* (1619), the Irish Articles (no. 15), the Conference at Hampton Court, the Articles of the Church of England (no. 17), John Rogers, John Field, Vincentius Lirinensis, Augustine, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Athanasius, Hillary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Beza, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, George Cassander, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Bradwardine, and Antonio del Corro.⁷⁰ Rous claims that Beza's double predestination is no more than a reiteration of Augustine.⁷¹

By publishing *Testis Veritatis*, Rous sought to remove any doubt about the heretical status of Arminianism, and whether it might be an acceptable alternative within the English Church, or even if it could be consistent with catholicity, which Arminius had argued for.⁷² Rous depicted Arminianism as

70 Rous, *Testis Veritatis*; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. 232.

71 Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, p. 15. Whether or not this identification is accurate, continues to be debated among historians. Indeed, Frank A. James III has cautioned against seeing a full double predestination in Augustine's theology, though he admits that Augustine did not "lend himself" to easy classification. Frank A. James III, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (New York, 1998), pp. 102–3. Both Jaroslav Pelikan and Bernhard Lohse have suggested that Augustine believed in double predestination. See Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of Catholic Tradition, 100–600* (Chicago, 1971), p. 297; and Bernhard Lohse, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*, trans. Ernest Stoeffler (Minneapolis, 1966), p. 116. See also Michal Paluch, O.P., *La profondeur de l'amour divin: évolution de la doctrine de la prédestination dans l'oeuvre de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 2004), which discusses Augustine's influence on Aquinas; and Joseph P. Wawrykow, *God's Grace and Human Action: "Merit" in the Theology of Thomas Aquinas* (Notre Dame, 1995), pp. 226–76.

72 Whether Arminius was truly "Reformed," being a pioneer who enriched the tradition, infusing it with new life, or a heretic who founded a new tradition that was an assault on Reformed mores, has received attention in Keith D. Stanglin, "Arminius and Arminianism: An Overview of Current Research," in *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius, 1559/60–1609*, ed. Theodoor Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma (Leiden, 2009), pp. 3–24; and Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacobus Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (New York, 2012), pp. 189–210.

a double-faced folly, and heresy, that flies “in the face of the whole *Protestant Doctrine*,” and “lookes to two Religions at once, *Protestantisme* and *Popery* . . .”⁷³

However persuasive *Testis Veritatis* might have been, it seems certain that King James’s professed Calvinism was more of a political balancing act than a genuine confession of faith, as political historians are apt to point out.⁷⁴ Indeed, while it is uncertain to what extent the king may have embraced the Reformed faith, James’s son, Charles, had little regard for Calvinism, and appointed Montagu as royal chaplain, much to the dismay of the godly. Parliament’s attempts to prosecute Montagu for heresy and schism were dismissed by the newly appointed king, and Charles I eventually dissolved Parliament, as a response to pressing religious and political disputes. When Charles I later reconvened Parliament, sensing the shifting times, and seeking financial support, he banned *Appello Caesarem*, calling it the cause of sedition within the church. Copies were to be handed over to authorities, or face prosecution.⁷⁵

The Montagu affair shows how the Reformed perceived Arminianism, and Catholicism, in the Stuart church. First, it highlights the disparity between “the godly” as sustainers of the “old” Reformed religion, and their pursuit for further reform, and Arminians as the true “innovators” of a dangerous doctrine. Second, it illuminates English fears of foreign oppression. In fact, Rous had conjectured that *Appello Caesarem* was part of a Spanish plot to reintroduce Catholicism into England.⁷⁶ Whether these fears were justified or not, the question of doctrinal indifference was much more than keeping the peace; it was an attitude that had the potential to overturn the social order, though, in turn, the establishment saw the dangers of Calvinism and popery to exist in rationalism and dogma.⁷⁷

73 Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, pp. 105–6. See also Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus*, p. 341.

74 Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, pp. 260–92; Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 174, n. 15. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that King James played both sides of the political fence: to the Arminian bishops, he was a paragon of sympathy and compassion; and to the Calvinists, he was the champion of Reformed Protestantism.

75 Auchter, *Literary and Dramatic Censorship*, p. 32; Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, pp. 51–2. See also Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter Revolution,” in *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*, ed. Margo Todd (New York, 1995), pp. 53–70; Kenneth Fincham, *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–42* (New York, 1993); Leo F. Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509–1640* (New York, 1990), pp. 168–9.

76 Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, pp. 106–7.

77 Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 69.

The second controversy began with the publication of *Charity Mistaken*, which appeared in 1630. The short work, ascribed to Edward Knott, argued that there was no salvation outside the Catholic Church.⁷⁸ Rous's *Catholick Charitie*, a heavily annotated rejoinder, was initially prevented from being published by Laudian censors. The manuscript circulated in Puritan circles, however, and was read by Pym and others, until Parliament intervened and the press relaxed, being finally approved in 1641.⁷⁹ Knott's tract, however, did not go unchallenged in the 1630s. Christopher Potter, provost of Queen's College, Oxford, a Calvinist convert to Arminianism, published his *Want of Charitie Iustly Charged* (1633), in which he contested Rome's monopoly on salvation, but followed Beza in conceding that Catholics could be saved.⁸⁰

Knott responded to Potter's work with an elaborate defense of his earlier work, and sought to reaffirm that salvation could not be found within more than one church, and that Protestants were in a dangerous state of damnation.⁸¹ In turn, Potter enlisted William Chillingworth, a renowned debater, to enter the dispute, which he did with his *Religion of Protestants* (1638), an epoch-making defense of English Protestantism, which was reprinted well into the nineteenth century.⁸² Rous's *Catholick Charitie* was one of the last of the Reformed tracts on the Knott-Potter debate. Knott wrote at least two more books, *Infidelity*

78 [Anonymous], *Charity Mistaken, with the Want Thereof* (1630).

79 Francis Rous, *Catholick Charitie: Complaining and Maintaining That Rome is Uncharitable to Sundry Eminent parts of the Catholick Church, and Especially to Protestants, and is Therefore Uncatholick* (London, 1641). Rous argued that the patristics refute Catholicism, and in this regard is similar to Andrew Willet's *Synopsis Papismi*. For Willet, see Stefania Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570–1625* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 93–103; and Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 10–30.

80 Christopher Potter, D.D., *Want of Charitie Iustly Charged, on All Svch Romanists, as Dare (Without Truth or Modesty) Affirme, that Protestancie Destroyeth Salvation* (Oxford, 1633). Potter was once a follower of Henry Airay, the previous Calvinist provost of Queen's, but in the 1620s travelled throughout the continent, and likely became imbibed with Arminianism there. See A. J. Hegarty, "Potter, Christopher," *ODNB*.

81 Edward Knott, *Mercy and Truth. Or Charity Maintayned by Catholiques* (1634).

82 Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, pp. 63–84, esp. 71–73. Chillingworth tried to balance religious toleration with political obedience, but he eventually chose to support obedience over toleration, especially in the case of Arminianism. Gary Remer, *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration* (University Park, 1996), pp. 145–8, 166–7. Patrick Collinson cites Chillingworth for holding the patent to the phrase, "Religion of Protestants," which the former used as the title of his *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (1982).

Unmasked (1652), and *Protestancy Condemned* (1654), the former of which was responded to by Jean Daillé, a noted French-Reformed theologian.⁸³

In 1640, Rous told Parliament that the prerogative taxes of the 1630s were so oppressive that “there hath not such a thing been done since Israell came from the Egypt of Roome.”⁸⁴ He implied that while the Reformation had been England’s Exodus from religious oppression, the king’s Personal Rule (1629–40) had taken the nation back into bondage, and threatened the Reformed religion. Parliamentarians feared ecclesiastical and political slavery, and Puritans accused the Caroline bishops of unlawfully binding their consciences through acts of conformity; both fostered distrust of the monarchy, and whether intentional or not paved the road to revolution.⁸⁵

In 1643, Long Parliament made him provost of Eton College in recognition of his academic labors and patronage. He served as provost for the rest of his life, and advanced a classical education infused with mysticism, as outlined his *The Heavenlie Academie* (1638).⁸⁶ As with Downname, Rous preferred knowledge gained through experience to speculative reasoning, but conceded to the necessity of human knowledge, a “natural night,” as a necessary step toward the higher and heavenly light, where one could come to know the love of God. Still, there was a place for learning; human knowledge, the “natural light,” was a necessary step toward the higher and heavenly light, where one could come to know the love of God.⁸⁷ Indeed, Kevin Sharpe wrote that for seventeenth-century religionists, “God’s act in creating the world was perceived as an act of love,” which included “not only personal but also cosmic, spiritual and political

83 Jean Daillé, *An Apologie for the Reformed Churches* (1653). For Daillé, see Jean Daillé (Son), *Abrege de la vie de Mr. Daillé*, which was printed with Jean Daillé (Father), *Les deux derniers sermons de Mr. Daillé* (Geneva, 1671); Eugene Haag, *La France Protestante* (Geneva, 1846–59), 4:180–6; Eugene Haag and Emile Haag, *La France Protestante* (Paris, 1877–88), 5:23–38; and Alexander Vinet, *Histoire de la Predication Parmi Les Reformes de France Au Dix-Septieme Siecle* (Paris, 1860). Cited in Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church* (Grand Rapids, 2002), 4:414, n. 14.

84 *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*, p. 148.

85 See John Coffey, “England’s Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance,” in *England’s Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. Charles W. A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 253–80.

86 William J. Wainwright, *Reason and the Heart: A Prolegomenon to a Critique of Passional Reason* (New York, 1995), p. 9; M. Greengrass, “Samuel Hartlib and the Commonwealth of Learning,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, ed. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), 4:304–22.

87 Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 59, 220–44; Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, pp. 85–7.

relationships.⁸⁸ Godly learning, education, and the spiritual life, then, were interwoven within Rous's *praxis pietatis*, and formed the basis for *unitas* among the English Puritans.⁸⁹

In 1645, an anonymous treatise, *The Ancient Bounds, or Liberty of Conscience Tenderly Stated*, was published in favor of tolerating tender consciences within the English Church.⁹⁰ The work was attributed to Rous, and there is little reason to dispute this, though it was probably a collaborative effort of the Independents, with some assistance from Joshua Sprigge.⁹¹ The Independents opposed the Presbyterian drive towards doctrinal and ecclesiastical uniformity, and generally contested much content of their heresiography, and instead wanted more freedom to believe and worship according to one's conscience. They sought to "embarrass the Presbyterians" by using arguments that Presbyterians had used against the bishops, especially on tyranny and conformity.⁹² In *Ancient Bounds*, Rous and Sprigge defend a limited or "modest" liberty of conscience, to be upheld the magistrate, and protected with vigor.⁹³ The pamphlet specifically deals with the power of the state to coerce religion, and argues that it should refrain from suppressing its free practice,

88 Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000), p. 109. See also Rous, *Heavenlie Academie*, p. 115.

89 Even when there was a class struggle, for instance, there was a shared unity among Puritans in indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. See Leo F. Solt, *Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell Army* (Stanford, 1959), p. 89.

90 [Francis Rous], *The Ancient Bounds, Or Liberty of Conscience, Tenderly Stated, Modestly Asserted, and Mildly Vindicated* (London, 1645). For Rous's notions of freedom and obligation to government, see Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 3:271, 287–307; John M. Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge, Eng., 1981), pp. 45–6, 51–6; and Perez Zagorin, *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution* (Humanities Press, 1966), pp. 67ff.

91 J. C. Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1516–1700* (Cambridge, Eng., 1981), p. 254; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, p. 186. On the authorship of *The Ancient Bounds*, see J. Sears McGee, "Francis Rous and 'Scabby or Itchy Children': The Problem of Toleration in 1645," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67 (2002), 401–22. McGee argues convincingly that Rous was the main author but that Sprigge was also involved. In contrast, in 1953, based on stylistic analysis, Kiefer argued that Sprigge was sole author. See Barbara Kiefer, "The Authorship of 'Ancient Bounds,'" *Church History* 22 (1953), 192–6.

92 Martin Dzelzainis, "Ideas in Conflict: Political and Religious Thought During the English Revolution," in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001), pp. 41–2.

93 [Rous], *Ancient Bounds*, sig. Biv.

unless it arises from a false, dangerous, or seditious religion.⁹⁴ It was never intended to allow for or encourage Catholics to freely engage in their religion, but only to set up the universal church as the “Pillar of the truth.”⁹⁵ The magistrate’s role was to enforce morality “by outlawing all blasphemous, idolatrous and scandalous opinions,” but he did not have power to “go any further in his government of the Church.”⁹⁶

The positions set forth in *Ancient Bounds*, begs the question whether Rous was indeed a Presbyterian. Though Baillie’s letters have, at times, moved scholars to place Rous among the Presbyterians, Baillie himself wrote that Rous had defected to the “Sectaries,” probably some time before 1645.⁹⁷ The *Ancient Bounds*, with its advocacy of toleration for dissenters, shows, if nothing else, that Rous leaned toward the Independent position, or had changed his views over the years; still, Blair Worden sees Rous as a “tolerant” Presbyterian, as, for instance, in his petition for leniency with Christopher Love in 1651.⁹⁸ Whether Rous was a Presbyterian or an Independent, for the purposes of our study, does not really matter. What matters is his insistence on tolerating the radical groups within the English Revolution, which had been targeted by such “rigid” Presbyterians as Thomas Edwards, Samuel Rutherford, and Ephraim Pagitt, who sought to “‘cleanse’ the city of London of ‘heresy.’”⁹⁹ Indeed, Rous’s sermon before the House of Commons on religious toleration had not only been well received, but was in hot and continuous demand, thus reflecting the overall climate to set aside bitter disputes for a more favorable and peaceful solution.¹⁰⁰

The anonymous pamphlet *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government*, also ascribed to Rous, appeared on April 25, 1649, and sought to establish the Rump as the true governing body within England, and establish its

94 Dzelzainis, “Ideas in Conflict,” pp. 42–4; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, pp. 186–7.

95 [Rous], *Ancient Bounds*, pp. 13–4.

96 Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, pp. 186–7.

97 Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, 2:97. For instance, Worden calls Rous a “religious Presbyterian,” and adds that “despite his Presbyterianism Rous . . . was of a tolerant disposition.” Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648–53* (Cambridge, Eng., 1974), p. 127.

98 Marchamont Nedham, *The Cases of the Commonwealth of England Stated*, ed. Philip A. Knachel (Charlottesville, 1969), p. xxvii; Worden, *The Rump Parliament*, p. 127.

99 Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration, and Early Enlightenment Culture*, p. 289.

100 Chris R. Kyle, *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England* (Stanford, 2012), p. 105. Jeremiah Burroughs also argued for broad toleration. See Burroughs, *Irenicum, to the Lovers of Truth and Peace. Heart-Divisions Opened in the Causes and Evils of Them, with Cautions that We May Not Be Hurt by Them, and Endeavors to Heal Them* (London, 1645).

dictates as requiring dutiful obedience, “so long as its commands were lawful.”¹⁰¹ Conal Condren calls it, “an elegantly structured casuistic exercise, moving from theological axioms to the present situation, concluding with a resolution to the problem of renegeing on *The Solemn League*.”¹⁰² Rous’s goal in writing was to solidify Parliament’s power to govern the Commonwealth, in wake of the collapse of the monarchy; it was equally an exercise to provide legitimacy to the new government, and argued from Romans 13.¹⁰³ Rous had many critics who challenged his interpretation of the biblical text, chiefly on grounds that the Pauline injunction commanded obedience to a “lawfully constituted” authority, but there were those who supported the Rump, and believed that a new and prosperous era had finally begun.¹⁰⁴

Rous was active in the new Rump regime.¹⁰⁵ He was a member of Cromwell’s council of state, and was nominated as one of Cromwell’s Triers. His role as Speaker of the House in the Barebones Parliament (1653) has been well documented;¹⁰⁶ Rous was “remarkable for his learning and piety, as well as for being re-elected month by month.”¹⁰⁷ His commitment to Cromwell, being a member of his inner circle, would seem to confirm a leaning towards Independency; regardless, Rous retired after Richard Cromwell succeeded in 1657, probably due to his declining health and age.¹⁰⁸ Rous’s absence in the

-
- 101 Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 199, n. 201; Fritze, *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England*, pp. 179–81, 199.
- 102 Conal Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 300.
- 103 Rous, *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government* (London, 1649).
- 104 Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England*, pp. 300–5; Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 2:271, 291–6.
- 105 Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603–1714* (New York, 1980), p. 252; Sean Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649–53* (Manchester, 1997), p. 171.
- 106 Sean Kelsey remarks that Rous’s ceremonial privileges as Speaker was “doubly ironic” in that “Rous, a Rumper, had... once enjoined the English people to ‘Judge not the appearances but judge righteous judgment’ and to render obedience to *de facto* authorities accordingly.” Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic*, p. 171.
- 107 Stephen K. Robert, “The House of Commons, 1640–60,” in *A Short History of Parliament*, ed. Clive Jones (Woodbridge, 2009), p. 113; Leora Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions: Everyday Life and Politics in Britain, North America, and France* (Berkeley, 2009), pp. 72–9; Paul Seaward, ed., *Speakers and the Speakership* (Malden, 2010), pp. 76–7; James Holstun, *Ehud’s Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution* (New York, 2000), p. 274.
- 108 Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 2:271; J. H. M. Salmon, *Ideas and Contexts in France and England from the Renaissance to the Romantics* (Variorum, 2000); N. H. Keeble, *The Cambridge Companion to the Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001), p. 42.

new regime was possibly one of the factors that precipitated the demise of the Protectorate.¹⁰⁹

Joseph Glanvill, later chaplain-in-ordinary to Charles II, ministered to Rous from 1658 until his death.¹¹⁰ Rous died at Acton, near London, on January 7, 1659, was buried in the college chapel at Eton, and had a grand funeral procession, depicted in the political newspaper, “Mercurius Politicus,” for January 27, 1658/9.¹¹¹ Following the interment, a sermon was preached by John Oxenbridge, a fellow of Eton College, but it does not seem to have survived.¹¹² Rous was known for his charity, and acts of kindness, and appointed three fellowships at Pembroke College. The royalists derided Rous as the “old illiterate Jew of Eton,”

109 John Peacey, “The Protector Humbled: Richard Cromwell and the Constitution,” in *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, ed. Patrick Little (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 35. There is some debate on Rous’s influence on Cromwell and the events of the interregnum. Though Peacey mentions Rous as having less influence, the council met several times a week, and Rous was doubtless among those who were “prodigiously energetic.” Nancy L. Matthews, *William Sheppard, Cromwell’s Law Reformer* (Cambridge, Eng., 1984), pp. 35–6.

110 Rhodri Lewis, “Of ‘Origenian Platonisme’: Joseph Glanvill on the Pre-Existence of Souls,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 69 (2006), p. 277; Martin I. J. Griffin, Jr., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden, 1992), p. 25.

111 The paper reported, “Monday the 24th being the day appointed for the interment of the corpse of the Right Hon. Francis Lord Rouse, it was performed in this manner. The lords of his Highness privy council met at his house at Acton, as also divers of the commissioners of the admiralty, and of the officers of the army, with many other persons of honor and quality. His Highness was also pleased to send several of his gentlemen in coaches with six horses to be present at the solemnity; three heralds likewise or officers at arms gave their attendance. The corpse was placed in a carriage covered with a pall of black velvet, adorned with escutcheons, and drawn with six horses in mourning furniture. The lords of the council followed it, and the rest in their order, towards Eaton college by Windsor, where the deceased lord, having been provost, desired he might be interred. The corpse being arrived there, it was received by the learned society of that college with much sorrow for the loss of so excellent a governor, and the young scholars had prepared copies of verses to express their duty and bear their part of sorrow upon this sad occasion. The body being taken off the carriage, was born towards the college chapel, four lords and gentlemen holding up each corner of the pall, and the whole company following it to the grave.”

112 Oxenbridge was a nonconformist divine who, upon being ejected, made several visits to Bermuda to advance the Puritan Reformation. He also seems to have been the source of inspiration for some of Andrew Marvell’s poems. Christopher Hill, *Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England*, p. 162; Myra Jehlen and Michael Warner, ed., *The English Literatures of America, 1500–1800* (New York, 1997), p. 544; Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999), pp. 158–9.

and “Proteus.”¹¹³ In 1661, the royalist provost of Eton, Nicholas Monck, removed “the standard and escutcheons from [Rous’s] grave,” in an apparent act of defamation.¹¹⁴ Rous outlived his wife, Philippa, who had died on December 20, 1657, and had a younger brother, Arthur, ministering in the New World.¹¹⁵ Rous left behind two sons, one that was disinherited due to an illicit marriage, and the other, a Francis Rous, Jr., author of *Archaeologiae Atticae* (1637).¹¹⁶

Rous’s social contexts show his affinity with Stuart politics, his mystical vision for the Commonwealth, toleration of dissenters, and his hatred of doctrinal indifference. Rous was a hero of the Calvinist line, and a foe to Arminianism and Catholicism. With Pym and Prynne, he became associated with the conservative wing in Parliament, and was a vocal reformer. While White has sought to establish the English Church as a highly fractured and eclectic group of Remonstrants, Rous’s belief in the historicity of his Reformed convictions within the church, confirm a broad “Calvinist consensus” in the Tudor-Stuart Church.¹¹⁷ Finally, Rous shows how the Puritan Reformation spread to all classes within society, as it sought to reform the practice and theology of the English Church.

We will now examine Rous’s writings in their historical context, then turn to his theology, specifically its points of continuity with the orthodox tradition, and then conclude the chapter.

-
- 113 Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2:231ff. For the practice of defamation in the period, see Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), esp. pp. 23–50; and Jane Kamensky, *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England* (New York, 1997).
- 114 Daniel Lysons, *The Environs of London*, 2nd ed. (London, 1830), 2:3–5. Upon Monck’s appointment as provost in 1660/61, most Puritan fellows resigned from the college or were deprived of their living.
- 115 Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, p. 101. A memorial to Philippa was affixed to the Parish Church of St. Mary in Acton in 1657.
- 116 Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995), p. 304; George Clement Boase and William Prideaux Courtney, *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis* (London, 1878), 2:601; Francis Rous’s will, dated March 18, 1657.
- 117 Gary W. Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 236–41. Further evidence lies in Rous’s speeches before Parliament, which depicted Arminianism as an innovation in and an increasing threat to the English Church. See for instance, *Commons Debates for 1629*, ed. Wallace Notestein and Francis Relf (Minneapolis, 1921), pp. 12–3, 24. In 1626, Rous had cautioned that Arminianism was “popery in a new dress”; and then, by the 1640s, Rous stated that Arminianism was “worse than popery.”

4.3 Rous's Writings in Historical Context

Though Rous was not a trained theologian, he had a profound religious experience, which, as with Luther and Calvin before him, put him on the path to study theology, and become a writer of devotional texts. Following his conversion, Rous did not pursue formal theological studies, but chose to read the mystics, church fathers, and, to some extent, the scholastics; like Baxter and Bunyan, he was mostly self-taught in matters of theology and biblical exposition. We do not have record of Rous's library, but his use of sources in his printed works provide a window into the kinds of books that he was acquainted with, and overall are consistent with Puritan attitudes toward learning. For instance, Rous shows remarkable awareness of Catholic writers, such as Thomas Aquinas and Thomas Bradwardine, and was familiar with Spanish mystics, and other continental writers that expanded upon *mystica theologia*.¹¹⁸ His work is peculiar, perhaps, in that virtually "none of the authorities whom he quotes belongs to the circle of the Reformation," with Luther being an exception. Instead, he favors the patristics, and "above all Augustine."¹¹⁹ Rous's learning and *pietas* furthered his reputation in the Netherlands and British colonies, and several of his works made their way into Norwegian collections.¹²⁰ Indeed, both Jacobus Koelman and Gottfried Arnold recommended *Interiora Regni Dei*.¹²¹ In his work, Rous communicates the dangers of corrupt religion, the need for experimental knowledge, and the urgency of mystical union and fellowship.

118 Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625–60* (New York, 2002), p. 134; Nicholas D. Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall, and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity: A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), p. 93, n. 116.

119 Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 31.

120 Gina Dahl, *Book Collections of Clerics in Norway, 1650–1750* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 109, 132, 161, 176, 187, 214. Several of Rous's works were also part of Countess of Bridgewater's London Library. See Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005), pp. 79, 269, 271–2, 279. While Van den Berg affirms that Rous had a strong following in the Netherlands, Willem op't Hof points out that the writings of William Perkins were most popular with twenty-nine titles eclipsing all others. Both Rous and Perkins had some influence on Witsius. Op't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1589–1622* (Rotterdam, 1987), pp. 634, 636–37, 640, 645; Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600–1640* (Leiden, 1993), p. 174.

121 Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 38, esp. pp. 35–42; Volker Keding, *Theologia Experimentalis: Die Erfahrungstheologie Beim Späten Gottfried Arnold* (Münster, 2000), pp. 57–8. See also Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London, 2006), pp. 59–70.

His pensive reflection brought him to the attention of other mystics, both in England and in the Continent, and reflects a distinct strain within English devotion, alongside New Model Army chaplains, Seekers, Ranters, and early Quakers.¹²²

As a whole, Rous's religious writings outnumber his other work, and can be divided into major and minor works. Thus, his major works are *Testis Veritatis* (1626), *The Mystical Marriage* (1631), *The Heavenly Academie* (1638), *Catholick Charitie* (1641), *The Psalmes of David in English Meeter* (1643), *The Ancient Bounds* (1645), and *Mella Patrum* (1650); and his minor works are *Meditations of Instrvction* (1616), *The Arte of Happiness* (1619), *Diseases of the Time* (1622), *The Oyl of Scorpions* (1623), *The Only Remedy* (1627), *The Balme of Love* (1648), and *The Great Oracle* (1655).¹²³ In 1655, a Latin compilation of the three most mystical writings was published as *Interiora Regni Dei*. An English collection was issued in 1657 as *Treatises and Meditations*, which reprinted the English equivalent of the Latin, and added six of Rous's other works.¹²⁴ The main corpus of Rous's work seems to have been composed throughout his fifties (c.1620–30s), when England was cast into political, religious, and cultural unrest.

In order to assess Rous and his contributions to orthodox Reformed spirituality, we will examine, in some detail, Rous's three most mystical works. However, before we assess these, let us survey his early work and minor writings:

(1) Rous's first appearance in print was a "Spenserian" sonnet, *Thvle, or Vertues Historie* (1596–8), which was prefaced to Charles FitzGeoffrey's laudation of Sir Francis Drake, *Sir Francis Drake, His Honorable Lifes Commendation, and His Tragicall Deathes Lamentation* (1596). Both FitzGeoffrey and Drake were friends of the Rous family.¹²⁵ There was an eighteen-year gap from Rous's first

122 Ian Green, "Varieties of Domestic Devotion in Early Modern English Protestantism," in *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), 24–25. Mystics on the Continent, such as Pierre Poiret, recommended Rous's works. See Poiret's endorsement in Pierre Poiret, *Theologiae Pacificae itemque Mysticae ac hujus Auctorum Idea Brevior* (Amsterdam, 1702), p. 286.

123 *Testis Veritatis* was reprinted without Rous's "To the Reader" in 1633 as *The Trvth of Three Things*.

124 A German translation of *Treatises and Meditations* (*Das Innerliche des Reiches Gottes*) appeared in 1682. Keding, *Theologia Experimentalis*, 57.

125 The Puritan FitzGeoffrey preached the funeral sermon of Rous's father, and praised him, "for the fair and just execution of his public duties." Duffin, *Faction and Faith*, p. 48; Martin Dzelzainis, "Ideas in Conflict: Political and Religious Thought During the English Revolution," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Writing of the English Revolution*, ed. N. H. Keeble (Cambridge, Eng., 2001), p. 42.

publication, a poem, and his religious writings; presumably, during this time he was occupied with theological reflection, and doubtless he influenced Pym at this stage, as threats of Arminianism and Catholicism prompted Rous to pick up the pen in the 1610s, and consequently these two themes dominated his early work.¹²⁶

(2) Rous spent much time in solitude prior to his first religious publication, *Meditations of Instrvction, Of Exhortation, Of Reprofe* (1616). Even in this early work, there is evidence of patristic and medieval awareness. In his dedication to the “Sonnes of the most High,” Rous writes of divers “sparks of holy fire,” which the Holy Spirit has “baptized with fire,” and which Rous has “gathered together by their united heate.” His goal, then, other than to bring glory to God, is to spark “a flame where there is none,” and rekindle those cold in their devotion.¹²⁷ Throughout the eighty-seven *Meditations*, Rous writes on such topics as the new birth, ambition, inward baptism, Christian progress, covetousness, divisions and schism, true friends, heaven, spiritual idolatry and images, kingdom of Satan, knowledge of self, loving God, presumption, providence, the pope, the name “Puritan,” resurrection, and worldly things. The book closes with Revelation 22:17, “The Spirit and the Bride say, Come, euen so, come Lord Jesus.” Rous sees the name “Puritan” as a defamatory word used against God’s people, and wonders how any in this “broad day light” of Protestantism can question the Pope’s status as antichrist.¹²⁸ Rous addresses a variety of churchly issues, but is caught up with anti-popery, and even laments the space given to it, having wanted to spend some time with the Christian’s warfare with the devil.¹²⁹ While not technically a manual of casuistry, the work has some semblance to Perkins and Gouge, and was part of the growing instructional genre.¹³⁰ The *Meditations* were later expanded to number 113 for the collected works.¹³¹

(3) Rous’s *Arte of Happiness* (1619) shows how a Christian is to attain “true happiness” in this life. There are tones reminiscent of the medieval mystics, but Rous remains grounded in more “mainstream” Reformed spirituality, noting

126 See Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (New York, 1978), pp. 7–76; Michael C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c.1550–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 389–98; Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, 51–2.

127 Rous, *Meditations of Instrvction*, sig. A2.

128 Rous, *Meditations of Instrvction*, pp. 259–74, 345–414.

129 Rous, *Meditations of Instrvction*, pp. 456–7.

130 Rous believed that ministers ought also to publish expositions of the Ten Commandments for public benefit, and criticizes those content to leave the matter to “secular” lawyers. Rous, *Meditations of Instrvctions*, pp. 459–62.

131 See Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 487–608.

that much heavenly joy comes from election, justification, regeneration, and perseverance.¹³² Rous likens the “very substance of the Spirit in us” to “heavenly oyl, which makes glad, not so much the face as the very heart of Man. It has a taste and relish of the Deity, and therefore above all other, this is the true oyl of gladness.”¹³³ The *Arte* shows how the theme of happiness supported the pursuit of piety, and was used to promote the *vita contemplativa* and the *vita activa*. LaFountain has stated that Puritans, such as Rous, drew upon Aristotle’s notion of *ἐπιπραξία*, in which godly living is equated with a divine “work of art”; says LaFountain, “Its practitioners are called artists, right artist, and artificers. These Puritan artists are, at the same time, said to be living images, lively images, living paintings, right images, pictures of God, pictures of Christ, true images, true portraits, and even divine landscapes.”¹³⁴ This emphasis supports “Christian humanism” within Puritanism, that Puritans, though reforming their own vision for society, were not originators, but heirs to a complex intellectual tradition that incorporated various aspects of the arts.¹³⁵

(4) Rous’s *Diseases of the Time* (1622) condemns the Catholic Church for differing from the Protestant by preventing its people from learning the truths of God.¹³⁶ Woven throughout are various social ills and theological topics; for instance, Rous questions those who love to publish books simply to advance their own name, and criticizes those who rely only on “natural wisdom,” preferring the handmaid to the mistress.¹³⁷ Rous distinguishes between “three sorts of Religion” in the “Romish Church”: First, there is what Rous calls *religio curialis*, whereby the hierarchy draws forth, “Policy, paraphrasing Divinity, and an unkindly and froward Alchemy, by which gross things are drawn out of pure things . . .” Moreover, the corrupting of the Bible and its doctrine “draw a Heathen, Secular and Carnal Empire, even a perfect story of a Man of sin, and of one that sitteth as God in the Temple of God. The Pope hath gotten a *Monopoly* of heaven and earth, and none may trade in either without some

132 Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, pp. 57–8; Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, pp. 27–8.

133 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 35. Quoted in Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 27.

134 Jason David LaFountain, “The Puritan Art World” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2013), p. 6.

135 Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), pp. 1–21, 53–95; Laam, “Borrowed Heaven,” pp. 83–7; Peltonen, *Classical Humanism*, p. 241.

136 Marc L. Schwarz, “Some Thoughts on the Development of a Lay Religious Consciousness in Pre-Civil-War England,” in *Popular Belief and Practice*, ed. G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker (Cambridge, Eng., 1972), pp. 173–4.

137 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 93–214.

tribute to his supremacy.”¹³⁸ Second, there is a *religio theologorum*, which is taught for the “saving of learned souls,” and which itself consists of three degrees: (a) the *crassa doctrina*, which was common before Luther, and contains “the doctrine of Merits, of Condignity, of Predestination *ex pravis operibus*; of worshipping of Images with the worship due to the sampler . . .”; (b) the *doctrina limata*, which is “conceived by the genuine interpretation of Scriptures . . . and approacheth very neer to that of the Reformed, so that though not out of one, yet out of all, our doctrine may be proved and deduced”; (c) the *doctrina spiritus; aut conscientia*, which is “when Men taught by the Spirit of God, or enforced by the Light of their own Conscience, confess their own unworthiness, and wholly extoll, as the surest Refuge, the mercy of God in the merits of Christ,” as seen, he says, “in *Bernard, Thomas Campensis*, and others, that lived in that Church; Men as I hope sanctified and taught by the Spirit.”¹³⁹ Third, there is the *doctrina idiotarum*, which is the doctrine taught to the masses, and deemed “sufficient to save their ignorant souls.” This doctrine is specifically taught in order to leave their souls in “darkness,” as, for instance, in their preference of images over preaching, or in the rote repetition of creeds, and the Ave Maria; thus, “They work it out with their limbs, and the poor Soul stands by, and knows not a jot of the business.”¹⁴⁰ In the end, they breed superstition and idolatry, all the while presuming to prevent it.¹⁴¹ Also worth noting is Rous’s use of “Children of the Light” to describe “spiritual Christians,” a phrase later adopted by the Quakers.¹⁴²

(5) Rous’s *Oyl of Scorpions* (1623), a Jeremiad, argues that divine judgments brought upon nations are for the purpose of bringing them to repentance; indeed, such providential plagues, storms, and fires are sent to remedy such ills as swearing, blasphemy, drunkenness, deceit, backsliding, and idolatry. The *Oyl* is similar to Thomas Vincent’s *God’s Terrible Voice in the City* (1667), and other

138 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 140–1.

139 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 141–2. Rous writes of a godly remnant within the Roman church: “I doubt not but that . . . there is a reserved number, even a number reserved by God’s election, which is truly *Ecclesia Electorum*; having washing their robes white in the blood of the Lamb.”

140 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 142–3.

141 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 143.

142 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 134. Some of Rous’s work comprised part of the Quaker canon. See Richard L. Greaves, *Dublin’s Merchant-Quaker: Anthony Sharp and the Community of Friends, 1643–1707* (Stanford, 1998), p. 160.

London Jeremiads, in that it seeks to reprove social ills by calling to memory past and present judgments.¹⁴³

(6) *The Only Remedy* (1627), another Jeremiad, continues Rous's efforts to reform England by drawing parallels between sin and punishment, the "only remedy" being "a sure and sound repentance." Towers said the work "combined anti-popery with an attempt to prevent those who led saintly lives from being categorized with the derisive term 'puritan.'"¹⁴⁴ Indeed, for Rous, name-calling is but one of many tactics the devil uses to disparage the godly, since "in the Devils language, a Saint is a Puritan." Rous adds, "Wherefore know, that for some good work, he calls thee Puritan, understand, that in this language he calleth thee Saint: wherefore let this turn to thee for a testimonial, that even thy enemies being judges, thou art such a one as is truly honourable here on earth, and shall eternally be honoured hereafter in heaven."¹⁴⁵

(7) Finally, Rous's short tract, *The Balme of Love* (1648), is a continuation of *Mystical Marriage*, and was written to ameliorate divisions among God's people by reiterating that the stronger bond of unity and love characterizes the church. As "true and reall Catholicks," Protestants are to "never rest" until they attain universal love and peace. Rous writes, "as a Christian let him aske his Soul whether it can be the Spirit that hates and endeavours to destroy a man that hath the Spirit, certainly it is impossible, that the Spirit should hate the Spirit, or him that hath it." Thus, the nine-page tract sought to stymy ongoing divisions among the godly, and to focus on mystical unity.¹⁴⁶

We will now examine the three works of *Interiora Regni Dei*.

143 For Puritan providentialism, see Michael P. Winship, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment* (Baltimore, 2000), pp. 74–137; Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison, 1978); and Bercovitch, ed., *The American Puritan Imagination* (Cambridge, Eng., 1974), pp. 45–55.

144 Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, p. 183.

145 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 318.

146 Francis Rous, *The Balme of Love* (London, 1648). George Yule states that Rous "favored toleration," and uses *Balme* as proof. Van den Berg questions this view in that Rous favored toleration of "lesser differences" within his Reformed sphere. See and compare George Yule, "Presbyterians and Independents: Some Comments," *Past & Present* 47 (1970), 131, with Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 33, n. 38. Worden also criticizes Yule's position that "Rous [had] a tolerant disposition for a commitment to the principle of religious toleration: Rous does not, in *The Balm of Love*, 'advocate toleration.'" Worden, *The Rump Parliament*, p. 127, n. 4.

4.3.1 *The Heavenly Academy* (1638, 1656; Latin 1655, 1674)

Van den Berg calls *The Heavenly Academy* Rous's "most interesting" work, because it was "written for young people who were studying," and consequently contains elaborate Latin citations and references.¹⁴⁷ It is the text in which Rous most clearly outlines his paradigm for the ascent of knowledge, from its "lower" rudiments to its higher, more mystical, and celestial form. The title page contains a quote from Augustine, "*Cathedram in Coelo habet, qui corda docet.*"¹⁴⁸ Indeed, the *Academy* equates the "highest teaching" with "the teaching of the heart."¹⁴⁹ Here, Christ is the highest Teacher, whose instruction is perfect and heavenly. Christians thus have an "advantage over all other people" because they are taught religion from the heart.¹⁵⁰ But Rous is careful not to disparage the "lower Academies," as though they were of little import. Indeed, Rous reiterates the usefulness of human learning because it provides a necessary foundation for heavenly attainments. Rous himself had been educated in the finest British and Dutch schools, and valued their contributions to his godly pursuits, but, with Downname, believed that formal education was not an end in itself, but a means to the knowledge of God, where one can "grow by use and exercise, and likewise become excellent instruments in the new estate; there being no little use of understanding, memory, and elocution, when they shall become new, and new things shall be added to them."¹⁵¹

In an "Advertisement to the Reader," prefixed to the 1702 reprint of *Academy*, the publisher states that the work was written before the English Revolution, and before the Quakers, who believed in the "more vivid Operations of the Internal Light of Souls"; as such, the *Academy* was not written in defense of their society, but only for the service of the English Church, and the training of its teachers and ministers.¹⁵² Rous sought to avoid the kind of mysticism that disparages human learning, believing that the "languages" of the unbeliever "serve for keys to open to new men, those mysteries which the old men see not," and are thus able to "help our eyes to a clearer discerning of heavenly

147 Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 30.

148 The quote is from *In Epistolam Joannis Tractatus III* in Augustine, *Opera Omnia* (Paris, 1837), 3:2515.

149 Rous, *The Heavenly Academie; Or, the Highest School Where Alone is That Highest Teaching, the Teaching of the Heart* (London, 1638), title page. There is a 1702 edition which uses the Latin title *Academia Coelestis*, and is touted as the "third edition, revised, and compared with the Latin."

150 Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 30.

151 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 618.

152 Rous, *Academia Coelestis* (London, 1702), sig. A2–3.

Images . . . to illustrate, to insinuate, to convince, and to gaine."¹⁵³ That *Academy* became an "acceptable text" for Quakers shows one possible trajectory for the mystical strain that Rous espoused;¹⁵⁴ however, Rous did not espouse a mindless mysticism, nor would he have approved of burning the Bible in favor of "indwelling light," as some radical Quakers advised.¹⁵⁵ As he wrote, "do not mistake a teaching of thine own for an heavenly Teaching; neither set thine own imagination in the Celestial Chair, This hath mis-led many into many and great errors, whiles being taught by the strength of their own imaginations, they have thought themselves to be taught of God."¹⁵⁶

The *Academy* is divided into ten chapters, and includes a preface in which Rous expresses his desire to testify to what he himself had experienced, with the hope that others might similarly graduate from the "grammar school of ordinary piety to the celestial university."¹⁵⁷ Just as students of earthly schools move through the academy, so must Christians enter the "heavenly academy," where they learn "divine, spiritual, and heavenly knowledge." Those who rely on the "old and natural understanding" are "short of the true and kindly knowledg of Divinity," since, "Divinity is a supernatural science, and therefore a supernatural light is needful for the right discerning of it."¹⁵⁸

For Rous, there are three schools for divinity students: the first is a lower school in which students learn how to read and write, and become familiar with basic concepts that are retained throughout life, the grammar school; the second is the place where students advance to higher subjects, and greater degrees of knowledge, the university; the third is the highest form of learn-ing, in which a student can claim, "I have evidently seen and felt, that Men are Taught of God," and this is the celestial academy. This highest place of learning is where Christians are taught by God's Spirit, having "quenched their own nat-ural lamps, that they might get them kindled above by the Father of Lights."¹⁵⁹ While earthly scholars seek "temporal profit, preferment, or pleasure," those

153 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 618.

154 Greaves, *Dublin's Merchant-Quaker*, p. 160.

155 Adriaan Davies, *The Quakers in English Society, 1655–1725* (New York, 2000), pp. 16–17; Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, p. 162.

156 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 643.

157 Rous, *Heavenlie Academie*, p. 13; Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, p. 85.

158 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 619. Rous further writes that, "He that seeth the things of Divinity, only with a natural light, doth not see divine things in the true, but false shapes."

159 Rous, *Heavenlie Academie*, p. 14.

who are “taught in the School of Christ, account their chief learning to learn, and by learning to receive Christ with his blessings and blessedness.”¹⁶⁰

Reflecting on Rous’s paradigm for godly education, Morgan writes, “Rous made it clear that, while reason might see the shadows, it could not perceive the Forms”; thus, “Puritans sought a new equilibrium . . . that would recognize the different areas of expertise for reason and faith, and would confine reason to the status of an ‘aid’ in the achievement and propagation of belief.”¹⁶¹ For Morgan, Sibbes is characteristic of this mindset when he chides the scholastics for relying too much on human logic and Plato.¹⁶² While Rous does criticize those who rely on the lower academy, he does not strictly censure the scholastics for their use of reason, but he does say that the “greatest Doctor on earth” cannot adequately convey what can only be known by “tasting.”¹⁶³

Thus, for Rous, divine “ravishment” and “tasting” are motives to ascend the mystical ladder to the higher academy, but he is careful to distinguish steps in the process, and urges readers not to “stint” themselves in the lower school, but “to ascend by it to the higher.”¹⁶⁴ Were one to persevere in this spiritual pursuit, the reward would be immense: “There drops and dewes of grace, by which you are now taught, shall bring you to the sight and fruition of the Teacher himself, who is an ever-flowing Fountaine, and boundless ocean of light, wisdom, grace, and glorie.” Being thus overwhelmed with divine goodness, “the most glorious Sun-light and influence of Gods presence, irradiating and overflowing thee, and so more than fully teaching thee, shall drowne the Star-light of this teaching, which you receivedst here below.” But unlike Sibbes, who seems to vilify human logic, Rous claims that Christians will “magnifie this lesser teaching, because it hath brought [them] to this great and glorious Teacher, whose light shall give [them] the sight of the highest wisdom; whose presence shall ebriate [them] with the fullnesse of joy, whose right hand shall give [them] the pleasures of eternitie.”¹⁶⁵

Within the *Academy*, Rous outlines steps familiar to the mystics, in the moving of the soul from basic rudiments to more personal and intimate union with

160 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 622.

161 Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 50.

162 See Richard Sibbes, *The Fovntaine Opened; Or, The Myserie of Godlinesse Revealed* (London, 1638), pp. 20–1. Cited in Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 50.

163 Rous, *Heavenly Academie*, pp. 38–9.

164 Rous, *Heavenly Academie*, p. 157.

165 Rous, *Heavenly Academie*, pp. 187–9. See also Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., “Glorification,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:405.

God. However, while he restates their teachings in this regard, especially in emptying the soul, he upholds the Bible as the place where one hears the voice of Christ, a departure from the medieval tradition.¹⁶⁶ For Rous, there should be no “division” between the lower and higher academy, and “he that is in the lower, should strive to be in both at once.” Thus, the purpose of his *Academy*, as he saw it, was to “conjoin the things which God hath not separated; and not to diminish, but to advance the lower, by lifting it up to the higher.”¹⁶⁷

Rous advocates climbing the mystical ladder in four steps, which, using the academy metaphor, he equates to “taking degrees.” The first step is to properly desire God as the end of one’s ascent: “When we come to God to be taught, we must propose an end worthy of God.” And rather than seek “worldly pomp,” the “pride of life,” or “outward preferment,” one ought to “propose God himself before thee, as thy highest preferment, exceeding great reward, and all-sufficient end . . . And according to thy degrees in grace, shall be thy degrees in glory: as thou hast sought him much in the gifts of his grace, so by them shalt thou find him much here, and much enjoy him hereafter in glory.”¹⁶⁸ The second step is deny human “wit and wisdom,” and to “go up to God for a new Principle, even a new mind, by which [to] truly see and know the things of God.” Here Rous emphasizes that Christians must empty themselves of self-reliance and carnal wisdom, since, “The new world of Divinity must be begun in a man, as God began the old world, it must have nothing for a foundation; and when man is nothing in himself, then God will begin to create, and make him something.”¹⁶⁹

The third step is “conformity to God,” because, “love it self is a likeness to him who is Love, and thus love from love draws a partaking of secrets: when the heart and ways of man are agreeable to Gods heart, then the heart of God is (as it were) great with that affection which longs to communicate.” This conformity reflects the “friendship” between God and his elect bride, who, being of “one spirit” share a “marriage-love between them.” Such love demands “communication”; while earthly spouses may keep secrets, “Christ, the best husband, having given his life for his Spouse, & himself to his Spouse in a sacred union, how shall he not with his life and himself give her his counsells also? It is his own word: If the wives be ignorant or doubtful, let them ask their husbands . . .”¹⁷⁰

166 John Barber, *The Road to Eden: Studies in Christianity and Culture* (Palo Alto, 2008), p. 330.

167 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 632; Barber, *The Road to Eden*, p. 330.

168 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 632–3.

169 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 634–5.

170 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 636–7.

The fourth step, and most thoroughly annotated, is “conversing with God, and diligent coming to his School.” Those who would ascend to the highest celestial academic degree must continually come to the divine Teacher, through earnest prayer and reflection: “But for so precious a gift as the Spirit, make thy prayer as powerful as thou canst; and more powerful maist thou make it, if thou get more power joyned together by a Communion of Saints.” Thus, Christians are to seek God communally and privately, especially when reading the Bible, for “many excellent Saints have found and acknowledged, professing that they received sometimes by prayer more light for the clearing of dark places, then by study and reading.”¹⁷¹ Christians ought to discern their gifts, and use them for the greater good, whether to govern, decide controversies, resolve doubts, interpret the mysteries, or engage in contemplation, or more practical duties; “Let every man therefore find out his different ability, and excellency, and with his greatest ability let him make his greatest traffick.”¹⁷²

The four steps lead believes, in the end, to the beatific vision, where they are caught up with joy, and eternal bliss at the sight of Jesus.¹⁷³ Such mystical visions and foretastes promote the *praxis pietatis*, and put worldly pursuits in their proper place. This is especially the case in *Ars Moriendi* literature, as seen in Edward Pearse:

To grow great and high in the World, to build our Names and Families, to live a life of sensual pleasures and delights, spending our dayes in mirth; these are low, mean, poor things; things infinitely beneath the dignity of a soul, and altogether unworthy of the least of its care and solicitude: but to know God, to love God, to obey God, to delight in God, to contemplate the glorious perfections of God, to live to God; upon him as our chief good and happiness, and to him as our last end; and withall to be found

171 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 640–1.

172 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 645.

173 Cocksworth states that the Puritans favored “an authority in which the Bible was regulative for all of the Christian life and not just its doctrines; and a piety of consuming zeal pervading the household rather than a beatific vision enshrined in the ‘sanctuary.’” While this was generally true, Puritans did write of the eternal beatific vision, especially to encourage private devotion and meditation as a “foretaste” and reward for Christian duty and felicity. Christopher J. Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England* (Cambridge, Eng., 1993), p. 46. See also Thomas Watson, *The Saint’s Spiritual Delight, and a Christian on the Mount* (London, 1657), p. 50, and Isaac Ambrose, *Looking unto Jesus: A View of the Everlasting Gospel; or, the Soul’s Eyeing of Jesus* (Pittsburgh, 1832), p. 673, who writes of the “top of heaven, when saints shall be enlightened with a clear and glorious sight of Christ as God; divines usually call it, ‘Beatifical vision.’”

ready at last to live with im for ever, to enter upon the beatifical Vision, and to pass into that life of love and holiness; which the Saints and Angels live above, being made perfect in the Vision and Fruition of the God of glory.¹⁷⁴

The *Academy* is unique among Rous's greater corpus in that, aside from his *Catholick Charity*, it is the most heavily annotated and source-cited piece. It shows Rous's preference for continental thought, and whereas his *Mystical Marriage*, as we shall see, contains numerous biblical citations in the margin, in the *Academy*, Rous quotes, in Latin, from the following authors, with the number of marginal citations in brackets: Dionysius the Areopagite (4); Irenaeus (1); Clement of Alexandria (1); Justin Martyr (2); Tertullian (3); Origen (2); Firmilian (1); Cyprian (1); Ambrose (1); Basil (2); Gregory Naziansen (2); Gregory of Nyssa (1); Chrysostom (2); Augustine (7); Primasius (1); Anselm (2); Rupert of Deutz (1); Bernard of Clairvaux (1); Richard of St. Victor (3); Aquinas (3); Jean Gerson (2); Thomas à Kempis (4); Henry Harphius (1); Savonarola (4); Luther (1); and Gabriel Vasquez (1).¹⁷⁵

Rous's cultivating of these sources likely began when he undertook his lengthier work, *Mella Patrum*, a budget-conscious collection of patristic quotations that he translated into Latin. From this short list, we can see how

174 Edward Pearse, *The Great Concern, or A Serious Warning to a Timely and Thorough Preparation for Death, with Helps and Directions in order Thereunto*, 3rd ed. (London, 1674), p. 2.

175 Noticeably absent is Calvin. On the question of historical reception of Calvin's ideas in later Reformed theology, see Carl R. Trueman, "The Reception of Calvin: Historical Considerations," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1–2 (2011), 19–27. Trueman correctly sees the reception issue as needing to be understood within a communal context, both synchronic and diachronic, and cautions against anachronistic criteria intruding into the historical task. There was a complex relationship between the theological work of the Reformers and that of later generations, and it should be noted that the absence of direct citation does not necessarily imply the absence of Calvin's influence, nor does citation imply direct causation. Rather, one must assess the context of an individual's thought and in the way in which the reading of Calvin or any influential thinker might have impacted the way a particular writer reads a biblical text or interprets doctrine. In the case of Rous, Augustine seems to be more influential than Calvin, though, arguably, Calvin had some influence contextually and communally. Further, the use of Augustine among early modern authors was quite flexible, and it could be argued that there were "Augustinianisms" that were derived either directly from Augustine or indirectly from the broader intellectual tradition to which they belonged. See Arnoud S. Q. Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500–1620* (New York, 2011), pp. 95–114.

Rous favored Augustine, Savonarola, and Pseudo-Dionysius, and specifically Dionysius's *De Mystica Theologia*. In fact, Rous's readings of Aquinas are solely from Aquinas's commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius. His readings of Gerson, another favorite, are from Gerson's glosses on *De Mystica Theologia*.¹⁷⁶ Though some of Rous's sources had made it into English translation, most remained in Greek and Latin editions.

The *Academy* proves that Rous had carefully studied the mystics of former centuries, and used their texts wherever they served his purpose. His bridal mysticism, developed more fully in *Mystical Marriage*, resembles that of Bernard, with its emphasis on personal union, and yet, while wading into these waters, Rous retained mainstream distinctions on the role of the Spirit, and the path to illumination through reading the Bible; he thus avoided the extremes of Jacob Boehme. Indeed, Stoeffler surmises that Rous's "Puritan Biblicism" saved him from delving into enthusiasm. Even at his most mystical, Rous believed that he was merely interpreting the Bible.¹⁷⁷

4.3.2 *The Great Oracle (1641; 1656; Latin, 1655, 1674)*

This short piece was published in English in 1641, and then again in 1656 as part of *Treatises and Meditations*.¹⁷⁸ The Latin edition appeared in 1655. Though printed as part of *Interiora Regni Dei*, the work is not overtly mystical, in that there is no elaborate discussion of union or spiritual marriage, and for this reason the *Oracle* was left out of Koelman's Dutch edition.¹⁷⁹ The *Oracle* does, however, complement the other two works in the collection, in that it shows Rous's covenant theology and reliance on the Bible. Rous here argues that salvation is not dependent on "free will," but only on God's "special" and "efficacious" grace. Rous writes of "God's plot of glory," language reminiscent of Shepard's *Autobiography*, and begins by stating that, "God is the end of himself, in all his ways, works and Counsels; [n]either is there any end worthy of God, but God."¹⁸⁰ The language of God as humanity's *summum bonum* is a

176 Like Lombard's *Sentences*, the rather short *De Mystica Theologia* was a heavily glossed text in the late Middle Ages. See James McEvoy, ed., *Mystical Theology: The Glosses by Thomas Gallus and the Commentary of Robert Grosseteste on De Mystica Theologia* (Leuven, 2003).

177 Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Pietism*, pp. 86–7.

178 Bradford F. Swan, *Gregory Dexter of London and New England, 1610–1700* (New York, 1949), p. 22.

179 Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 38.

180 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 651; Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge* (Amherst, 1994), p. 3. Shepard refers to "God's great plot" of reformation and redemption, thus identifying God's providence in working all aspects of life for his divine purpose.

common tenet within Puritan devotional texts, and can be found in Perkins, Ames, Greenham, Gouge, the Westminster catechisms, and numerous others, and was used to promote an active and contemplative life.¹⁸¹

Rous proceeds to recount the history of God's plot upon mankind, and human beginnings in the Garden of Eden, and their redemption through Christ. Though Adam was created with "free will," there was joined to his estate a "covenant of works," in which, "Life and Death, a tree of Life, and a tree of death; a tree of standing, and a tree of Falling" was set before him.¹⁸² Adam, who had both "free will," and "free-will grace," did not fall into "a single sin," but into "a state of bondage under sin." Human love is thus turned away from the Creator to the creature, and it is only because of God's infinite goodness that the path to restoration is given to humanity. God thus sets out "to make good his own Plot," and fights "the self-sufficiency of fallen mankind," which Rous classifies as "philosophers," "justitiary Jews," and "philosophizing Judaizing Christians." Rous cites Cicero, Seneca, Exodus, Romans, Pelagius, Faustus, and Cassian, and discusses the Incarnation, in which humanity was woven to divinity, and the New Covenant given to God's Son, in which a promise was made to Eve's seed, to "break the Serpents Head." This promise, says Rous, is "even the brief and sum of the new Covenant of grace given to man upon the breach and forfeiture of the old Covenant of works; broken and forfeited by Free-will attended with general grace: the grace of the old Covenant."¹⁸³

Rous praises God's wisdom, and chastises those who praise human wisdom. As an example, he cites Pierre Charron's revised preface to *De la sagesse* (1601), where Charron justifies his decision to omit a discussion of "divine wisdom."¹⁸⁴ The rest of *Oracle* details the insufficiency of free will, and the need for efficacious grace. He concludes the work with citations from Augustine, Luther, and Paolo Sarpi.¹⁸⁵

181 See, for instance, Anne Bradstreet's poem in Robert D. Richardson, Jr., "The Puritan Poetry of Anne Bradstreet," in *American Puritan Imagination: Essays in Revolution*, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch (Cambridge, Eng., 1974), p. 110.

182 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 652–3.

183 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 656–7.

184 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 658. See also Maryanne Cline Horowitz, *Seeds of Virtue and Knowledge* (Princeton, 1998), pp. 224–5. Charron states that human wisdom is that "integrity, a beautiful and noble composition of the entire man, in his insides, his outsides, his thoughts, his words, his actions, and all his movements; in the excellence and perfection of man as man."

185 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 678–9. Sarpi's history of the papacy, which Rous cites, is important because the work was produced in response to jurisdictional disputes in 1606, in which the Pope commanded Venetians to cease performing the Mass. Sarpi,

4.3.3 *The Mystical Marriage, Or, Experimental Discoveries of the Heavenly Marriage between a Soul and Her Savior (1631, 1635, 1653–56; Latin, 1655, 1674)*

Mystical union was a common theme among seventeenth-century mystics, and such Puritan mystics as Peter Sterry, drew extensively on the imagery of the Song of Songs, and often wrote paraphrases of it. There were, however, generally two strains or emphases within the bridal mysticism of Puritan mystics. The one is preference for a more ecclesiastical or communal reading of the biblical Songs, which emphasizes Christ's mystical union with his elect church, and can be seen in Richard Sibbes. The other strain stresses personal union, and its intimate experience, as reflected in Rous, Sterry, Walter Cradock, Giles Randall, and others.¹⁸⁶

This union between Christ and his church, or Christ and the believer, was seen as the highest blessing a Christian could have in this life, even above that of justification.¹⁸⁷ For Rous, the theme dominated his writings, but was articulated chiefly in his slim allegory, *The Mystical Marriage*, which has been called, “the apotheosis of Reformed thinking on the Song of Songs,” and representative of the “personally mystical” readings of the Song of Songs.¹⁸⁸ As stated before, Rous integrated mystical union in his political reforms, and was a driving force behind his pursuit of toleration, artfully depicted in Frederick Newenham's portrait of Rous as Speaker of the House, where Rous is shown to

a Venetian, was chosen to lead “a propaganda effort to defend the Venetian case against the papacy.” Matthew Vester, “Paolo Sarpi and Early Stuart Debates over the Papal Antichrist,” in *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture*, ed. Karl A. Kottman (New York, 2001), p. 53.

186 See Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*, p. 47; Gordon S. Wakefield, “The Puritans,” in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainright, and Edward Yarnold (New York, 1986), p. 444; and Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, p. 67. Intriguingly, while the English edition of Rous's *Mystical Marriage* refers, in its subtitle, to marriage “between a Soul and her Savior,” the Latin edition has “*Quo Junguntur Christus et Ecclesia*.”

187 Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids, 2012), pp. 483–4. Mystics often refer to “unitive” theology, that is, as the highest part of theology, the doctrine unites the believer with Christ, and with fellow believers. See Rous, *Academia Coelestis* (1702), sig. A5.

188 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, p. 52; Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*, pp. 47–50.

wear his broad-trimmed black hat, and gold-braided black gown, with ceremonial mace in his right hand, and *Mystical Marriage* in his left.¹⁸⁹

Rous's short allegory was published several times in the seventeenth century, and a Latin edition appeared in 1655.¹⁹⁰ Why Rous translated this work into Latin is open to conjecture. Given that Latin was the language of academic theology, it is possible that his translation was aimed at advancing *mystica theologia* and *experimentalis*; minimally, it would seem that he intended his work to reach the continent. Clarke, who sees inherent anti-Catholicism and anti-Arminianism in the text, confirms that there were strong political overtones within it, suggesting it had possible motives outside its bare sense.¹⁹¹ But she also sees uniting characteristics in the work, which was meant to bring the Reformed together, and heal their divisions. This reading of Rous is consistent with his other works, and with the political atmosphere of the 1630s.¹⁹² Rous was a longtime advocate of *unitas* among the Reformed, and conceived a utopian society where all Christians were in harmony, dwelling in union with Christ and each other. Rous was not the first to conceive of mystical union as grounds for *sensus unitatis*. In 1647, Joseph Hall published his *Christ Mystical*, which equally pitched the doctrine as a basis for ecclesiastical unity.¹⁹³

Rous provides four reasons for *Mystical Marriage*, which he divides into nine chapters, and pitches as being fit "all times and seasons." First, it is suitable to the time, where divisions and carelessness have plagued the godly; such "Communion with Christ" is likened to "fastening . . . the soul to a mighty and impregnable Rock, which makes her steadfast even against the gates of hell." Second, the work "presents to the view of the world some bunches of Grapes brought from the land of promise, to shew that this Land is not a meer imagination, but some have seen it, and brought away parcels, pledges, and earnest of it." Mystical union is thus "a place where love passes human love, peace passes understanding, and where there is joy unspeakable and glorious." Third, mystical marriage affects the whole person, including one's will and affections, "And that as by a borrowed sight men are provoked to come to tasting, so by their own tasting, they may come to a sight of their own, which only

189 Frederick Newenham, "Francis Rous," oil painting. Collection: Palace of Westminster (WOA 2690).

190 Lane suggests that *Mystical Marriage* began as a sermon, but this seems unlikely given that Rous was not a minister. Lane, *Ravished by Beauty*, p. 100.

191 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, pp. 52–3.

192 Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, pp. 54–5.

193 Joseph Hall, *Christ's Mystical; Or, the Blessed Union of Christ and His Members* (London, 1647), pp. 113–48. The work bears John Downname's *inprimatur*.

tasting can teach them.” The fourth and last is to inspire others to “bring forth more boxes of this precious ointment” into the world, to write of “that mystical love which droppeth down from the Head of Christ Jesus, into the souls of the Saints, living here below.”¹⁹⁴

Rous’s reading of the Song of Songs is distinct from more ecclesiastical readings in four ways. First, he freely employs sensual language, even erotic, to describe mystical union. Thus, he admonishes believer to, “Looke on him so, that thou maist lust after him, for here it is a sinne not to looke that thou maist lust, and not to lust having looked.”¹⁹⁵ Further, Christians experience such an intimate bond with Christ that they can faint in his presence, are wooed by his love, and distressed by his absence, though such “desertions” are profitable for drawing them into deeper communion.¹⁹⁶

Second, in contrast to other, more cautious Reformed treatises on the subject,¹⁹⁷ Rous sees spiritual marriage as having, in some sense, already occurred in this life, and thus not strictly as a betrothal. Thus, Rous writes that it should be “the main endeavvour of a soul married to Christ, to keep her self still in that point wherein she may keep him; and so keep him that she may still say, and feel what she sayes, ‘My wel-beloved is mine, and I am my wel-beloveds.’” Those married to Christ must be active in their communion, and look to heaven: “Let her often go out of the body, yea out of the world by heavenly contemplations; and treading on the top of the earth with the bottom of her feet, stretch herself up, to look over the world, into that upper world, where her treasure, her joy, her beloved dwelleth.”¹⁹⁸

Third, Rous speaks of various signs and marks of genuine “visitations.” These marks are seen through the use of human reason and heavenly light; thus, the believer first witnesses “a Light not fitted for the eye, but the soul.” This light must agree with the Bible, since there is no higher authority than the word of God. Further, there is an intense and indescribable joy that comes from Christ’s divine visitations, and, finally, the mark of holiness: “For when Christ visits the

194 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 683–4.

195 Rous, *Mystical Marriage*, pp. 13, 25. Philip C. Almond suggests that, for Rous, lust and sexuality were intertwined, and that possibly being influenced by Jacob Boehme, Rous believed that the Fall was caused by sexuality. However, it is equally possible that Rous was influenced by Augustine. See Philip C. Almond, *Adam and Eve in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Cambridge, Eng., 1999), p. 162; David G. Hunter, “Augustine on the Body,” in *A Companion to Augustine*, ed. Mark Vessey (Malden, 2012), pp. 358–61.

196 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 700–11; Clarke, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs*, p. 55.

197 For instance, there is only passing reference to marriage in Sibbes’s *Bowels Opened*.

198 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 726.

Soul, as he doth clarifie her with light, and ravish her with joy, so he doth beautifie her with holiness.”¹⁹⁹

Overall, Rous sees mystical union mainly in terms of happiness, joy, fruition, and activity. While there are times when Christians are sad or depressed, specifically when Christ is absent and the soul is deserted, the prevailing emotional state is one of bliss and pleasure. Rous did not equate the Christian life with morbid introspection, but saw it as the only way a human being can attain true happiness in this life, and secure eternal happiness hereafter. While he relied on the writings of the mystics, and baptized many of their concepts, such as that of the Christian’s beatific vision of God, the overpowering sense of light, and a union that ravishes the imagination, he nonetheless remained committed to orthodox boundaries, and saw the Bible as the guide to the mystical life.²⁰⁰ In the end, Rous’s mysticism was not new, but it did consist of a unique appropriation of sources within Puritanism, where “the Calvinist tradition allied itself with elements from the medieval mystical tradition,” and reflects the overall flexibility that devotional writers had in their promotion of the Puritan Reformation.²⁰¹

We will now turn to Rous’s theology, and assess his familiarity with the orthodox doctrines of the Reformed tradition, and this will help to evaluate his *unitas* with Downname and Crisp, which we will explore more fully in Chapter 6.

4.4 Rous’s Theology in Historical Context

Though Rous was not a “trained” theologian, he must have been exposed to some extent to theological studies at Oxford and Leiden, the latter of which he graduated as a “*studiosus artium liberalium*.”²⁰² Like Baxter, Rous’s theological education came primarily through private reading and reflection, church attendance, dialogue with Calvinist brethren, and polemics.²⁰³ Through his studies he gained an uncommon awareness of the Catholic mystical tradition,

199 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 720–6.

200 Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” p. 53.

201 Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 32.

202 Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, pp. 26, 41.

203 See, for instance, Rous’s comments on reading in *Treatises and Meditations* (p. 560). Baxter wrote that the greater part of theological education should consist of “as many affectionate practical English writers” as possible. Simon J. G. Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter’s Methodus Theologiae* (Leiden, 2012), p. 36.

and became familiar with Augustine, Aquinas, Lombard, and other dogmatians commonly found in the margins of the Protestant scholastics.²⁰⁴ Even though Rous did not have a “formal” theological education, he nonetheless was aware of the major themes within Reformed theology, and embodied what has been called the “rise of the laity in Evangelical Protestantism.”²⁰⁵ Rous can be seen as a lay affectionate theologian, who sought to advance mystical divinity through the published word, and cultivate a religiosity that encompassed “all religious obedience, actions, and virtues.” This piety was to be the source for how one worshipped and lived “both in private and public.”²⁰⁶

To fully assess Rous’s *unitas* with the Reformed orthodox, and especially in relation to Downname and Crisp, we will examine his thoughts on (1) Doctrine of God and Humanity; (2) Predestination and Assurance; (3) Covenant of Works and Grace; (4) Justification and Sanctification; (5) Law and Gospel; and (6) The Christian Life and Piety. That Rous was familiar with orthodox Reformed theology, never having pursued the ministry attests to English Puritanism’s mental culture and proclivity for education of the laity.²⁰⁷

4.4.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

Rous believed in the classical formulation of the Triune God who exists in three Persons, and who is responsible for the salvation of humanity.²⁰⁸

204 Emma Wilby, *The Visions of Isobel Gowdie: Magic, Witchcraft, and Dark Shamanism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Eastbourne, 2010), p. 406; Luca Baschera, “Aristotle and Scholasticism,” in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James III (Leiden, 2009), p. 140; Jordan J. Ballor, *Covenant, Causality, and Law: A Study in the Theology of Wolfgang Musculus* (Göttingen, 2012), p. 215.

205 See Carl R. Trueman, “Reformers, Puritans, and Evangelicals: The Lay Connection,” in *The Rise of the Laity in Evangelical Protestantism*, ed. Deryck W. Lovegrove (New York, 2002), pp. 17–35.

206 Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” p. 39; Wainwright, “Jonathan Edwards and His Puritan Predecessors,” p. 228; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, p. 74. Wallace sees Rous as a “mainstream” Puritan alongside Ames and Owen. For the practice of prayer among the laity, see Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York, 2013), pp. 99–258; Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie, eds., *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain* (Aldershot, 2012); and Christopher Haigh, *The Plain Man’s Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570–1640* (New York, 2007), pp. 1–16, 218–28.

207 It has been suggested that much Puritan motivation behind the drive to educate was living “in a world in which death—and especially the death of children—was so common, and damnation so real and horrifying a prospect, [that children] would be subjected to early and rigorous religious training by parents who earnestly hoped to secure their salvation.” Judith S. Graham, *Puritan Family Life: The Diary of Samuel Sewall* (Lebanon, 2000), p. 92.

208 Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic,” pp. 51–98.

Rous's reliance on Augustine, especially on the doctrine of God, is possibly seen in his referring to God as "light," which some have called *Lichtmetaphysik*.²⁰⁹ Calvin's influence is evident in Rous's understanding of God the Creator, even though there are few direct references to him. Rous's doctrine of God seems to have been sourced from various patristic and medieval authors. While these authors spent much time discussing the existence of God, their greatest concern was to elaborate on his being, an impulse seen in Rous's equating God with "love," "goodness," and "purity," as well as his upholding Trinitarian doctrine and divine simplicity.²¹⁰

The most extensive account of who God is in Rous's writings occurs in his *Art of Happiness*, where Rous discusses God as the *summum bonum*.²¹¹ Here God is said to be "a most blessed Spirit, the true beatifical object of Spirits blessed, his supremacy in Excellence, wisdom, and power . . ."; God is "the beginning of all beginnings," and thus "without beginning"; he is the "fountain" from which everything flows, and the "end," to which all things return.²¹² Rous affirms God's aseity when he states, "God is an eternal Essence, that by himself upholdeth himself, and all things else."²¹³ God is also timeless, being above the

209 Rous, *Mystical Marriage*, pp. 44–6; *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 495, 499–500; Lewis Ayres and Michel R. Barnes, "God," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids, 1999), pp. 384–90. In 1939, Perry Miller proposed that Augustine had more influence on the "Puritan mind" than John Calvin. Thus, Miller sees the prominence of "Augustinian piety" within Puritanism. While it is possible to call Puritans "Augustinian" in that they were heirs to a complex variegated tradition bequeathed through the Reformation, some caution should be exercised. Even in the case of Rous, where Augustine is often cited, one cannot infer direct causation, but only possible influence. Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1939), pp. 4–5. James Calvin Davis and Charles Matthewes refer to the "Augustinian legacy" within Puritanism. See Davis and Matthewes, "Saving Grace and Moral Saving: Thrift in Puritan Theology," in *Thrift and Thriving in America: Capitalism and Moral Order from the Puritans to the Present*, ed. Joshua J. Yates and James Davison Hunter (New York, 2011), pp. 89ff. For *Lichtmetaphysik*, which has been traced to Plotinus, see Barry Sandywell, *Dictionary of Visual Discourse: A Dialectical Lexicon of Terms* (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 382–3.

210 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 26, 49, 69, 635; G. R. Evans, *Philosophy and Theology in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1993), pp. 55, 60–6; and Peter Weigel, *Aquinas on Simplicity: An Investigation into the Foundations of His Thought* (Bern, 2008), p. 14.

211 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 15–9.

212 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 10, 15.

213 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 15.

created world, and the most “pure” essence, who can only be seen with a spiritual sight. He is the soul’s “true rest and happiness.”²¹⁴

God, who is “eternal Spirit,” makes himself known in “three Persons”: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. All three persons are involved in creation, and necessarily co-create, but they are distinct in their relationship and activity:

The first, in order of Consideration, though there be no first in order of Time, is the great and infinite Minde or Understanding, which begetteth a great Wisdom, Thought, or World; even the first and radical Light, the Almighty Begetter of the second Light; and this person is called GOD the Father. The second, is the begotten and second Light; even the Wisdom and Conception of the minde or understanding; an Image and issue thereof, and this person is called GOD the Son. The third, is the Vertue and Power, which breatheth or floweth from the Godhead, whereby GOD loveth and enjoyeth himself, this person is called GOD the Holy Ghost. These three are one God . . .²¹⁵

Rous upholds divine simplicity and equates God’s excellence with his pureness, stating, “Now what is to be thought more pure than a glorious, single, un-compounded Essence . . .” This divine essence is “wisdom” and “light,” and excels “all things in power.”²¹⁶ God is thus said to be the “Cause, and Fountain, and Father of Spirits,” but he does not say that God causes himself (*Deus causa sui*).²¹⁷

Further, God does all things for his own glory, and is a jealous God, as when Rous writes that “the Lord of hosts is as jealous of his Spouse, as thou of thy wife; he will not have temptations set before her, and therefore forbids altogether the making of Images for any worship”; and “God is a Jealous God, and his Jealousie burns like fire, when he is not loved in his right place and degree, his Creature being put into a comparison with him.”²¹⁸

214 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 15–6. Rous writes, “We finde in our selves an excellent essence, intelligent, uncorporeal, invisible, untouchable (which are the expressions of a Spirit) . . . If therefore there be such an essence in us, we may imagine the Creator to be purer then his work, and therefore he must be more spiritual than we, or more then spiritual, but cannot be less” (p. 11).

215 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 16.

216 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 10–1.

217 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 10. See Leo Elders, *The Philosophical Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Leiden, 1990), p. 153.

218 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 153, 582.

For Rous, human beings were created in God's image, which, following Augustine, he identifies as "reason," bearing the "print and impression" of the Trinity. Thus, "God planted in Man a reasonable soul, in which was written an Image and Counterpawne of the Deity, although not in degrees, yet like in resemblance."²¹⁹ Through Adam's fall into sin, the image was defaced and holiness lost, but Christ, through regeneration, "restoreth again to us the Image itself; and finally, as he taketh from us the wrath and terrors of God, so he gives us the pleasures and happiness which are in the presence of God for evermore."²²⁰ The Trinity alone, apart from human activity, is the cause for salvation; God is thus the "repairer of his own faln Creature," whose being is derived from him. God's oneness and immutability are a source for comfort and mercy. Christians should not "doubt any change in him, but in our selves; and striving by all holy contention, prayer, fasting and watching to keep our selves stedfast toward him, let us assure our selves, that he is the Rock immoveable, whom we shall ever finde in one and the same place."²²¹

Significant about Rous's doctrine of God is that he discusses it within the greater context of redemption and moral responsibility, with the aim of showing the path to true happiness through the *ars bene vivendi*.²²² This emphasis is not surprising in that the main ethos of the Puritan Reformation has been described as the *doctrina Deo vivendi*.²²³ Indeed, while Reformed theologians defended the doctrine of God against Socinianism, and had more polemical aims, Rous used it to advance the *praxis pietatis*, and to show the way to "eternal felicity" through the "Life of blessedness."²²⁴ But he did not delve into moralism, as some Anglicans had done, or abandon the doctrine of total depravity. He taught that only God's grace could restore fallen creatures to their pre-fallen state. Human beings are powerless to earn grace through their free will, otherwise "the grace of God lackey it after the will of man."²²⁵

219 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 17, 25.

220 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 30–1, 38.

221 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 12, 15, 504, 509–10, 577; Rous, *Meditations of Instrction*, 60–1.

222 See title page to *The Art of Happiness*.

223 Willem Frijhoff, *Fulfilling God's Mission: The Two Worlds of Dominie Edwardus Bogardus, 1607–47*, trans. Myra Heerspink Scholz (Leiden, 2007), p. 186. See also William Ames, *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity* (London, 1623), pp. 1–4; and Edward Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity* (London, 1654), p. 3.

224 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 46.

225 Scott Paul Gordon, *The Power of the Passive Self in English Literature, 1640–1770* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), p. 33.

There is nothing “radical” about Rous’s doctrine of God, or his beliefs about the creation of humanity, and its fall into sin, other than, perhaps, some affinity to *Lichtmetaphysik*. As Brauer observed, Rous’s doctrine stands within the Augustinian and Calvinist tradition, seen in his Trinitarian doctrine, creation *ex nihilo*, Adam’s willful fall into sin, and the restoration of humanity through Christ’s death and resurrection. While Rous did have parallels to the metaphysics of light, his overall teachings are consistent with the Reformed orthodox tradition, even if they are clothed in mystical dress.²²⁶

4.4.2 *Predestination and Assurance*

For Rous, as for other Reformed polemicists, the doctrine of predestination was the axis in the Arminian-Calvinist debates of the 1620s. Much effort was spent in his *Testis Veritatis* to show the catholicity of the doctrine. Indeed, Rous contends that double predestination had been the doctrine of the English Church since its reformation, and cites in support of the doctrine Augustine, Justin Martyr, Anselm, Vincent of Lerins, Isidore of Seville, Thomas Aquinas, John Field, John Rogers, and Theodore Beza. Rous quotes from diverse ancient and medieval texts, and evinces awareness of scholasticism and its sources.²²⁷

In addition to arguments in *Testis Veritatis*, Rous discusses the doctrine in his “Aphorisms of Predestination.”²²⁸ Part of his *Diseases of the Time*, Rous begins his discussion with how difficult the doctrine is to comprehend.²²⁹ Being “unsearchable,” he argues that it is best to “set down short and evident Truths,” and “by light to chase away the errors of those that deceive,” and so, “by brevity to make knowledge portable, and so either easie or pleasant to the knower.”²³⁰ Thus Rous sets forth ten short points: (1) That the doctrine is mysterious, and must be received with submission to the Bible’s teaching; (2) though God chooses some and leaves others, the reason for God’s choosing or leaving “is hidden from us”; (3) God’s will is joined with wisdom and justice, and thus his election and reprobation are “the just Judgments of God”;²³¹ (4) since all humanity fell into sin freely, God is free to judge and punish sin; (5) before the

226 Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic,” pp. 51–75. See also John Barber, *The Road from Eden: Studies in Christianity and Culture* (Palo Alto, 2008), pp. 330–1.

227 Rous, *Testis Veritatis*, pp. 3–5, 8–9, 15, 17.

228 Rous, *Treatises and Mediations*, pp. 137–40.

229 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 137.

230 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 137.

231 Rous does not here use the word “reprobation,” but refers to it in substance when he speaks of the “hardening” of Pharaoh. Rous does use the word “reprobation” in *Testis Veritatis* (p. 18).

world was made, God decided to leave some to their “self-purchased misery,” and chooses or leaves according to what will bring him most glory; (6) God appointed “Christ Jesus to be the Saviour of his Elect, and his Elect to be saved by Christ Jesus, and all these from eternity”; (7) “God is free to make *Adam* free, even to leave him in an aequilibrinous estate, with a possibility to be overweighed by temptation if he listed”; thus, Adam could have freely eaten from the tree of life or the tree of death, being “as neer to Happiness as to Misery”; (8) God does not harden sinners by infusing corruption, and is not the cause of sin, “no more then the Sun is the cause of Ice . . . God . . . doth not put the hardness into the heart, but he leaves the heart and hath nothing to do with it”; (9) Adam’s offspring are sinners by virtue of their birth, but may justly be punished because Adam had voluntarily sinned: “And surely if they had been in his place they would likewise have done the same; for *Adams Children* would have been no better then their Father, the print no better than the stamp”; and finally, (10) the doctrine is deep and mysterious; thus, “in these and the like depths of God, let no man wade above his stature.”²³²

While the doctrine of predestination had the potential to cause distress among the Reformed, especially for precisianists who looked inward for marks and signs, Rous urged his readers to “converse in points of more absolute necessity to salvation, and larger edification,” with such doctrines as “our grafting into Christ Jesus by Faith, and our growth in him by Love the stablishing of our hearts in the hope suggested by the earnest and testimony of the Spirit.”²³³ Every Christian should aspire to “receive that which is meet for his measure,” and so avoid being “possessed by pieces of this secret, rather then possessing them.”²³⁴

Rous tried to address the pastoral questions that plagued the English Church by adopting a more infralapsarian line of thought. He said that reprobation was similar to the absence of heat when the sun recedes at night, and so God withholds his saving and efficacious grace.²³⁵ Indeed, Rous stresses this passivity when he writes:

[God] does not put the hardness in the heart, but he leaves the heart and hath nothing to do with it; and then where God doth nothing to soften, there will quickly enough be done by sin and Satan to harden. Therefore,

²³² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 137–40.

²³³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 137–40.

²³⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 140.

²³⁵ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 139.

when we are hardened, Let us rather complain that God doth nothing, then that he doth something in us.²³⁶

In conjunction with the doctrine of predestination, Rous emphasized the Holy Spirit as the one who brings about salvation and causes personal holiness.²³⁷ The path to assurance, then, is grounded more on mysticism and *unio mystica*, with the Spirit's testimony, than in marks and signs that one could discern. But Rous does, at times, equate growth in grace with an increase in assurance.²³⁸ Brauer clarifies:

The two doctrines of growth in grace and assurance of the elect were complementary and so supplemented one another. The former prevented excesses and kept the believer in continual need of the grace of God. The latter prevented the saint from total despair when the sinner was predominant over the saint. Also, it was a source of strength in time of trouble and the basis of a vigorous ethical outlook. For Rous these two central Puritan doctrines could be surrendered at no cost.²³⁹

Rous suggests that the elect might be more numerous than one might suspect, and that the workings of grace, however miniscule, should be seen as possibly efficacious and encouraged.²⁴⁰ Rous cautions against too much "sorrow for sin," since "it may be a sin, not to joy after sorrow [for it]"; indeed, Rous adds:

Some think it a thing becoming them to be ever sad, under a pretence of being sad for sin. Let God say what he will; sad they may be indeed upon just occasion for sin, but with a sadness ending in joy; for godly sorrow causeth Repentance, and Repentance joy; for there is joy in heaven and earth for a sinner that repenteth.²⁴¹

For Rous, there is an inexpressible belonging to God that is a foretaste of eternal bliss: "There is an Abba, Father, which no man knows but he that hath it;

236 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 139.

237 See Brauer, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic," pp. 75–85, 219–20.

238 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 534, 597–9.

239 Brauer, "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic," p. 213.

240 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 137.

241 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 603–4. See also Jeremy Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2007), ch. 5.

and he that hath it cannot express it; it is like the earning of a Lamb, whereby she owneth her Dam; by which she owneth her, but knows not her self whereby she owneth her.”²⁴²

Rous’s doctrine of predestination was specifically tailored for polemics in that he sought to protect the doctrine from what Scott Paul Gordon called “innovative free willers,” while ensuring that it was not used to crush the spirit, or cause gratuitous stress over one’s eternal abode. In the end, the doctrine was a testament to the necessity and efficacy of divine grace, and a pillar of the Reformed church.²⁴³

4.4.3 *Covenant of Works and Grace*

While Rous does not formally articulate a covenant theology along the lines of Johannes Cocceius, John Ball, or Francis Roberts, he does show awareness of its thought.²⁴⁴ We do not know whether Rous had read or was aware of English texts on the covenant (he does not cite any), but he does refer to the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, and possibly hints at a covenant of redemption.²⁴⁵ He sees Christ as the “Second Adam” in his *Meditations*, and posits Adam as the head of humanity in his “Aphorisms of Predestination.” He sees the covenant of grace as, essentially, a marriage contract, and balances Adam’s voluntary sinning and the unavoidability of the fall under a covenant of free will and grace.²⁴⁶ Though Rous calls the fall a “voluntary certainty,” he says that Adam, having an enlightened understanding, was created with a holy will set in “equipoise” and “freedom.” Adam could choose to continue to follow grace, and remain righteous, or he could refuse grace, and fall from righteousness. His choice was between living as a “true expression” of the divine image, or indulging in self-sufficiency by following the light of reason apart from the divine and heavenly light.²⁴⁷ Whether Rous conceived Adam’s integrity as

²⁴² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 302; Gibbons, *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought*, p. 66.

²⁴³ Gordon, *The Power of the Passive Self in English Literature*, p. 33.

²⁴⁴ See Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 54, 71, 261, 299, 301, 589, 634, 636, 704. For Cocceius’s doctrine of the covenants, see Willem J. van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603–69* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 248–70; and Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, ed. E. Bizer and trans. G. T. Thomson, 2nd ed. (1934; Grand Rapids, 1978), pp. 281–319. For Ball and Roberts, see John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Eugene, 2010).

²⁴⁵ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 138, 652–3, 655.

²⁴⁶ Emma Wilby, *The Visions of Isobel Gowdie: Magic, Witchcraft and Dark Shamanism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Portland, 2010), pp. 406–15.

²⁴⁷ Brauer, “Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic,” pp. 65–6.

non posse peccare, had he chosen to obey, is not certain. What is certain is that post-Fall, all humanity is *non posse non peccare*, and because of this God is free to punish humanity, for Adam did not only fall “for himself,” but all humanity “in gross” fell “in him.”²⁴⁸

While Rous was indebted to Protestant scholasticism for his views on the covenant of works, he does seem to be unaware or unaffected by its more technical discussions. For instance, in his “Aphorisms” just referred to, Rous distinguishes between *necessitas activa* and *necessitas otiosa* in reference to Adam’s free will and fall into sin. He states that since “*causa sine qua non*” is called “*stolida causa*,” he sees no reason for not calling “*necessitas per quam*” a “*stolida necessitas*.”²⁴⁹ This distinction between active and passive necessity does not reflect the patterns of definition typically found within Protestant scholasticism, and its lineage has been difficult to trace.²⁵⁰

The idea of the covenant is spread throughout Rous’s writings and is arguably in the background, but there is no elaborate discussion of it. Remarkable, however, he devotes some length to personal covenanting.²⁵¹ While Rous does refer to a “new covenant of grace and salvation,” the absence of a more nuanced understanding of covenant theology may reflect Rous’s preoccupation with *unio mystica*, and his status as a lay devotional writer. There is some question to what degree covenant theologians engaged in mysticism, or whether, as Perry Miller put it, the “fervent rationalism” of the federalist contradicted the “passion of the senses,” and the subject warrants further investigation.²⁵² Regardless, as Van Asselt has persuasively shown, covenant theologians were

248 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 138–9, 504–5, 507–8, 542, 660, 675. On the issue of primitive Adam’s ability to achieve perfection, see D. F. Wright, “*Non posse peccare* in this life? St. Augustine, *De correptione et gratia* 12:33,” in *St. Augustine and His Opponents*, ed. M. F. Wiles and E. J. Yarnold (Louvain, 2001), pp. 348–56.

249 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 138–9.

250 For Protestant scholastic distinctions of *necessitas*, see J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 96–156, esp. p. 142; and “*necessitas consequentiae*” and “*necessitas consequentis*,” in Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms, Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1985), p. 200.

251 Rous, *The Only Remedy*, pp. 299–300.

252 Perry Miller, *Jonathan Edwards*, p. 147. Cited in Michael J. McClymond and Gerald R. McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 2012), p. 642. However opposed the mystical strain might seem to the “fervent rationalism” of covenant theology, E. Brooks Holifield has demonstrated that Edwards, for instance, was continually attracted to it. See Holifield, “Edwards as Theologian,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen J. Stein (New Haven, 2007), p. 157.

equally preoccupied with the *praxis pietatis*, and their theologies involved much more than a reasoned exposition of Scripture. They had the same pastoral concerns and congregational problems as other ministers, and fought to establish personal renewal within their own parishes.²⁵³ Finally, God's binding himself to his elect through an act of love, the very heart of covenant theology, played a prominent role in Rous's conception of *unio mystica*.

4.4.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

We observed before how the doctrine of predestination, and not justification, was the hot topic of debate in the English Reformation.²⁵⁴ This too seems to have been the preoccupation of the religious debates of the 1620s when Rous, as a polemicist, was most active.²⁵⁵ Within Rous's work, the term "justification" is only used sporadically and never receives a formal articulation, but Rous does see the doctrine of justification occurring alongside that of sanctification, as works of the Holy Spirit. For Rous, it is not possible for the one to exist without the other.²⁵⁶ Thus, Rous equates the removing of filth (sanctification) with the taking away of guilt (justification) in distinct but simultaneous acts.²⁵⁷ Justification occurs apart from works, and without regard to merit.²⁵⁸ He follows Calvin's understanding of the *duplex gratia*, and, characteristic of Puritan devotional literature, argues that Christians should have daily recourse to the "stock of justification, and sanctification," so that they may be "daily applied, and distributed to our particular necessities."²⁵⁹

The practical use of the two doctrines for personal renewal is evident in how Rous encourages his readers to make use of them for growth and comfort. Though Christians are "in Christ," they should daily "offer up to him the justification of Christ to purge away the guilt of sin: and daily request of him the Spirit of sanctification, and the increase thereof to purge away the defiling of sin." This daily practice will preserve "continuall pureness." Through the act of sinning, believers continue to incur the guilt of sin, which can only be forgiven

253 Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, pp. 101–5.

254 See Chapter 2.

255 So his *Testis Veritatis* attacks Arminianism on the grounds of predestination, free will, and assurance.

256 See Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 311, where he writes, "Justification is given together with sanctification; and where sanctification is not present, justification is absent."

257 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 311, 449–50. Rous does state that one may be justified and die before any good works are performed, "and yet his Justification may be good."

258 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 406.

259 Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 512.

“by Christs blood,” but nonetheless one should “ask Christs Spirit to wash away the spot contracted by sin.”²⁶⁰

For Rous, at the moment of justification the guilt of sin is put away “by the washing of Christs blood, and the particular uncleanness of that sin by the washing of Christs Spirit.” He distinguishes between a general and a “particular and continuall cleansing and justification.”²⁶¹ The initial act of justification would seem to occur only once, while its ongoing benefits are conferred to the believer continually in an act of eternal justification:

That being justified by faith we have peace with God through Jesus Christ, and this peace shall none take from us. It is a great part of the Covenant God will remember sins no more, and if God remember them no more, then he gives an everlasting justification in that act of everlasting Oblivion, and if God eternally justifie, what time is there left for natural conscience, or any thing else to condemn?²⁶²

Rous extols the work of the Trinity in salvation when he says that Christians should ascribe glory to the Trinity for “our Election, for our Justification, for our Regeneration, which are the main works of our salvation, and are the joint works of the undivided Trinity.” Moreover, “the salvation of man is derived into man from God alone, and is then absolute and full in parts, when Election, Justification, and Regeneration, the absolute and onely works of the Trinity, have wrought upon him.”²⁶³

Good works come after the Christian enters into “the state and right of life and glory.” Thus, it is from the Christian’s regeneration that good works flow, but such works “add not a new part of salvation but onely increase the issues and fruit of a part formerly possessed.” Rous sees good deeds as the fruits of salvation, being the internal working of the divine Spirit, with “Grace the true root and fountain of them.”²⁶⁴

4.4.5 *Law and Gospel*

Rous discusses the relationship between the law and the gospel in his *Mediations* and *Catholick Charity*, though the concept operates throughout his work, as seen in his defense of grace over works, and various rebuttals of Arminianism.

²⁶⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 512.

²⁶¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 511–2.

²⁶² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 589.

²⁶³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 509–10.

²⁶⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 316, 510.

In the *Meditations*, Rous distinguishes between the “preaching” which is from God, and that which is from the devil. The former begins with the law, and ends with the gospel. This is seen in God’s command to Adam: “When you eat, ye shall die”; and yet, when humanity falls, God “giveth Christ to restore him.” The latter preaches that human beings shall not die at all because “God is merciful, and Christ is a reconciler of our sins.” The devil thus upholds to the believer the promise of forgiveness before the commission of sin, to “kill that Christ which was to be the life of them.” After the sin is committed, however, the devil accuses the sinner that “whosoever sinneth is not born of God; The soul that sins shall die,” and, “There remains no more sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking for of judgement.”²⁶⁵ The solution to the devil’s accusations is to “use Gods kind of Preaching” before the commission of sin, so that the “the whole Law, even the terror of God,” should be considered to frighten and prevent willful sin. When sin is committed, Christians must “carry the yoaik of the Law,” until one is humbled for it, and, after “due humiliation,” to “take hold of the Gospel” that is promised to the sorrowful; thus, for Rous, grace and forgiveness follow the law, with the law’s purpose being to bring sinners to Christ.²⁶⁶

In *Catholick Charity*, Rous discusses those who revive the “old Pelagian business of the possibility of keeping the Law,” and argues that the patristics “spoke of a power which was never brought to effect.” Indeed, the “Fathers and too much experience confirm it, that how possible soever the keeping of the Law is: yet no man ever brought this possibility to an actual keeping of the Law.”²⁶⁷

In the end, Rous’s dialectic between law and gospel, and its positive use in preaching, reverberates with the orthodox Reformed. Though a mystic, Rous distances himself from the more radical theologies that disparage any use of the law, and instead focus on the Quaker ethic of love and feeling.²⁶⁸

4.4.6 *Christian Life and Piety*

As a devotional writer, the Christian life and the *praxis pietatis* are the most prevalent themes within Rous’s writings. Rous’s purpose in composing *Art of Happiness*, for instance, was to bring Christians into to a state of perpetual bliss, “*summa philosophia est, quae exquirat Summum bonum.*”²⁶⁹ The *Diseases of the Time* contains numerous remedies for spiritual ailments, and emphasizes the

²⁶⁵ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 559.

²⁶⁶ Rous, *Treatises and Mediations*, pp. 559–60.

²⁶⁷ Rous, *Treatises and Mediations*, pp. 481–2.

²⁶⁸ E. P. Thompson, *Witness Against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law* (Cambridge, Eng., 1993), p. 32; Carol Wayne White, *The Legacy of Anne Conway: Reverberations from a Mystical Naturalism* (Albany, 2008), p. 37.

²⁶⁹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, sig. A3r.

practice of holiness.²⁷⁰ The *Oyl of Scorpions*, Rous's work on providence, traces the cause of pestilence, economic crisis, poverty, and extreme weather to swearing, blasphemy, drunkenness, unthankfulness, deceitfulness, filthiness, prophaneness, and backsliding.²⁷¹ *The Only Remedy* is a biblical exposition of the practice of repentance.²⁷² The *Meditations*, devoted to the edification and reparation of the house of God, covers such themes of piety as an increase in good works, Christian happiness, passion and despair, loving God, combating the devil, meditations, godly submission, trusting God, patience, humility, cards and dice, and maintaining a good conscience.²⁷³ Rous's *Meditations* further sought to gather "the diverse sparks of Holy fire, which have issued from the Spirit that baptizeth with fire . . . [and by] their united heat, to kindle a flame where is none or to increase it, where it is already kindled."²⁷⁴ Overall, Rous states that the purpose of his devotional writing is to "propose to the interal Eys of souls, the internal operations of this Kingdom . . . that hence they may gather true, and solid consolations, while they find themselves inwardly taught, drawn, and united to Christ."²⁷⁵

Finally, for Rous, the "fundamentals" of the Christian life are simple and without controversy, and they are "to know God and Jesus Christ by a true faith unto justification and sanctification . . ." He continually returns to *unio mystica cum Christo* as the central theme in Christianity, and the Christian's motive for godly living; the motif was integrated into his utopian vision for Christian society.²⁷⁶ It is through the believer's awareness of the divine, through *unio*, *resignatio*, and *communio* that they best serve God in this world, and maintain peace among the Calvinist brethren; thus, in the end, Rous's mysticism contributed to a Reformed *sensus unitatis*.²⁷⁷

4.5 Conclusion

Francis Rous was an enigmatic character in four ways. First, he delved into mystical currents within the Christian tradition, and articulated a utopian dream

²⁷⁰ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 93–214.

²⁷¹ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 215–80.

²⁷² Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 281–332.

²⁷³ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 487–608.

²⁷⁴ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 489.

²⁷⁵ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, p. 610.

²⁷⁶ Rous, *Treatises and Meditations*, pp. 116, 209, 375, 445, 598.

²⁷⁷ Van den Berg, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents*, p. 42.

of toleration in which believers worshipped and adored the Triune God, being united through *unio mystica cum Christo*, all the while protesting Arminians and Roman Catholics. His “toleration” was for the lesser differences among the Reformed, and this fact attests to a broad Reformed *unitas* that can be identified as “Calvinist.” Second, though Rous employed more sensual and mystical language than was common among his Calvinist brethren, he nonetheless retained prestige as an orthodox Puritan. Their reception of his work suggests that orthodox boundaries were more flexible and tolerable for those who were believed to be among the godly fold, however divergent, at times, their expressions might be. Third, Rous’s brand of bridal mysticism in the line of earlier medieval trajectories on spiritual marriage and reflects a robust interpretive tradition of the Song of Songs. Eclectically borrowing from patristic, medieval, and, to a lesser extent, Reformation writings, Rous’s unique contribution to *mystica theologia* was his belief that believers, as spiritual lovers and intimates of Christ, were co-heirs of God and could experience the bliss of spiritual marriage in this life. Fourth, Rous was an active educator when many mystics were berating philosophy and learning. He shared Hartlib’s vision to revive British intellectual life, and, by extension, to enrich European devotional culture, seen most lucidly in his reception in the Netherlands.

That the Reformed could unite around a common expression of faith and *pietas* is evident in their shared concerns for spiritual instruction. Further, that Rous’s mysticism appealed to circles outside the mainstream suggests that the radical culture of the English Revolution, and its homegrown heterodoxies, were as often a magnification of internal tendencies within Puritanism, as anything new and innovative.

Finally, Rous’s life and work express continuity and unity with the earlier English Reformed tradition. There was a shared and eclectic use sources, often medieval, and a diverse reading culture within Puritanism. Though Rous dived into deeper mystical waters than Downname did, their combined work reflects a common divinity and desire to be orthodox, and so counted among the Reformed and Calvinist line. Their affective piety and theological *unitas* bridged any differences; their shared experience of other-worldliness and insistence on correct doctrine reveal that, above all, the Puritan Reformation was a reform of mind and morals.

We will now turn to Tobias Crisp, whose antinomian strain also suggests *unitas* within the tradition, with its similar aims and desires for edifying “the godly,” and instructing them in *praxis pietatis*.

Tobias Crisp (1600–42/3)

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we will assess the “radical” Puritan Tobias Crisp, whose life and thought illustrate both *unitas* and *diversitas* within Puritanism.¹ As a representative of the antinomian strain, his teachings and emphasis on non-brooding piety illuminate the internal conflicts within Puritanism to come up with an alternative to the precisianist consensus.² Within the literature, Crisp has been called “an antecedent of the Ranters,” “the great champion of antinomianism,” the “arch-Antinomian,” and “a stimulator of religious controversy.”³ In his

-
- 1 As we saw in Chapter 1 and will look at again in Chapter 7, classifying Puritans as either “orthodox” or “radical” is not always easy, nor are the terms mutually exclusive. As with Rous, Crisp typifies elements of Reformed orthodoxy, and evinces the more “radical” notions associated with the alternate strains within Puritanism.
 - 2 See David Como, “Crisp, Tobias (1600–43),” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:64; Victor L. Nuovo, “Crisp, Tobias (or Crispe: 1600–43),” in *The Continuum Encyclopedia of British Philosophy*, ed. A. C. Grayling, Naomi Goulder, and Andrew Pyle (London, 2006); Roger Pooley, “Crisp, Tobias (1600–43),” *ODNB*; Christopher Hill, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*, 3 vols. (Malden, 1986), 2:141–61; Richard L. Greaves and Robert Zaller, eds., *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*, 3 vols. (Brighton, 1982), 1:191–2; Benjamin Brook, *The Lives of the Puritans*, 3 vols. (London, 1813), 2:471–5; Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, ed., John Gill, 4th ed. (London, 1791), 1:v–xii; and *A Biographical History of England, from Egbert the Great to the Revolution*, ed. James Granger, 2nd ed., 4 vols. (London, 1775), 2:179–80.
 - 3 James G. Turner, “The Properties of Libertinism,” in *Tis Nature’s Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality during the Enlightenment*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Cambridge, Eng., 1988), p. 86, n. 21; Robert Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 30; Tim Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter, and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Aldershot, 2011), p. 299; Pooley, “Crisp, Tobias,” *ODNB*. For a helpful study on the rhetoric of seventeenth-century language, see Conal Condren, *The Language of Politics in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1994), pp. 140–68. The best analysis of Ranter mythology to date is J. C. Davis, *Fear, Myth, and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986). Davis challenges the assumption of a “Ranter” existence in the seventeenth century. It is noteworthy that Laurence Clarkson, an alleged Ranter founder, listed Crisp as one of his mentors, and seems to have attended Crisp’s parish in London. Clarkson, *The Lost Sheep Found: Or, the Prodigal Returned to His Fathers House, After Many a Sad and Weary Journey through Many*

own time, Crisp was accused of both “Antinomianisme” and “Libertinisme,” the latter title of which he fully embraced because, for Crisp, at the heart of the theological debate that characterized his ministry was the *libertas fidelium* in Christ,⁴ and the real possibility of acquiring assurance.⁵ Crisp remains one of the most vilified and misunderstood Puritans of the early modern period, having been credited, among other things, with the rise of ranterism, hyper-Calvinism, and communism.⁶ That the Westminster Assembly recommended his sermons be burnt is indicative of the religious atmosphere and general disfavor with which the antinomian strain, whether genuine or perceived, was met with.⁷ Crisp’s sermons, despite the wishes of some members of the

Religious Countreys (London, 1660), p. 9; Christopher Hill, *The World of the Muggletonians* (London, 1983), p. 167.

- 4 Crisp said, “To be called a libertine, is the most glorious title under heaven; take it from one that is truly free by Christ.” Quoted in Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity*, p. 33; Nicholas McDowell, “The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism: Richard Crashaw, John Saltmarsh, and the Language of Religious Radicalism in the 1640s,” in *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century Religious Radicalism in Context*, ed. Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Aldershot, 2011), p. 43. Of course, Crisp, by this, did not mean lawless living. William Lamont sees Crisp’s “libertinism” as the apotheosis of Puritan commitment to liberty. See Lamont, “Puritanism, Liberty, and the Putney Debates,” in *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State*, ed. Michael Mendle (Cambridge, Eng., 2001), pp. 250–1. While we must consider such labels within their context of controversy, they are still useful classifications. Though Crisp never embraced the term “antinomian,” and his defenders repudiated its application to him, Crisp can cautiously be classified “antinomian,” if, by this, we contrast his emphasis on free grace with the prevailing “legal” strain within English divinity. For contemporary accusations against Crisp, see Robert Lancaster, “The Preface to the Christian Reader,” in Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted in Fourteen Sermons Preached in and neere London* (London, 1644).
- 5 That the doctrine of assurance was paramount to English Puritanism has been demonstrated in Joel R. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York, 1991). See also David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590–1644* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 88–130, esp. pp. 106–15.
- 6 Robert J. McKelvey, “‘That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism’: Eternal Justification,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 233–7; Curt Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” in *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697–1771). A Tercentennial Appreciation*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin (Leiden, 1997), pp. 172–5; John Jones, *Balliol College: A History*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2005), p. 109.
- 7 For instance, in 1646, William Gouge and John Ley brought the subject of Crisp’s books before the assembly. Three years earlier, Independent divine Joseph Caryl was appointed to a committee of the assembly to consider the spread of antinomism. In his report, he referred to the “unhappy differences . . . that had lately broken out afresh amongst us.” Chad B. Van Dixhoorn,

assembly, were printed in various editions, and continued to bring his life and work to the forefront of English antinomian controversy.⁸ While alive, Crisp ministered in relative obscurity, was respected by his peers, and had a wide following in Brinkworth and London;⁹ it was only in his final year, and later, with the posthumous publication of his sermons, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1643–46), that he came to fame and infamy.¹⁰

Before we turn to Crisp's social contexts it would be prudent to define English antinomism.¹¹ In essence, it is the "tendency to exalt the transformative

ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–52*, 5 vols. (New York, 2012), 2:452, 3:750; Robert S. Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the "Grand Debate"* (Edinburgh, 1985), p. 180.

- 8 Victor Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment: Interpretations of John Locke* (New York, 2011), p. 32; Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer, 1993), pp. 62–3. For histories of English antinomism, see David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford, 2004); Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill, 2004); Barry H. Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: The Question of Orthodoxy Regarding the Theology of Hanserd Knollys, c.1599–1691* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 79–132; and Norman B. Graebner, "Protestants and Dissenters: An Examination of the Seventeenth-Century Eatonist and New England Antinomian Controversies in Reformation Perspective" (PhD diss., Duke University, 1984). For an older, though still useful history, see Gertrude Huehns, *Antinomianism in English History with Special Reference to the Period 1640–60* (London, 1951).
- 9 See, for instance, the anonymous *A Memoriall to Preserve Vnsported to Posterity the Name and Memory of Doctor Crispe* (London, 1642/3), which consists of a three-column poem in defense of Crisp's doctrine and integrity. The lyric concludes: "Let no mans forward malice strive to cast Dirt on his fame, or with false rumours blast His honest life or Doctrines, because they Perceive some of their audience drop away; If they shall yet persist and vainly shew They feare truth will yet thrive, let such men know I doe denounce 'em mine and plaine truths foes: He that can bite in verse, can sting in prose."
- 10 Alan P. F. Sell, *Philosophy, Dissent, and Nonconformity, 1689–1920* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), p. 20; Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment*, p. 32; Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 114; Peter Lineham, "Antinomianism," in *The Encyclopedia of Protestantism*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand, 4 vols. (New York, 2004), 1:128–9; R. K. Webb, "The Emergence of Rational Dissent," in *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge, Eng., 1966), p. 25.
- 11 For antinomian tenets more generally, see Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, pp. 114–5; William K. B. Stoever, "A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven": *Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown, 1978). See also Ephraim Pagitt,

power of free grace on believers and to denigrate, or even deny, the role and use of the Moral Law as revealed in the Old Testament in the lives of converted Christians,” either in the preaching of the gospel, or in the practice of piety, and especially in self-examination by marks and signs.¹² As Ephraim Pagitt wrote, “The *Antinomians* are so called, because they would have the Law abolished.”¹³ But this short definition is not without difficulty, and the matter is further complicated in that few antinomians embraced the name, or actually denied the law in its entirety.¹⁴ Indeed, many alleged antinomians spoke favorably of the law, and nearly all preached the necessity of living a godly Christian life, which brings into question whether the term, within an English context, sufficiently reflects their beliefs.¹⁵ However, as with “Puritan,” the term has strong historical connotations, and in the absence of a better term, it is as good as any to distinguish those Calvinists who emphasized grace over law from the prevailing “legall preachers.”¹⁶ When antinomians did speak against the law, often caught up in a firestorm of anti-precisianist rhetoric, they did so with such extravagant language that their opponents had enough fuel to keep the controversy burning, even if such statements were, at times, taken out of their greater context, and susceptible to misinterpretation.¹⁷ Indeed, few, if any, English antinomians

Heresiography: Or, A Description of the Heretickes and Sectaries of These Latter Times (London, 1645), pp. 88–101.

12 Como, “Antinomianism,” p. 305.

13 Pagitt, *Heresiography*, p. 88.

14 One exception is Richard Coore, a curate in Halifax parish, who applied for a license as an antinomian, and seemed to fully embrace the name and its negative association. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (1947; repr. Chicago, 1992), p. 179.

15 See McKelvey, “Eternal Justification,” p. 235.

16 In his 1644 rebuttal of antinomism, Stephen Gere wrote, “of the *Antinomians*, (give me leave to call them so, because they count us *Legall Preachers*) . . .” Stephen Gere, *The Doctrine of the Antinomians by Evidence of Gods Truth, Plainely Confuted* (London, 1644), sig. A3v. David Hall states that those “who stood for ‘free grace’ against the ‘legall’ preachers did not call themselves Antinomians since to them, as to most seventeenth-century Protestants, the term implied licentious behavior and religious heterodoxy.” The term was often used within a political context to discredit opposition, and censure dissident voices; however, name-calling went both ways. Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636–38: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. (Durham, 1999), p. 3. See also Hill, *Collected Essays*, 2:162–84.

17 Even the Scottish Calvinist James Hogg later acknowledged that antinomism is, in many ways, the “logical outcome of fundamental principles in his faith.” Hogg, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, ed. Adrian Hunter (Peterborough, 2001), p. 18. On the use of language in antinomism, see Tamara Harvey, *Figuring Modesty in Feminist Discourse Across the Americas, 1633–1700* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 86–9.

actually preached true libertinism, even though this allegation became the cornerstone of precisionist critique.¹⁸

In the first half of the seventeenth century, when Crisp ministered, British antinomism was still an emerging phenomenon that defies easy classification, and it is uncertain how widespread these ideas were, but they appear to have been more attractive to the mystically inclined, and to those with sensitive consciences.¹⁹ What is certain is that “antinomian” tenets were circulating London in the 1630s, as Thomas Bakewell attested, possibly being spurred on by recent English printings of Luther’s Galatians commentary.²⁰ It was not until after mid-century, however, when the presses were less governed, and more antinomian tracts published, that a more cohesive theology emerged. Thus, while Crisp was promoting his brand of antinomism during the 1630s, it was still coming into being. Not long after the crisis ensued, John Sedgwick, rector of St. Alphage’s, London Wall, made the distinction between “doctrinal” and “practical” antinomism, doubtless to concede to the well-known fact that few antinomians actually lived lives of disrepute.²¹

British antinomism surfaced in response to particular themes within practical divinity, emerging out of its shadows, and should be seen as a reactionary movement; antinomians believed that a legal strain had infiltrated, and thus compromised, orthodox religion.²² That antinomians in this period are often identified with Lutheranism, for their sharp distinctions between law and gospel, and for their preference to be affiliated with Luther, suggests something of an English-Lutheran renaissance within the movement, even though antinomian use of Luther was hotly contested. Indeed, there were many English

18 For instance, Baxter seems to have used antinomism and libertinism synonymously. Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study in the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660–1780* (Cambridge, Eng, 1991), p. 140.

19 Davis, *Ranters and the Historians*, p. 21, n. 20; Huehns, *Antinomianism*, pp. 8, 28, 66, 68, 71.

20 Thus, on the cover of John Eaton’s *Honey-combe*, which was in manuscript form in the 1630s, is a direct but altered citation from Luther’s commentary on Galatians 2:11. The word “justification” in Luther’s text was changed to “free justification.” Cf. Martin Luther, *A Commentarie of Mater Doctor Martin Luther upon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Glathians* (London, 1635), p. 55.

21 John Sedgwick, *Antinomianisme Anatomized. Or a Glasse for the Lawlesse* (London, 1643). Cited in Huehns, *Antinomianism*, p. 40. See also Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, p. 103, n. 105, where he affirms that Crisp, Denne, Eaton, and Paul Hobson “clearly indicate [that] they abhorred the concept of a true Christian willingly living in sin.”

22 Hill, *Collected Essays*, 2:177.

reprints and translations of Luther's Galatians commentary, and at least one edition of *The Freedom of the Christian* (1636) during these formative years.²³ Luther was quoted, and for some, over-quoted.²⁴

Yet even with variance among antinomians, a general consensus emerged as to an "anti-legal" divinity, which gave the antinomian strain a sense of solidarity, connectedness, and platform to voice objections to the prevailing divinity. At the center of this belief-set was the idea that the moral law, including the Ten Commandments, had no or little role in the salvation or lives of believers, and that its integration compromised true Reformed spirituality. Implicit in its denunciation was a critique of what was seen as an obsession with sanctification, and fierce self-examination, which, it argued, would lead to many crises in assurance. Thus, the origins and defining characteristics of British antinomism, as seen in its early contexts, have to be equated with an early-modern crisis of conscience.²⁵

We will now move on to consider Crisp's social contexts, then examine his sermons in their historical context, assess his relation to Reformed orthodoxy, and conclude the chapter. This method will enable us to see whether vying strains within Puritanism shared basic theological assumptions, and whether overall there was more in common among them than the heresiographer might suggest.²⁶

23 Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids, 2012), p. 325; Van den Brink, "Calvin, Witsius (1636–1708), and the English Antinomians," pp. 231–2; Tim Cooper, "The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the 'Radicals' from Mid-Seventeenth-Century Religion," *Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000), 247–62; J. Wayne Baker, "Sola Fide, Sola Gratia: The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985), 115–33.

24 John Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace: Or, the Flowings of Christs Blood freely to Sinners* (London, 1646), sig. A4r.

25 Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636–41* (Princeton, 1998), pp. 12–27; Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, p. 89; Como, "Antinomianism," pp. 305–7.

26 See, for instance, David Loewenstein's magisterial study, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York, 2013); and Cooper, "The Antinomians Redeemed," 62. Cooper writes, "The fact is that by focusing on the Antinomian chimera so artfully drawn by their opponents our attention has been distracted from those who were always the most important players in this debate—the critics themselves."

5.2 Social Contexts

Relatively little is known about Crisp's life, other than that he was born into a wealthy merchant family in London, and instigated a fiery theological crisis.²⁷ He was born in Bread Street, London, the third son of Alderman Ellis Crisp and his wife, Hester. He was the younger brother of Sir Nicholas Crisp (1599–1666), a slave trader, who operated a gold trade in West Africa.²⁸ Crisp was first educated in the grammar school in Eaton, near Windsor, and then entered Cambridge University, where he earned his first degree in 1621. He continued his studies at Oxford, and then seems to have earned a terminal degree at Cambridge; thus having several degrees—BA (Cambridge, 1621), MA (Oxford, 1627), DD (Cambridge, c.1638)—Crisp was one of the more educated Puritans at the time, and one of the few to have earned a Doctor of Divinity degree, joining the ranks of William Twisse, George Downname, John Preston, Joseph Hall, Thomas Taylor, John Everard, John Wallis, Robert Harris, and James Ussher.²⁹

27 The two most substantial accounts of Crisp's life are John Gill, "Memoirs of the Life, &c. of Tobias Crisp, D.D.," prefaced to his 1791 republication of Crisp's sermons, and Christopher Hill, "Dr. Tobias Crisp (1600–43)," in his *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*, 3 vols. (Amherst, 1986), 2:141–61. Shorter accounts are Roger Pooley, "Crisp, Tobias (1600–43)," *ODNB*; and David Como, "Crisp, Tobias (1600–43)," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:64.

28 Hill, *Collected Essays*, 2:141. Nicholas Crisp, a militant royalist who raised a London army to support the king, was knighted by Charles I, and was favored at court. During the civil wars, he maintained a fleet of ships that helped Charles to maintain communication with the continent. He was among those who greeted the return of Charles II at the Restoration. See R. W. Harris, *Clarendon and the English Revolution* (Stanford, 1983), p. 116; Robert Ashton, "Crisp, Sir Nicholas," *ODNB*.

29 Pooley, "Crisp, Tobias"; Daniel, "John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism," p. 172. Pooley has Crisp earning a B.D. from Oxford in 1638, based presumably on his reading of Joseph Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses* (1891), but this seems unfeasible. Crisp likely proceeded DD directly from MA (in the seventeenth century there was a statute at Cambridge that a master of arts could be admitted to the doctoral degree if he had been a master of twelve years, and maintained a teaching position). This is further attested in Wood's *Athene Oxonienses*, where Crisp is said to have earned only three degrees, and "was admitted to proceed in [Oxford's] faculty" in 1626/7, though it is unclear what subject Crisp taught or what his dissertation, if he wrote one, may have been on.

There also appears to be confusion in the literature whether Crisp earned his doctorate from Oxford or Cambridge. Several older sources have Crisp earning the degree at Oxford, but Pooley has cited Cambridge based on J. A. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (1922), and here I concur. On the "Doctor of Divinity" degree in the seventeenth century, see G. D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Cambridge, Eng., 1937),

Crisp took up livings successively at Newington Butts in Surrey,³⁰ and then, in 1627, at Brinkworth in Wiltshire, the latter from which he was removed by royalist soldiers in August 1642, for his support of Parliament, even though he never approved of harsh measures or the execution of a king.³¹ While at Brinkworth, was known for his hospitality, often entertaining 100 guests at a time, and making full provision for their horses. He was generous with his wealth, had a wide following with his preaching, and raised a large family, having thirteen children. Because of his affluence, he refused preferment, and more freely pursued his theological interests, and though charged with antinomism, he lived an admirable “godly” life, engaged in evangelical duty with his family, and observed a strict Sabbath.³²

Though Crisp was initially imbued with the Arminianism that was sweeping through the English Church in the 1620s–30s, at some time he drifted toward doctrinal antinomism, likely in response to both personal and pastoral difficulties associated with introspection, the moral imperatives of Stuart Arminianism, and the inadequacy of precisianism to resolve his inner conflict.³³ While he was known to frequent London during the height of the first antinomian crisis, it is not known whether he came into contact with John Eaton, the “antinomian heresiarch,” or whether he even read Eaton’s *Honey-combe*,

pp. 40–3. In the eighteenth century, Edward Wells claimed that the conferring of the doctorate to Crisp was “to the Scandal and Reproach of [the] Faculty.” Wells, *An Help for the Right Understanding of the Several Divine Laws and Covenants* (Oxford, 1729), p. 140.

30 Crisp was deprived of his Newington post because of accusations of simony, that he had bought the living with his substantial wealth. However, he purportedly “swore on the Holy Evangelists” that he was innocent, and the whole affair seems to have been motivated by anti-Puritan bias. John A. Vern, *Biographical Register of Christ’s College, 1505–1905* (Cambridge, Eng., 1910), p. 337.

31 Robert Rix, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 30.

32 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 2 vols. (1791), 1:vii–viii. Crisp had married Mary Wilson in 1626, daughter of Rowland Wilson, a London merchant and activist in the Civil War. See Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans* (London, 1813), 2:471–2; Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 3:50–1; Hill, *Collected Essays*, 2:141.

33 Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist*, 1:193; Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, p. 27; Hill, *Collected Essays*, 2:141–2; Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, 2:473; Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Non-Conformists, from the Battle of Edge-Hill, to the Death of King Charles I* (Boston, 1817), 3:44–5. Rutherford states that Crisp, “a godly man,” had built “much on qualifications and signes, [but] fell to the other extremity of no signes of sanctification at all.” This is confirmed by Brook, who alleges that Crisp began with “exceedingly low” ideas of Christ’s grace, which “produced in him a legal and self-righteous spirit,” and thus being, “Shocked at the recollection of his former views and conduct, he seems to have imagined that he could never go far enough from them.”

which was then circulating in manuscript. However, Robert Lancaster, who knew both Eaton and Crisp, and who was involved in publishing the works of both men, probably connected the two, or minimally provided Crisp with Eaton's manuscript, though it is plausible that Crisp had heard Eaton preach. Regardless of who knew whom, there were important doctrinal differences between the two, specifically in that Crisp more freely acknowledged sin in the believer after justification, and that God does, in fact, see sin in the elect, even though it has no power to condemn them.³⁴

After being forced out of his rectorship in Brinkworth, Crisp preached his "controversial message" in London, but does not seem to have drawn ire until shortly before his death from smallpox in February 1642/3.³⁵ Wood states that it was Crisp's dispute in London against 52 ministers, which Crisp was said to have "eagerly managed," that brought about his last illness, he having overly exerted himself.³⁶ In his final hour, Crisp "was in a most comfortable and resigned frame of mind, and declared to them that stood by his firm adherence to the doctrines he had preached; that as he had lived in the belief of the free grace of God through Christ, so he did now, with confidence and great joy, even as much as his present condition was capable of, resign his life and soul in to the hands of his heavenly Father."³⁷ He was buried in his family vault in the Church of St. Mildred in Bread Street, next to his father, who had preceded him in death.³⁸

34 Within the literature, few individuals have been given to the "heresiarch" title, including Eaton, Crisp, Anne Hutchinson, and John Everard. It is difficult, if not impossible, to trace the precise origins of English antinomism, but the movement seems to have originated in the 1620s, possibly with Eaton's reading of Luther, and doubtless within the context of concern over Laudianism. See Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, pp. 29, 73–4; Peter W. Williams, *Popular Religion in America: Symbolic Change and the Modernization Process in Historical Perspective* (Champaign, 1989), p. 107; William Hunt, "Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War," in *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair (Philadelphia, 1990), p. 227.

35 Como, "Crisp, Tobias," p. 64; Alison Jasper, "Female Genius: Jane Leade (1624–1704)," in *Literature and Theology: New Interdisciplinary Spaces*, ed. by Heather Walton (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 84–5. See also David Parnham, "The Humbling of 'High Presumption': Tobias Crisp Dismantles the Puritan *Ordo Salutis*," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2005), 50–74. Crisp's wife, Mary Wilson, died on September 20, 1673, and left her estate to be divided among her children and grandchildren, with the exception of "my grandson Tobias... [who] opened and read this my will contrary to modesty and ingenuity..." Henry F. Waters, *Genealogical Gleanings in England* (Boston, 1901), 1:835.

36 Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1817), 3:50–1.

37 Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans*, 2 vols. (New York, 1843), 1:447.

38 Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 3:51.

Though his life was cut short in his forty-third year, he proved to be influential among civil-war chaplains, soldiers, and various lay “radicals” throughout the revolutionary years. He had a following well into the eighteenth century and beyond, especially among English Particular Baptists, and is often associated with the rise of “high Calvinism.”³⁹ Shaw sees this latter position as a move beyond the Calvinism of Beza, in which “free grace to the elect was stressed and, by focus on eternal justification, human responsibility for continued penitence was downplayed.”⁴⁰ While Peter Toon has traced the emergence of high Calvinism to Eaton and Crisp,⁴¹ Shaw states that “full progression to high Calvinism had not yet occurred,” in that Crisp “urged that Christ be freely offered to all . . .”⁴²

Crisp’s appeal to “radicals,” can be seen in the mystic Jane Leade, who went to London to find some sort of context for her visionary experiences. She was troubled and upset until she met with Crisp. He was able to “resolve all her doubts and give her a much clearer understanding of what had happened to her.”⁴³ Though she later moved beyond orthodox sentiment, Leade often reminisced of her time with Crisp, and even wrote that his “free-grace sermon was quite different from the others I had heard so that I decided to tread no other path.”⁴⁴ Indeed, Crisp had such a formative influence on Leade’s theology that such themes as the freeness of God’s redemptive love, and the blotting out of sin, were more impressionable on her than the doctrine of predestination.

39 Ian J. Shaw, “‘The Only Certain Rule of Faith and Practice’: The Interpretation of Scripture among English High Calvinists, c.1780s–1850,” in *Dissent and the Bible in Britain, c.1650–1950*, ed. Scott Mandelbrote and Michael Ledger-Lomas (New York, 2013), p. 135, n. 12.

40 Ian J. Shaw, *High Calvinists in Action: Calvinism and the City, Manchester and London, 1810–60* (New York, 2002), p. 14.

41 See Peter Toon, *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity* (London, 1967), pp. 49–50, 82–3, 96.

42 Shaw, *High Calvinists in Action*, p. 14.

43 Arthur Versluis, *Wisdom’s Children: A Christian Esoteric Tradition* (New York, 1999), p. 58; Julie Hirst, *Jane Leade: Biography of a Seventeenth-Century Mystic* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 18–9; E. P. Thompson, *Witness Against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law* (Cambridge, Eng., 1993), p. 41.

44 Jane Leade, “Lebenslauff der Autorin,” in *Sechs Unschätzbare Mystische Tractatelein* (Amsterdam, 1694–96), p. 417. Quoted in Hirst, *Jane Leade*, p. 19. Leade’s autobiography no longer exists in the English version, but can be found in the German translation of 1694–96.

Leade would later, from the mid-1680s, embrace the idea that everyone would eventually be saved.⁴⁵

Leade was not alone in attributing influence to Crisp. The Ranter Laurence Clarkson says that he “went to” Tobias Crisp, having heard of his ministry, and sat “under Doctor Crisp’s Doctrine, in which I did endeavor to become one of those that God saw no sin.” It is not certain whether Clarkson actually attended Crisp’s London parish, or whether he merely read Crisp’s books, which he “seriously perused.”⁴⁶ In 1644, John Coulton gives evidence of the influence of *Christ Alone Exalted* among Parliamentary forces. Henry Pinnell, an army radical, vindicated Crisp and ascribed to him a formative influence in shaping his own religious identity.⁴⁷ In 1646, Mary Greaves, an avid reader of “radical” writings, lent her copy of Crisp’s sermons to an Adam Eyre.⁴⁸

It is not surprising, then, that when Crisp’s sermons resurfaced in the 1690s that a number of testimonies were quickly sent to the press to show both how Crisp had lived an exemplary life, and equally transformed the lives of

45 Alana Vincent, “Two (and two, and two) Towers: Interdisciplinarity, Borrowing, and the Limits of Interpretation,” in *Literature and Theology: New Interdisciplinary Studies*, ed. Heather Walton (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 84–5; Douglas H. Shantz, *Between Sardis and Philadelphia: The Life and World of Pietist Court Preacher Conrad Broske* (Leiden, 2008), pp. 130–1. For the same idea in Peter Sterry, see Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660–1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (New York, 2011), p. 57.

46 Clarkson, *Lost Sheep Found*, p. 9.

47 Hill, *Collected Essays*, 2:142; *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557–1695*, ed. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), pp. 414–5. According to Richard Baxter, antinomism was the predominant infection in the army, circulated with books by Crisp, Paul Hobson, John Saltmarsh, and Walter Cradock. N. H. Keeble, “‘Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposing on Others’: Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition,” in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 287; Richard L. Greaves, *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Macon, 1985), p. 136.

Cooper states that Crisp became Baxter’s “boogeyman,” presumably because of the infectious nature of Crisp’s sermons within the revolutionary army. Indeed, Rutherford wrote, “It shall never be well with England, till the like abjuration of the doctrine of . . . Wil. Del., Joh. Saltmarsh, of Town, Eaton, Den., Crispe . . . be tendered to most of the Army of Sir Thomas Fairfax, and all the Sectaries in England.” Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, p. 27; Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist* (London, 1648), 1:354. See also Leo F. Solt, *Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell’s Army* (Stanford, 1959), pp. 25–42.

48 Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580–1680* (London, 1990), p. 159. This is further evidence of Crisp’s popularity among the laity, where he popularized the grace of God for all. John Jones, *Balliol College: A History*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2005), p. 109.

others. Indeed, one said, “There has been a great deal of Talk about *Dr. Crisp*, but I look upon him to have been a Godly, Holy Man, and that he was Sound and Orthodox, and that he brought in more Souls to Christ than any of us.”⁴⁹ Twisse was reported to have read Crisp’s sermons, and “could give no reason why they were opposed, but because so many were converted by his preaching, and so few by ours.”⁵⁰ In 1653, Johannes Hornbeeck, professor of theology at Leiden, wrote that Crisp had “non malo animo,” but, “ut magis Christi solius gloria appareat.”⁵¹

While the focus has often been on how antinomians deviated from the precisianists in their discussion of law and gospel, few have questioned why this was so; that Crisp’s message to the distressed mind was so successful that a prominent minister would claim that he had more comfort in it “than from any other Book, except the Bible,” raises questions as to how effective the paradigm of “marks and signs” was.⁵²

In the end, Crisp ministered during a pivotal time in English religious history, with the aura of revolution in the air, and when “radical” theologies were spreading like wildfire in response to the moralism of Arminianism and precisianism, whether real or imagined. His preaching was thus popular and feared. While he doubtless had his critics, he did have prominent defenders as well, especially those of a high Calvinist bent, and others wanting to preserve *unitas* among the “Calvinist brethren,” in a time when division and strife were all too rampant.

49 Hananiel Philalethes, *Christ Exalted and Dr. Crisp Vindicated in Several Points called Antinomian* (London, 1698), sig. Alv. See also Thomas Beverley, *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp’s Sermons, and Mr. Baxter’s Dissatisfactions in Them* (London, 1690); and Beverley, *A Conciliatory Discourse upon Crisp’s Sermons, on the Observation of Mr. Williams’s Dissatisfactions in Them* (London, 1692). Beverley, who had been imprisoned along with Baxter in 1686, attempted to arbitrate between Baxter and Crisp’s supporters. He argued that both Baxter and Crisp reflected the two sides of the same coin, and that their differences lay only in emphasis. Beverley’s support of Crisp alienated him from Baxter, his efforts having proved unfruitful. Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, pp. 174–7.

50 Samuel Crisp, *Christ Made Sin* (London, 1691), p. 4. The source of Twisse’s comment seems to be Christopher Fowler (1613/4–77), whose nephew, likely the Puritan Thomas Cole (1628–97), had sat under his ministry for a time, and had himself received much comfort from Crisp’s sermons.

51 Johannes Hornbeeck, *Summa controversiarum religionis cum infidelibus, haereticis, schismaticis*, 2nd. ed. (Utrecht, 1658), pp. 812–3.

52 Crisp, *Christ Made Sin*, p. 4; Clarkson, *Lost Sheep Found*, pp. 8–9.

5.3 Crisp's Writings in Historical Context

We will now consider Crisp's sermons in their historical context. Though better educated than many of his peers, Crisp's corpus does not rest in the technical works of theology, seen in the more dogmatic tomes of Edward Leigh, but in the sermons that he preached at Brinkworth and London, which were recorded in shorthand, and posthumously published in three volumes from 1643–46. Given Crisp's popularity in the 1630–40s, it is little surprise that his sermons were quickly printed, purchased, and disseminated among all sorts of the godly, being especially received by those who were mystically inclined, or who had tender consciences; nor is it surprising that almost as soon as the first edition was printed in 1643, that numerous responses, specifically those from the Presbyterians, were rushed to press in order to ward off the antinomian "infection." Among those voices that criticized Crisp were Thomas Bakewell, Stephen Gere, John Benbrigge, Anthony Burgess, Samuel Rutherford, and Richard Baxter, in the first published controversy, and Richard Baxter, again, John Flavel, John Edwards, and Daniel Williams, in the second.⁵³

In 1643, Bakewell rushed to press his synopsis of antinomian errors,⁵⁴ and criticizes (1) justification from eternity, that a person is justified "as soon as he hath a being in the sight of God, before they had any faith or calling"; (2) the absence of remaining sin in the elect, as though God "cannot see their sinne"; (3) an assurance of faith that is based on the inner witness of the Holy Spirit only, to the exclusion of "marks and signes"; (4) the absence of divine correction for sinful behavior; and (5) the abolition of the commanding power of the law as a rule for life.⁵⁵ All of these charges seem to be in response to Eaton's *Honey-combe*, even though he does not mention anyone by name, other than

53 Baxter called Crisp the "most eminent Ring-leader whose books took wonderfully with ignorant Professors." Richard Baxter, *A Treatise of Justifying Righteousness* (London, 1676), 1:21.

54 Bakewell claims to have heard firsthand the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly on antinomism, and Jason Peacey has called him a member of the assembly, but it is uncertain whether Bakewell was ordained or not, as he does not appear on any official roster. It is possible that he was an assistant to one of the official members, or the rector of Rolleston, or otherwise was allowed to sit in on the meetings. See Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), p. 68; Thomas Bakewell, *A Faithfull Messenger Sent After the Antinomians* (London, 1644), pp. 28–9; and cf. Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord*, p. 513, where Bakewell is called a "woodmonger in Fleet Street," and Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 203, where he is referred to as "the London lay presbyterian."

55 Bakewell, *A Short View of the Antinomian Errovr*s (London, 1643), sig. A4v.

to say, “These things I have gathered both from their Sermons, and by conference with them, as also out of their books, which have passed privately among themselves.”⁵⁶ Echoing Thomas Taylor, Bakewell was among the first to defend Luther in the 1640s debate,⁵⁷ asking, “but then is *Luther* an Antinomean?”⁵⁸ Bakewell criticizes antinomians for purposefully twisting the teachings of “those worthy Divines,” who, he alleges, never taught that salvation was due to any other cause than the grace of God.⁵⁹ Though Bakewell does not name anyone in his synopsis, he has no reservation in a second book, published in 1644, which was prompted by borrowing for two days the first edition of Crisp’s *Christ Alone Exalted*. Bakewell claims that Crisp and Lancaster did “rake out of Eatons *dunghill*”⁶⁰ the belief that a Christian is justified in God’s sight before faith.⁶¹ He continued his assault in a third tract on the nature of God’s decrees, and argues that it is inconsistent for God to simultaneously see a sinner both

56 Bakewell, *A Short View of the Antinomian Errovrns*, sig. A2v. This statement confirms that antinomian tracts were circulated in private circles before freedom of the press allowed them to be published in the 1640s.

57 Taylor wrote, “With what boldness doe they claime Mr. *Luther* to be wholly theirs, and themselves to bee wholly of his judgement: and that they hold nothing in this point but what they sucked from his breests?” Thomas Taylor, *Regula Vita, the Rvle of the Law Vnder the Gospel* (London, 1631), p. 191.

58 Bakewell, *A Short View of the Antinomian Errovrns*, p. 23. Bakewell answers, “doth [*Luther*] not directly contradict your foolish tenets, and disclaime you as adversaries and false accusers: you reject the law and workes, but he rejecteth neither; you abolish the whole law, but he establisheth it; you reject them all for legall preachers that teach not Christ aright who urge men to the duties of the law, but he imposeth it as a necessary part of their office to urge the law, as to teach the doctrine of faith: for shame never claime *Luther* more.”

59 Bakewell, *A Short View of the Antinomian Errovrns*, p. 33.

60 Crisp was damned as an apostle of “his Master Eaton, from whom he hath borrowed most of his new Divinity”; yet, it is not certain whether Crisp had in fact read Eaton, or was even a frequenter of Eaton’s parish in London. However, given the tight-knit “free grace” community, it is reasonable to assume that Crisp knew of Eaton, and possibly had read his manuscript, but he also distanced himself from Eaton theologically. Given his extensive library, Crisp could have come to ideas similar to Eaton independently. See Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, p. 196; Michael Hunter, Giles Mandelbrote, Richard Ovenden, and Nigel Smith, *A Radical’s Books: The Library Catalogue of Samuel Jeake of Rye, 1623–90* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. xli, n. 1.

61 Bakewell, *The Antinomians Christ Confounded, and the Lords Christ Exalted* (London, 1644), sig. A1r. Bakewell seems to be unaware that William Twisse, William Pemble, William Eyre, William Robertson, John Cotton, and Thomas Goodwin all held to the doctrine of justification before faith. See Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn*, pp. 66–71; and the judicious treatment of the matter in Mark Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of*

in a state of guilt and innocence. He claims to have heard the personal testimonies of various antinomians at a session of the Westminster Assembly.⁶² Bakewell's intent with his foray into print was to distance Crisp and other antinomians from being reputed as orthodox, a common Presbyterian tactic that sought to control of the flow of information in order to mitigate the influence of radical religion.⁶³

The next attack on Crisp came in 1644, when Stephen Geree rushed to press his *Doctrine of the Antinomians*, a fairly thorough examination of the first half of the first edition of Crisp's sermons.⁶⁴ Geree argued that antinomism was more dangerous than other heresies, because it was exceedingly more plausible, having some affinity and semblance with the truth.⁶⁵ He likened the doctrine to "sweet poysons," which are easily swallowed, and sleeping pills that bring on a state of slumber, and remove the sense of pain, but cannot cure the disease. Thus, for Geree, antinomian doctrine was doubly dangerous, in that it drew the profane and licentious, and gave them a false sense of safety, and equally seemed to so magnify the grace of God that it tainted those who had been justly humbled by their misery. In short, antinomism lured and monopolized those who were prone to melancholic fears and distempers. Rather than concede to antinomian allegations, Geree alleged that it is they who are causing most harm with their false hopes and promises.⁶⁶

the Puritan Reformed Orthodox Theologian, Thomas Goodwin, 1660–80 (Göttingen, 2010), pp. 230–8.

62 Bakewell, *A Faithfull Messenger Sent After the Antinomians*, sig. A2r–3v, p. 28.

63 Indeed, if Crisp's reputation could effectively be removed from orthodoxy, his beliefs could be more easily controlled, and their damage mitigated. On the paradoxes of "heresy-making," see Lowenstein, *Treacherous Faith*.

64 That Geree only examines the first seven sermons reflects the sense of urgency felt. As Geree wrote, "Having sadly considered how busie *Satan is to sow Tares*, where the precious seed of Gods saving truth has been sowne, I thought it necessary for every Seeds-man to hinder the growth thereof, by word or writing, by conference or calling on the name of God, by one means or other, according to our occasions and abilities, lest Satans vigilancy rise in judgement against us for our negligence." See Geree, *Doctrine of the Antinomians*, sig. A2r. See also the vindication of Crisp in Samuel Richardson, *Divine Consolations* (London, 1649). Richardson, most likely a soldier and army preacher, addressed his book to Thomas Fairfax, Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and Thomas Harrison.

65 Geree, *The Doctrine of the Antinomians*, sig. A2r.

66 Geree, *The Doctrine of the Antinomians*, sig. A2r–3v. See also Mary Ann Lund, *Melancholy, Medicine, and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading "The Anatomy of Melancholy"* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 69–72.

In 1645, Benbrigge published a sermon that he had preached at Rye, in Sussex, against the “new-fashioned Christians,” as he called them.⁶⁷ Approved for the press by John Downame, the acrimoniously titled *Christ Above All Exalted, as in Justification so in Sanctification*, sought to defend precisianist self-examination as the “very key of the work of assurance,” and to safeguard against presumption. Indeed, says Benbrigge, “Alas, how many are gone to hell with this hope that Christ dyed for them! their false hearts told them they should be saved, and they believing them sat down in security and sought no further till it was too late, so late as Heaven gate was shut again them . . .”⁶⁸

In 1646, Burgess published his *Vindiciae Legis*, targeted toward the errors of papists, Arminians, Socinians, and antinomians. The treatise, based on twenty-nine lectures he gave at his parish in Laurence-Jury, London, was published at the request of Arthur Jackson and the fellows of Sion College. Burgess sought to discredit antinomism and establish the relevance of the moral law as the historic and biblically Reformed position, and challenged the assumption that antinomian writings merely reflect the “unsavory assertions” of those who lack finer judgment, as though they thought “more orthodoxy then they write.”⁶⁹ Burgess does concede that there are many passages in their books that are “wholesome” and “good,” but finds too many contradictions in them to allow

67 John Benbrigge, *Christ Above All Exalted, as in Justification so in Sanctification. Wherein Severall Passages of Dr. Crisps Sermons are Answered* (London, 1645), sig. A4r. While Benbrigge's title suggests interaction with Crisp's published sermons, the only mention of Crisp is on the title page. It is uncertain when Benbrigge's sermon was preached. In a 1646 sermon, *Gods Fury, Englands Fire*, Benbrigge, with “rhetorical zest . . . vents his anguish over what he perceives to be the dissolution of society, and hurls accusations at the religious sectarians whom he considers to be the source of this disruption.” Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000), p. 1.

68 Benbrigge, *Christ Above All Exalted*, p. 20.

69 Anthony Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis: Or, A Vindication of the Morall Law and the Covenants from the Errours of Papists, Arminians, Socinians, and more especially Antinomians* (London, 1646), p. 29. For Burgess, were the matter one of ignorance, antinomians might be “excused”; however, he was suspicious of their motive: “For my part, I am acquainted with them no other waies, but by their Books which they have written, and in those every error is more warily pressed, then in secret. There I finde, that sometimes they yield the Law to be a rule of life; yea they judge it a calumny to be called Antinomists; and if so, their adversaries may better be called Antifidians . . . yet for all this, in the very places where they deny this assertion as theirs, they must be forced to acknowledge it” (p. 278).

them.⁷⁰ Burgess further vindicates Luther from antinomism, and shows awareness, however briefly, of earlier controversies on the continent.⁷¹

In 1648, Rutherford published his massive *Survey* of “anti-Christian” theology, which “stretched strict Calvinist theologies of grace to heretical lengths,” and equated Crisp with the “radical” theologies of John Saltmarsh, William Dell, Robert Towne, Henry Denne, and John Eaton.⁷² The text shares the “conservative sensibilities” of the heresiographers, and seems to have been occasioned by witnessing the radicals firsthand in England.⁷³ As with earlier books by Taylor, Bakewell, and Burgess, Rutherford spent considerable time clearing “Luther’s legacy” from antinomism. He refuses to concede any ground to them, and sees them as deceivers who carry the masses away with their heresies.⁷⁴ He praises Thomas Edwards for speaking and crying out “against the

70 Burgess writes, “And it cannot be denied, but that in some parts of their Books there are wholesome and good passages; as in a wood or forrest, full of shrubs and brambles, there may be some violets and primoses . . .” Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, p. 278.

71 Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, pp. 276–81.

72 Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Wig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689–c.1830* (Cambridge, Eng., 1993), p. 58. Rutherford, a professor of divinity at St. Andrews, was renowned for his affective piety, penchant for controversy, and “international reputation as a champion of Reformed orthodoxy.” John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), p. 114.

73 Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York, 2012), p. 97.

74 Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist* (London, 1648), sig. A2r. Overall, little work has been done on the *Survey*. It warrants further study, especially to assess Rutherford’s accuracy in depicting historical facts, and the positions of his opponents. For instance, John Wheelwright, whom Rutherford calls a “familist,” published a vindication from Rutherford’s allegations, which first circulated in manuscript before finally being printed in 1658. In the *Apology*, Wheelwright challenges Rutherford’s accuracy, asking, “Is Mr. *Rutherford* certain that what he reports is true?” He adds that, “Mr. *Rutherford* stands as it were upon the shoulders of the shorte story-writers, takes his bloody pen (as he cal[s] it) into his hand, draws blood of many sound men in judgment, the deare Saints, and servants of God, whose blood in the sight of God is precious, and what they report he reports, and more too, with much passion, and in most reproachful language, where I leave him to stand or fal with them.”

Wheelwright further states that, “Mr. *Rutherford* makes himself my judg. Severing me (in his notion) from the sheep, and sets me amongst goats, condemning me amongst the rest, as a man not truly Godly . . . This is a dreadful sentence which is passed against me, in respect of my personal standing, by Mr. *Rutherford*.” Fearing for public censure and irreparable harm to his “Ministry, Family, wife, Children, and posterity for ever,” Wheelwright’s church petitioned a Boston court to assess Rutherford’s allegations, and on August 24,

New altar,” and claims numerous divines in support of his aspersions: Calvin, Beza, Cartwright, Brightman, Dod, Hildersham, Dering, Greenham, Perkins, Baynes, Pemble, Ames, Sibbes, Preston, Knox, Bruce, Welsh.⁷⁵ Throughout the *Survey*, Rutherford distances antinomians and mystics from orthodox expression of faith, and accuses English antinomians of reviving continental heresy, and ignoring Luther’s own refutation of it, though overall he scarcely mentions Crisp, who he calls “a godly man.”⁷⁶ Rutherford’s heresiography is noteworthy in that he expands discussion of the Antichrist from that of the papacy, and its remnants within the English Church, to include all sorts of “heretical theology,” both in England and New England.⁷⁷

Baxter’s entrance into the debate was with his first foray into print, *Aphorisms of Justification* (1649), which postulated some conditionality in the doctrine of justification.⁷⁸ He was, perhaps, the most vocal and persistent opposer of antinomism, in that his opposition to it gave his life-work symmetry. Baxter believed that his rebuttals were so successful that it had quenched its flame.⁷⁹ For instance, in 1664, Baxter recorded the success of his writings against the antinomians, and claims that the “Sect,” which had been the “predominant Infection,” in the army, had been dead for many years.⁸⁰ Though Baxter was known for ecumenicism and pursuit of Christian unity, he believed that

1654, the court cleared Wheelwright’s name, owning him as a “sound, orthodoxe, and profitable Minister of the Gospel.” Indeed, Wheelwright confessed that he did “not hold . . . any opinion of Sectaries, as such, nor any Doctrine condemned in any approved Council, or Synod, but such as is maintained by some Orthodox Divines, not dissonant from the Harmony of Churches Confessions, though I do not build my Faith upon the Dictates of men, but only upon the written Word of God.” John Wheelwright, *A Brief, and Plain Apology, written by John Wheelwright* (London, 1658), pp. 15, 28–9.

75 Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist*, sig. A4v.

76 Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist*, pp. 68–71, 86–9, 193.

77 Adrian Chastain Weimer, *Martyrs’ Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England* (New York, 2011), pp. 73–4.

78 Baxter later called Crisp the “most eminent Ring-leader whose books took wonderfully with ignorant Professors.” Baxter, *A Treatise of Justifying Righteousness* (London, 1676), 1:21.

79 The antinomian crisis, as Baxter saw it, gave his life-work symmetry. Mendle, *Putney Debates of 1647*, pp. 250–1. See also Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter, and the Formation of Nonconformity*, pp. 74–82; and Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth Century England*, pp. 87–191.

80 Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae: or, Mr. Richard Baxter’s Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times* (London, 1696), 1:111. Baxter’s claim was, of course, overblown, but it is noteworthy that Crisp’s sermons were not reprinted from 1649–89.

antinomism was a poison within English divinity, presumably because it had the potential upend his life's work on piety. He blamed its popularity on the "darkness" of many preachers "in the Mysteries of the Gospel," and especially in the "common neglect of studying and preaching Grace, and Gratitude, and Love."⁸¹

Long before, John Saltmarsh had ridiculed Baxter for his views on grace on the charge that it failed to separate free grace from works.⁸² Just prior to his death in 1691, Baxter launched a campaign against antinomianism that reignited the pamphlet wars.⁸³ Keeble states that Baxter's attack on antinomism was at odds with Baxter's conciliatory efforts and reputation as an "irenical Reconciler," which suggests how much Baxter hated the doctrine, and its tendency to belittle the law, and, in his mind, Christian conduct.⁸⁴

Notable among the later attacks are John Flavel's *ΠΑΝΗΛΟΓΙΑ* (1691), which equated antinomism with the doctrine of justification from eternity, but which also saw some good in Crisp's preaching, and believed its differences were merely formal;⁸⁵ John Edwards's *Crispianism Unmask'ed* (1693), aimed at dismantling Crisp's "pernicious doctrines"; and Daniel Williams's *Gospel Truth* (1693), which sought to prove the unorthodoxy of Crisp's teachings by comparing them with Westminster.⁸⁶ In 1692, Robert Traill published a letter on

81 Alison Searle, "Writing Authority in the Interregnum: The Pastoral Letters of Richard Baxter," in *Debating the Faith: Religion and Letter Writing in Great Britain, 1550–1800*, ed. Anne Dunan-Page and Clotilde Prunier (Dordrecht, 2013), p. 51; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, 1:111.

82 John Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace: Or, the Flowings of Christs Blood freely to Sinners* (London, 1646); William M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (London, 1979), p. 308.

83 R. K. Webb, "The Emergence of Radical Dissent," in *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), pp. 25–6.

84 Keeble, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition," p. 295.

85 See John Flavel, *ΠΑΝΗΛΟΓΙΑ: A Succinct and Seasonable Discourse of the Occasions, Causes, Nature, Rise, Growth, and Remedies of Mental Errors* (London, 1691), sig. A4r, pp. 307–408; Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), p. 222. The signatories to Flavel's book, who also signed the "certificate" to authenticate Crisp's unpublished sermons in the 1690 edition of *Christ Alone Exalted*, state that, "A Spirit of meekness and love, will do more to our Common Peace, than all the Disputations in the World." Further, they see Flavel's handing of the doctrine so articulated to "not on the one hand to injure the memory of the Dead; and on the other, to prevent hurt or danger to the Living."

86 See Daniel Williams, *Gospel Truth Stated and Vindicated. Wherein Some of Dr. Crisp's Opinions are Considered, and the Opposite Truths are Plainly Stated and Confirmed,*

the subject, and circulated it throughout the vicinity of London; and though it contained a tempered criticism of Crisp, Traill actually, in a sense, vindicated him by affirming that there were many good things in his sermons.⁸⁷

The antinomian crisis, which embroiled Crisp posthumously, produced a treasure trove of response on both sides of the question. So fierce was the “heat” over “Crispianism” that it caught John Locke’s attention in the winter of 1694–5, prompting him to a deeper inquiry into the doctrine of justification, though he was attracted more to the “noise” surrounding it than the actual doctrine itself.⁸⁸ The issue at hand was who could claim to have the correct and unadulterated Protestant doctrine of justification.⁸⁹ While Crisp was associated with other antinomian “radicals,” including Eaton, Saltmarsh, Denne,

3rd ed. (London, 1698), sig. A2r–3v. Williams enlisted his own attestation to authenticate the “truths and errors” handled in the book, and prove that “the *Presbyterian Ministers* . . . Espouse not the *Antinomian Dottages* . . .” Notable among the forty-eight signatories are William Bates, John Howe, Vincent Alsop, John Showers, Thomas Kentish, Samuel Slater, George Hammond, Richard Bures, Daniel Burgess, and Edmund Calamy.

- 87 See Robert Traill, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification, and of its Preachers and Professors from the Unjust Charge of Antinomianism* (London, 1692), pp. 1, 10, 16–7. Traill credits the rise of antinomism not to Crisp’s sermons, but to the ragings of Arminianism in the 1630s. While he distances himself from Crisp (“Let not Dr. Crisp’s Book be looked upon as the Standard of our Doctrine”), he confesses, “there are many good things in it; and many expressions in it that we generally dislike.” Charles Pastoor and Galen K. Johnson mistakenly cite Traill’s work as a posthumous publication, and see it as an attack on Crisp’s theology. See Pastoor and Johnson, *Historical Dictionary of the Puritans* (Lanham, 2007), p. 321.
- 88 John Locke, *Vindications of the Reasonableness of Christianity* (New York, 2012), p. 34. See also Victor Nuovo, ed., *John Locke and Christianity. Contemporary Responses to The Reasonableness of Christianity* (Bristol, 1997), pp. xviii–xix, 111–48; Nuovo, “Locke’s Proof of the Divine Authority of Scripture,” in *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies*, ed. Ruth Savage (New York, 2012), p. 70; Nuovo, “Locke’s Theology, 1694–1704,” in *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke*, ed. M. A. Stewart (New York, 2000), pp. 195–6; Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment*, pp. 32–3; Patrick Muller, *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-Century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith* (New York, 2007), pp. 67–8.
- 89 Indeed, Rutherford exerted great effort to confute Eaton’s claim that he was merely reviving Luther’s teachings. Whoever could present a better case for claiming Luther could show that they stood “in line of true Protestantism.” John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 132–40; Carl R. Trueman and Carrie Euler, “The Reception of Martin Luther in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England,” in *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, ed. Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson (New York, 2010), p. 76. While antinomians favored Luther and his Galatians commentary, Calvin was a close second. See G. A. van

Traske, Randall, and Gerrard Winstanley, Crisp more effectively “sought to establish the doctrine of free grace on a respectable intellectual basis,” and garnered more “mainstream” support than others had done.⁹⁰

Thus, during the era of English revolution, the *ordo salutis* became a point of contention among Puritans, especially as they sought to define with greater clarity the subjective experience of salvation, the role of faith in justification, the implications of grace and election for assurance, and the acceptable boundaries of expressing one’s beliefs. In short, while the substance of orthodoxy was generally uncontested, at least for those who subscribed to some form of Reformed confessionality, the language of orthodoxy often was, and this seems to have been the crux of the debate over Crisp.⁹¹

While Crisp had his critics, so he had his defenders. Those who came to his defense in some measure were William Twisse, Isaac Chauncey, Increase Mather, Thomas Beverley, John Howe, and others, thus illustrating the theological diversity of English Reformed thought, though few had actually endorsed the whole of Crisp’s teachings, finding at least some fault with the way certain doctrines or ideas were expressed.⁹²

The prolific millenarian Thomas Beverley defended the republication of Crisp’s sermons, stating that “as the Preaching of these Sermons was before a notable Breaking out of Gospel Light . . . So I cannot but hope, The Reprinting of these Sermons is order’d by Providence, as a Fore-Running of a much

den Brink, “Calvin, Witsius (1636–1708), and the English Antinomians,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011), 231–2.

90 McDowell, “The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism,” p. 43. Though there was a definite “radical godly community,” it is less certain to what degree each thinker relied on the other. Further, no antinomian believed that they were espousing heresy or heterodoxy; they felt that the “legall preachers” were introducing a new strain of works righteousness into English divinity, and believed themselves to be operating within the bounds allotted by Westminster. See sig. A3r in the posthumous and incomplete Robert Lancaster, *Vindiciae Evangelii: Or, A Vindication of the Gospel with the Establishment of the Law* (London, 1694).

91 See Flavel, *IIAANHAOTIA*, sig. A6, where the signatories write that between Crisp and his critics “there are much more material things, wherein they cannot but agree, and would have come much nearer to each other, even in these things, if they did take some words or terms which come into use on the one or the other hand, in the same sense.”

92 Crisp’s foremost defender, other than his son, was probably Isaac Chauncy, who believed that Crisp had falsely been charged with antinomism, the real threat to English religion being a legalizing strain, which he dubbed “neonomism.” See Chauncy, *Neonomianism Unmask’d: Or, the Ancient Gospel Pleaded Against the Other, Called a New Law or Gospel* (London, 1692).

Clearer opening of that Kingdom of Redemption.”⁹³ Beverley supported Crisp’s notions of righteousness by grace alone, and sought to defend them against Baxter and Williams, arguing that Crisp “had simply concentrated his expositions on the doctrines of election and imputed righteousness through Christ.”⁹⁴

In spite of early criticisms, Samuel Crisp sought to finally settle the controversy over his father’s reputation by collecting and publishing an enlarged edition of *Christ Alone Exalted* in 1690, which included new sermons on the usefulness of the law, and brought to the fore internal tensions and rifts between Congregationalists and Presbyterians.⁹⁵ We will now turn to this edition, and then consider Crisp’s theology, specifically as it relates to orthodox Reformed doctrine.

5.3.1 *Christ Alone Exalted: Being the Compleat Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D. Containing XLII Sermons on Several Select Texts of Scriptures (1690)*

This enlarged 1690-edition includes Crisp’s previously printed sermons from 1643–46, which number forty-two, and adds ten more, eight of which had never before been printed, being collected from private manuscripts.⁹⁶ The text contains 726 pages, an undated portrait of Crisp, prefatory inscription by twelve divines that attest to the authenticity of the newly transcribed sermons,⁹⁷ a new preface by Samuel Crisp, dated October 28, 1689, and a table of the

93 Thomas Beverley, *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp’s Sermons and Mr. Baxter’s Dissatisfaction in Them* (1690), p. 11. See also Warren Johnston, *The Apocalypse in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2011), p. 97.

94 Warren Johnston, “Beverly, Thomas (d. 1702),” *ODNB*.

95 Nuovo, “Crisp, Tobias”; David Steers, “Arminianism among Protestant Dissenters in England and Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,” in *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60–1609)*, ed. Th. Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma (Leiden, 2009), p. 166.

96 Crisp’s son, Samuel, responsible for organizing this new edition, states that William Marshall, an “undertaker” and bookseller in London, had urged for its production. The Marshall bookshop, then located at the Bible in Grace-Church Street, had a longstanding and thriving Puritan book trade. See Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, sig. A3v; Frederick Joseph Harvey Darton, *Children’s Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life* (Cambridge, Eng., 1932), p. 70; Toon, *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity*, p. 49; cf. *Elizabethan Non-Conformist Texts, Volume 3: The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587–1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson (New York, 2003), p. 60.

97 The twelve were George Griffith, George Cokayn, Isaac Chauncy, John Howe, Vincent Alsop, Nathaniel Mather, Increase Mather, Hanserd Knollys, Thomas Powell, John Turner, Richard Bures, and John Gammon. Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A2r.

contents. The edition was later corrected, annotated, and published by John Gill in a “definitive” two-volume edition (1755; repr. 1791).⁹⁸

There was some controversy surrounding the authenticators, as critics alleged that they were unwittingly endorsing the totality of Crisp’s theology, and so had guilt by association, whereas in their minds they were only attesting that the sermons were, in fact, in Crisp’s own hand, and should therefore be received as genuine artifacts of his thought.⁹⁹ While the twelve divines could also allow for Crisp’s status as generally orthodox, many were careful to distance themselves from wholesale approval of its contents.¹⁰⁰ Whatever

98 Gill adds a short memoir, and states that his motive for the new edition was “the relief of distressed minds and consciences burdened with a sense of sin”; and, more generally to vindicate Crisp’s doctrine from allegations of unorthodoxy. See Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 2 vols. (1755), 1:iii. See also, Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” pp. 171–90.

99 For instance, in 1690, after Baxter’s public censure of Crisp’s doctrine at Pinners’ Hall on January 28, John Howe published *Some Considerations of a Certificate Prefixed to Doctor Crisp’s Work* (London, 1690), and clarified that some had subscribed to the work “never having perused the Works of Dr. Crisp,” the attestation being “only needful to think them *his*, not to think them *perfect*.” He states that, “We may in some respect Judge of Books, as of Men, i.e. reckon that tho divers very valuable men have had remarkable failings, yet that upon the whole ’tis better they have liv’d and been known in the World, than that they should not have liv’d, or have lived obscure.” Howe further criticized Baxter, stating that, “It can hardly be supposed that if Dr. Crisp were now living, he would silence him from preaching. Then why from Printing?” In the end, for Howe, “there are many things said in them, with that good favour, quickness and spirit, as to be very apt to make good impressions upon mens hearts. And do judge that being greatly affected with the grace of God to sinners himself, his Sermons did thereupon run much in that strain.”

100 See Flavel, *IIAANHAOΓIA*, sig. A3r–5v; cf. John Fesko, *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology, 1517–1700* (Göttingen, 2012), pp. 342–3, where Fesko states that “a number of . . . ministers . . . endorsed the republication” of Crisp’s sermons. However, for most, they were merely attesting to the fact that the previously unpublished manuscripts were, in fact, in Crisp’s handwriting and faithfully transcribed, and had no intent to endorse the contents without reserve: “Whereas some of us who subscribed a Paper, the design whereof was only to testify, That we believed certain Writings of the Doctor’s never before Published, were faithfully transcribed by his Son, the Publisher of them; which Paper is now, by the Bookseller, prefixed to the whole Volume, containing a large preface, which we never saw till after the publication, together with all the Doctor’s former Works that were published many years before; And are hereupon, by some weak People, misunderstood, as if by that Certificate, we intended an Approbation of all that is contained in that Volume. We declare, we had no such intention.”

Cooper suggests that given the limited statement that the signatories signed to their signatures were never intended to be an endorsement of Crisp’s theology. That Baxter did

their intent, the signatures were often interpreted to be a full endorsement of the book, born, perhaps, by its strategic placement before all other prefatory material, even though the wording of the subscription itself is clear and uncontroversial.¹⁰¹

Samuel Crisp had wanted to exonerate his father's image, and to show that those who criticized him were, in the end, fussing over trivial matters since his father's sermons were preached during the English Revolution, with "Death hanging immediately over the heads of all," and that he agreed with the greater consensus of the standard divines. His motive in republishing the sermons was to provide a corrective to the "new Gospel," or "*Grotian Divinity*," that reintroduced works into salvation, and claim that "our Good works concur to our Justification . . ." ¹⁰² Indeed, Samuel's defense rests on various appeals to such authorities as Perkins, Thomas Manton, Thomas Jacomb, and "the Testimony of many Eminent Divines," who all agreed that there was no mixture of human

see them as such, however, raises questions as to Samuel Crisp's motives in publishing them. Indeed, the biographer of John Howe states that they were used against their intent to fully endorse the book's contents. See Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, p. 171; Henry Rogers, *The Life and Character of John Howe, With an Analysis of His Writings* (London, 1836), pp. 390–7.

101 Rogers claimed that it was a publisher's "trick" that unwittingly led to a division in the "Happy Union" of 1691: "Now that it was a *trick*, I am led to believe for the following reasons. First, what imaginable reason could the publisher have for supposing that the world would, without the shadow of a cause, doubt his affirmation as to the genuineness of the sermons in question, or suspect that he had foisted on the public, as Dr. Crisp's productions, what were not his? Was there any thing incredible in the representation that his father *had* left some mss. behind him? Or, when mss. are published under some circumstances, it is customary to seek attestations to their genuineness before the world has already hinted some suspicion of fraud? Does an honest man think it worth while to *anticipate* slander, or to declare himself innocent before any one has breathed a suspicion of his guilt? These reasons, if there were no others, would be sufficient to show that the younger Crisp's *pretended* motives could not have been the *real* ones. But secondly, could the works of Dr. Crisp—inimitably absurd in sentiment, vulgar in conception, and ridiculous in style, as they are—need any other attestation to their genuineness than their own intrinsic folly? Would they not infallibly authenticate themselves all the world over? . . . Dr. Crisp had a patent for nonsense and folly, which defied successful imitation. Upon the supposition that this eager solicitation of signatures was, as I firmly believe, a mere trick, it must be confessed that it was a trick exactly suited to the meridian of Antinomianism." Rogers, *The Life and Character of John Howe*, pp. 392–3.

102 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A3v.

righteousness with that of Christ's in the justifying of the sinner.¹⁰³ Samuel recounts his reasons for publishing the new edition:

... the republishing these Discourses may comfort and settle many Souls. Whereupon I gladly accepted the Bookseller's Motion, to assist in reprinting them; provided he would add to them several other *Sermons* that have not been yet Printed, which I would Transcribe out of my Father's own Notes: which I desired him to do on two accounts. *First*, To set forth more of the glorious Free Grace of God, in what is added. And, *Secondly*, To remove some Reflexions cast on my Father's Discourses; as if his advancing Free Grace, tended to suppress Good Works, which was far from his, as it is also is from every good Christian's thoughts. For who but a Divil, or his Children will say, *Let us sun that Grace may abound*, or because a good blessed Prince hath with the hazard of his Life rescued us from slavery, therefore we will spit in his Face. Therefore to shew that my Father was not of that Spirit, I have transcribed from his Notes . . .¹⁰⁴

Samuel attests that the new sermons are the "genuine offspring" of his father's pen, consisting of "his own hand-writing," and agree with his other sermons; moreover, he doubts not that they are his father's, as he does not doubt "that once there was a Queen *Elizabeth* in *England*."¹⁰⁵ Further, while "some Persons of great Learning" had put many "hard Censures" on his father's work, he wished that "they had better learned Christ," and then they would have been more sympathetic to the "Honour ascribed to him by my Father." Those who criticized the senior Crisp may have had learning, but if "Learning must take the upper-hand of Divinity, then *Antichristian*, *Socinian*, *Pelagian*, *Arminian* Doctrines would have justled out Christianity long since; for who more Scholastically Learned than *Antichrist's* Doctors, and yet who greater Dunces, like *Nicodemus*, in Christ's School, where we are to account all our own Righteousness, much less our Learning, Dung, for the Excellency of the Knowledge of *Jesus Christ*."¹⁰⁶

Samuel Crisp claimed to have 5,200 discourses from such orthodox divines as Thomas Goodwin, John Owen, and John Wilkinson that confirmed his father's teachings, but could hardly "reckon fix of the 5200. that do Oppose

103 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A8r.

104 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A3v.

105 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A3r.

106 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A4v.

the Doctrines my Father Asserted.”¹⁰⁷ He includes extracts of two sermons preached at Pinders Hall, one by Christopher Fowler, and the other by Thomas Cole, who both attest to Christ’s righteousness as the “material cause” for justification.¹⁰⁸ He further cites Edward Reynolds, and alleges that the bishop’s work “confirms the Tenour of my Father’s Discourses, *That the Sins of the Elect do not hinder the Operation of God’s Grace*,” and lays claim to Cole, Pemble, Wilson, Gouge, Powell, Sutton, Cooper, Ussher, Perkins, Jenkins, and Manton.¹⁰⁹

This strategy of enlisting orthodox authorities also appears in *Christ Made Sin* (1691), where Samuel enlists the reputations of Chamier, Perkins, Polanus, Twisse, Reynolds, Manton, and others, to support the freeness of justification.¹¹⁰ Such appeals to “mainline” authorities confirm the strong desire of antinomians to be associated with the orthodox tradition, as well as a very real thread of antinomism within their writings, especially in their discussions of the doctrine of justification.¹¹¹ While antinomians were not systematic theologians, and did not produce a system or manual of divinity like their precisianist counterparts, they did seek to establish a *sensus unitatis* with the greater Reformed tradition, even though they did not seek to prove that such authorities as Luther, Calvin, Perkins, Goodwin, or Owen, systematically agreed with them on every contested point. They sought to show that their doctrines and emphases were compatible with the tradition, and could be substantiated from orthodox writings,¹¹² much, perhaps, in the same way that Augustine had been used during the Reformation, when credibility was synonymous with continuity.¹¹³ The antinomian desire for legitimacy warrants a revision of their standing

107 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A4v.

108 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A4v–8r.

109 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), sig. A10v–cv.

110 Samuel Crisp, *Christ Made Sin: 2 Cor. 5:21 Evinced from Scripture, Upon Occasion of an Exception Taken at Pinders-hall, 28 January 1689, at Reprinting the Sermons of Dr. Tobias Crisp* (London, 1691), sig. B2.

111 Thus Robert Traill’s vindication of the doctrine against charges of antinomism.

112 This was truer of the earlier Luther than Calvin. While Calvin was cited as an authority, Luther was more so. Van den Brink, “Calvin, Witsius (1636–1708), and the English Antinomians.” See also Richard A. Muller, “Reception and Response: Referencing and Understanding Calvin in Seventeenth-Century Calvinism,” in *Calvin and His Influence, 1509–2009*, ed. Irena Backus and Philip Benedict (New York, 2011), pp. 182–201; and Muller, “The ‘Reception of Calvin’ in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91:1–2 (2011), 255–74, esp. 273–4.

113 Here see Arnoud S. Q. Visser’s excellent *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500–1620* (New York, 2011), which shows how Augustine was variously portrayed as Lutheran, Catholic, and Calvinist.

within the tradition, regardless of the precisianist cause célèbre to discredit, disparage, and disinherit them.¹¹⁴

Among the hitherto unpublished corpus are the sermons, “Free-Grace the Teacher of Good Works” (Sermons 3–6), and, “The Use of the Law” (Sermon 9), both of which contest accusations of antinomism, as they affirm the Christian’s duty for godly living, and maintain the positive use of the law. They question the typical “mainline” allegations that antinomians reject the law in its entirety, and did not see it as a moral guide. It is surprising that these sermons were not transcribed and published in the 1640s, during the heat of the first crisis, as they evince greater continuity on the nature of the law. Regardless, Lancaster wrote that Crisp was a “modest man” who “did he never in his Sermons, maintain any professed opposition to any one, much less to all Protestant Learned men.” Further, Lancaster sought to prove that “there is no matter of moment in all his Sermons, which the best, and most Orthodox Protestant Divines that are extant, have not asserted before, for which the odious imputation of *Antinomianism* was never cast upon them.”¹¹⁵

Finally, with the republication of the Gill edition in the eighteenth century, the debate continued over theologically high Calvinism, often associated with antinomism, and more moderate Calvinism, at times closer to Arminianism, with the diving issue being to what extent human beings are actively involved in salvation, and whether the gospel should be preached to all indiscriminately, or only to those showing signs of election.¹¹⁶ High Calvinists denied any appearance of human cooperation, whereas Arminians openly advocated some degree of human activity.¹¹⁷

114 See, for instance, Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England*. While I agree with Bozeman that the antinomism of John Eaton is contra “orthodox” Puritanism, I do not believe that the antinomian strain is inherently “contra- and post-Puritan.” Bozeman does not take fully into account the subjective belief of antinomians that they were merely replicating the theologies of the “common consent of the Learned Orthodox Writers.” Moreover, it is possible to see Eaton as a “Puritan,” though not “mainstream.” See Bozeman, “John Eaton as Contra-Puritan,” 653–4; John Eaton, *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (London, 1642), sig. B4; Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, 3 vols. (London, 1813), 2:466.

115 Lancaster, *Vindiciae Evangelii*, p. 43.

116 John Coffey states that Crisp was also popular among Wesleyan Methodists. Coffey, “Puritan Legacies,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), p. 334.

117 Sell, *Philosophy, Dissent, and Nonconformity*, pp. 19–20.

5.4 Crisp's Theology in Historical Context

There is no exhaustive study of Crisp's theology within current literature.¹¹⁸ This lacuna arises from the fact that Crisp never wrote a *medulla* or *corpus theologiae*, or even with a view to publish. Thus, his theology has to be discerned from his published sermons, most of which illustrate a Puritan pastor who believed in the importance of doctrine and its implication for Puritan practice. Indeed, Crisp shows an intimate awareness and pastoral sensitivity to such standard doctrines as the covenant of grace, predestination, justification, regeneration, sanctification, and assurance. While he uses more "radical" language to convey many of these ideas, most likely arising from his own religious experience,¹¹⁹ he nonetheless stood in the line of high Calvinism that went before him.

Crisp's sermonic collection *Christ Alone Exalted* was not intended to elucidate a highly scholastic theology, or systematically discuss the doctrines of the Reformation, but to confute human involvement in the process of salvation. As such, he emphasized a highly passive reception of grace and justification. What infuriated Crisp's critics most, however, was his seeming careless words about the forgiveness of God, as when he said, "There is not one sin you commit, after you receive Christ, that God can charge upon your person."¹²⁰ This type of unrestrained language was believed to encourage wickedness, and jeopardize the moral imperative, even though Crisp continually denied these allegations, and had achieved a rigorous piety.¹²¹

Crisp did not deny the obligations of "the godly" to actually be godly. He fully believed that free grace was the teacher of good works, and sought to paint the beauty of holiness and the *via activa* in the minds of his hearers.¹²² Believers, he taught, are commanded to live moral lives, and

118 Studies of Crisp's theology can be found in G. A. van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme: Met tekst en vertaling van de Animadversiones Irenicae* (Apeldoorn, 2008), pp. 23–4, 66–86; David Parnham, "The Humbling of 'High Presumption,'" 50–74; Parnham, "The Covenantal Quietism of Tobias Crisp," *Church History* 75 (2006), 51–43; Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, pp. 143–5, 157–9, 172–3; and Hill, *Collected Essays*, 3:142–61.

119 Howe, *Some Considerations of a Certificate Prefixed to Dr. Crisp's Works*, pp. 1–2. On antinomian language, see McDowell, "The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism," pp. 1–30.

120 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:7–8, 11, 16, 429–30, 437–40.

121 Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment*, p. 32, n. 29.

122 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:68–9, 76–7, 123. Cited in McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, p. 62.

conduct themselves as citizens of heaven; but this godly activity did not determine whether one was saved, or even if they remain saved. For Crisp, works merit nothing; they are neither the cause, nor the continuance of justification.¹²³

Because of Crisp's emphasis on the *praxis pietatis*, and his own godly reputation, charges of antinomism seem dubious, an "odious label," possibly resulting from backlash for breaking custom and convention, the result of "religious demonization" and "heresy-making."¹²⁴ While it is tempting to dismiss the term altogether, there were ways in which antinomians emphasized their doctrines from the pulpit and in their writings that were distinct from the Reformed mainstay; as often as they were "provocative," they were scathing of "legal teachers," but, in the case of Crisp, as we will see, in spite of accusations, and could be taken to be orthodox.¹²⁵

We will now move onto Crisp's understanding of: (1) Doctrine of God and Humanity; (2) Predestination and Assurance; (3) Covenant of Works and Grace; (4) Justification and Sanctification; (5) Law and Gospel; and (6) Christian Life and Piety. By looking at Crisp's thought, and its overall tenor, we will better be enabled to assess questions of *unitas* in Chapter 7.

5.4.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

While Crisp does not formally articulate a doctrine of God as Downname does, perhaps surprising given that he was better educated, this absence does reveal his preference for pastoral issues. He does, however, evince the basic Thomist metaphysics that underlie Reformed orthodox opinion at the time, including a strong adherence to the Trinity, divine eternity, omnipotence, foreknowledge, decrees, predestination, and high distinctions between Creator and creature.¹²⁶ Again, belief in the Trinity, especially as outlined in

123 In stressing this point, Crisp insulted "mainline" sensitivity to Catholic charges that Protestants were antinomians in theological dress. Fears of unguarded pulpit-language were fostered by the "excesses of the extreme Calvinism prominent among Dutch Contra-Remonstrants . . . such as Rippertus Sixtus, who taught that a faithful man could commit murder and adultery yet God could not dam him for it." Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–40* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995), p. 419.

124 Robert J. McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan's Holy War* (Göttingen, 2011), p. 62; Nuovo, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment*, p. 32, n. 29; Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith*, p. 193.

125 McDowell, "The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism," p. 43.

126 Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York, 2012), pp. 115, 358, n. 128, 391, n. 174. For the Reformed doctrine of God, see Robert Letham, "John Owen's Doctrine of the Trinity in Its Catholic Context," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology*, ed. Kelley M. Kapic and Mark Jones

Augustine's *De Trinitate*, is a point of *unitas* among orthodox divines in the seventeenth century, seen, among other things, in their unequivocal acceptance

(Aldershot, 2012), pp. 187–97; and Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, pp. 35–66.

There is some scholarly debate as to the identification of Reformed thought as holding to a basically “Thomist” metaphysic. The opposing school identifies Reformed thought as essentially or increasingly “Scotist,” and is seen in J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as Against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 29–33, 497–526; Antonie Vos, “Scholasticism and Reformation,” in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids, 2001), pp. 99–119; Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh, 2006), p. 7; Vos and F. Dekker, “Modalities in Francis Turretin: An Essay in Reformed Ontology,” in *Scholasticism Reformed. Festschrift Willem van Asselt*, ed. Marcel Sarol, et al. (Leiden, 2010), pp. 74–92; and Andreas Beck, “Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): Basic Features of His Doctrine of God,” in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, pp. 205–26. While Bac correctly sees Scotism in William Twisse, and even classifies Twisse as essentially “Scotist” because of his emphasis on divine agency, he does not give adequate consideration to the influence of Thomism on other Reformed thinkers of the seventeenth century, especially on John Owen, or in certain Reformed categories that seem to have Thomist origins. Vos correctly notes that “Aristotelianism” and “Thomism,” in the early modern centuries should not be confused with the *historical* Aristotle, and that “the seventeenth-century Utrecht *Aquinas* is Reformed,” but the same caution should be asserted towards classifications of Scotus. Perhaps early modern Reformed thought is best seen as an eclectic use of medieval strains, both Thomist and Scotist, which were appropriated and used much in the same way that Augustine was. This is in line with Sebastian Rehnman's sympathetic assessment of Vos's work but which also concedes to the strongly Thomistic nature of Owen's thought, for instance, by classifying Owen as holding to a “Scotistically modified Thomism.” See Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation*, pp. 94–114; Sebastian Rehnman, *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids, 2002), pp. 62–4, 181; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 58; and Christopher Cleveland, *Thomism in John Owen* (Aldershot, 2013); Richard A. Muller, “The ‘Reception of Calvin’ in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011), 258–60.

Simon J. G. Burton has argued for Scotist strains in Baxter's metaphysics of the Trinity in his *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's “Methodus Theologiae”* (Leiden, 2012), and Rehnman has aptly observed that Baxter listed Aquinas among his favorite authors, even before Scotus (Rehnman, *Divine Discourse*, p. 32). This further evidences the widespread use of both Scotus and Thomas among the Reformed. See Leonard Bacon, ed., *Select Practical Writings of Richard Baxter* (New Haven, 1831), 1:26; John K. Ryan, *The Reputation of St. Thomas Aquinas among English Protestant Thinkers of the Seventeenth Century* (Washington, D.C., 1948); Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen, “Scotus and the Scotist School: The Tradition of Scotist Thought in the Medieval and Early Modern Period,” in *John Duns Scotus, 1265/6–1308: Renewal of Philosophy*, ed. E. P. Bos (Amsterdam,

of God as love.¹²⁷ Though Crisp does not provide an elaborate discussion of the order of the divine decrees, as Twisse does, he nonetheless seems to confuse primary and secondary causes. In fact, Williams criticizes Crisp on this point, “The Doctor mistakes the Nature of God’s Decree, because a Decree ascertains a thing shall in time be, therefore he thinks it gives a thing a present subjective Being.”¹²⁸ For Crisp, the paradox is that while God, from all eternity, looks on his people with love, he, at the same time, comprehends their sins which alienate them from him; yet, because God sees Christ’s satisfaction at the same time that he sees their sins, there is never a moment when the elect are at enmity with him. This is not because God sees no sin, but because at the same eternal moment God comprehends both sin and satisfaction.¹²⁹ Crisp’s *unitas* with the orthodox is seen in that they agree that (a) God has eternally decreed that certain persons elected by him shall be justified and adopted; (b) that these elect are the objects of God’s love of good-will, even while they are sinners; (c) God continues his gracious purpose to do them good in his appointed time; (d) Christ has made full satisfaction for sin and merited eternal life for the elect; (e) that there is a significant difference between the elect sinner and others as to what they shall be in time.¹³⁰ Their differences have to do with how God sees the elect prior to their exercise of faith, and whether they are children of wrath.¹³¹ Crisp further harmonizes on the nature of the fall into

1996), pp. 197–210. See also Henry G. van Leeuwen, *The Problem of Certainty in English Thought, 1630–90*, 2nd ed. (Hague, 1970).

On the question of Scotus and Calvin, see Richard A. Muller, “Scholasticism in Calvin: A Question of Relation and Disjunction,” in *Calvinus Sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion*, ed. Wilhelm Neuser and Brian Armstrong (Kirkville, 1997), pp. 247–65; and Heiko A. Oberman, *Initia Calvini: The Matrix of Calvin’s Reformation* (Amsterdam, 1991), pp. 10–19.

127 See, for instance, Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 47. For decline of the Trinity, see Philip Dixon, *Nice and Hot Disputes: The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 2003). See also William Placher, *The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking about God Went Wrong* (Louisville, 1996). While Placher correctly sees the emergence of modernity and Enlightenment rationality as eclipsing classical Christian theism in the seventeenth century, he incorrectly sees the doctrine of Scripture as eclipsing the Trinity within Puritanism.

128 Williams, *Gospel Truth*, pp. 6–7; Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 69–70.

129 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:325–7.

130 Williams, *Gospel Truth*, p. 3. See Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 69–71.

131 Williams, *Gospel Truth*, pp. 4–7; Rutherford, *Spirituell Antichrist*, 2:208–9. See Boersma, *Hot Pepper Corn*, pp. 80–7, 114–8.

sin, and its ramifications for posterity. He nowhere suggests that Christians are without sin.¹³²

Criticisms of Crisp's doctrine of God centered on his understanding of the divine decrees, and how they were executed in time. Many Puritans saw this as an important distinction because it had implications for how they should preach the gospel, and minister to those undergoing a crisis of assurance.¹³³

5.4.2 *Predestination and Assurance*

Though Crisp never uses the word “predestination,” he nonetheless refers to it in substance: “You know well, in respect of men, who are the elect, they are from all eternity in the purpose of God . . . he had them in his thoughts, as the objects of his love, from eternity.”¹³⁴ For Crisp, the sins of the elect were laid on Christ in eternity, as to promise or covenant, but in time, when Christ was on the cross, as to execution; the whole history of redemption was planned from eternity, but enacted in time.¹³⁵ When sinners, in time, “make application of this, that our iniquities are laid upon Christ; this application of ours, gives not any being at all unto the thing”; thus, one's faith is no more than an assent to an eternal reality.¹³⁶ Further, while God “was free in himself how to dispose of the sins of men,” he chose to impute human iniquity to Christ, through counsel “secret within his own breast.”¹³⁷ God could have forgiven sin through other means, but for reasons known only to him, he decided that Christ should die and redeem the elect.¹³⁸

Crisp avoids the pretension that faith might be a condition of justification, but does not go so far as to assume that believers are justified from eternity

132 Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 75–7.

133 In Rutherford's *Spiritual Antichrist*, where Crisp is cited more than twenty times, criticisms have to do with the doctrine of justification, the experience of faith, and the relation between law and gospel. See Rutherford, *Spiritual Antichrist*, 1:14, 105; 2:3, 17–19, 24, 27, 30, 39, 47, 49, 55, 63, 80, 87, 115, 158, 170–1, 174, 176, 220, 234.

134 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:396.

135 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:550–1, 553, 556.

136 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:552–3.

137 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:552.

138 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:552. God's ability to forgive sins without satisfaction to his justice was a common belief among high Calvinists, as seen, for instance, in Twisse and Rutherford, and reflects Scotistic rather than Thomistic interests, having precedents in Calvin and Vermigli. John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), pp. 130–1.

on the basis of predestination, but within time and on account of the cross.¹³⁹ Further, there is nothing within the creature that might move God to elect them. Crisp clarifies:

God, in his election, had no eye in the world unto any thing that the creature might do, which should have any prevalency with him to sway him this way, or that way; it was not the consideration of *Esau*, as one that would be resolute and peremptory in a way of sinfulness, that was a motive with God to reject him; nor was it the consideration of any propensity in the spirit of *Jacob* to yield unto calling, or of any inclination in *Jacob* to glorify him being called; I say, none of these considerations entered into the thoughts of God, when he established his love, even in election itself, upon *Jacob*; his thoughts were merely upon his own good pleasure within himself: as if he should see a whole heap of creatures together, and, as it were, (if I may so speak) blindfolded to any good the creature could have to move him; he picked out this, and that, and the other, without respect of any difference between them.¹⁴⁰

Since God loves the elect with an everlasting love, there is comfort for the believer when they ponder that God has received their person from eternity to eternity: “I have loved you freely, I will love you freely, I cannot alter: *Whom he loves, he loves unto the end*: it is in respect of his unchangeableness.”¹⁴¹ This undying love was foundational to Crisp’s understanding of assurance; being thus tied to God’s testimony of his love through his indwelling Spirit, Crisp’s doctrine is not dissimilar to Calvin or Perkins.¹⁴² Crisp believed that the

139 Cf. William Eyre, *Vindiciae Justificationis Gratuitae* (London, 1654). Eyre’s work, which sought to prove justification from eternity, was endorsed by Owen and is congruous with the theologies of John Eedes and John Crandon. See Michael Bryson, *The Tyranny of Heaven: Milton’s Rejection of God as King* (Cranbury, 2004), p. 188, n. 28; C. Fitzsimons Allison, *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (New York, 1966), pp. 171–2.

140 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:243; see also 1:360, 550.

141 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:20.

142 James Leo Garrett, *Baptist Theology: A Four-Century Study* (Macon, 2009), pp. 90–1; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, pp. 69–75; Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 79–82; Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, pp. 119–37. At times, Perkins speaks of faith as a persuasion of one’s own salvation; at other times he identifies this persuasion its fruit, and not to be identified with faith itself. He distinguishes between those have strong faith, and who are fully assured, from those with weak faith, who have been forgiven, but as yet do not believe. Letham believes that this tension within

solution to the assurance problem was to get believers to see their eternal status as God sees it, through Christ's merits and satisfaction.¹⁴³ To rely on "evidences" will only bring the doubting so far, and will, in the end, collapse, so long as "there is a defect of sincerity and singleness of heart . . ." ¹⁴⁴ Since there is so much imperfection mixed with one's actions, even in one's love for others, there can be no continuing comfort from them.¹⁴⁵

Crisp's emphasis on the Spirit's witness, and his assuring word, as distinct from marks and signs, is different from precisianism, but not wholly unrelated. Precisianists did not usually claim that believers could find peace by looking within; and while Crisp denied that marks could sufficiently add to assurance, he did not totally dismiss them; he criticized their ability to bring comfort that would last.¹⁴⁶ In fact, says Crisp, there is "not one in a thousand" who has actually attained assurance through the usual means, a claim also made by John Goodwin.¹⁴⁷ One then can only come to assurance by listening for the Spirit to speak "your sins are forgiven you."

This passive receiving of faith and assurance is similar to John Cotton's criticisms of the orthodox elders in New England. Cotton had argued against the sinking sand of "good qualifications" that formed the basis for religious assurance. Such qualifications as prayers, tears, humiliation, sorrows, reformation, and obedience, were on hollow ground, and could not provide lasting confidence in one's election. An assured faith ought be grounded in objective reality, namely, Christ's covenant and promise. The contested question was

Perkins suggests the internal struggles between two concepts of faith within Reformed theology: one that derives from Zwingli, Calvin, Bucer, and other continental Reformed theologians, who equate faith with assurance; and the other from Bullinger, Ursinus, and Gomarus, which separates faith from assurance, and promotes a subjective discernment of its effects within believers. Joel R. Beeke, *The Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York, 1991), pp. 49–50, 108; Robert Letham, "Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1979), 1:285.

143 See also Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, pp. 45–7. Cotton's belief that the graces of sanctification actually occur in Christ, and not in the believer, and consequently that Christ is the objective ground for any attainment of lasting assurance is similar to Crisp's own position.

144 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:114.

145 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:117–20.

146 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, p. 478–9. See also Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, pp. 195–6; Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, p. 269.

147 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:5, 82; John Goodwin, *Απολντρωσις Απολντρωσεας Or Redemption Redeemed* (London, 1651), pp. 108–9.

whether the object of one's assurance should be in the signs and marks, or in the giver of grace.¹⁴⁸

While Crisp pitched an alternative path than that espoused in Thomas Shepard's precisianist manifesto, *The Sincere Convert* (1640), both alike preached for true converts and genuine Christians, and not for "near converts," and "almost Christians," or those who only conformed to outward social convention.¹⁴⁹

While precisianist directive was targeted more against the prevailing assumption of salvation within the English Church, and especially outside congregations of "the godly," their rhetoric had a profound affect upon the lay conscience, evidenced in numerous private confessions and autobiographies of the period. Moreover, hagiographic memoirs of noted "saints," did not alleviate the problem because they often depicted overly high attainments in the godly life as a normative experience for the elect.¹⁵⁰

5.4.3 *Covenant of Works and Grace*

Crisp's contributions to covenant theology are his sermons on the covenant of grace, where he distinguishes between two general covenants that God enters into with humanity.¹⁵¹ The first covenant, the covenant of works, is called the "old covenant." and stood upon the terms, "Do this, and live." The second covenant that Crisp discusses is the covenant of free grace. Crisp equates Christ with the covenant of works, and though it is not a covenant of grace as the

148 See Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, p. 255.

149 Thomas Shepard, *The Sincere Convert, Discovering the Pavcity of True Beleevers and the Great Difficulty of Saving Conversion* (Cambridge, Mass., 1640).

150 The intent of writing and publishing such memoirs was, of course, to produce godly conduct and emulation in those still living. Joseph Alleine, for instance, was said to have spent many days in solitude for prayer and self-examination, and that he was never "spotted in the least degree with any unjust, or uncharitable Act." Theodosia Alleine, *The Life and Death of that Excellent Minister of Christ, Mr. Joseph Alleine* (s.l., 1671), p. 33.

151 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 74–92, 241–59, 501–47. See Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 85–6; Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, pp. 81–118. Perry Miller states that Crisp began "as an orthodox federalist, basing the Covenant of Grace between man and God upon an anterior Covenant of Redemption between Christ and the Father, but came to the same conclusion as Anne Hutchinson that the Covenant of Grace had nothing to do with moral behavior . . . therefore no ethical duty could be imposed upon, or any response expected, from mankind." Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 219. For overview of the covenant within Puritanism, see John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (1986; repr., Eugene, 2010), pp. 53–86, 155–91.

second covenant is, it may in some sense be called a covenant of grace in reference to creation.¹⁵² The covenant of works differs from the covenant of grace in that it was based on a stipulation with conditions on both sides: on God's part was the promise of life upon obedience, and upon man's part was obedience.¹⁵³ However, Adam broke this covenant, and so God was free from giving life; humanity thus lay under a curse for breaching covenant.¹⁵⁴ The covenant of grace differs from the covenant of works in that it has no conditions. Crisp states that since the covenant of grace is from eternity, it cannot be tied to conditionality, especially since God is the one who performs and fulfills the covenant through union with his elect.¹⁵⁵ Faith, then, is not a condition of the covenant, but merely the manifestation of being justified.¹⁵⁶

For Crisp, Christ can be identified with the covenant of grace in a three-fold sense: First, Christ is the covenant *fundamentally*, in the sense that he is the one who establishes or originates the covenant with the Father; here Crisp describes Christ as being the maker, undertaker, dispatcher, and author of the covenant who manages the whole affair. Second, Christ is the covenant *materially*, as he both represents God to the people, by becoming human, and the people to God, by being mystically united to them as their head. Third, Christ is the covenant *equivalently* in the sense that once the believer has the "earnest of salvation" (Christ himself), they have the whole covenant, even though there is progress in the Christian life. Trueman argues that this latter sense is problematic for those who dismiss Crisp as antinomian "*tout court*"; that is, if there is progress in the Christian life, then there is need for a more nuanced approach to understanding how time and eternity coalesce in the timing of justification; moreover, Crisp's notions of the covenant of grace would seem to parallel the Christological representations of Owen's own understanding of covenant theology.¹⁵⁷

Crisp emphasizes the absolute and unconditional nature of the covenant of grace in that all the benefits that Christ is or can be to the believer is a gift, which is given for no other reason than because the Father willed it. Thus, in

152 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, p. 79; Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, pp. 148–55.

153 Other theologically high Calvinists, such as John Bunyan, did not believe in the covenant of works. Roger Sharrock, ed., *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan: The Doctrine of the Law and Grace Unfolded and I Will Pray With the Spirit* (Oxford, 1976), p. xxv.

154 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, p. 80.

155 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 82–3.

156 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 84–7.

157 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 87–9; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 114.

administering the covenant, God requires nothing from humanity, and will not give Christ to those who do not take him freely; there is no vileness or sinfulness that can bar one from a portion in Christ.¹⁵⁸ Rutherford criticizes this latter point, asking:

But the question is, of Christs order of bringing us to believe and close with Christ; and the question is, whether a damned Pharisee on his high horse of merits and law-righteousness, an *undaunted Heifer*, a *Simon Magus*, a despiteful *Atheist*, *Elymas* a Witch never broken, nor convinced by the law, must in that distance to Christ and the Gospel, be charged to believe an everlasting love of election toward himselfe, and without more adoe, be led to the *Kings chamber of wine*, to the flowings of soule-redeeming blood; or must he first bee humbled, convinced of sinne, burdened with everlasting burning due to him, and so led to Christ.¹⁵⁹

The contested point, of course, is how a person comes to believe in Christ, regardless of when they were justified, and to what extent the law was useful for bringing a sinner to a sense of their own unworthiness, as a possible preparation for grace; this Crisp categorically rejects when he says, “there is nothing to be done by man as a preparation to his justification.”¹⁶⁰ Again, by emphasizing passivity in the covenant, Crisp fought against anything that could potentially be ascribed a meritorious role, even though, in substance, those who criticized him most would agree.

Crisp further differentiated between the covenant of works and the two covenants of grace (of the Jews and Christ). The covenant of grace with the Jews was administered by the priests, and is not to be equated with the covenant of grace under Christ, which is a better covenant with respect to remission of sins, peace of conscience, and freedom from punishment.¹⁶¹ Finally, the

¹⁵⁸ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 90–2.

¹⁵⁹ Rutherford, *Spiritual Antichrist*, 2:3; Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, p. 94.

¹⁶⁰ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:95.

¹⁶¹ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 241–59. See Edmund Calamy, *Two Solemn Covenants* (London, 1647), sig. A2–3, where Calamy notes the various opinions of divines on the number of covenants. Burroughs is said to have held to three covenants but believed in contrast to Crisp that there were two of works and one of grace. Covenant theology within Puritanism often had a highly dispensational structure in how covenants were understood, such as Samuel Mather’s numerous “dispensations,” in which God in the Old Testament reveals the covenant. Karen E. Rowe, *Saint and Singer: Edward Taylor’s Typology and the Poetics of Meditation* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986), pp. 17–23. Crisp’s particular formulation of one covenant of works and two covenants of grace, as stated here, seem to

covenant provides tremendous comfort for the elect since God is forever bound to be their God.¹⁶²

With John Saltmarsh, Robert Towne, John Traske, and other “high” Calvinists, Crisp emphasized the absolute and unconditional nature of the covenant of grace, as he sought to remove any sense of human activity from the covenant because he believed that it compromised its integrity. While Crisp repeatedly stressed that Christ was a free gift, given only to the elect by God’s pleasure, he did not intend it to remove the saint’s life of gratitude, but only to show that God alone was the architect of salvation.¹⁶³

Thus, a more nuanced understanding of Crisp’s teachings on the covenant show only a partial affinity to high Calvinism. There is no discussion of the order of divine decrees, no overt doctrine of justification from eternity, and no mention of a Trinitarian covenant. Crisp’s twofold understanding of the covenant of grace, and his equating of Christ with the covenant of works, seems to be unique. However, his emphasis on the unconditional nature of the

be unique. Another source on covenantal diversity within Puritanism is Samuel Bolton, *The True Bouds of Christian Freedome* (London, 1656), pp. 128–62. Bolton’s work is interesting because he printed his English translation of John Cameron’s *De Triplici Dei cum Homine Foedere Theses* (1608), with it, which Bolton says, “. . . is . . . the best resolver that I have met with all of those intricate Controversies, and Disputes concerning the Law” (sig. Aa). Cameron’s influence on Puritanism (e.g. John Preston, Nicholas Byfield, Obadiah Sedgwick), has been well noted, but does warrant further investigation. See Richard A. Muller, “Divine Covenants, Absolute and Conditional: John Cameron and the Early Orthodox Developments of Reformed Covenant Theology,” *Mid-America Journal of Theology* (2006), 49–53; and Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2007), pp. 218–9.

On covenant theology within Puritanism, see Perry Miller, “The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,” in *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 48–98; Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), pp. 365–462 (see his “Appendix B” which lists seventeenth-century works on the subject); David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract* (Chicago, 1985); Michael Walzer, *Revolution of the Saints* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965); Christopher Hill, “Covenant Theology and the Concept of ‘A Public Person,’” in *Powers, Possessions, and Freedom: Essays in Honor of C. B. Macpherson* (Toronto, 1979), pp. 3–21; William Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York, 1955), ch. 3; John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640–48* (Princeton, 1969); John von Rohr, “Covenant and Assurance in Early English Puritanism,” *Church History* 54 (1961), 195–203; and Von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*.

162 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 501–47.

163 On the question of whether to equate antinomism with the unconditional nature of the covenant, see McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, pp. 58–9.

covenant was consistent with the Reformed orthodox, and did not depart from its overall consensus.¹⁶⁴

5.4.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

The doctrine of justification and sanctification are significant within Crisp's theology because he was criticized for teaching justification from eternity, and for confusing justification with sanctification, ascribing the perfection of the former to the latter.¹⁶⁵ Flavel, for instance, protested “the Antinomian . . . makes our actual justification to be nothing else but the manifestation or declaration of our justification from eternity.”¹⁶⁶

Where these ideas originated from is difficult to discern. Como has stated that the doctrine of justification before faith had “cropped up repeatedly in the history of puritanism, and always apparently for very much the same reason—in order to eliminate any hint that faith itself might be seen as meriting or deserving salvation.”¹⁶⁷ He sees the doctrine in the early 1600s, with a publication by Thomas Wilson, a Kentish Puritan, but it is possible that it had roots even earlier. Regardless, he cites Ezekiel Culverwell's complaint in 1623 that, “I see some honestly minded, to imagine that a man may be a true member of Christ, and so be justified, before he thus actually believe, and thereby apprehend Christ”; and adds that the notion “appears to have spread with some speed and breath within the puritan community many years before the idea came to be associated with antinomianism proper.”¹⁶⁸ As an example, he refers to Robert Jenison, who in 1626 wrote to Samuel Ward for clarification of the teachings of Richard Rothwell, a Puritan who espoused that the elect were

164 McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize*, p. 59; Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford, 2002), pp. 103–15.

165 Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 71–3; Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, p. 145.

166 Flavel, *Planelogia*, p. 260; Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, pp. 94–101; Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 114. Fesko, Coffey, and Lim all claim that Crisp taught eternal justification. See Fesko, *Beyond Calvin*, p. 336, n. 63; Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions*, p. 134; Lim, *Mystery Unveiled*, p. 358, n. 128. For seventeenth-century responses to Crisp's sermons, see Stephen Gere, *The Doctrine of the Antinomians* (London, 1644); and John Benbrigg, *Christ Above All Exalted, As in Justification so in Sanctification, Wherein Severall Passages in Dr. Crisps Sermons are Answered* (London, 1645).

167 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 203.

168 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 204; Ezekiel Culverwell, *A Treatise of Faith: Wherein is Declared How a Man May Live By Faith, and Find Releefe in All His Necessaries* (London, 1623), pp. 16–7.

justified from eternity, and had been united with Christ before time began. Rothwell believed that faith was merely the reception of the truth of one's justification, and not a condition for it.¹⁶⁹

Overall, the doctrine of justification before faith emphasized passivity and passive reception; it was opposed to any sense of active participation that could be interpreted as human involvement; by placing justification in the immanent act of God in eternity, there was no possibility that faith could be ascribed a causative role.¹⁷⁰ But if the doctrine developed prior to the Arminian controversy, as attested in Wilson's treatise, then it did not arise in response to it, but, perhaps, as a reaction to proto-Arminian currents within the English Church.¹⁷¹

William Pemble was circulating the idea of justification before faith (but not from eternity) at Oxford in the 1610s, in a series of lectures on grace and justification.¹⁷² William Twisse, who advocated justification from eternity, was influential in Oxford in the early-1610s, when he was a divinity student there. Twisse earned his D.D. from New College, Oxford, in 1614, and later wrote an elaborate defense of supralapsarianism.¹⁷³ Both Pemble and Twisse likely influenced the spread of the doctrines, but it is not certain how they may have affected the rise of antinomism, though Baxter did say that he had

169 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 205; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, p. 266.

170 Passivity was, of course, a shared experience between precisianist and antinomian, and was used as a common defense "against Catholic and Arminian errors." See Baxter, *Aphorismes of Justification*, p. 164; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, p. 266, n. 16; and Scott Paul Gordon, *The Power of the Passive Self in English Literature, 1640–1770* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), p. 49.

171 Theodore K. Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561–1629* (Princeton, 1998), pp. 41–2; Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 204. See also Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (New York, 1987).

172 Remarkable, such mainstream authors as Richard Capel, who was Pemble's divinity tutor at Oxford, and John Gere, praised the contents of the lectures, and testified that they were well received by those in attendance, which confirms that there was diversity on the doctrine of justification within Puritanism.

173 E. C. Vernon, "Twisse, William (1577/8–1646)," *ODNB*; Peter J. Thuesen, *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (New York, 2009), pp. 49–54. Remarkably, no elaborate study of Twisse's theology and method exists. For fragments, see J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 99–156; Richard H. Popkin, *The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 99–103; and Stephen Strehle, *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: A Study in the Reformed Doctrine of the Covenant* (New York, 1988), pp. 104–11.

“very narrowly escaped” those teachings espoused by Twisse and Pemble.¹⁷⁴ John Cotton claimed that “some great Divines had let fall some expressions, that seemed to favour the Antinomian party,” such as Chamier, Twisse, and Pemble, who all denied that faith was a cause or instrument of justification.¹⁷⁵ Regardless of how and when the doctrine made its way into antinomism, by the 1620s it had become a “central tenant” of its theology, again characterized by passivity, and further impacted several high Calvinists, including George Kendall, John Owen, William Eyre, and John Crandon.¹⁷⁶

While most high Calvinists taught some form of justification from eternity, believing it to be an immanent rather than a transient act, it is questionable whether Crisp did; nowhere in his published sermons do we find a clear articulation of the doctrine.¹⁷⁷ Rather, there is some affinity to the work of William

174 Baxter, *Aphorismes of Justification*, p. 163. See also Leo F. Solt, *Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell's Army* (Stanford, 1959), p. 36, where he states, “In his confession of faith in 1655, Baxter admitted that he had ten years earlier been half-ensnared by the opinions about ‘Justification before Faith.’ He was ultimately disabused by his reading of Saltmarsh’s *Free-Grace*, which he describes as ‘exceedingly taking’ both within and without the Army.”

175 David D. Hall, ed. *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636–38: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. (Durham, 1999), pp. 409–11; Winship, *Making Heretics*, p. 159–61. Winship states that at John Wheelwright’s trial, critics “had tried to convict him for heresy” for his views on the “precedence of faith and union in the process of justification.” Cotton, who “had always argued that faith participated in justification,” defended Wheelwright at trial, stating that faith’s participation was “passive . . . as most divines insisted . . . Faith had nothing to do with justification itself; it only perceived an event that had previously transpired.” See also Anthony Burgess, *The True Doctrine of Justification Asserted and Defended* (London, 1651), p. 175, who states, “Indeed some learned and worthy men speak of a Justification before faith in Christ our head . . . Thus *Alstedius* in his supplement to *Chamier* . . . That Christ and the elect are as one person, and therefore an elect man is justified before faith in Christ . . .” See also Martha L. Finch, *Dissenting Bodies: Corporealities in Early New England* (New York, 2010), for Cotton’s famed reputation as a model of the “socially and spiritually devoted man.”

176 Richard Snoddy, *The Soteriology of James Ussher: The Act and Object of Justifying Faith* (New York, 2014), p. 135; McKelvey, “Eternal Justification,” p. 246. Snoddy states that “Ussher categorically rejects the idea of justification before faith.”

177 Trueman states that Crisp’s views are more sophisticated than the term “eternal justification” imports. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 114. For distinctions between high and evangelical Calvinism, see Ian J. Shaw, *High Calvinists in Action: Calvinism and the City, Manchester and London, 1810–60* (New York, 2002), pp. 10–36. Andrew Fuller called “high Calvinists” those who were “more Calvinistic than Calvin himself; in other words, bordering on Antinomianism.” Idem, *High Calvinists in Action*, p. 10.

Pemble, and his *Vindiciae gratiae* (1625), which distinguishes between justification *in foro Dei* (“in the court of God”) and *in foro conscientiae* (“in the court of conscience”), distinctions that occur throughout Crisp’s sermons.¹⁷⁸ This is not to suggest that Crisp teaches two justifications, but rather that there is one active justification before God, which is passively received in the court of conscience, and is the evidence of faith.¹⁷⁹ Both Pemble and Crisp place justification before faith, at the time of Christ’s death; says Crisp, “Christ justifies a person before he believes; for, he that believes is justified before he believes.”¹⁸⁰ Samuel Crisp defended the orthodoxy of his father’s doctrine by purposefully identifying it with Pemble and Twisse: “‘Tis well known Mr. *Pemble* was no *Antinomian*, yet he saith, in concurrence with Dr. *Twisse* and Dr. *Crisp* . . . *In foro Divino* . . . *Justification goeth before our Sanctification; for even whilst the Elect are unconverted, they are then actually justified and freed from all Sin by the Death of Christ* . . .”¹⁸¹ Cotton had made similar claims.¹⁸²

Whether Crisp was more influenced by Twisse or Pemble is not certain. J. I. Packer suggests that Twisse had the formative role, but given Crisp’s closer affinity to Pemble, and the fact that when Crisp entered Balliol College, Oxford, in 1626, Pemble’s work on grace just been printed, it seems probable that Pemble, not Twisse, had the formative role.¹⁸³ Whoever influenced whom, pre-war beliefs on justification before faith, which caught ire from the Westminster

178 Crisp writes, “You may consider justification in a double sense, and that, according to the opinion of our divines, there is justification in heaven, and in a man’s conscience.” Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:515–6; Samuel Crisp, *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated* (London, 1698), p. 27. Curt Daniel has proposed that Crisp popularized this distinction. Daniel, “Hyper-Calvinism and John Gill” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1983), p. 309. See also William Pemble, *Vindiciae Gratiae: A Plea for Grace More Especially the Grace of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London, 1629), pp. 21–2; Fesko, *Beyond Calvin*, pp. 336–7; Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn*, pp. 71–2.

179 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:144–7.

180 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 356–7, 360; Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:141, 144–5, 2:345; Flavel, *Planologia*, pp. 318–9; Boersma, *Hot Pepper Corn*, pp. 71–4; Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 77–9. Gill adds that “Justification before faith . . . has been embraced, affirmed, and defended by the divines of the greatest note for orthodoxy and piety, as *Twisse*, *Pemble*, *Parker*, *Goodwin*, *Ames*, *Witsius*, *Maccovius*, and others.”

181 Crisp, *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated*, p. 27.

182 Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, pp. 409–11.

183 Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, p. 50; J. I. Packer, *The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter* (Vancouver, 2003), p. 250. Robert Harris, Puritan President of Trinity College, Oxford, preferred Pemble “in divinity,” before all others. William Durham, *The Life and Death of* . . . *Robert Harris, D.D.* (London, 1662), pp. 20–1.

Assembly, were challenged in *aula orthodoxae*, but were never formally charged as heresy outside of the heresiographies.¹⁸⁴ Crisp's doctrines, in spite of accusations, did not breach the greater consensus that could be found in Pemble, Twisse, Eyre, Owen, and Goodwin. Samuel Crisp was disheartened that the doctrine could be "orthodox" in one, and "heresy" in another; the disconnect between the well-received and the pariah, suggests that opposition to the anti-nomian strain was much more than its doctrine of justification, and potentially had more to do with the precisianist paradigm for accruing assurance.¹⁸⁵

Crisp elsewhere describes the *obligation* of justification, which occurs in eternity, and its *execution*, which took place within time on the cross; and its *application*, which occurs in the womb.¹⁸⁶ At the moment of justification, the sins of the elect are forever discharged, forgiven, and cast upon Christ, and the covenant of grace is fulfilled in substance.¹⁸⁷ Christ's righteousness, in turn, was transferred to the believer, even before he was born.¹⁸⁸ Thus, for Crisp, as for Pemble, justification occurs within time, and not from eternity, even though the doctrine has God's eternal love for the elect as its foundation; but such love does not justify itself.¹⁸⁹

Crisp allowed that, in a sense, no one is saved until he believes, but this belief is equated with awareness of salvation, and does not bring about the fact.¹⁹⁰ When one receives Christ, says Crisp, he is instantly justified and freed from any fault that may be brought against him; in fact, "There is not one sin you commit, after you receive Christ, that God can charge upon your person."¹⁹¹ Faith flows from one's union with Christ, and evidences justification; and as with justification, this union occurs before faith.¹⁹² When a person is united

184 Snoddy states that the views were "condemned at the Westminster Assembly," but the wording of the confession does not overtly condemn the doctrine as a heresy; moreover, adherents of eternal justification allowed for a "justification" in time, being the apprehension of an eternal estate. Snoddy, *The Soteriology of James Ussher*, p. 88, n. 209.

185 Howson, *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions*, pp. 99–100; McKelvey, "Eternal Justification," pp. 237–45, 259–62; Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," pp. 17–30.

186 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, pp. 365–6; G. A. van den Brink, "Impetration and Application in John Owen's Theology," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology*, ed. Kelly M. Kopic and Mark Jones (Aldershot, 2012), p. 93.

187 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:141, 151–2, 512–6, 569.

188 Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, p. 145.

189 Boersma, *Hot Pepper Corn*, pp. 72–4.

190 Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, p. 144.

191 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:7–8, 68.

192 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:381.

to Christ, God wholly cleans the person, and imputes Christ's righteousness to the believer.¹⁹³

For Crisp, justification was a distinct act from sanctification, and preceded it. While justification is a single act of God and occurs only once, sanctification is a successive act in which God sanctifies the believer continually.¹⁹⁴ No matter how far one has progressed in their sanctification, such progress can never move them closer to heaven since Christ is the only way to eternal blessedness.¹⁹⁵

The sanctification of the believer, which is the end of their love for God, consists of mortification and renovation; Christ merited salvation and sanctification for the elect. Crisp cites various biblical texts for support, but he does not, as Downname and Rous do, cite authorities from the standard divines. When the controversy over Crisp resurfaced in 1690, Samuel Crisp had a concerted effort to purposefully identify his father with the orthodox divines; he wanted to clear his father's name once and for all.¹⁹⁶

Crisp does not, as some have alleged, confuse justification with sanctification; he believed that they are two distinct acts, and his view is consistent with Reformed orthodoxy, though there is some question whether Crisp ascribed the gracious acts of believers to regeneration, or the indwelling Spirit.

Precisianist criticisms of Crisp were fueled by the logical outcomes of the way in which he chose to express himself, and he consistently associated with Eaton's view that God saw no sin in the elect.¹⁹⁷ While this view is a major point in Eaton's work, it is questionable whether Crisp actually held this view, at least as stated by Eaton; Crisp never used the phrase "God sees no sin." In fact, Crisp distinguishes between actual sins, which God sees, and sins imputed to Christ. The believer's sins are imputed to Christ, presumably at the moment of Christ's death in time, and thus have no condemnatory power over the believer; they are truly free from the curse of the law. Indeed, with Christ bearing all their sins, and nailing them to the cross, it is, says Crisp, as if the believer had committed

193 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:139, 2:346, 349–50, 365–86. See Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 73–5.

194 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:473.

195 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:77.

196 See Samuel Crisp, *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated* (London, 1698), pp. 13–4. The Puritan Thomas Cole is reported to have said that he would gladly depart with £50 to own Crisp's sermons, than be without them, even if he only had £100 in the world; and John Howe and William Bates said that if Crisp was an antinomian, so were they.

197 Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 82–4; Winship, *Making Heretics*, p. 264.

no sin.¹⁹⁸ Crisp did not believe that Christ was actually made a sinner, that he had actually committed sin, but that sins thus imputed to him were “so as” to make Christ a sinner. This language, which could be misconstrued, brought disfavor with some of the orthodox, and is a point that Rutherford capitalizes on; however, as Daniel and McKelvey observe, Rutherford misrepresents Crisp, and even argues for a double imputation akin to Crisp’s.¹⁹⁹ Indeed, Crisp’s enemies as often misread his meaning, as they understood it; regardless, his rigorous piety is evidence of his Puritan focus.²⁰⁰

In the end, Crisp taught justification before faith, but not from eternity. In this context, faith manifests what was before hidden, and declares the presence of the righteousness of Christ which was before faith.²⁰¹ Though Crisp speaks of God’s eternal love for the elect, he does not equate this with eternal justification. While the mainstay of Reformed orthodox writers disparaged the doctrine, and even called it the “pillar” of antinomism, others advocated some form of it, and doubtless influenced later generations of theologically “high” Calvinists.

Finally, Crisp’s concern was to remove any sense of human activity by emphasizing the divine; therefore, faith had to be a subsequent to justification, and correlated with coming to awareness of one’s righteous standing before God. Crisp thus understood justification within a strictly Christological and covenantal framework.²⁰²

5.4.5 *Law and Gospel*

Within Crisp’s sermons, the dialectic of law and gospel relates to the preaching of the gospel, and the moral imperative for the believer’s conduct. The doctrine was the hinge upon which the antinomian controversies had spun, which is not surprising since the very name “antinomian” denotes one who is categorically opposed to the law, regardless of how dubious the label might

198 Compare Eaton, *Honey-Combe of Free Justification*, pp. 362–5, with Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1643), pp. 146–7; and Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1690), pp. 286–8, 405–6. Bozeman sees Crisp’s view as a variant of Eaton’s. Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, p. 197; Bozeman, “John Eaton as Contra-Puritan,” 638–54.

199 Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” p. 184; McKelvey, “Eternal Justification,” p. 233; Rutherford, *Spiritual Antichrist*, 2:18.

200 Peter Lineham, “Antinomianism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Protestantism*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (New York, 2004), 1: 128–30.

201 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 3:225.

202 Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man*, p. 114; McKelvey, “That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism,” p. 261.

be.²⁰³ Within Puritanism, this distinction between the law, and its demands, and the gospel, which brings comfort and resolution from the threatening of the law, can be traced, in part, to first generation Puritans, who saw the dialectic as a “principal hermeneutical key” for interpreting the Bible. Indeed, as Primus contends, only later would the covenant supersede “law and gospel as the governing theme of the Bible.”²⁰⁴

Calvin, following Melanchthon, had proposed three uses of the law: *usus politicus*, to restrain sin within society by issuing laws against immorality; *usus pedagogus*, as a preaching device in the church to convict people of their sin; and *usus normativus*, as a moral compass for the believer’s conduct.²⁰⁵ Few religious radicals denied the first use, and taught anarchy; the second and third uses were often divisive matters, as some believed that only the gospel, and not the law, should be preached to believers, and that “legal teachers” had imbalanced the moral imperative with the terrors of the law.²⁰⁶

It was within this context that Crisp preached *libertas* to his hearers, “. . . if you be free-men of Christ, you may esteem all the curses of the law, as no more concerning you, than the laws of *England* concern *Spain*, or the laws of *Turkey* are *Englishmen*, with whom they have nothing to do.”²⁰⁷ Anthony Burgess criticized Crisp, stating:

For, howsoever the Law doth not curse or condemne him, in regard of his state; yet those particular sins he commits, it condemnes them, and they

203 See, for instance, Rutherford, *Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist*, 1:120; David Parnham, “Soul’s Trial and Spirit’s Voice: Sir Henry Vane against the ‘Orthodox,’” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70 (2007), 375–85.

204 John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon, 1998), p. 93. See also John H. Primus, “Lutheran Law and Gospel in the Early Puritan Theology of Richard Greenham,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 8 (1994), 287–98.

205 Richard A. Muller, “*Ordo docendi*: Melanchthon and the Organization of Calvin’s *Institutes*, 1536–43,” in *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence Beyond Wittenberg*, ed. Karin Maag (Grand Rapids, 1999), p. 138; Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, p. 38; John Witte, Jr. *The Reformation of Rights: Law, Religion, and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), pp. 39–80.

206 Thus John Saltmarsh accused mainstream precisianist divinity for preaching “usually but a Grain or Dram of Gospel, to a Pound of Law.” Saltmarsh, *Free-Grace: Or, The Flowing of Christ’s Blood Freely to Sinners* (London, 1700), p. 38. Walter Cradock said that Christ had “dissolved those little childish laws, those beggarly Rudiments.” Quoted in Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory*, p. 107.

207 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:210; cf. Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, p. 15. See also Ariel Hessayon, “The Making of Abiezer Coppe,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 62 (2011), 52.

are guilty of Gods wrath, though this guilt doth not redound upon the person: Therefore it is a very wilde comparison of * one, that a man under grace hath no more to doe with the Law, then an English-man hath with the lawes of Spain or Turkie: For, howsoever every Beleever be in a state of grace, so that his person is justified; yet, being but in part regenerated, so farre as his sins are committed, they are threatened and condemned in him, as well as in another: for there is a simple guilt of sin, and a guilt redundant upon the person.²⁰⁸

Crisp did not, however, claim that the law was abolished completely, but only in respect to its power to actually condemn *believers* for their sins, and not, as Burgess alleged, their *sins*.²⁰⁹ This distinction is important because much of the controversy over Crisp had to do with these same allegations, that is, that he taught lawless living, or God's dismissal of the elect's moral infelicities.

Crisp's understanding of the law has to do with to what extent Crisp believed that the law could be positively used in preaching; whether he thought the law was a moral compass; in what sense the law was abrogated; and whether or not his views are in line with the mainstay of Reformed teaching. While antinomians were consistently accused of preaching lawlessness, and impropriety, in the case of Crisp, the charge does not hold; he urged his hearers to believe the gospel, and to pursue holiness, but he did not believe that preparations for grace were necessary, or beneficial. He believed that the law could be used to show believers how to behave, but that it could not condemn them in their person, and thus the law was abrogated in its power to curse. Finally, as Stoever claimed, "Formally, much of Tobias Crisp can be derived from Perkins and Ames, if certain elements in the latters' theology are highlighted and others are suppressed."²¹⁰

Crisp did not deny that the law had some use for believers, or that they were free from ethical norms. He rejected the idea that it could curse and condemn them for their sins, even future sins, but he never claimed that those sins were not offensive to God, or that they were not, in fact, the objects of God's wrath and reproof. He believed that the application of Christ's redemption to them was such that God could not hold the sins of the elect against them, so full a satisfaction had Christ merited. While the law required perfect felicity, Christians would be accepted for their weak performances, if they were sincere. Christ

208 Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, p. 15; see also pp. 14–5, 208–10, 212–20.

209 See Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:210, and Gill's explanation, where he says, "This passage is most grossly misrepresented by Mr. Burgess, in his *Vindiciae Legis* . . ."

210 Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, p. 233.

thus had abolished the “irritating” power of the law, so that one could say, “I am dead unto the Law.” The law offers no comfort for believers since it is impossible to live to its standard; Christ thus removed the stress caused by the law, and brings comfort to his beloved, and empowers them to live a life pleasing to God; since the law could not give life, only the gospel could be used as a mirror for assurance.²¹¹ Crisp was sensitive to charges of antinomism, and though he claimed to be a “libertine,” he did not, by it, mean freedom from godly custom.²¹²

In the end, precisianist criticisms of Crisp centered more on perception and implication, than on what Crisp actually taught. It was the perceived consequences of what he had said that were feared most, or in the very least the possibility that one interpret him as giving a license for sin.²¹³

5.4.6 *Christian Life and Piety*

While Crisp’s critics claimed that his teachings would lead to ungodliness and lawless living, there is little evidence to support them.²¹⁴ Crisp was reacting to what he believed to be a legal strain within Puritan piety.²¹⁵ He encouraged a rigorous spirituality that rose above legalism, and taught his parishioners to actively pursue good deeds within the church and in society.²¹⁶ Wherever the grace of God brings salvation, the heart, says Crisp, is inclined towards new obedience, which, in turn, exists in three parts: (1) there is obedience *ex parte Dei*, in that God works fidelity “in the heart and life of such on whom he entails salvation by grace”; and he does this by combining “salvation, with a holy life”; (2) there is a necessary relation *ex parte rei* between godly conduct and free grace, in that “they mutually embrace each other”; and (3) godliness is required *ex parte nostri*, since believers are subjected to God’s will, as a servant is to his master, but such obedience is not wearisome, but flows from “thankfulness for what we have already received.”²¹⁷ With regard to the question whether sin still exists within believers, Crisp writes that when the Apostle John “speaks of Gods forgiving freely, he would not have men mistake, as if his revealing pardon of sin intimated, that people did not sin any more . . . sin we do, but the

211 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 4:93–5; Stoeber, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, p. 157.

212 Cooper, *Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*, pp. 33–4.

213 See Williams, *Gospel Truth*, pp. 120–52, 207–34.

214 See Cooper, “The Antinomians Redeemed,” 251–62.

215 Bozeman calls Crisp a “disillusioned [veteran] of Puritan piety.” Bozeman, “John Eaton as Contra-Puritan,” 641.

216 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:532–3; Lineham, “Antinomianism,” p. 129.

217 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:516–7.

grace of God stands in this, that when we sin, it is forgiven, and it is an act of justice for God to forgive it.”²¹⁸

While Crisp believed that grace is the teacher of good works, and commended the life of piety, his continual focus was to repudiate what he believed to be a legal strain, that “men must have many legal preparations . . . before they may dare to apply Christ by faith for justification.”²¹⁹ Thus, the majority of Crisp’s sermons address controversial themes within Puritan piety, such as the implication of sins being cast upon Christ, what degree God sees and remembers sins, how to come to an assured faith, and whether forgiveness precedes confession.²²⁰

For Crisp, God casts the sins of believers upon Christ, and chooses to remember them no more; they “come not into the thoughts of God, so as now to think that such and such a man stands guilty before him of such a transgression.” This divine forgetting of sins occurs from the time believers enter into covenant with God through the covenant of grace.²²¹ Though Crisp taught that sin can do the believer no harm, Curt Daniel notes that this is to be interpreted in the context of Romans 8:28, in that God overrules sin in believers so that all things, even sin, eventually work for their own good. Thus, sin cannot condemn those whom God has elected and justified.²²² Gill comprehends Crisp’s comments within the context of alleviating a distressed conscience; God does not see sin in believers to condemn them, but because he is omniscient, and sees all things.²²³

Finally, Crisp commends both public and private worship. Christians must hear and read the Bible; they should praise God with “psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, with melody in the heart.”²²⁴ They should pray in private, and with their family, encouraging each other in “sacred godliness,” by meditation and self-examination; thus, “we must be flourishing trees in the courts of God’s house, as well in old age, as in our prime.”²²⁵

218 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:252.

219 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:640.

220 Crisp goes so far as to say that God made Christ sin. Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 1:11. See also Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain*, pp. 84–104, 105–20, 183–210; Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, pp. 104–37; and Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 71–3.

221 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:279.

222 Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” p. 180.

223 John Gill, *Sermons and Tracts* (London, 1814–15), 3:8–19, 42–9. Quoted in Daniel, “John Gill and Calvinistic Antinomianism,” p. 180. See also Stoever, *A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven*, pp. 157–9.

224 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:590–2.

225 Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (1791), 2:593–4.

5.5 Conclusion

Within the literature, Tobias Crisp has been called a “radical,” and an “antecedent to the Ranters.” Indeed, much controversy has surrounded his standing within English religious culture, specifically his alleged antinomism, and “radical” Puritanism. While famous divines rejected his teachings as dangerous to public welfare, others believed Crisp to be a scapegoat for Presbyterian vendettas against toleration and criticisms of antinomian theology. That such a famed disputant as William Twisse could attest to Crisp’s orthodoxy, while others urged restraint in assessing him, calls for rapprochement of Crisp’s standing within the tradition.²²⁶ Moreover, the doctrine of justification before faith had an orthodox following, even if the doctrine was a “pillar” of antinomism.²²⁷

Crisp’s sermons went through numerous editions before their final edition of 1690. Their contents show a Puritan pastor who was imbibed with “mainline” Puritanism, but who sought to correct its deficiencies by stressing the highness of God’s justification and free grace, and the lowness of human works. His emphasis on passivity was not new to the tradition, but stood in the line Chamier, Pemble, and Twisse, who amplified the doctrines of grace in their polemics against papists and Arminians. By emphasizing divine activity, Crisp believed that Christians could actually come to an assured faith, and not be caught up in its promise or possibility only. He influenced numerous radicals who would later emerge during the English Revolution as heretics, who carried the antinomian strain to various heights and extremities.

Crisp was vilified and commended. While Baxter hated Crisp and his alleged heresy, Twisse, Howe, Cole, Mather, and others, believed that Crisp was generally orthodox, even if, at times, he went too far in his expressions. In the end, Crisp’s doctrines had much more in common with the Reformed orthodox than his critics would have conceded. They reveal a “mainline” Puritan who was united with his brethren with a common understanding of God and divine activity, but who digressed in how to resolve the afflicted Puritan conscience.

The study of Crisp shows the elasticity of English Reformed divinity, the appeal of “radical” doctrines for the disenfranchised, the ongoing debates over justification in the seventeenth century, and the often-insufficient remedies that precisianists prescribed for the truly melancholic.²²⁸ While Crisp had an

²²⁶ See Van den Brink, *Herman Witsius en het Antinomianisme*, pp. 66–86.

²²⁷ See Mark Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of the Puritan Reformed Orthodox Theologian, Thomas Goodwin, 1600–80* (Göttingen, 2010), pp. 230–8.

²²⁸ For instance, the two founders of Ranters and Muggletonians credit their fears of hell and doubts about salvation as their primary motives for leaving “orthodox” Puritanism. See

affinity to the radical theologies of his time, he was distinct from them in his orthodox beliefs in the Trinity and the history of redemption. The aura of controversy surrounding him illuminates Puritanism's internal tensions and trajectories. It shows that as often as "the godly" fought over doctrine, they also fought, wherever possible, to preserve the memory of their saints, and maintain *sensus unitatis*.

Let us now turn to *unitas* within the Reformed tradition, and specifically look at how Downname, Rous, and Crisp, though diverse, attest to *unitas* within *diversitas*.

Clarkson, *The Lost Sheep Found*, pp. 8–10; and T. L. Underwood, *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings* (New York, 1999), pp. 35, 38, 43.

PART 3

Unity in Diversity



Unitas within Diversitas: Downname, Rous, and Crisp

6.1 Introduction

While recent academic trends have focused more on Reformed diversity, such findings do not suggest a radical break with the past, or the absence of a greater consensus and unity among its doctrines and piety, but an ongoing concern for further Reformation through doctrinal clarity, and interaction with confessional boundaries.¹ While there were debates and discussions that were clearly held within confessional limits, and that dealt more with preferences for wording or ordering of doctrines than any substantial differences, there were those discussions which threatened to rise to a confessional level (e.g. hypothetical universalism), and those that did cross over, and which were taken more seriously (e.g. Socinianism, Arminianism).² Suggestions of a Reformed *unitas*

-
- 1 Richard A. Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 11–30, esp. pp. 29–30. Another reason for theological variance has to do with concerns over heresy and heterodoxy; thus religious writers would often clarify a prior doctrine or expand on it in order to solidify confessional teaching and suggest its possible parameters. More broadly, Emidio Campi and Willem van Asselt have argued that the Reformed tradition should not be seen as a static movement, but as one that evolves in different but interrelated patterns and directions. It is further possible to see "mainstream" Puritanism as a subtype of broader Reformed orthodoxy, with its own challenges, patterns, and contexts. See Emidio Campi, *Shifting Patterns of Reformed Tradition* (Göttingen, 2014); Willem J. van Asselt, "Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), pp. 11–26; and Oliver Crisp, *Deviant Calvinism: Broadening Reformed Theology* (Minneapolis, 2014).
 - 2 Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," pp. 23–29; Sarah Mortimer, "Human and Divine Justice in the Works of Grotius and the Socinians," in *The Intellectual Consequences of Religious Heterodoxy, 1600–1750*, ed. Sarah Mortimer and John Robertson (Leiden, 2012), pp. 75–94; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 13–38, 177–204. Jan Rohls sees internal polarities between strict Calvinists and those more broadly oriented as the impetus for criticisms of Arminius and his followers, whereas the latter were more tolerant of differences in theological viewpoints. Jan Rohls, "Calvinism, Arminianism, and Socinianism in the Netherlands until the Synod

should not minimize substantive differences where they exist, nor should *diversitas* be exaggerated at the cost of *unitas*, or *sensus unitatis*.³

Given the current academic atmosphere and tendencies toward deconstruction, it is essential to clarify how *unitas* and *diversitas* worked within Puritanism. Thus, in this chapter, we will consider unity and diversity within Puritanism by contrasting the three strains reflected in Downname, Rous, and Crisp. We will see whether any of their distinctive traits pressed, or crossed over, broad consensus on the confessions or the mainline tradition.⁴ Based on these findings, in the next chapter, we will suggest the concept of metanarrative as a way to understand *unitas* within *diversitas*, and propose a working definition for *Puritanism* going forward. As we will see, current academic pessimism on defining Puritanism, while duly noted, should be overturned; the phenomena of Puritans and Puritanism, and their classification has had a long and esteemed existence within the literature, and even with its irradial confusion, and perceived lack of a “static spiritual or moral ‘essence,’” the terms are not going away.⁵ Further, too much deconstruction and proposals of *Puritanisms* are, in the end, equally unsatisfactory. They undermine Puritanism’s greater social and theological coherence, especially among the more confessionally minded Puritans, even though such notions accurately curb a “rigid” monolithicism.⁶

of Dort,” in *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists, and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. Martin Mulso and Jan Rohls (Leiden, 2005), p. 3.

- 3 Edwardus van der Borght, “The Unity of the Church and the Reformed Tradition: An Introduction,” in *The Unity of the Church: A Theological State of the Art and Beyond*, ed. Edwardus van der Borght (Leiden, 2010), p. 5.
- 4 Since Crisp died in 1642/3, well before the consensus reached at Westminster, discussions of Crisp’s orthodoxy must relate to the broad orthodox consensus within the English Church pre-Westminster. However, Crisp’s defenders and detractors both argued over his “orthodox” status, at times, invoking the “fundamental Points” laid out in “the 39 Articles, *Westminster* and *Savoy* Confessions, the Assemblies larger and shorter Catechism, and by our best Divines, ancient and modern, since the Reformation hitherto.” Isaac Chauncy, *Neonomianism Unmask’d: Or, the Ancient Gospel Pleaded, against the Other, Called a New Law or Gospel* (London, 1692), p. 97. Wallace writes, “For all that most Calvinists decried it as heresy, much of what has been described as Antinomianism can be classified as another Calvinistic variety.” Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660–1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (New York, 2011), p. 5.
- 5 Catherine Gimelli Martin, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot, 2010), p. 32.
- 6 John Coffey has aptly called Puritanism an “evolving, protean phenomenon” while giving assent to “Puritanisms.” John Coffey, “Puritanism, Evangelicalism, and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition,” in *The Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart (Nashville, 2008), p. 261.

We will now discuss Reformed *unitas*, especially as it relates to Puritanism, then contrast the theologies of Downname, Rous, and Crisp, and finally conclude the chapter.

6.2 Reformed Unity and Diversity

The topic of Reformed diversity has been the subject of several recent works, and relates, by implication, to the thesis proposed in R. T. Kendall's *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, among others.⁷ Kendall has suggested that the differences between Calvin and his successors, such as Theodore Beza and William Perkins, on the extent of the atonement, or the nature of faith, showed a radical shift in emphasis and break with the earlier Reformed tradition, rather than a natural progression of variegated development.⁸ This thesis, known as "the Kendall thesis," has been sufficiently repudiated. Muller, Trueman, Van Asselt, Helm, Beeke, and others, have shown convincingly that while differences between Calvin and his successors do exist, they are consistent with the trajectory of Calvin's thought, and the earlier Reformed tradition.⁹ Differences

7 R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York, 1978); Basil Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Grand Rapids, 1966), pp. 19–37; Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (Madison, 1969); James B. Torrance, "The Incarnation and 'Limited Atonement,'" *The Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983), 83–94; Charles Bell, *Calvin and Scottish Theology: The Doctrine of Assurance* (Edinburgh, 1985).

8 Kendall, *Calvinism and English Calvinism*, pp. 1–9, 29–41, 51–78, 151–66, 197–208; Graham Redding, *Prayer and the Priesthood of Christ in the Reformed Tradition* (Edinburgh, 2005), pp. 98–101.

9 The "Kendall thesis" in substance was proposed before Kendall's work. See Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison, 1969), pp. 158–221. For repudiations of the "Kendall thesis," see Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2003), 63–104; Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark, "Introduction," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark (London, 1999), pp. xiii–ixx; Van Asselt, "'Scholasticism Revisited.' Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-century Reformed Thought," in *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, ed. Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory (Notre Dame, 2009), pp. 154–174; Paul Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh, 1999); and Joel R. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York, 1991). Though the "Kendall thesis" has been supplanted by current scholarship, there are still remnants of it in recent scholarship, as in John Spurr's *English Puritanism, 1603–1689* (New York, 1998), pp. 166–70; and in Jill Raitt's "Beza-against-Bezans" motif in Raitt, "Metonymy and Relation in the Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza and Its Reception in the Seventeenth Century," in *Théodore de Bèze (1519–1605)*, ed. Irena Backus (Genève, 2007), pp. 305–7;

among the Reformed of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on the extent of Christ's satisfaction, or the particular ordering of the divine decrees, or the nature of faith and assurance, to name but three, should not be seen as a profound break with the past, but rather as a continuous line of Reformed exegesis, growth, and development.¹⁰ While it is true that Reformed orthodoxy grew to greater clarity because of internal and external debates over much of its theology, it is not true that these debates and clarifications were innovations within the tradition in so far as espousing a new theology, but rather that Reformed scholastics espoused the same theology in scholastic dress, adapted to polemics, changing times, new modes of delivery, and the need to respond to the "shifting imperatives" of their own heritage.¹¹

This continuity is important to note because when one considers *diversitas* within the Reformed tradition, one has to understand that doctrines and clarifications of those doctrines develop naturally over time;¹² further, by the time of the confessional consensus brought about by the meetings at Westminster, and the codification of English Reformed orthodoxy, there had already been a robust Reformed culture of ideas that had long circulated among the Reformed, and which can be seen in the debates within the assembly itself.¹³ That there was a pervasive harmony across the Reformed confessions, and an

Raitt, "Review of Jeffrey Maillinson, *Faith, Reason, and Revelation in Theodore Beza (1519–1605)*," *Church History* 73 (2004), 857–8. Cf. Richard A. Muller, "Not Scotist: Understandings of Being, Univocity, and Analogy in Early-Modern Reformed Thought," *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 14 (2012), 127–50.

- 10 Muller, *After Calvin*; Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Durham, 1986). See also I. John Hesselink, "The Revelation of God in Creation and Scripture," in *Calvin's Theology and Its Reception: Disputes, Developments, and New Possibilities*, ed. J. Todd Billings and I. John Hesselink (Louisville, 2012), pp. 19–21; Joel R. Beeke, "Faith and Assurance in the Heidelberg Catechism and Its Primary Composers: A Fresh Look at the Kendall Thesis," *Calvin Theological Journal* 27 (1992), 39–67.
- 11 Michael P. Winship, "Contesting Control of Orthodoxy among the Godly: William Pynchon Reexamined," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 54 (1997), 795–822, there 797.
- 12 Winship states that Puritans recognized the need for more clarification of its doctrines, and consequently "spun out treatises endlessly in pursuit of the further clearing of ancient gospel truth." Winship, "Contesting Control of Orthodoxy among the Godly," 798.
- 13 See Jan Rohls, *Reformed Confessions: Theology from Zurich to Barmen* (Louisville, 1998), pp. 29–264; Chad Van Dixhoorn, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–53*, 5 vols. (New York, 2012); Robert Letham, *The Westminster Assembly: Reading Its Theology in Historical Context* (Philipsburg, 2009); Robert S. Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the "Grand Debate"* (London, 1985), pp. 175–94.

international *sensus unitatis*, confirms the greater *unitas* among the Reformed, even when at their most controversial, seen in a communal desire to find common ground.¹⁴ While Perry Miller had established the importance of religious orthodoxy within Puritanism, this should not suggest that there was no elasticity within discussions of its doctrines, or that all thinkers agreed on its borders, or that they refrained from charging each other with “heresy,” or “heterodoxy,” but that there was a need among most of the “the godly” to be counted among the “orthodox,” and thus be in the true line of Protestantism, along with the “standard divines” from the earliest pages of Christian history.¹⁵

Most differences among the Reformed were held within confessional limits; others threatened to cross over or did cross over, and yet, even within these internal debates, so long as they were united in the major doctrines of the Christian tradition, there was an overarching *sensus unitatis* that they were generally born of the same stock. While such debates sufficiently contradict older academic notions of a “rigid orthodoxy,” they nonetheless affirm the continuance of orthodox structures, and suggest a tradition that was broadly unified on most subjects, even if varied in background and sources.¹⁶

We will now turn briefly to *unitas* and *diversitas* within Puritanism, and then look at how these concepts relate to Downname, Crisp, and Rous, which will pave the way to Chapter 7, and help to furnish a better working definition for Puritanism.

14 For instance, the Heidelberg Catechism contains no article on predestination, possibly because it was an “ecumenically-protestant” document, which sought to encompass Zwinglian, Bullingerian, Calvinist and Philippist notions. See Lyle D. Bierma, *The Theology of the Heidelberg Catechism: A Reformation Synthesis* (Louisville, 2013); and Bierma, ed., *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, History, and Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2005).

15 See, for instance, the multifarious appeals to orthodox divines in such diverse “heretical” works as William Pynchon’s *The Meritorious Price of Mans Redemption; Or, Christ’s Satisfaction Discussed and Explained* (London, 1650), and John Eaton’s *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (London, 1642). Pynchon’s work was condemned in Boston for its denial of traditional covenant theology, and subject to burning in the town square. However, to defend the orthodoxy of his opinions, he later wrote a rejoinder in a 1655-work of the same name, in which he cites, among others, Calvin, Beza, Vermigli, Perkins, Ames, Ball, and Ainsworth. Winship has stated that, “Pynchon always insisted on his orthodoxy, and others agreed with him.” As with Augustine in the Reformation, the prized trophy of “orthodoxy” was often who could genuinely claim whom. Winship, “Control of Orthodoxy among the Godly,” 796.

16 Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition,” p. 30.

6.3 Reformed Unity and Diversity within Puritanism

Questions of Reformed diversity within British Puritanism have also gained recent attention.¹⁷ That there was vibrant diversity among the Reformed theologians of the seventeenth century on various aspects of their doctrine seems without question. Facets of Christ's satisfaction, atonement, millennialism, lapsarianism, hypothetical universalism, antinomism, and assurance of faith were all at the forefront of English debate.¹⁸ While the meetings at Westminster produced a mammoth achievement in theological consensus, their debates reflect underlying diversity in the tradition, especially on matters of church governance and toleration. The codification of Reformed theology in the seventeenth century did not put an end to those variances, nor did result in a "rigid" monolithicism, but it rather served as a broad confessional standard and litmus test for theological discussions going forward. In essence, it put into writing what had generally been agreed on among upon for generations, but brought the discussion current, reflected in such doctrines as the covenant of works.

Debates among the Reformed of the seventeenth century may be classified as *internal*, or those that did not press confessional boundaries, and those which were *external* and threatened to or did, in fact, cross over such boundaries.¹⁹ Such differences should neither be minimized nor exaggerated. Even when the Reformed were at their most polemical, there was still an overarching theological consensus, both with the past and with the present, in diachronic and synchronic unity.²⁰ British Puritans generally agreed, for instance, on the existence of a covenant, though this too was developed

17 See, for instance, Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," pp. 12–30; Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations*, 2nd ed. (Malden, 2010), pp. 1–22, 293–320; Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., "Puritan Polemical Divinity and Doctrinal Controversy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 206–22; Richard A. Muller, "John Calvin and Later Calvinism: The Identity of the Reformed Tradition," in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge, Eng., 2000), pp. 130–49; and Janice Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), pp. 1–12.

18 Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," pp. 17–29.

19 Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition," pp. 17–22.

20 For instance, Tyacke wrote of the "Calvinist consensus" in the English Church, which culled from the Reformation its language and identity. See Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (New York, 1990); and Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530–1700* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 262–319.

over time, and they had near unanimous consent on predestination and its practical implications.²¹ At times, there were significant areas of contention, but while the pastors and theologians of the Puritan Reformation engaged in debate, and often employed harsh and unforgiving rhetoric, they had a clear sense of *unitas* on other *loci*.²² As Muller has pointed out, there was an understanding among Reformed theologians that the confessions were “specifically worded to exclude certain positions,” but also “very carefully worded either to discourage certain positions without overtly condemning them or to allow a significant breadth of theological expression within and under the confessional formulae.”²³ This understanding fostered a rich and vibrant interpretive confessional tradition that allowed for unity in diversity, and diversity in unity.

Though there were significant points of dispute among the Reformed of the seventeenth century, there was nonetheless a greater sense of unity and harmony among its variants.²⁴ This is evident in the numerous conciliatory works of the period, as Jeremiah Burroughs’s *Irenicum* (1645), which sought to restore peace among the orthodox godly; in the similar aims and methods of the “contested” godly, as seen in Peter Sterry;²⁵ in the doctrinal agreements set forth in the bodies of divinity; in the overwhelming consensus on the *praxis pietatis*, and in the combined efforts to combat Socinianism and Arminianism.²⁶ Recent studies on heresiography, and the often-blurred edges of orthodoxy, suggest that precisianist rhetoric was, at times, contrived to distance dissenting voices

-
- 21 See J. Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin’s Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace* (Göttingen, 2007), pp. 19–76; Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982); and Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c.1590–1640* (Aldershot, 2014).
- 22 As seen in Baxter’s overall orthodoxy, even though he was believed to have brought into question the very article by which the church was said to stand or fall. See, for instance, C. F. Allison, *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (1966; repr. Vancouver, 2003), ch. 8.
- 23 Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition,” p. 29.
- 24 This unity can be seen in social contexts and theology; e.g. covenant and predestination. See Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 24; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, eds., *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700* (New York, 1996).
- 25 Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, pp. 51–86.
- 26 Burroughs purportedly put on his study door the motto: “Variety of opinions and unity in opinion are not incompatible.” Quoted in Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610–1692* (Lebanon, 1994), p. 168.

from the lot of the “orthodox,” even if there was a greater consensus than their “religious demonization” would intimate.²⁷

Given the current academic atmosphere on early modern Reformed theology, its diversity and reception, it is needful to reassess the discussion, and decipher how *diversitas* and *unitas* worked within the spectrum of English Puritanism.²⁸ That there was a “mainstream” of Reformed opinion among English divines is without question. The various confessions, catechisms, creeds, divinity manuals, polemics, and practical divinity, prove this point, as does the consensus reached at Westminster, all of which served to solidify Reformed belief.²⁹ But there is more than bare assent to the circulating Reformed theology, or the blatant dissent of sectaries; indeed, there was a wider spectrum of *unitas* and *diversitas*, of *unitas* amidst *diversitas*, and *diversitas* amidst *unitas*.³⁰

Within Puritanism there was a strong consensus and continuity with the core doctrines of the Reformation, and often dissent only in emphasis or

-
- 27 See David Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature & Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013); Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan, ed., *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 1–50, 161–82, 241–60; David Loewenstein and John Marshall, eds., *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 1–10, 108–59; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, pp. 9–50; Muller, *After Calvin*, pp. 63–104; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), pp. 377–477; Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: “Orthodoxy,” “Heterodoxy,” and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford, 2001), pp. 2–10; and David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 1–16.
- 28 R. N. Swanson, ed., *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (Oxford, 1996); Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, pp. 3–8.
- 29 I here use “Reformed” in a broad sense to refer to the theologians and theologies that stood within the Reformed community during and after its confessional codification; thus it refers to the Reformed tradition from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-eighteenth century.
- 30 Thus, for instance, when one strips away rhetoric, there often remains an overarching *unitas*, such as the sharing of a common Reformed ancestry, reliance on authority and sources (e.g. both Rutherford and Eaton's shared use of Luther), and desire for godly living. Again, this is not to minimize substantial differences, or belittle departures from Reformed orthodoxy, but assert that the rhetoric often employed in the “heat” of debate was, at times, laced with all sorts of unjustifiable charges, as when Thomas Taylor charged Baxter with “pleading for the Devil's Kingdom.” See Thomas Taylor, *Richard Baxter's Book, Entitled, The Cure of Church-Divisions, Answer'd and Confuted; and He Provid to be a Physician of No Value* (London, 1697), p. 231.

ordering of doctrines.³¹ While it is true that, at times, dissent is more substantial, and potentially presses confessional boundaries, such as how a sinner is to be justified (eternal justification, neonomism), or how deeply one can experience God (mysticism, biblical authority, inner light), or beliefs about the law and gospel (antinomism, legalism), it is equally true that unity and continuity can be seen with the earlier English and Continental Reformations.³² Thus, for instance, Downname, Rous, and Crisp, shared a reverence for the vernacular Bible and its importance in defining religious experience; even at their most mystical the Bible was the guiding rudder that gave their devotion shape and life.³³ All three authors in this study, though representative of variant strains, stood within “mainstream” Puritanism, though others, such as John Eaton and John Goodwin, moved beyond the mainstream, and arguably beyond the boundaries of the orthodox Reformed; but, as Nicholas Tyacke has argued, in the seventeenth century, there was “a radical puritan continuum,” and, as will be argued in the next chapter, a *Puritanism* that broadly encompassed “variant” and “deviant” forms.³⁴ Indeed, even with a myriad of complexities and nuances involved in various formulations of the *ordo salutis*, and such concepts as hypothetical universalism, union with Christ, and justification before faith, there was still a harmony among religious thinkers on the fundamental aspects of these doctrines, as, respectively, that Christ’s death was sufficient for the sins of all people, that union was really possible, and that justification reconciled unworthy sinners to God through the merits of Christ.³⁵

31 Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition,” pp. 25–9.

32 See, for instance, Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, eds., *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain* (New York, 2011); John Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 149–204; and Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: On English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983), pp. 245–72.

33 John Coffey warns of “the folly of trying to understand the ideas of Puritan writers without reference to their principal intellectual source, the Bible itself.” Coffey, *Religion and the British Revolutions*, p. 81. Thus, one must duly consider the importance of biblical language and its categories, giving consideration to “scholastic, humanist, and Ramist influences on Puritan thinking,” which emphasized more literal readings of the biblical text.

34 Nicholas Tyacke, *The Fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603–40* (London, 1990), pp. 20–1; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530–1700* (Manchester, 2001), p. 116; Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c.1560–1643* (Woodbridge, 2005), p. 7.

35 For the doctrine of union with Christ and justification within the Reformed theology of the period, see J. V. Fesko, *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology, 1517–1700* (Göttingen, 2012), pp. 13–33, 251–68, 300–17, 380–4. Fesko sees a departure of later Reformed theology from Calvin on the logical importance

The authors in this book drew on a vast wealth of theological inheritance, and cited numerous and diverse sources, and yet all could agree that mystical union was always “in Christ,”³⁶ and that such benefits were conferred with the sanctifying Spirit; thus, among Puritans, living the Christian life was utmost in their minds.³⁷ Indeed, James R. Martel has observed that Thomas Hobbes was not alone in his interest in the Holy Spirit, and that such notions of a personal connection to the Spirit were ways to distinguish Puritanism from Catholicism and ceremonial Anglicanism.³⁸

Though Puritans had much in common, this does not mean that they were always congenial toward one another, or that fierce debates never occurred, but that even in the midst of “heat” and “noise,” there were striking similarities in *dogma* and *praxis*. Samuel Rutherford, one of the most virile attackers of antinomism and enthusiasm was equally charged for holding to such doctrines himself, because of his own endorsement of affectionate religion, which, at times, competes with the most mystical utterances of Rous or Saltmarsh.³⁹ Rutherford’s criticisms were as often based on inference as on evidence, and,

of union and justification as it relates to sanctification. He questions whether Calvin was normative for the later Reformed tradition, and concludes that Calvin, while revered, was but one of many sixteenth-century sources. Calvin was, indeed, one voice in the chorus, and while he strongly influenced seventeenth-century Reformed theology, he was not the chief architect of their thought, even if he had a revered seat. However, this revisioning of Calvin’s role should not be seen as a defense of the “Kendall thesis,” but to comment only on actual source citing. For more on this, see Richard A. Muller, “Reception and Response: Referencing and Understanding Calvin in Seventeenth-Century Calvinism,” in *Calvin and His Thought, 1509–2009*, ed. Irena Backus and Philip Benedict (New York, 2011), pp. 182–201; and Muller, *After Calvin*, pp. 63–104.

36 Belden C. Lane sees “union with Christ” as the primary theme within Puritan experience. Lane, “Puritan Spirituality,” in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, ed. Philip Sheldrake (Louisville, 2005), p. 519.

37 Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript, and Puritanism in England, 1580–1720* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011), pp. 243–5.

38 James R. Martel, *Subverting the Leviathan: Reading Thomas Hobbes as a Radical Democrat* (New York, 2007), p. 179.

39 John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), pp. 114–45; Crawford Gribben, “Preaching in the Scottish Reformation,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan (New York, 2011), p. 282. See also and compare the many *Letters* of Rutherford (comp. 1664) with Saltmarsh’s *Sparkles of Glory* (1647), and Rous’s *Mystical Marriage* (1631).

in keeping with common Reformed polemic, he was free with all kinds of allegations against those he disagreed with.⁴⁰

That such books as Thomas à Kempis's *Imitatio Christi* were read and endorsed by both "mainstream" and "radical" authors suggest shared kinds of piety, as does their mutual reliance on the authors and sources of the Reformation.⁴¹ Bernard of Clairvaux was not a favorite of Calvin's only, but also of diverse Puritans.⁴² Piety and the godly life were the strongest points of unity within English Puritanism, as were notions of the covenant, predestination, and mystic union.⁴³ When one removes polemical jargon from even the most virile of pamphlets, and places them within their context of controversy, one can readily see *unitas* in similar aims and methods in their theology of reform. This is the case with such vehement opponents as John Owen and Richard Baxter, who, though they hated each other, were united in their vision for the godly life, covenant theology, predestination, and use of scholastic method.⁴⁴ Moreover, Puritans were near unanimously opposed to Arminianism and Catholicism, and freely appropriated the best arguments of their opponents within their own polemics against them, even, at times, resulting in misrepresentation.

That there was variance and variety within Reformed expression, such as minor differences in definition or emerging uses over the course of scholastic development, is uncontested, but the extent to which these writers at liberty to formulate their own distinct theologies, digress from mainline thought, and continue to be received into the orthodox fold, remains open for ripe exploration. Indeed, such questions as whether such differences reflect "variance" or

40 See, for instance, Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of Spirituall Antichrist* (London, 1648).

41 Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (New Haven, 1975), p. 34; J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England* (New Haven, 1976), pp. 107ff. See also Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York, 2013); Maximilian von Habsburg, *Catholic and Protestant Translations of the Imitatio Christi, 1425–1650: From Late Medieval Classic to Early Modern Bestseller* (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 107–78; Carl R. Trueman and Carrie Euler, "The Reception of Martin Luther in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," in *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (New York, 2010), pp. 63–82.

42 Anthony N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (London, 1999), pp. 87–114; Charles L. Cohen, *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York, 1986), p. 6.

43 As I will argue in Chapter 7, Puritanism cannot be equated with isolated doctrines or experiences; rather, Puritanism, while chiefly a movement of piety and godly reform, has to be seen as a cluster of traits interacting and interwoven at a specific period in time.

44 For a comparison of Owen and Baxter and their similar aims, see Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity*, pp. 55–86, 137–68, 303–11.

“deviance” depend on to what extent thinkers received, inherited, and altered a theological language from those who went before. Using Downname, Rous, and Crisp as studies, we will attempt an answer to such questions.

Downname, Rous, and Crisp had much more in common than they differed. Their disagreements did not actually press confessional boundaries, even though some of their contemporaries did push them. Within their discussions of the doctrine of justification, whether to place its occurrence in time or eternity, at the moment of faith or before it, there was a *unitas* and shared acknowledgement that wherever justification is to be placed, it was a free and sovereign act of God, and without the consideration of merit or works; thus, they were united in their repudiation of Roman Catholicism.⁴⁵ Though they were united in ascribing justification to unmerited grace, they did differ on various aspects of how the doctrine should be fully understood, and their overall *unitas* does not suggest that such differences were inconsequential. For instance, numerous authors were vehemently opposed to the idea that justification occurred from eternity, and believed that it could only lead to lawless living, and this seems to have been the driving force behind Baxter’s opposition to antinomism. However far the pendulum swung, the Reformed fought to safeguard the doctrine of justification from forthright antinomism and legalism.⁴⁶

We have seen how Downname, Rous, and Crisp, as representatives of different strains within Puritanism, differed in their emphasis; we will now see where they tended to agree most: their social contexts, theological convictions, and pursuit of the godly life. In short, they all actively pursued the Puritan Reformation.

6.4 Unity in Society

Any study or attempt to understand Puritanism must give consideration to its society, and the greater narrative of the English Reformation.⁴⁷ That Puritanism

45 McKelvey, “That Error and Pillar of Antinomianism,” pp. 223–62; Robert J. McKelvey, *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan’s Holy War* (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 44–73.

46 Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 1–12, 15–45, 87–151; Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter’s Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer, 1993), pp. 41–56.

47 See Todd, *Christian Humanism*, pp. 1–21; Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (New York, 1997), pp. 1–15; Leland Ryken, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were* (Grand Rapids, 1986), pp. 1–23.

was a movement within an identifiable period of reform has been shown in Chapter 2. Downname, Rous, and Crisp, were all members of Stuart Puritanism. They witnessed radical change in the English Church, as it sought to fashion its own identity in a volatile time of political and theological controversy. They sought to advance their brand of Puritanism through the use of the printing press, and the communion of saints. Indeed, they directly influenced the reading culture of “the godly,” and radiate various internal tensions and trajectories.

Of the three writers discussed in this book, two of them were clergy (Downname and Crisp), and one was a politician (Rous). All three were respected in their spheres, though Crisp, by far, received most criticism for his alleged antinomism. All three were educated at major English and Dutch universities (Downname and Crisp at Christ’s College, Cambridge; Rous at Broadgates Hall, Oxford, and Leiden University); and all three studied theology, though Crisp was the most educated, having earned a D.D. Their lives show that a premium was placed on pious education, and a “well-educated” ministry.⁴⁸ Indeed, Puritanism’s greater concern for education strove to “keep justification by faith from becoming justification of illiteracy.”⁴⁹ Richard Greaves adds, “The Puritan problem was to prevent such an occurrence, and in doing so to avoid the pitfalls of an educated but equal congregation of saints and an uneducated congregation subservient to the whims of the clergy.”⁵⁰

All three were concerned with advancing a Puritan Reformation of the English Church, and strived within their spheres to bring it about through preaching, teaching, publishing, and politics. Their sermons and treatises reflect growing concern over many social ills from the theater to poverty to drunkenness to Sabbath breaking; and they were equally concerned for the poor as for the nobility.⁵¹

48 Darren Staloff, *The Making of an American Thinking Class: Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in Puritan Massachusetts* (New York, 1998), p. 95.

49 See Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 1–8, 23–40, 121–41.

50 Richard L. Greaves, *The Puritan Revolution and Educational Thought: Background for Reform* (New Brunswick, 1969), pp. 8–9.

51 For Puritanism as “popular” culture, see Patrick Collinson, “Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York, 1996), pp. 32–57.

6.5 Unity in Reformed Theology

While Downname, Rous, and Crisp, shared similar social contexts, and agreed that the English Church should undergo a continuing reformation of its morals and manners, they were also united in many aspects of their theologies, showing significant agreement on (1) Doctrine of God and Humanity; (2) Predestination and Assurance; (3) Covenant of Works and Grace; (4) Justification and Sanctification; (5) Law and Gospel; and (6) The Christian Life and Piety. Let us now turn to these subjects, and assess whether there was a *unitas* within *diversitas*.

6.5.1 *Doctrine of God and Humanity*

As we have seen, one of the greatest threats to the Reformed orthodox was Socinianism, or beliefs that challenged the doctrine of the Trinity on rational and spiritual grounds. The doctrine was thus contested during the seventeenth century, as the Reformed sought to defend its teachings from heretics. While significant agreement had already existed among the Reformed, there were pressing challenges to this doctrine, which demanded greater articulation and clarification. Reformed distinctions were often forged in polemics against Socinianism, and shaped by growing appreciation for scholastic methods. While many of the Reformed wrote in defense of the Trinity, or otherwise sought to clarify its doctrine, the practical writers and preachers in this study used classical Trinitarianism to convey the history of redemption, and the mystery of godliness to the masses.⁵²

The study of Downname, Rous, and Crisp on the doctrine of God show minor variations in emphasis, adapted to their particular settings, but nonetheless reflect Stuart-Puritan orthodox consensus, as seen in Ames's *Medulla* or Charnock's *Existence and Attributes*; that is, they all agreed on God's existence, being, character, person, and work; moreover, they could accede that human language about God was analogous, and, ultimately, that he was incomprehensible.⁵³ The essence of God is thus understood fully only by God;

52 On *unitas* in the doctrine of God, see Dolf te Velde, *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School: A Study in Method and Content* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 246–55; Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York, 2012), pp. 1–15, 69–123, 172–216, 320–28; Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution*, pp. 1–38, 147–204, 233–41; and Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, 2003), 4:143–381.

53 See William Ames, *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity* (London, 1629), p. 9; 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. F. W. Stone (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 29–46; Larry Siekawitch, *Balancing Head and Heart in Seventeenth-Century Puritanism: Stephen*

or, as Ames put it, “God as he is in himself cannot be apprehended of any, but himself . . . Dwelling in that inaccessible light, whom never man saw, nor can see.”⁵⁴ There was agreement about God’s incommunicable attributes, which belong only to him, such as eternity, infinity, simplicity, omnipotence, and immutability; and on the communicable attributes that God shared with his creation, such as life and goodness.⁵⁵ They could agree that God is one divine essence, and not an abstraction but a living being. He thus enjoys himself in infinite self-love, and subsists in three distinct persons. All three persons are active in creation and salvation, but have distinct roles.⁵⁶ Downname, Rous, and Crisp, being fully Trinitarian and generally Thomist, restated traditional Christian concepts drawn from the Bible, creeds, church fathers, and medieval scholastics, all of which were interpreted through the Continental Reformation, and their own English dogmatists.⁵⁷ The doctrine of the Trinity was an essential article of faith, and was defended with vigor.⁵⁸

Charnock’s Doctrine of the Knowledge of God (Milton Keynes, 2012), pp. 77–118, 147–92; and, more generally, Ralph M. McInerny, *The Logical of Analogy: An Interpretation of St. Thomas* (New York, 1971).

54 Ames, *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*, p. 9.

55 See Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, 2003), 3:212–26.

56 See Chapters 3.4.1, 4.4.1, 5.4.1; and compare with Ames, *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*, pp. 9–23.

57 See, for instance, Christopher Cleveland’s *Thomism in John Owen* (Aldershot, 2013), pp. 11–18, which sets forth a case for “Reformed Thomism” among seventeenth-century theologians, and moves the discussion beyond that of Peter Martyr Vermigli and Jerome Zanchi; and Simon J. G. Burton’s *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter’s Methodus Theologiae* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 14–15, which sees “Nominalized Scotism” in Baxter’s Trinitarianism. See also John Patrick Donnelly, “Calvinist Thomism,” *Viator* 7 (1976), 441–55; Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli’s Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden, 1976); and Otto Grundler, *Thomism and Calvinism in the Theology of Girolamo Zanchi, 1516–1590* (PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1961).

One of possible way in which Thomas was appropriated in the Reformed was their conviction that knowledge of God was possible through analogical reasoning by way of Aristotelian arguments of causation. Of course, such appropriations of medieval metaphysics were generally subservient to biblical reasoning, and the systematic task at hand. While Thomas was more influential than has often been conceded, so too was Scotus. Both Thomas and Scotus were used in accord with polemical needs, and as Van Asselt has argued, “terms like Scholasticism, Aristotelianism, Thomism, and Scotism can no longer be seen as referring to purely static entities.” Willem J. van Asselt, “Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), p. 25.

58 See, for instance, Edward Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity, Consisting of Ten Books* (London, 1654), pp. 204–15.

But the doctrine of the triune God, especially as seen in Downname, Rous, and Crisp, had much more application than a scholastic defense against heresy. It was used to promote the *praxis pietatis* by instructing the elect in how to believe and behave. That God timelessly free from corruption and change, being the most pure essence, his electing love and good will could never change. Thus, the doctrine was used to foster devotion, and was pitched as a corrective to both doctrinal and practical atheism.⁵⁹

As they shared a common belief in the doctrine of God, so they shared belief in the doctrine of humanity and its fall into sin, and human inability to achieve perfection, or repentance without the intervention of grace; they attested to the total depravity of the sinner, and were orthodox on the subject.

6.5.2 *Predestination and Assurance*

The doctrine of predestination, while a hotbed of controversy in debates over Arminianism, was a crucial point of unity for Downname, Rous, and Crisp, and within Puritanism more generally. In fact, within the literature, the doctrine has often been pitched as the defining feature of Puritanism, which is not surprising given that much of its piety surrounded it.⁶⁰ Though Downname, Rous, and Crisp formulated the doctrine in slightly different ways, again, in their emphasis, adapting it to their own contexts and the needs of their hearers, they still generally agreed that the predestinating act of God was double, that it consisted of both positive and negative aspects, and that, properly understood, would bring consolation to the elect, and terror to the reprobate. They tied it to the invariable love of God, and his power to accomplish what he promised in the covenant. The doctrine further magnified God's sovereignty, and the freeness of salvation as a gift of God that could not be earned.⁶¹

Finally, they agreed that the doctrine did not remove or take away secondary causes, or that God caused people to sin, and, as such, they did not delve into determinism. The human will is thus not forced or coerced by God, but acts willingly and without compulsion, according to its nature, whether unregenerate or renewed through grace. While they used the doctrine to confute

59 See, for example, Lewis Bayly, *The Practice of Pietie: Directing a Christian How to Walke That He May Please God*, 17th ed. (London, 1616), ch. 1; and, more generally, Carl R. Trueman, *The Claims of Truth: John Owen's Trinitarian Theology* (Cornwall, 1998), pp. 1–46; and Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 35–66.

60 See Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, "Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700," in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York, 1996), pp. 6–9.

61 See Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, pp. 79–111, 191–6.

free-will doctrine and uphold divine sovereignty, its chief value lay in its devotional implications and applications, and as a way to resolve crises through a system of “practical predestinarianism.”⁶²

6.5.3 *Covenant of Works and Grace*

The doctrines of the covenants of works and grace characterized Reformed writers of the seventeenth century, and followed the earlier motifs of Zwingli, Calvin, and especially Bullinger. Again, as with the other Reformed *loci*, there was variance in expression and growth over the first half of the seventeenth century.⁶³ Of all three authors in this study, Downname seems to have been the most consistent with the burgeoning tradition.⁶⁴ Rous was aware of covenant theology, but did not advance its discussion, but his concept of *unio mystica cum Christo* was undoubtedly made possible by a covenant of marriage binding God to God’s people.⁶⁵ Crisp made his own distinct contributions in emphasizing the unconditional nature of God’s grace, and equating the Old (Mosaic) Covenant with the covenant of works, and the New Covenant with the covenant of grace. Though none of the three authors were as fluent in the minutiae of scholastic definitions that characterized Cocceius, Roberts, or Turretin, with possible caveat for Downname, they were nonetheless proficient in the biblical exegesis which gave rise to later developments of the doctrine.⁶⁶

As Van Asselt has said, the rise of federal theology was “fostered by a desire to produce a system that was eminently practical and which promoted genuine devotion (*pietas*) to God.” Thus, for Cocceius, “theology has to do with the manner in which one acquires the love of God (*ratio percipiendi amoris Dei*).”⁶⁷ This inner motive was at the core of Stuart Puritanism; thus Cocceius’s “*doctrina est pietas*” echoes Ames’s earlier “*doctrina est Deo vivendi*,” and Perkins’s “*doctrina*

62 See, for instance, 3.4.2, 4.4.2, 5.4.2, and, more generally, Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c.1590–1640* (Aldershot, 2014); and Dewey D. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982).

63 David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago, 1985), pp. 128–98.

64 See 3.4.2, 4.4.2, 5.4.2.

65 Though distinct, there are similarities to Calvin. See, for instance, Paul S. Chung, *The Spirit of God Transforming Life: The Reformation and Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York, 2009), pp. 85–8.

66 For the role of biblical exegesis in the rise of federal theology, see Brian J. Lee, *Johannes Cocceius and the Exegetical Roots of Federal Theology: Reformation Developments in the Interpretation of Hebrews 7–10* (Göttingen, 2010), pp. 14–18, 23–72; and Willem J. van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603–1669* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 106–31.

67 Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, p. 1.

bene vivendi.”⁶⁸ Though federal theology has often been derided for its scholasticism, it is important to note that federal theologians generally disassociated themselves from the *quaestiones stultae* of the medieval scholastics.⁶⁹ Though trained in both philosophy and theology, they believed in *Sola scriptura*, and used reason to analyze and assess, but always with an eye to its limits and depravity. Their ultimate intent was not speculation but devotion (*doctrina secundam pietatem*).⁷⁰

6.5.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

Downname, Rous, and Crisp all believed that justification was by free grace alone, without any consideration of merit or works. Justification was believed to have been “in Christ,” though there were differences as to the placement of justification, either within time at the moment of believing (Downname, Rous), or before faith and at moment of Christ’s death on the cross (Crisp). Differences between “moderate” and “high Calvinists” on the doctrine of justification were generally limited to its placement, whether before faith, or at the moment of faith. Variance had to do with its practical implications: What did a justified sinner look like? How do they behave? Do they have to prepare for it with threatenings of the law? Such questions, in turn, fostered self-analysis, and became a disputing point within Puritanism, and relates to the subject of assurance, its possibility and consoling properties.⁷¹

Preparation for faith, a doctrine most clearly articulated by Thomas Hooker, argued for several stages of the soul’s humiliation prior to conversion.⁷² Both the mature John Cotton and Tobias Crisp criticized this doctrine for introducing works into the process of salvation, and thus compromising the freeness

68 Willem Frijhoff, *Fulfilling God’s Mission: The Two Worlds of Dominie Everardus Bogardus, 1607–47*, trans. Myra Heerspink Scholz (Leiden, 2007), p. 186. See also Te Velde, *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy*, pp. 82–3.

69 Van Asselt, “Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, edited by Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), p. 21. Van Asselt states that Cocceius’s protests against scholasticism are seen in a very narrow sense, that is, in introducing superfluous issues into theological discourse. Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, p. 102.

70 Van Asselt, *Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, pp. 1, 125.

71 Joel R. Beeke, “The Assurance Debate: Six Key Questions,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 263–83.

72 See Perry Miller, *Nature’s Nation* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 50–77; and Norman Pettit, *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven, 1966).

of divine grace.⁷³ Whatever differences in emphasis that existed between precisianist and antinomian, they generally agreed on formal aspects of justification, that is, that it was wholly an act of grace, and did not result from merit.⁷⁴ Rhetorically, both sides levied the other with legalism or libertinism, but, having inherited the doctrine from the Reformation, they were united in the nature of justification as a forensic declaration, with the *forma causa* being the alien righteousness of Christ; in fact, Como suggests that the doctrine of justification before faith evolved out of mainstream Puritanism, and was nothing more than an embellishment of justification through the alien righteousness of Christ.⁷⁵

Downname, Rous, and Crisp, agreed on the doctrine of sanctification as well, believing them to be a distinct act from justification, and progressing throughout life. Where Downname and Rous differed from Crisp was in how far sanctification could go in assuring the elect.⁷⁶

6.5.5 *Law and Gospel*

Was there a consensus concerning the law for Downname, Rous, and Crisp? While there would appear to be substantial differences between precisianists and antinomians overall, as, for instance, between Downname and Eaton, the same could not be said of Crisp, who, as we have seen, allowed for use of the law to guide Christian conduct. When Crisp did disparage the law, it was to emphasize that it had no power to give life, or enable a Christian to keep its commands, a belief similar to Downname and Rous. Moreover, for the authors in this study only the gospel had the power to give life; obedience was fueled through the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit. They disparaged the oppressive power of the law, and its ability to condemn Christians for their sin. There would, then, seem to be more in common on this divisive issue overall than heresiography might suggest, even though there were substantial differences in how the law could be used for self-examination and discerning of marks and signs. In the end, however, this study has shown that Downname, Rous, and

73 See John H. Ball III, *Chronicling the Soul's Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion* (Lanham, 1992), pp. 73–200; William K. B. Stoever, “A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven”: *Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown, 1978); and Stoever, “The Covenant of Works in Puritan Theology: The Antinomian Crisis in New England” (PhD. diss., Yale University, 1970).

74 McKelvey, “Eternal Justification,” pp. 226–37.

75 David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford, 2004), p. 203. Cited in McKelvey, “Eternal Justification,” pp. 231–32.

76 See 3.4.4, 4.4.4, 5.4.4.

Crisp, all believed that true comfort, which comes from an assured faith, could not be found in the law, but in the power of the Spirit to testify and transform.⁷⁷

6.5.6 *Christian Life and Piety*

Even with consensus on major doctrinal themes, the greatest point of unity between Downname, Rous, and Crisp, was in their shared vision for a Puritan Reformation. Indeed, Puritanism as a whole excelled in publishing treatises that were written to teach readers how to believe, and how to live as a Christian.⁷⁸ Puritanism had its own unique experimental emphasis on doctrine and life.⁷⁹ As we have seen, all three authors used their theology to teach piety and godly living. That none of them wrote formal theology manuals suggests that at the heart of Stuart Puritanism was the doctrine of living to God.

6.6 Conclusion

Though Downname, Rous, and Crisp represent three different strains within Puritanism, their disagreements over certain features of core doctrines were often only matters of emphasis or ordering, and did not officially cross confessional boundaries. While their theologies were not identical, and had, at times, significant variances in how doctrines were emphasized, whether it be *unio mystica* or justification before faith, they were united in their social contexts, as members of the Puritan Reformation, and in their understanding of traditional Calvinist doctrines. Their beliefs can be seen as variants within Reformed orthodoxy, existing under the umbrella of Stuart Puritanism, and as a reflection of elasticity within the tradition, all of which attest to *unitas* and *diversitas*.

Downname, Rous, and Crisp, envisioned reform of the English Church through godly instruction, and Christian living. They shared a reverence for the vernacular Bible, and its exegesis, and despised popery and Arminianism. They

77 See 3.4.5, 4.4.5, 5.4.5, and Robert Bolton, *Instrvctions for a Right Comforting Afflicted Consciencs*, 3rd ed. (London, 1640), p. 70. Cf. Matthew Meade, *The Almost Christian Discovered; Or, the False-Professor Tried and Cast* (London, 1662), pp. 38–49.

78 See 3.4.6, 4.4.6, 5.4.6. For overviews of the Puritan “ethos” of godly discipline, see Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York, 2013), pp. 77–8, 100–2, 129–32, 196–7, 203–5, 215–18, 237–8, 245–6, 292–3; and Bernard Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–1660* (New York, 2012), pp. 1–12, 87–220.

79 Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill, 1982), pp. 1–53, 278–88.

desired to see Christians educated in sound theology, and conduct themselves as becoming citizens of another world; and they all conceived the Christian life and progress toward heaven as a conflict and spiritual battle. They had significant agreement on the doctrine of God, and generally agreed on the *ordo salutis*. They inherited their view of God from the medieval schoolmen, and thus their positions can be classified as “Reformed Thomist,” or “Christian Aristotelian,” and were harmonious on the person and work of Christ, and the activity of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Christian. They, at times, disagreed on how best to procure assurance of faith, but believed that it was a problem within the Puritan Reformation that had to be addressed. They had essential agreement on the fundamental concepts of predestination, covenant, justification, sanctification, and providence. Their chief theological concern was to glorify God and promote Christian piety through the English pulpit and printing press. Their bequest from prior generations consisted of both vocabulary and content, and as often as they prized education and scholarship, they did not see it as an end in itself, but as a way toward godliness.

While recent historians have recovered the varieties of religious expression within English Puritanism, and have pitched *Puritanisms* as a way to sort out the problem of definition, when one takes into consideration *unitas* and *diversitas*, especially as they relate to Downname, Rous, and Crisp, and the strains here discussed, one can reasonably discern *unitas* within *diversitas*. Whether *Puritanism* or *Puritanisms* better account for this unity within diversity, is the subject of the next chapter.

Defining Puritans and Puritanism: Narrative and Metanarrative

7.1 Introduction

While a sufficient definition of English Puritanism continues to elude historians, this has not stayed the use of the terms *Puritan* and *Puritanism*.¹ In the first chapter we saw, briefly, how various historians have attempted to define Puritanism.² We also saw that some leading historians, given the sheer

-
- 1 Most English historians continue to employ “Puritan” and “Puritanism” with confidence. See, for instance, Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013), pp. 1–12; Bernard Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–60* (New York, 2012), pp. 1–12; Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript, and Puritanism in England, 1580–1720* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011), pp. 10–15; Michael P. Winship, *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012); Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 30–31; Catherine Gimelli Martin, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot, 2010), pp. 31–64; John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, “Introduction,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 1–18; Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620–43* (Cambridge Eng., 2003), pp. 1–8; N. H. Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Malden, 2003), pp. 124–40; Ann Hughes, “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), 1–7; John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–89* (New York, 1998), pp. 1–16; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York, 1996), pp. 1–31; and John S. Morrill, “The Impact of Puritanism,” in his *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London, 1991), pp. 50–66.
 - 2 In his essay, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” Peter Lake writes that “The definition of Puritanism is an issue which has been both addressed and avoided to great profit by many scholars. The result is that it is not a subject upon which there is anything very new to say.” Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives in a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston, 1993), p. 3. I agree with Lake’s tempered optimism, but would note that while there may not be much new to say, there is the possibility of reappraising what scholars are currently saying and of addressing tendencies toward deconstruction; indeed, Patrick Collinson long agonized over the subject. See Alexandra Walsham and John Morrill, “Preface,” in *Richard Bancroft and Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013), pp. ix–xvi. See also Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983); Collinson, *The Puritan Character: Polemics*

difficulty of identifying a definition that is encompassing enough, are now referring to *Puritanisms*.³ This shift is not too different from trends in Reformation historiography that speak of the *Reformations*.⁴ The ideas behind this are simple: there is simply too much diversity within Puritanism, and even more so within the Reformation, to write of monolithicism; the various theologies and expressions are too different and any collective term does not give due weight to the overtones of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century religious history; any attempt to classify Puritanism by its piety minimalizes the pietism of other Reformed writers; the phenomena, it seems, especially in an English context, are too loose and disconnected.⁵ But the lingering question is whether this deconstruction compromises something. With respect to the *Reformations*, Scott H. Hendrix believes so and has argued for a plurality of agendas within the Reformation rather than a plurality of Reformations. The united vision of the Lutheran and Reformed were to “recultivate the vineyard” and promote Christianization; further, all the branches of the Reformation shared a common patristic and medieval spring from which they drew. Though there were many Reformation “orthodoxies,” they were united in a common vision for the Reformation of the known world.⁶

and *Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles, 1989); Collinson, “Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism,” in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge, Eng., 1995).

- 3 As early as 1974, H. J. Kearney wrote that there were as many “puritanisms” as “socialisms.” Kearney, “Puritanism and Science: Problems of Definitions,” in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Charles Webster (New York, 1974), p. 255.
- 4 Cp. C. Scott Dixon, *Contesting the Reformation* (Malden, 2012), pp. 9–12, with Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations*, 2nd ed. (Malden, 2010), pp. 1–22.
- 5 Francis J. Bremer, “Introduction,” in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:xiii–xiv. On pietism within the Reformed more generally, a clear case is Johannes Cocceius, who combined Reformed theology with piety. More broadly, Stephen Foster writes, “Because practical divinity was so deeply rooted in its own time and place, many of its means for a ‘lively’ education in godliness were endorsed by a great variety of Englishmen who can in no sense be termed Puritan.” Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570–1700* (Chapel Hill, 1991), p. 76. For a partially opposing viewpoint, see Eric Josef Carlson, “‘Practical Divinity’: Richard Greenham’s Ministry in Elizabethan England,” in *Religion and the English People, 1500–1640: New Voices, New Perspectives*, ed. Eric Josef Carlson (Kirkville, 1998), pp. 147–200.
- 6 Scott H. Hendrix, *Recultivating the Vineyard: The Reformation Agendas of Christianization* (Louisville, 2004), pp. xv–xxiv; and cf. the responses to Hendrix’s thesis in *The Reformation as Christianization*, ed. A. M. Johnson and John A. Maxfield (Tübingen, 2012).

What of Puritanism? Is there more unity or more diversity within the tradition? Were the Puritans united in a greater vision of Puritan Reformation? Is it possible to write of *Puritanism* when discussing the more pious factions of early modern Protestant religion? Or, given the immense diversity of the religious groups associated with the tradition, especially during the English Revolution and afterwards, is it better to abandon *Puritan* and *Puritanism* altogether and come up with alternatives, such as *Reformed*, *Calvinists*, *Separatists*, *Radicals*, *Evangelicals*, the “*Godly*,” or simply *Reformed orthodox*? Or, was Margo Todd correct when she said, “a puritan by any other name is still a puritan.”⁷ Indeed, there are prominent historians on either side of the question; some have suggested abandoning “Puritan” and “Puritanism” while others have vigorously defended them;⁸ and still others have chosen other, seemingly more appropriate terms. All concede, however, to the immense historical and historiographical problems arising from their use.⁹ Should the terms be retained, how are we to understand them? Is there a way of defining Puritanism that acknowledges both the unities and diversities within the tradition without having to abandon the term or resigning to alternatives, which have their own historiographical issues? Is it possible to distinguish between a confessionally minded tradition within Puritanism, and its more radical expressions? I believe so.

In this chapter, I will attempt to answer these questions and suggest that *Puritan* and *Puritanism* should be retained in the literature.¹⁰ This conclusion is based on the findings of this thesis and on a careful assessment of the

7 Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), p. 9.

8 For instance, Charles W. A. Prior has “strenuously avoided” use of the term “puritan” in his book on the Jacobean Church, and instead opted for “conformists” and “reformists” to describe the tension between broad groups in the English Church. Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603–25* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005), p. 7.

9 Perhaps the most comprehensive criticism of “Puritan” and “Puritanism” is C. H. George, “Puritanism as History and Historiography,” *Past & Present* 41 (1968), 77–104. The best defense of its use is Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” pp. 3–29. A temperate approach is seen in Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 5–11.

10 I am not aware of any recent historian who has actually, in practice, abandoned the term, except, perhaps, Conrad Russell who opts for “the godly.” See Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York, 1990), p. 85. It should be noted, however, that any term used to supplant “Puritan” and “Puritanism” will have equal, if not greater, historiographical issues, as is the case with “Calvinist,” “Reformed,” and other like terms.

massive body of literature on this subject.¹¹ First, I will present a nuanced agenda for defining Puritanism. Second, I will present a case for metanarrative or the idea that one must consider *Puritanism* as a whole in order to understand its various parts. Third, I will conclude the chapter with observations on how *Puritan* and *Puritanism* could be applied when referring to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century individuals. In short, I will criticize the use of *Puritanisms* while also conceding that Puritanism was by no means a monolithic movement, at least not in Miller's sense that Puritans centered around the notion of the covenant, but rather that there was a majority of confessionally minded Puritans.¹² This method, it is hoped, will set the course for future studies in that it reiterates the need for narrative and metanarrative when looking at early modern intellectual and social history, and, by definition, requires consonance across various cognate disciplines. It suggests that Norbert Elias was correct when he observed that the individual should not be considered above his society, which in itself would tend to *Puritanisms*, but rather within and belonging to a society or plurality of persons who interacted with each other; and that Wittgenstein's concept of *Familienähnlichkeit* is further helpful in understanding both *unitas* and *diversitas* within Puritanism.

11 Thus John H. Primus's observation that "an entire dissertation [could] be devoted to the history of efforts to define Puritanism"; and Patrick Collinson's comment that a "secondary academic industry has arisen, devoted to the search for an acceptable definition." John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: The Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon, 1998), p. 4; Patrick Collinson, *English Puritanism* (London, 1983), p. 6.

12 I am here indebted to Janice Knight's *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994). Knight correctly sees certain polarities within Puritanism and questions Perry Miller's idea of monolithicism, but goes too far in seeing multiple "orthodoxies." While there were multiple confessions in the seventeenth century, there was nonetheless great harmony and agreement on most topics, as seen in the widespread confessional consensus of such harmonies as the English adaptation of the Genevan *Harmonia confessionum fidei* in 1586 and the publication of *An Harmony of the Confessions of the Christian and Reformed Churches* (1643). Thus, while Knight's classifications of "Intellectual Fathers" and "Spiritual Brethren" illumine various emphases within Puritanism, they should not be seen as rigid distinctions between opposing groups, nor, contra Knight, should orthodoxy be seen as a battleground. Indeed, Knight's major neglect in her work is that she does not give due consideration to plasticity within confessional discussions, nor does she account for the overly charged rhetoric of the period's polemical works. Disagreements among clergy do not suggest vying orthodoxies, but the various ways in which doctrines could be understood and restated in an orthodox sense. See Stephen Foster, "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630–60: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 38 (1981), 624–60.

7.2 Defining Puritanism

As we saw before, defining Puritanism is wrought with difficulties, and has often led historians to give up the enterprise in utter frustration.¹³ This is not only because the literature is immense, but also because historically there are many gray areas and often it is impossible to tell when and where the line should be drawn, as, for instance, between Puritanism and a moderate Calvinist consensus within the English Church, or between its majority expression and radical developments, as seen in such figures as Giles Randall, John Milton, and Walter Craddock.¹⁴ Defining Puritanism is further complicated in that the use of the

-
- 13 For studies of the problems and approaches associated with the definition of Puritanism, see Michael G. Finlayson, *Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution: The Religious Factor in English Politics Before and After the Interregnum* (Toronto, 1983); Basil Hill, "Puritanism: the Problem of Definition," in *Studies in Church History, Vol. 2*, ed. G. J. Cuming (Edinburgh, 1965), pp. 283–96; Peter Lake, "The Historiography of Puritanism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 346–71; "Defining Puritanism—Again?," pp. 1–27; Patrick Collinson, "Puritans," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (Oxford, 1996); Lawrence A. Sasek, *Images of English Puritanism: A Collection of Contemporary Sources, 1589–1646* (Baton Rouge, 1989), pp. 1–27; John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986), pp. 9–22; Patrick Collinson, "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), 483–88; J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620–70* (New Haven, 1976), pp. 1–14; John Coffey, "Puritanism, Evangelicalism, and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition," in *Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart (Nashville, 2008), pp. 255–61; Coffey, "The Problem of 'Scottish Puritanism,'" pp. 66–90; and Spurr, *English Puritanism*, pp. 1–27.
- 14 Michael P. Winship, "Defining Puritanism in Restoration England: Richard Baxter and Others Respond to 'A Friendly Debate,'" *The Historical Journal* 54 (2011), 689–715, there 689; David R. Como, "Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 64–87; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–40* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995), p. 12. Indeed, Collinson and Tyacke have tended to view puritans as a "hardly-distinguishable" element among the Elizabethan church's Calvinist consensus. Others, such as Fincham, Lake, and Webster see a more distinct group within that consensus. Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p. 12. Cp. Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley, 1967); Collinson, *The Religion of the Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1599–1625* (Oxford, 1982); Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (Oxford, 1987), with Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, Eng., 1982); Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate*

term is heuristic and its usage has changed over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Though the use of the term “Puritan” was initially pejorative, it nonetheless was an attempt to describe and react to something real within the Established church;¹⁵ it is undeniable that its initial use was descriptive of a “hotter-sort” of Protestantism characterized by its zeal that was preoccupied with wanting simplicity in worship, and removing its various perceived “popish” ceremonies in an attempt to “ostracize all Catholics.”¹⁶ Some historians have aptly described this Puritan motif as “discontents.”¹⁷ This perceived discontentedness is the earliest use and connotation of the word “Puritan.” Indeed, this early status and connotation of Puritanism as a “movement” for ecclesial reform has led scholars to describe Puritanism chiefly within political terms, and coterminous with such environments. In other words, Puritanism is seen as one half of a stressful relationship within a particular set of circumstances. Where this overt tension does not exist, there is no Puritanism.¹⁸ Thus

as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I (Oxford, 1990); Peter Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?”; Lake, “Moving the Goal Posts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 179–205; and Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*, pp. 95–121.

- 15 Collinson notes that though the label “Puritan” first arose as “stereotypical stigma” that it was “a badge soon accepted by the so-called Puritans themselves.” Patrick Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft* (London, 2006), pp. xiii–xiv.
- 16 R. C. Richardson, *Puritanism in North-West England: A Regional Study of the Diocese of Chester in 1642* (Manchester, 1972), p. 160; John H. Primus, *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions with the Church of England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth* (Kampen, 1960), p. 4. See also Dwight Brautigam, “Prelates and Politics: Uses of ‘Puritan,’ 1625–40,” in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Cranbury, 2003), pp. 49–66; Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, pp. 1–12; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 27. Carl R. Trueman, who has grown increasingly cautious over the years, once defined Puritanism as “that tendency to push fore a more thoroughly Reformed theology and ecclesiology within sections of the Anglican Church between the early 1530s and 1662, the date of the most important Act of Uniformity. The definition is far from perfect; but it is probably as good as it gets . . .” Trueman, “Puritanism as Ecumenical Theology,” *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 81 (2001), 326–36, there 327.
- 17 See Laura Lunger Knoppers, ed., *Puritanism and Its Discontents* (Cranbury, 2008). In 1974, H. F. Kearney defined Puritanism as “a growing circle of dissent.” Kearney, “Puritanism and Science: The Problems of Definition,” in *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Charles Webster (New York, 1974), p. 255.
- 18 Kenneth L. Campbell, *Windows into Men’s Souls: Religious Nonconformity in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (New York, 2012), p. 15; Peter Lake, “Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism, and Nicholas Tyacke,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*,

Collinson and Foster, among others, favor a more *nominalist* approach to defining Puritanism as a “movement” within the English Church as opposed to more *realist* intellectual constructs, though Collinson has also defined Puritanism as a “strenuous search for salvation according to Calvinist understandings.”¹⁹ But, as said before, Puritanism cannot simply be defined in terms of its piety, or desire for salvation; were that the case, the whole of Christendom could be classified as “Puritan.”

Though there are generally two sides to the definitions problem, that is, those who question its usefulness (C. H. George, Basil Hall, Michael Finlayson, and Paul Christianson) and those who show more optimism (Patrick Collinson, Ian Breward, Peter Lake, John Coffey, David Como, among others), there exists a wide spectrum of ideas in between.²⁰ Some have suggested that Puritanism had “no static spiritual or moral essence,” that it was a protean

ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 6, n. 15; Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York, 1988); Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 14.

In *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998), Achsah Guibbory divides religion in the seventeenth-century English Church between “Puritans” and “ceremonialists,” but Kate Narveson cautions against too sharp distinctions since the lines are not so easily drawn. Narveson, “Profession or Performance? Religion in Early Modern Literary Study,” in *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia, 2002), p. 116.

19 Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 20; John Coffey, “The Problem of ‘Scottish Puritanism,’ 1590–1638,” p. 68; Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London, 1967), p. 33. I am here indebted to Morgan and Coffey for distinguishing between “nominalist” and “realist” approaches in the definition of Puritanism. Intriguingly, Primus calls Lake’s approach “nominalist,” which suggests, as Coffey has observed with Collinson, that historians have different “modes” which teeter between nominalism and realism. My own approach is a convergence of the two. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, p. 4; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 17. See also Patrick Collinson, “The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture” (Los Angeles, 1989); Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*; and Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Sapping of New England Culture, 1570–1700* (Chapel Hill, 1991).

20 C. H. George preferred “the Protestant mind” over “Puritan” but the former is too inclusive in that a robust Anglican ceremonialism and thoroughbred Arminianism could equally be included in the term. In 1972, Breward predicted, “It is my conviction, that far from leading to the abolition of ‘puritanism,’ further study will lead to its reinstatement as an important factor in the causation of the civil war and the search for a new basis for church and society that marked the interregnum.” Breward, “The Abolition of Puritanism,” *The Journal of Religious History* 7 (1972), 34. Breward rightly sees this fierier brand of Protestant as a causative force in English society and politics. John Morgan,

phenomenon.²¹ Indeed, over the past sixty years “great effort has been expended on the attempt to devise a universally acceptable definition of ‘Puritan’ and ‘Puritanism.’”²² Various historians, at different times, have suggested different defining features of Puritanism, such as the covenant, experimental predestinarianism, millenarianism, assurance of faith, affective Biblicism, or even iconoclasm.²³ For Sprunger, “the essence of Puritanism was a balanced combination of Calvinist theology and intense personal piety;” hence Puritanism is essentially to be identified as a highly experiential or “hot” English Reformed theology.²⁴ John Spurr claimed that Puritans “were simply more intensely protestant than their protestant neighbors or even the Church of England.”²⁵ Others, as said before, prefer to define Puritanism chiefly within its political contexts.²⁶ The major flaw in this last approach, however, is that it suggests the “collapse of Puritanism into the Calvinist mainstream” when there was not a strong overt “agitation for further reformation.”²⁷ This view essentially challenges distinctive characteristics within Puritanism, and should either be dismissed (for those who would define Puritanism solely as a political

Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560–1640 (Cambridge, Eng., 1986), p. 9.

21 Martin, *Milton among the Puritans*, p. 32.

22 Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 9.

23 David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago, 1985); Spurr, *English Puritanism*, pp. 156–7; Lake, “Puritan Identities,” pp. 118–9; Stephen A. Bondos-Greene, “The End of an Era: Cambridge Puritanism and the Christ’s College Election of 1609,” *The Historical Journal* 25 (1982), 197–208; David George Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638* (New York, 2000), p. 41; Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. xiii.

24 Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of the English and Scottish Churches in the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982), p. 457.

25 Spurr, *English Puritanism*, p. 4.

26 Thus Puritanism, in this sense, becomes irrevocably tied to “anti-Puritanism.” See Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, pp. 1–12, 60–82; Collinson, “Antipuritanism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), p. 24.

27 Lake, “Introduction,” p. 6, n. 15; on Haigh and Walsham’s views, see Lake, “Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism, and Nicholas Tyacke,” in *Religious Politics in Post Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 13, n. 40. Foster criticizes this view when he states, “Frequent points of contacts . . . never added up to wholesale congruence, and it has become too easy to dissolve the Puritan movement in the larger culture of which it was a subspecies.” Foster, *The Long Argument*, p. 76.

movement), or nuanced to allow for a distinctive style of piety and divinity. Lake and Como have suggested that the various internal tensions within Puritanism and its competing strands have had, at times, the potential to threaten the social order and its religious unity.²⁸ Arnold Hunt sees preference for the spoken word as distinguishing Puritan culture.²⁹ Others have focused on various aspects of piety, the pious life, or “reformation of morals and manners.”³⁰ N. H. Keeble wrote that though “it is impossible to offer a precise definition of Puritanism in ecclesiological, doctrinal, or political terms, there is not, in practice, much difficulty in recognizing the puritan spirit.”³¹ There is a certain intuition on what Puritanism is, though there has never been, and possibly never will be, a consensus on how to understand it. This intuition has, perhaps, most often identified Puritanism as a distinct form of religious experience, which centers on divine love, both in the soul and in the life of the community,

28 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, p. 439; Peter Lake and David R. Como, “Orthodoxy and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of ‘Consensus’ in the London (Puritan) Underground,” *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), 66–70; David R. Como and Peter Lake, “Puritans, Antinomians, and Laudians in Caroline London: The Strange Case of Peter Shaw and Its Contents,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (1999), 684–715; Ian Atherton and David Como, “The Burning of Edward Wightman: Puritanism, Prelacy, and the Politics of Heresy in Early Modern England,” *English Historical Review* 120 (2005), 1215–50; Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge: “Orthodoxy,” “Heterodoxy,” and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford, 2002); Lake, *The Anti-Christ’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002); David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford, 2004); and Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisian Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill, 2004).

29 Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, p. 30.

30 Indeed, Patrick Collinson wrote, “a whole book could be devoted to the distinctive culture of the godly household.” Collinson, “Puritanism as Popular Religious Culture,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700* (New York, 1996), p. 56. See Capp, *England’s Culture Wars*, pp. 1–3; Bruce C. Daniels, *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England* (New York, 1995), pp. 3–26; Ronald P. Gildrie, *Profane, the Civil, and the Godly: The Formation of Manners in Orthodox New England, 1679–1749* (University Park, 1994), p. 1; Dewey D. Wallace, *The Spirituality of the Later English Puritans: An Anthology* (Macon, 1987), p. i; Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill, 1982); Levin L. Schücking, *The Puritan Family: A Social Study from the Literary Sources* (1929; repr. New York, 1970); Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England* (1944; repr. New York, 1966).

31 Keeble, “Milton and Puritanism,” p. 125.

and in an extreme sense of self-sinfulness.³² William A. Dryness sees within Puritanism a distinct approach to visual culture, which centered on attitudes toward popular culture, within a strict biblical framework, for which the Bible “was not a straightjacket, but a ‘rich and infinitely varied source of imagination and formal inspiration.’”³³

While there are merits in the many approaches to definition just mentioned, they are either too negative or isolationist. They either deny the heuristic use of the term or suggest a defining feature of Puritanism where there is none; thus, John Stachniewski sees English Puritanism as an impulse driven by intense predestinarian convictions, which lead to and are interwoven with religious despair.³⁴ R. T. Kendall’s notion of “experimental Calvinism,” which is again tied to predestination, does little to alleviate the problem, because while Puritanism was that, it was much more.³⁵ Indeed, predestination was a central and commanding influence among Puritans, but it was not the *sine qua non* of Puritanism because there were varieties of opinion on how it should be understood; moreover, it was a common doctrine among Catholics, Reformed, and

32 Charles Cohen, *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York, 1986), pp. 3–5; Hugh M. Richmond, *Puritans and Libertines: Anglo-French Literary Relations in the Reformation* (Berkeley, 1981), p. 166. There is much warrant in seeing a distinctive “Puritan” sense of sinfulness, as depicted in the diaries of Richard Rogers, Samuel Ward, Thomas Shepard, Michael Wigglesworth, Samuel Rogers, and Cotton Mather. However, while Puritans were known for their mistrust of human behavior, they generally cautioned against too severe self-criticism and melancholy. See M. M. Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Diaries by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward* (Chicago, 1933); Michael McGiffert, ed., *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge* (Amherst, 1994); Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653–57: The Conscience of a Puritan* (New York, 1965); Tom Webster and Kenneth Shipp, eds., *The Diary of Samuel Rogers, 1634–38* (Woodbridge, 2004); Worthington Chauncey Ford, ed., *The Diary of Cotton Mather*, 2 vols. (New York, 1911). See also Ralph Venning, *Sin: The Plague of Plagues; Or, Sinful Sin the Worst of Evils* (London, 1669).

33 William A. Dryness, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 118–21; Richard D. Altick, *The Shows of London* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), p. 99; and, on Puritan disdain for stain-glassed windows, Robert Whiting, *The Reformation of the English Parish Church* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), p. 136.

34 See John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (New York, 1991).

35 R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York, 1979), esp. pt. III; John Coffey, “A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution,” in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 108.

Arminians.³⁶ Though predestination should not be seen as the defining feature of Puritanism, or of the Reformed more broadly, this should not minimize the strong predestinarian convictions that the Puritans generally shared; indeed, as has been shown in prior chapters, predestination and assurance were often inseparable from the Puritan conscience, and great effort was expended in order to resolve the pastoral issues that it raised, especially as the movement grew to maturity and came into its own in the seventeenth century.³⁷

Defining Puritanism in more *realist* terms as a particular style within English divinity, which expressed itself in varying degrees of hotness and intensity, as the times dictated, over the course of its theological, historical, and social existence, can ameliorate these difficulties.³⁸ Understanding Puritanism to consist of *Familienähnlichkeit*, co-existing in relation to earlier Elizabethan Puritan forms, is not only essential to allow for *diversitas* among Puritans, but gives weight to their remarkable *unitas* and theological confluence. This “style” or Puritan “ethos” was not so much the existence of any particular doctrine, which could not be seen in other religious circles, as, in fact, they were, but the way in which these doctrines were interwoven into something unique.³⁹ Thus Puritanism should be seen as a cluster of attitudes and priorities that worked

-
- 36 Augustinian and Thomist notions of predestination and election are scintillatingly close to that of the Reformed. See Frank A. James III, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (New York, 1998); Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination from Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids, 2008), p. 62; David R. Como, “Puritans, Predestination, and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 64–87.
- 37 Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (Manchester, 1996), p. 8.
- 38 Lake, “Puritan Identities,” p. 20. Kenneth L. Campbell affirms the merits of Lake’s approach in seeing Puritanism tied to godly expression and religious zeal in contrast to a “clear-cut party label.” Campbell, *Windows into Men’s Souls: Religious Nonconformity in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (New York, 2012), p. 13.
- 39 Charles W. A. Prior cautions that in the Jacobean Church “‘orthodoxy’ was not a word that Jacobean writers used with sufficient frequency or consistency to justify its adoption in a study of their theological attitudes. The instability of categories explains why a search for useful terms to describe parties in dispute has occupied historians of religion since S. R. Gardiner threw down the ‘puritan’ gauntlet.” Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, p. 7. While Prior may technically be correct when one counts how many times authors in this period used the word “orthodox” and “orthodoxy,” a case could be made that the very culture of “anti-heresy” necessarily implies significant solidarity in the church’s doctrines.

within but were not absorbed by “the wider bodies of Reformed thought and feeling” which dominated “the Elizabethan and Jacobean theological and ecclesiastical establishments.”⁴⁰ The unities found within Downname, Rous, and Crisp, as discussed in Chapter 6, confirm this approach to definition; indeed, this broader definition allows for variance among its adherents as well as for both synchronic and diachronic unity. Puritanism defined too narrowly would exclude those dissenters who characterized the movement in the latter half of the seventeenth century, while making Puritanism too broad, so as to include all of the most radical sects of the English Revolution, would, to some degree, compromise any meaningful designation.⁴¹ In short, Puritanism should be defined diachronically in looking at how it changed and evolved from its earliest political and religious ambitions in the sixteenth century, to its more mature expression and confessionalization in the seventeenth; and synchronically in the lives and theologies of its particular adherents. In other words, Puritanism should be assessed in its narrative and metanarrative.

The benefit of this approach is seen, partly, in Lake’s work on the subject. In his *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (1982), Lake examines the life and work of Laurence Chaderton, the “pope of Cambridge puritanism,” and contrasts that to other noted “puritans” of the time: Edward Dering, Thomas Cartwright, William Whitaker, and William Bradshaw.⁴² Lake sees a distinctive approach to divinity in these pastors and a common thread or style among them.⁴³ Further, in his “Defining Puritanism—Again” (1993), Lake outlines his approach to defining Puritanism by combining two distinct paths:

I would wish to see Puritanism as a distinctive style of piety and divinity, made up not so much of distinctively Puritan component parts, the mere presence of which in a person’s thought or practice rendered them

See, for instance, David Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature & Culture* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 176–87.

40 Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*, p. 12; Hunt, *The Art of Preaching*, p. 30.

41 See, for instance, Michael P. Winship, “Defining Puritanism in Restoration England: Richard Baxter and Others Respond to a Friendly Debate,” *The Historical Journal* 54 (2011), 689–715, esp. 714–15, where Winship applies the term “puritanism” to the internal conflicts within the Restoration Church of England. Gary S. De Krey has suggested that early-modern Protestantism should be divided into Anglican, Reformed Protestant (“Puritan” as a subset), and Sectarian. Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659–83* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005), pp. 5, 92, 125–34.

42 Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, p. 116; see also pp. 77–115, 262–78. For the Cambridge “pope” comment, see Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 435.

43 Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, pp. 279–92.

definitely a Puritan, as a synthesis made of strands most or many of which taken individually could be found in non-Puritan as well as Puritan contexts, but which taken together formed a distinctively Puritan synthesis or style.⁴⁴

This approach prevents historians from seeing distinctive traits where there are none; it also allows for variance of expression within Puritanism over the course of its existence. Thus, predestination could be seen not as a distinctive Puritan trait in the sense that were one to adhere to it that would classify them “Puritan,” but rather predestination woven with an English Reformed symbiosis of doctrine and practice, generally operating with confessional sensibilities, and united in common understandings of God, covenant, justification, sanctification, the Christian life, and “morals and manners,” within a specific historical context.⁴⁵ Affinity to other Reformed expressions, such as Voetius’s precisianism, or Cocceius’s experiential theology, for example, can partly be accounted for by direct influence; indeed, English Puritanism as often influenced other forms of Reformed piety, as they were independent from it.⁴⁶ This is confirmed not only in their direct relationships with many English Puritans, but also in the existence of English churches in the continent, rogue Puritan presses overseas, and the distribution of “canonic” Puritan sources.⁴⁷

44 Lake, “Defining Puritanism—Again?,” p. 6.

45 This approach is similar to Wittgenstein’s theory of *Familienähnlichkeit* in that it suggests that things believed to be connected by a common feature may actually be connected by “overlapping similarities” and resemblances. On the philosophical contexts of this concept, see Michael Forster, “Wittgenstein on Family Resemblance Concepts,” in *Wittgenstein’s Philosophical Investigations: A Critical Guide*, ed. Arif Ahmed (Cambridge, Eng., 2010), pp. 66–87.

46 Voetius’s mediation of Puritanism in the Netherlands has been well documented. Cocceius was a student of Ames at the University of Franeker when Ames was in exile there. W. R. Ward, *The Protestant Evangelical Awakening* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), p. 226; Andreas J. Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre* (Göttingen, 2007), pp. 124–41; Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of the English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982), pp. 223–4, 361; Keith L. Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Backgrounds of English and American Puritanism* (Chicago, 1972), p. 151.

47 See Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism*, pp. 13–42; Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600–40* (Leiden, 1994), pp. 1–27, 84–169. By “canonic,” I mean the growing body of divinity and piety endorsed in Puritan treatises. For instance, for the study of divinity, Cotton Mather recommends Wollebius’s *Manuductio ad Theologiam*, which is possibly a reference to Wollebius’s *Christianae Theologiae Compendium* (1634); Ames’s *Medulla Theologiae* (1627); Markus Friedrich Wendelin’s

While Lake's more *realist* approach is favorable in that it posits Puritanism as a more distinguishable group among the "Calvinist bedrock" within the English Church,⁴⁸ there are obvious merits to Collinson's *nominalist* approach. Puritans not only had a distinct way of doing things, a distinct way of thinking about the Christian life, and the Christian's place within the world, they were also involved in something greater: an agenda for the reformation or recultivation of their society. They were involved in a Puritan Reformation, which thought of the ideal Christian life as one of "precise" living.⁴⁹ Given the profundity of positive "Puritan" character literature within the 1640s, those Puritans who embraced the term were accustomed to look back to the good "old English Puritan" with longing and respect. This nostalgia became an integral part of how they viewed themselves within the greater society.⁵⁰

Compendium Theologiae Christianae (1646); the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* of the Leiden divines (1642); Ussher's *Body of Divinity* (1645), as well as the works of Alting, Tuckney, Heningius, Aretius, Edwards, Witsius, Maastricht, Gerhard, Voetius, Owen, Perkins, Scudder, Bolton, Dyke (Jeremiah and Daniel), Sibbes, Capel, Fenner, Burroughs, Gurnall, and Baxter, among others of that "good old puritan divinity." Though Mather prefers Maastricht's *Theoretico-Practica Theologia* above all, he says of Calvin, "You might wonder at me, if I should forget Calvin's *Institutions*, to which the concurrent opinion of them that wished well to the reformed religion assigned a preference before all the writings that the church of God has enjoyed since the apostolical . . ." Cotton Mather, *Manuductio ad Ministerium* (Boston, 1726), pp. 84–9, 100–1. See Eugene E. White, "Cotton Mather's *Manuductio ad Ministerium*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 49 (1963), 308–19.

48 Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p. 11.

49 Within the literature, historians have consistently identified the "puritan reformation of manners" to consist of "the struggle against the more mundane sins of sexual immorality, drunkenness, swearing, and idleness," among all sorts of other wickedness. However, it is better to see the Puritan Reformation as greater movement for reform of doctrine and discipline, both on an individual and societal level, than merely in terms of its strict behavior. This revised understanding of "Puritan Reformation," concedes to the strong interplay between *dogma* and *praxis* within Puritanism, and overturns "prudish" caricatures of Puritans. J. A. Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550–1750* (New York, 1998), p. 218. See also Richard Dean Smith, *The Middling Sort and the Politics of Social Reform: Colchester, 1570–1640* (New York, 2004); Robert von Friedberg, "The Making of Popular Cultures of Social Control: A Comparison of Essex (England) and Hesse-Cassel (Germany) during the Reformation," in *Social Control in Europe, Vol. 1: 1500–1800*, ed. Herman Roodenburg and Pieter Spierenburg (Columbus, 2004), pp. 258–9; Von Friedberg, "Reformation of Manners and the Social Composition of Offenders in East Anglian Cloth Village: Earls Colne, Essex, 1531–1642," *Journal of British Studies* 29 (1990), 347–85; Keith Wrightson, "The Puritan Reformation of Manners with Special Reference to the Counties of Lancashire and Essex, 1640–60" (PhD diss.; Cambridge University, 1974).

50 See John Gere, *The Character of an Old English Puritan* (London, 1646), sig. A2–3.

In addition, this view coincides with the more recent advances in the social sciences by Norbert Elias, who argued that individuals should be understood within the context of society; being interdependent on one another, and reacting in response to various processes for change, Elias's concept of "configuration" sees the "web of independences formed among human beings and which connects them; that is to say, a structure of mutually oriented and dependent persons."⁵¹ It avoids older sociological notions that elevated individuals above society, or society above the individual, as though individuals and societies were distinct and operated in isolation.⁵² Connections and interdependencies within Puritanism, in its reliance on other forms of thought and "canonic" texts, should overturn contentions that the Puritans were somehow unaffected by the greater society to which they belonged. At the same time, their reliance on society should not be seen as an eradication of the individual, or a denial of *diversitas* in the way thoughts and ideas were expressed, so long as they generally coalesced with the social and intellectual milieu of that tradition. It is in this sense that *unitas in diversitate* can help to sort out some of these issues, in that it accounts for diversity and distinction on an individual level, but also for unity in shared social experiences, belief, and *Familienähnlichkeit*. Seeing Puritanism as a *cluster* of attitudes and priorities, which exist in relation to each other, and are interdependent on the society and culture of the time, can provide immense fruition in ongoing studies of Puritanism.⁵³ This approach concedes to Coffey's observation that doctrinal consensus did not come easily, but also suggests that common doctrinal themes across the "puritan spectrum" served as a basis, however fragile, for a *sensus unitatis*.⁵⁴

Thus, in sum, Puritanism, though fissiparous in nature, should be seen as a collective cluster of attitudes and ideas shared among its members within an English Reformed context of dissent, and characterized by its degree of hotness and intensity in piety. It cannot be understood only in terms of its thought or behavior, but in the way thought and behavior intersect to form a *medulla divinitatis*.⁵⁵ This "marrow" was promulgated from the pulpit and press by the "Puritan church militant," and touched a wider body of Calvinists and others

51 Norbert Elias, *O processo civilizador*, trans. Ruy Jungmaun (Rio de Janeiro, 1990), p. 249.

52 Norbert Elias, *Norbert Elias por ele mesmo*, trans. André Telles (Rio de Janeiro, 2001), p. 148.

53 For Elias's ideas on the dependence between society and its members, see Elias, *The Society of Individuals* (1939; repr. New York, 1991).

54 John Coffey, "A Ticklish Business," p. 108; Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, p. 3.

55 Thus Ames's "*theologia est doctrina Deo vivendi*."

to varying degrees.⁵⁶ But this simple definition is not enough; due weight must be given to the greater aims of individual and collective Puritans as they sought to reform their society. Just as individual Puritans had often unique, though complimentary, ways of discussing the theology to which they subscribed, they were part of a greater social movement for reform. We will now turn to the concepts of narrative and metanarrative.

7.3 Narrative and Metanarrative

In his book *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, Lake suggests that the proper way to come to a definition or understanding of Puritanism is to do so by its characters, that is, by first studying and examining the Puritans who by any definition make up the movement.⁵⁷ We thus define Puritanism by Puritans.⁵⁸ He suggests that to define Puritanism too early in a study might create an exercise in circular reasoning; for instance, a definition too narrow brings the danger that “the results of the entire enterprise would be determined by the initial point of reference.” Thus he urges scholars to take a more inductive approach and suggests that the concept of Puritanism “should only emerge from a study of the activities of particular men [and women] in particular contexts, acting and reacting to events over a period.”⁵⁹ Lake has done this in his work on Chaderton and Stephen Dennison.⁶⁰ Others have done this on Heywood, Wallington, Baxter, Prynne, the Newdigates, or the Harleys.⁶¹ While

56 David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590–1644* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 106.

57 For lives of “common consent” Puritans, see Charles Pastoor and Galen K. Johnson, *Historical Dictionary of the Puritans* (Lanham, 2007); Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, eds., *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006); Joel R. Beeke and Randall J. Pederson, *Meet the Puritans: A Guide to Modern Reprints* (Grand Rapids, 2006); Benjamin Brook, *The Lives of the Puritans*, 3 vols. (London, 1813); and James Reid, *Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of Those Eminent Divines who Convened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster*, 2 vols. (Paisley, 1811).

58 Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, p. 11; Spurr, *English Puritanism*, p. 3.

59 Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, p. 11.

60 Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, pp. 11, 25–54; Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge*, pp. 11–85.

61 See Samuel S. Thomas, *Creating Communities in Restoration England: Parish and Congregation in Oliver Heywood's Halifax* (Leiden, 2012); Paul S. Seaver, *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (Stanford, 1985); Paul C. H. Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century*

Lake used Chaderton, a Puritan by any definition, to contrast Cartwright and Whitaker to come up with a spectrum of ideas within Elizabethan Puritanism, this study has strived to do this with the Stuart Puritans Downname, Rous, and Crisp, which more clearly show the spectrum, continuity, and unity of Puritans across diversified beliefs. The findings of this study confirm that Puritanism should be viewed as a cluster of attitudes and ideas across a spectrum or continuum, which results in a distinct expression of Reformed doctrine and practice.⁶² The Puritan strains discussed in this book (precisianist, mystical, antinomian) depict tendencies within Puritanism since the sixteenth century.

It is not enough, however, to examine individual lives or narratives of Puritans because they lived within specific social, cultural, economic, political, and religious contexts. Their lives must also be seen as part of the greater context or narrative of the Puritan Reformation. This Puritan Reformation began sometime in the 1550s with a desire for further ecclesial reform, and spread into the seventeenth century with its distinctive experiential piety, and grew to maturation in the codification of the tradition at the Westminster Assembly. This tradition, in turn, was challenged during the English Revolution, with its internal tendencies becoming more radicalized, and then slowly dissipated toward the end of the seventeenth and into the eighteenth centuries. What were the chief concerns of this Puritan Reformation, or how should we see it? In short, the Puritan Reformation was a movement characterized by an insistence on correct doctrine and godly conduct in concert with a further reformation of society.⁶³ This “doctrine according to godliness” consists of a distinct approach to personal reformation which wove self-examination and assurance with experimental predestinarianism, stressed the binding covenant that God had with his elect, endorsed justification by faith alone as distinct but inseparable from the sanctifying effects of the Spirit, and all within the rubric of anti-popery, millenarianism, sabbatarianism, and other refinements of

Context (Leiden, 2004); William Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (Montreal, 1996), pp. 15–26, 41–54; V. M. Larminie, *Wealth, Kinship, and Culture: The Seventeenth-Century Newdigates of Arbury and Their World* (Woodbridge, 1995); and Jacqueline Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads: The Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the English Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 1990).

62 Spurr, *English Puritanism*, pp. 6–8.

63 Thus Richard L. Greaves writes, “Nonconformists of nearly all stripes shared a common goal—the dream of a church conformable to the precepts of Scripture.” Greaves, *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Macon, 1983), p. 2.

morals and manners.⁶⁴ This blend of ideas and attitudes expressed within sixteenth and seventeenth century British contexts formed the Puritan “ethos,” and this is what historians have intuited since the seventeenth century. Jacob Bronowski and Bruce Mazlish wrote, “Alongside or in place of the Elizabethan spirit arose a new ethos, the Puritan ethos. It was the Puritan ethos which served as the English counterpart to the displacement of the Italian Renaissance by the Reformation.”⁶⁵ In other words, the Puritan Reformation is distinct from the Protestant Reformation, and even the English Reformation from which it sprung. Puritanism came to its own identity and ethos over the course of its existence, with its own patterns, directions, and trajectories as it responded to the society around it.⁶⁶

Thus, Downname, Rous, and Crisp, were advocates of the Puritan Reformation. Their narratives should be seen within the context of an overarching agenda for the further reformation of the English conscience, farther than formally allowed by the English Reformation. Not only were these Stuart Puritans influenced by the writings of earlier Puritans, their own writings carried on the Puritan Reformation in the seventeenth century, and afterwards. Their contribution to the “ethos” of Puritanism is attested in the proliferation of their works, and their reception by other cultures and societies. They were cultivators of their own English vineyard, and, though distinct in emphasis, they do not represent *Puritanisms*, but a richly diversified *Puritanism*.

But how can we identify “Puritans”? Let us briefly turn to that question, draw some conclusions, and then conclude this study.

64 The “strict Sabbath” was an important aspect of Puritan practical divinity. For the Puritan theology of the Sabbath, see John H. Primus, *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath* (Macon, 1989); and Kenneth L. Parker, *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 1988). Both Primus and Parker have studied Richard Greenham, Puritanism’s foremost Sabbatarian. See John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: The Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon, 1998); Kenneth L. Parker and Eric Josef Carlson, eds., “Practical Divinity”: *The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot, 1998). See also James T. Dennison, *The Market Day of the Soul: The Puritan Doctrine of the Sabbath in England, 1532–1700* (Grand Rapids, 2001).

65 Jacob Bronowski and Bruce Mazlish, *The Western Intellectual Tradition: From Leonardo to Hegel* (New York, 1960), p. 145.

66 See, for instance, Webster, *Godly Clergy*, ch. 8.

7.4 Identifying Puritans

Given the general pattern of Puritanism as a distinctive style of divinity and piety, and as a form of “hot” or “intense” Protestantism, which generally related to Reformed orthodoxy, can we apply this term to such controversial figures as John Goodwin, Joseph Hall, John Eaton, Lodowick Muggleton, Thomas Adams,⁶⁷ and John Milton? Were they “Puritans”? For Goodwin, historians Coffey, Webster, and Spurr, allow for the existence of “Arminian” or “Arminian-like” Puritans.⁶⁸ However, given Puritanism’s immense anti-Arminianism within the seventeenth century, and its status as a “heresy” on a confessional level, it is perhaps better to assess Goodwin and those like him as proponents of “hybrid” Puritanism, or those “Puritans” who stood close to the mainstream and had its characteristic theological and pietistic structures, but who nonetheless digressed significantly from its orthodoxy, had more “radical” leanings, and that possibly metamorphosed into something other, being influenced by competing theological currents and crossing confessional mores.⁶⁹ As Glenn

67 For a recent attempt to classify Adams, see J. Sears McGee, “On Misidentifying Puritans: The Case of Thomas Adams,” *Albion* 30 (1998), 401–18. McGee concludes that though Adams is more like Puritans than others, he “is best seen as a mainstream Protestant—a Calvinist, a great evangelist like John King or George Downham, both preachers as well as bishops, sharing much with their puritan confreres but in no sense puritans themselves.” McGee bases his conclusion, in part, on the fact that Adams was not in the “web of connections” of London Puritans and did not associate himself with them. Though Adams was vilified in a 1647 Puritan tract as a “Ceremony monger,” in the nineteenth century his works were published as part of the Nichol’s Series of Puritan divines. Robert Southey claimed him as the “prose Shakespeare of puritan theologians,” but he is not counted among those in Benjamin Brooks’s *Lives of the Puritans* (1813). His association with Puritanism derives from his affinity to its distinct style and piety; indeed, McGee writes, “His sermons abound in statements that puritans would have admired” (McGee, “Adams, Thomas,” *ODNB*). Thus, Adams was doctrinally harmonious with the Puritans, similar to Featley, but remained a “Calvinist episcopalian” and ceremonialist. Moira P. Baker, “Thomas Adams,” in *Dictionary of Literary Biography: British Prose Writers of the Early Seventeenth Century*, ed. Clayton D. Lein (Detroit, 1995), 151:3–10.

68 John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 10; Webster, *Godly Clergy*, p. 147; Spurr, *English Puritanism*, p. 68. See also Peter Lake, “Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism, and Nicholas Tyacke,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, ed. Kenneth C. Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 1–15.

69 Trueman identifies Goodwin and Milton as “Puritan,” in part, because of their experiential piety and emphasis on conversion. Carl R. Trueman, “Puritanism,” in *The Oxford*

Burgess observed, “historians are much more concerned with origins and causes than they are with consequences, effects or ‘aftermath.’”⁷⁰

This broader definition, in which there was “a new breed, a bit detached from Calvinism,” would allow room for Goodwin, who offered competing ideas about justification and predestination, but who was “Puritan” with respect to the “hotness” of his piety, overall theology, and recognition as such in the literature.⁷¹ It would also allow for some variation on prized themes, as with Baxter who digressed from Reformed orthodox consensus on justification, but who was nonetheless within its borders. Baxter’s status as an “orthodox divine” requires a more plastic understanding of confessionalism within the seventeenth century. Indeed, Baxter’s efforts to mediate Calvinist orthodoxy, “sought to lessen the number of disputed points dividing Protestants by appealing to reason and the sufficiency of Scripture rather than relying on doctrinal formulas.”⁷² But this mediation and critique of “over-Orthodox Doctors” did not disannul urgency in defining orthodoxy and heresy.⁷³

This broader approach would also allow qualified use for the “puritan phases” of Joseph Hall, who, though being born to Puritan parents and imbibed with Puritanism at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, came to defend episcopacy by divine right, but whose *Meditations* (1606), and other devotional works were favored among the Puritans; and John Milton, who seems to defy “Puritan” classification because of his Socinian and quasi-Arian tendencies, as members of the greater narrative, though on the fringes and not orthodox

Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine, ed. Karla Pollmann, 3 vols. (New York, 2013), 3:1622.

- 70 Glenn Burgess, “Radicalism and the English Revolution,” in *English Radicalism, 1550–1850*, ed. Glen Burgess and Matthew Festenstein (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), p. 62.
- 71 Theo Hobson, *Milton’s Vision: The Birth of Christian Liberty* (London, 2008), p. 80; Jonathan Yeager, *Enlightened Evangelicalism: The Life and Thought of John Erskine* (New York, 2011), p. 120; Joseph E. Duncan, *Milton’s Earthly Paradise: A Historical Study of Eden* (St. Paul, 1972), p. 98; cf. John T. McNeil, who calls Goodwin, “that Calvinist puritan.” McNeil, *Makers of the Christian Tradition from Alfred the Great to Schleiermacher* (New York, 1964), p. 221.
- 72 David L. Wykes and Isabel Rivers, “Introduction,” in *Joseph Priestley: Scientist, Philosopher, and Theologian*, ed. Isabel Rivers and David L. Wykes (New York, 2008), p. 7. See also N. H. Keeble, “‘Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposing On Others’: Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition,” in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 282–305.
- 73 Coffey, “A Ticklish Business,” p. 129.

Reformed.⁷⁴ Indeed, Coffey remarks that English religion should be seen as a

74 See John Rogers, "Milton and the Heretical Priesthood of Christ," in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 203–20. Keeble, who aptly observes Milton's digression from Puritan doctrine, in the end, sees Milton's obsession with the conscience as indicative of the Puritan bias and makes the provocative statement, "To read Milton is to know what it was to be a Puritan." Keeble, "Milton and Puritanism," pp. 126, 139–40; cf. Stephen M. Fallon, *Milton's Peculiar Grace: Self-Representation and Authority* (Ithaca, 2007), pp. 21–44, where Fallon correctly sees Milton as embodying "the extreme development of Puritan belief and practice," but not as a representative of mainstream Puritan practice and perspective. That Milton was exposed to Puritanism early in life suggests that it had a formative influence. See Jeffrey Alan Miller, "Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young," in *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620–42*, ed. Edward Jones (New York, 2013), pp. 72–106. Though Milton was imbibed in Puritan *dogma* and *praxis* in his youth, he would later "retain his anti-Papist views and his dislike of rich, morally lax aristocrats throughout his life, but . . . repudiate [Puritan] views on marriage . . . Sabbatarianism . . . and . . . tithes. Indeed, later in his life, Milton did not even attend church." Neil Forsyth, *John Milton: A Biography* (Oxford, 2008), p. 17.

In his book on Milton, Loewenstein distinguishes between "orthodox" and "radical" Puritanism, which in itself is a helpful distinction in that it bifurcates between the mainstream of Puritan thought and those branches that significantly stretched beyond it. He writes, "Puritanism itself harbored contradictory impulses: its tendencies towards liberty of conscience and towards discipline, towards spiritual individualism and towards building a godly community." David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 6, 8, 20, 65, 95, 178, 183, 190, 238–9. Other than Milton, Loewenstein's "radicals" include Gerrard Winstanley, Abiezer Coppe, George Fox, and William Dell.

On Joseph Hall's relation to Puritanism and divine meditation, see Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen, "Love Tricks and Flea-Bittings: Meditation, Imagination and the Pain of Christ in Joseph Hall and Richard Crawshaw," in *Meditatio-Refashioning the Self: Theory and Practice in Late Medieval and Early Modern Intellectual Culture*, ed. Karl Enenkel and Walter Melion (Leiden, 2011), pp. 212–4; Peter Damrau, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London, 2006), pp. 71–95; D. C. Mantz, S. E. Gardiner, and E. M. Ramsden, "'The Benefit of an Image, Without the Offence': Anglo-Dutch Emblematics and Hall's Liberation of the Lyric Soul," in *Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem*, ed. Bart Westerweel (Leiden, 1997), pp. 253–76; and Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "Popularity, Prelacy, and Puritanism in the 1630s: Joseph Hall Explains Himself," *The English Historical Review* 111 (1996), 856–81. Van Dijkhuizen notes that prior to the first decade of the seventeenth century the practice of meditation had been mostly a Catholic discipline, with most English books consisting of those translated from Spanish sources. Hall was able to popularize meditation within the English Church, and had a profound influence on Puritan devotional writers, including Isaac Ambrose, whose definition of "meditation" is almost word-for-word from Hall. Moreover, "the sea change that Hall engineered in

continuum whose positions were often blurred at the edges; this should allow for some flexibility when determining “Puritan” classifications.⁷⁵ Scholars should also take into account that various conformist divines either inclined towards puritanism (e.g. James Ussher) or had phases when they were more sympathetic to Puritan intensity (e.g. Thomas Adams, Lancelot Andrewes, Joseph Hall).⁷⁶

Identifying Puritans within the seventeenth century is based, in part, on intuition, and on the evidence of historical inquiry. This intuitive sense dates to the seventeenth century, and continues to this day; however, evidence should guard intuition. G. R. Elton said that questions must be “forced upon” the historian by the material rather than the converse.⁷⁷ By examining thinkers within their theological and social contexts, and especially in relating them to the consensus reached at Westminster and embodied within the devotional corpus of its members, one can get a sense of whether “Puritan” really applies in any given case or at any given time in a person’s maturation.

But how can one be excluded from being a “Puritan”? Those thinkers who endorsed strict ceremonial forms of worship, or who allowed for the use of

Protestant meditation led to the release of a flood of Puritan aesthetic energy, central to England and the Dutch Republic, which, from thence and Germany, rolled throughout the Protestant world for centuries to come” (Mantz, et al., p. 254). Damrau equates “Puritan meditation” with Hall. There is some scholarly debate as to how “Protestantized” Catholic sources became before they made it to the English press. See Richard A. McCabe, *Joseph Hall: A Study in Satire and Meditation* (Oxford, 1982); Frank Livingstone Huntley, *Bishop Hall and Protestant meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study with the Texts of “The Art of Divine Meditation” (1606) and “Occasional Meditations” (1633)* (Binghamton, 1981); U. Milo Kauffmann, *The Pilgrim’s Progress and Traditions in Puritan Meditation* (New Haven, 1966), pp. 120–33; and Frank Livingstone Huntley, *Bishop Joseph Hall, 1575–1656: A Biographical and Critical Study* (Cambridge, Eng., 1979), pp. 71–90, 91–101. John Downname called Hall “our famous and diuine English *Seneca*, in which, wit and piety are so matched, as that they seem to striue which should exceed the other.” Downname, *A Guide to Godlynesse* (London, 1622), p. 637.

75 Coffey, “The Problem of ‘Scottish Puritanism,’” p. 69.

76 Jonathan D. Moore, “James Ussher’s Influence on the Synod of Dordt,” in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt, 1618–19*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Leiden, 2010), pp. 163, 177; P. E. McCullough, “Andrewes, Lancelot (1555–1626),” *ODNB*; Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983), pp. 438–9. See also M. M. Knappen, “The Early Puritanism of Lancelot Andrewes,” *Church History* 2 (1933), 95–104.

77 G. R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (London, 1969), p. 31. Cited in Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Eng., 2001), 1:15; see also Richard J. Evans, *In Defense of History* (New York, 1999), pp. 65–88.

images within personal and corporate devotion, who deviated significantly from Westminster, and who criticized “the godly” for their reformation of morals and manners were, to a large degree, outside the confessionally minded fold.⁷⁸ They generally represent the class of society to which Puritans were reacting.⁷⁹ But even here one needs nuancing. There are those ceremonial Anglicans, such as Lancelot Andrewes, who were exposed to Puritanism in their formative years, and who carried aspects of it, as, for instance, in the deeply personal nature of faith, well into adulthood, while eschewing others.⁸⁰ Further, those Puritans who deviated from the greater theological consensus, but who nonetheless retained facets of its practice and theology, as with Milton, can, with qualified use, be understood to stand in relation to that consensus, as members of the greater Puritan Reformation.

There is another class of episcopal Calvinist that bears consideration. Daniel Featley, who was invited to and attended the Westminster Assembly, is an inter-

78 As, for instance, in allowing images of the Incarnation to be produced, though there seems to be some contention since William Perkins did not explicitly condemn pictures of Jesus for non-religious use, though one could argue that within Perkins are seeds for the more thorough rebuttal seen in John Vicars. William Perkins, *A Reformed Catholike* (London, 1597), pp. 169–82; cf. John Vicars, *The Sinfulness and Unlawfulness of Making or Having the Picture of Christ’s Humanity* (London, 1641). David J. Davis elaborates on Perkins’s general disdain for image use within devotion, in contrast to Vermigli’s permitting that the humanity of Christ could, like all other physical subjects, be depicted and painted for meditative purposes. Davis, *Seeing Faith, Printing Pictures: Religious Identity During the English Reformation* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 59–60, 107, 159–60.

79 See, for instance, Arthur Stephen McGrade, ed., *Richard Hooker, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: A Critical Edition with Modern Spelling*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 2013), 1:191–242; and cf. the responses to “ceremonialism” in William Ames, *A Fresh Svit Against Human Ceremonies in God’s Worship* (s.l., 1633). See also David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York, 1997), pp. 197–8, where Cressy comments on the “sensitive” and “opaque areas of early modern culture” as they relate to the further Reformation of “allegedly Jewish, popish, or superstitious practices.”

80 Thus Kenneth L. Parker points out that Andrewes practiced a “strict Sabbath” long after his youthful “puritan phase.” Parker, *The English Sabbath*, p. 99. Whether or not a strict Sabbath observance was a unique Puritan contribution to the English Church bears further investigation. Katz has suggested that the Puritan notion of Sabbath keeping dates to medieval Catholic doctrine. David S. Katz, *Sabbath and Sectarianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Leiden, 1988), p. 7. See also Parker, *The English Sabbath*, p. 2; Laurie Throness, *A Protestant Purgatory: Theological Origins of the Penitentiary Act, 1779* (Aldershot, 2008), p. 159; Edward Martin Allen, “Nicholas Bownde and the Context of Sunday Sabbatarianism” (PhD diss.; Fuller Theological Seminary, 2008), p. 6; John H. Primus, *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath* (Macon, 1990); and John Wigley, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Sunday* (Manchester, 1980), pp. 15–6.

esting case because he was a “confessional” Calvinist who defended church governance by bishops. He was “Calvinist,” and “Reformed,” but not necessarily “Puritan.” His reputation as a controversialist and refuter of Arminianism earned him a favorable reputation among “the godly.” It is possible that his invitation to Westminster was politically motivated to safeguard its reputation. Regardless, Featley has been portrayed in the literature as a “patron of puritanism,” and a “contented conformist.”⁸¹

The “anti-Puritan” Peter Heylyn, who wrote approvingly of iconoclasm, and praised Thomas Cartwright’s critique of the Rhemish Testament, and had numerous “Puritan” connections, evidences many Puritan attitudes, but, as Anthony Milton points out, “Heylyn’s opinions were conventional ones for his time. While not overtly ‘godly,’ they nonetheless displayed none of the divisive attitudes and reservations of a new breed of ‘avant-garde conformist’ such as Lancelot Andrews, John Buckeridge, William Laud, or Richard Montagu.”⁸²

Perhaps much confusion in identifying and defining Puritans rests in the symbiotic nature of religious belief within the English Church. Further, while Puritans generally sided with Parliament during the English Civil Wars, this was not always the case, as the events surrounding the execution of Christopher Love point out.⁸³ Indeed, there were vying interests and ideas on how to bring

81 Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, p. 7. See also Julia F. Merritt, “The Pastoral Tightrope: A Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London,” in *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain*, ed. Thomas Cogswell, et al (Cambridge, Eng., 2002), p. 160, who states that while scholars are attracted to “cantankerous, divisive, and controversial figures,” they should not ignore the “emollient, unifying, pastorally sensitive puritan clergymen.”

82 Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 10, 14, and pp. 230–2, for Heylyn’s equating of “Calvinism” with the “Puritan Faction” in the English Church. See also Heylyn’s contentious *Aerius Redivivus; Or, the History of the Presbyterians* (Oxford, 1670), pp. 480–2, which sets out to prove that the Presbyterians were responsible for dragging the Stuart realms into “a calamitous and destructive war.” Cited in Matthew Nuefeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 40–1.

83 In 1649, Love became involved in a plot to assist Scottish covenanters to bring back the exiled Charles II to the English throne. He was executed in 1651 after being found guilty of treason by the High Court. See Christopher Love, *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication of the Principles and Practices of Me Christopher Love, Since my Tryall Before and Condemnation by, the High Court of Iustice, whereby It is Manifested, That a Close Prison, a Long Sword, a High Court, and a Bloody Scaffold, Have Not in the Least Altered My Judgment* (London, 1651), pp. 9–11; and Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648–53* (Cambridge, Eng., 1977), p. 244.

about a Puritan Reformation, but there was widespread belief that the further reformation was necessary.

In sum, given that human beings are complicated, contradictory, and defy neat categories, classifications are not easy and require careful contextualization. Classifications are based on evidence and intuition, but the former must provide the basis for the latter. Further, consideration must be given to the society in which an individual belonged. Individuals are not above their society, nor are societies merely the ideations of the individual. Distinctions can be made between “mainstream” or “orthodox” Puritanism, and the more “radical” varieties that came into prominence during the English Revolution. While mainstream Puritans had confessional commitments and sensibilities, radical Puritans were more free to question and abandon orthodox structures, but regardless there were irrevocable ties between “Puritans” of all persuasions, as they sought to renovate their church and society through theological, personal, and secular reformation.⁸⁴

7.5 Conclusion

Since the sixteenth century, the terms “Puritan” and “Puritanism” have had a robust industry of use. Historians have attempted, with varying degrees of success, to come to some sort of consensus to their precise meaning. There are generally two perspectives with a wide spectrum in between. On the one end are those who question the historical validity of these terms because of their seeming inability to be applied evenly and accurately across various contexts. Those of the other end defend their use and project more optimistic outcomes of historical inquiry. Within this latter group there are those who prefer either more nominalist or realist approaches. Those advancing nominalism generally see Puritanism as a movement for reform, and those of the realist persuasion focus on identifying Puritanism as a distinctive weaving of doctrine and piety. Puritanism cannot be understood only in terms of its manners, nor in its thought, both which can be seen in the wider groups of the seventeenth century, but in the convergence of the two, within an English context of dissent.

To account for *diversitas* among Puritans, some historians have begun to speak of *Puritanisms* in the plural as preferable to *Puritanism* in the singular. This deconstruction is not unlike that of the *Reformation* and *Reformations* debate, as both are attempting to account for unity and diversity; however,

84 Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), p. 229.

given that Puritanism had one major confessional consensus, as codified at Westminster, the notion of *Puritanisms* is, in the end, unsatisfactory and suggests that there was an irreconcilable diversity among “the godly.”

There is not one single defining feature of Puritanism. Rather, Puritanism was a cluster of attitudes and priorities that centered on a distinctive style of practical divinity, which was characterized by its intensity or hotness. Drawing insight from Elias’s formative work on the society of individuals, the narrative of an individual is only part of the Puritan story. They must be understood to exist in relation to their society, to their sages and pariahs. Hence, narrative and metanarrative are useful, even essential, concepts to better understand Puritans as cultivators of their English vineyard.

Identifying Puritans in the seventeenth century is a demanding enterprise and needs nuancing. However, given Puritanism’s strong *unitas* in its production of a confessional standard, one can employ evidence and intuition to assess whether an individual belonged to the Puritan Reformation, or whether they were the objects of that reforming society.

Puritanism was a cohesive and varied movement, and network of reform, connected by overlapping similarities and representative of distinct but often-complementary strains. Notions of *Puritanisms*, while helpful in distinguishing between polarities within the movement, do not ultimately allow for or recognize the categorical continuity existing within it. They inadvertently place too much attention on the individual being above society, and do not sufficiently account for the relatedness and interdependence of individuals to the society to which they belonged.

Conclusion

The study of English Puritanism remains a vibrant and rewarding, if not utterly frustrating, endeavor for historians of English religious culture. While scholarship has made significant strides over the past sixty years, there are still several issues within the literature that need to be addressed and nuanced; they, a veritable quagmire, have to do with how Puritans and Puritanism are best identified, defined, and understood, and how this, in turn, relates to their desire for greater reform. That there has been so much discussion on how to define Puritanism has contributed to pessimistic attitudes on the possibility of coming to terms with the evidence. This pessimism, however, has born some fruit: it has reiterated the need to restate how historians should see Puritanism as a whole, a collective group of generally Reformed Protestants who were united not only in their overall theology, but who, because of that theology, wanted to reform their church and society through preaching, publishing, and politics.

While books continue to be published on this subject, and have explored various facets of Puritan religion and practice, there remains not only pessimism in being able to define and identify Puritanism, but also emerging reference to *Puritanisms*, as though there were numerous competing systems of thought and practice to the exclusion of a confessional tradition. It is possible to speak of *Puritanisms* to highlight its varieties, as between orthodox and radical Puritanism, but this deconstruction to “-isms” seems to compromise the greater intellectual and social narrative of both the confessionally mined Puritans and the more radical sectaries in their combined pursuit for a further Puritan Reformation. *Puritanisms* suggest that there was more or greater diversity than harmony and unity; or that *diversitas* was more of a guiding force than *unitas*. The aim of this study, therefore, has been to address this issue and consider whether three uncontested Puritans, representative of vying strains and trajectories within Puritanism, were so diverse that hardly any discernable unity could be identified among them, or whether there was indeed some sort of theological unity, and, if so, to what extent this *unitas* contributed to the “ethos” of Puritanism itself. Put another way, if there was a *sensus unitatis* within Puritanism, then, given its diversity, there must be a *unitas* within *diversitas*.

This study has shown that though Puritans were diverse and expressed, at times, competing ideas, and were often embroiled in controversy with one another, there was still significant unity among them, both historically, in that

they were clearly progenitors of a movement for further reform, and theologically, in that they exemplified a distinct style of divinity and piety. Indeed, any study of the writers of the seventeenth century has to take into consideration the various historical and intellectual forces then converging together. The challenges of studying religion in this period will not be overcome until competency is developed in various cognate disciplines; indeed, there must be greater communication across disciplines in order to provide more holistic portraits of early modern Puritans. While this work has focused chiefly on theological identity, it has, at times, incorporated insights from the social sciences, as, for instance, by incorporating the work of Norbert Elias. However, this is not primarily a book of social research; more work will need to be done on how this Puritan identity relates to the other concerns of the Puritan Reformation.

The significance of this work is fivefold:

First, it argues to retain “Puritan” and “Puritanism” as helpful, even essential, designations. For the past sixty years historians have postulated with varying degrees of optimism over how to define and identify Puritanism. Some of the more critical historians, such as C. H. George and Conrad Russell, have suggested abandoning the term because of its obfuscating nature, though very few, if any, have actually, over the long term, consistently dropped its use. The terms *Puritan* and *Puritanism* have been employed since the sixteenth century to describe a certain strain within the English Church, and there is no sign that they are going away. This study contributes to this ongoing academic discussion and suggests that both terms, though hotly contested, should continue to be used when discussing this fiery brand of English Protestantism. While other terms such as “the godly” and “Reformed orthodox” will continue to be used to refer to Puritans, they should not supplant “Puritan” and “Puritanism,” but rather complement them because the terms suggest something unique and distinctive, perceptions that date to the 1560s, if not earlier, and continue to this day. While these terms are often interchangeable, they are not always so, nor is it always easy to identify those on the fringes of the movement. Moreover, Puritanism is best understood as a rather broad conglomerate of tendencies and trajectories of such overlapping strains as precisianism, mysticism, antinomism, and neonomism.

This broader approach to Puritanism concedes to *diversitas* within Reformed orthodoxy, and indicates that Puritanism could be classified as a unique subtype of that orthodoxy in its mainline expression. This Puritan-Reformed orthodoxy expressed itself in an English Reformed context of dissent and which adapted to its own challenges, patterns, and directions. This conclusion confirms Steinmetz’s contention that Puritanism was a “special

type” of Calvinism, and is suggested in that these vying strains, as depicted in Rous and Crisp, despite accusations, never pushed past confessional bounds. Their emphases, whether mystical or antinomian, were never unequivocally regarded as a “heresy” on a confessional level. While there were those Protestants who could be classified as “Puritan” more generally, but who were neither “mainstream” nor “Reformed orthodox,” such as John Goodwin, John Milton, John Eaton, and Lodowick Muggleton, they did not form a consensus on the scale of Westminster. Therefore, it is better to see these dissidents as proponents of a radicalized Puritanism, which were more varied than their confessional counterparts, but which nonetheless remain within mainstream trajectories through a magnification of its inherent tendencies.

Does this mean there are two or more *Puritanisms*? While one could see it this way, the evidence does not mandate this interpretation. Research suggests that radical Puritanism arose in response to and out of frustration with mainstream sensibility, especially on the issue of assurance and comfort for the afflicted conscience. Though neither Rous nor Crisp abandoned confessional structures, both mysticism and antinomism had inherent tendencies to do so. Indeed, in an ironic twist, confessional Puritanism breathed life into the radical sects of the English Revolution by igniting its infant embers, and paving the way for revisionism of its cherished piety. These sects, in turn, departed from their progenitor in often-irreconcilable ways theologically, while still incorporating elements of the “precise” way of doing things.

The distinctive traits of mainline Puritanism, in its emphasis on practical divinity, for instance, and the unique way in which it embraced or rejected social customs and manners, came to be appreciated by other groups, but even here their appropriation does not nullify the merits of seeing that tradition as a collective of belief and practice. The question of *Puritanism* and *Puritanisms*, then, is important because, unlike that of the Reformation, English Puritanism produced one major confessional standard to which the mainstay of “the godly” subscribed as accurately reflecting their theological and social inheritance. This Puritan-Reformed orthodoxy is evidenced in the numerous divinity books, catechisms, and casuist works produced and disseminated among them since its birthpangs in the sixteenth century through its era of codification and long afterwards. This tradition allowed for sufficient variance of emphasis and doctrinal plasticity. Moreover, the codifiers at Westminster did not see themselves as innovating new theology; they were simply confessionalizing what they believed to be their heritage from the originators, heirs, and proponents of Puritanism through to their time. Thus, within Puritanism, there was unity in its confessional tradition, which itself was varied and diverse, and unity in its pietism. Those radicals and revolutionaries who challenged the

confessional mainstream, and moved beyond its borders, became so splintered and fractured that they never achieved the consensus reached at Westminster, but nonetheless they stood in relation to it.

Second, all three Puritans discussed in this work have hitherto been neglected. While recent studies have focused on John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, Cotton Mather, Peter Sterry, and Jonathan Edwards, this is the first recent attempt in English to assess Downname's contributions to Reformed theology, Rous's contributions to mystical piety, and Crisp's contributions to theologically high Calvinism within their historical, theological, and social contexts. Taken together, they show the unity that existed among diverse Puritans in the era of orthodoxy, and how their writings served to promote the Puritan Reformation. The strong theological identity of these authors is significant precisely because none of them wrote systematic works of divinity, and instead promulgated practical divinity, or "lived theology," in which they drew from their theological bequest, and advised readers, for instance, on how to dress oneself, how frequently to attend church, how to observe the Sabbath, how to avoid the theater, and how to cultivate a good conscience. These "morals and manners," however, were inseparable from their theological *unitas*, and were deduced from their doctrines of God and humanity, predestination and assurance, justification and sanctification, covenant of works and grace, and the Christian life. This convergence between doctrine and discipline is what Ames called "the Doctrine according to godliness."¹

Third, this work has shown that to assess the distinctive qualities of Puritanism one must assess the Puritans themselves, in their immediate social and intellectual contexts, and their standing within the greater narrative of the Puritan Reformation. The more diverse the Puritans, the more one can get at the Puritan "ethos." This approach combines, in parts, both Collinson's and Lake's attempts at defining Puritanism, and allows for a richly diversified understanding of Puritanism, while at the same time retaining its core semblance as a distinct style of divinity and piety. It also confirms Nuttall's work in that it sees similarities of style and expression across the radical Puritan spectrum. But it avoids the pitfall of being too narrow, which excludes certain Separatists and Baptists, and too wide, which would nullify any significant meaning. It suggests that there was both an "orthodox" and "radical" Puritanism, which, though distinct, are related with the latter being a magnification of the mystical and antinomian strains of the former. It identifies Puritans as a discernable core within the English Church, and corrects notions that Puritans were "hardly discernable" within the Calvinist bedrock. Further, it shows that

1 William Ames, *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof* (London, 1643), sig. A2.

historians have to consider more than piety within Puritanism, and give weight to its dominant theological consensus and homogeneity.

Fourth, this work shows that continuity existed, not only among Puritans of various persuasions, but also between the Reformation and Post-Reformation. It confirms Muller's work that there was not as an intense break between the theologies of these periods as Armstrong, Kendall, and others have suggested. Rather, the Reformed theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had considerable continuity and confluence, and exhibited within it a strong *sensus unitatis* in theological content and method. This greater *unitas*, as seen among these Puritans, does not suggest that Puritanism, as a whole, was monolithic in the sense of a "rigid" orthodoxy, or that Puritans were cast from one stone, or even that Calvin was their chief source, but that there was *unitas* within *diversitas* in shared theological concerns and social paradigms.

Far from being meaningless, "Puritan" and "Puritanism" have rich and vibrant connotations. The terms suggest an immense devotion, interest in Reformed piety, and strong adherence, with some flexibility, to Reformed orthodoxy, woven into a distinct style, which resulted in "precise" customs and manners. Lake is essentially correct in wanting to see Puritanism as a style that is distinct from its ceremonial counterpart; and Collinson is correct in seeing a discernable reform movement at work, which, depending on ecclesiastical and political pressures, varied in its hotness and intensity. Cohen is correct in identifying a large reliance within Puritanism on the experience of conversion and of personally clinging to God; and many other "definitions" proposed are all partially correct; but they only present a partial, and not a holistic, portrait. None of these themes, when considered atomically, render someone a "Puritan." It is only when they are considered together, as a style that weaved *dogma* and *praxis*, as a cluster of attitudes and expressions, as a movement for reform, as a desire to recultivate society for God's glory, and as a continuance of an earlier tradition, that one begins to get at the "ethos" of the Puritan.

Fifth and finally, this study emphasizes the importance of intellectual history in the study of religion, as well as the importance of society, social interactions, and relations between individuals. While the English Reformation has chiefly been the field of social historians, this study reiterates the need for communication across the disciplines in order to illuminate the intellectual and spiritual origins of a thinking people. Social histories should neither ignore nor minimize the greater intellectual continuity within Puritanism, nor should intellectual histories suggest the absence of diversity by identifying one defining feature where there is not one but many. Social histories provide the contexts in which ideas were circulated and advanced, and much fruit will be born with greater academic confluence.

In sum, the three Puritans in this study evidence *diversitas* and *unitas* within seventeenth-century Stuart Puritanism. They show that their identity as strangers and pilgrims was inseparable from their vision of the Puritan Reformation. John Downname was chiefly concerned with promoting precisianism. He did this through advocating Puritan-Reformed divinity through a series of works, which, in turn, fostered a distinctive Puritan piety. His *Christian Warfare* and *Guide to Godliness* are clear examples of the way in which Puritans explained the “doctrine according to godliness.” Francis Rous, whose political career spanned generations, was a writer of mystical piety, and a champion for spiritual reform. His *Mystical Marriage*, arguably his chief and most important work, shows how important union and communion with Christ as a uniting theme within the Puritan Reformation. Tobias Crisp, who advanced an alternative to precisianist introspection, was more concerned with his parishioners’ assurance and devotion than he was in writing theology textbooks. However, their connection to each other was greater than their experimental piety; it consisted of theological commitments concerning who God is and how he relates to the world. Their overall theological consensus reflects the broad confessional atmosphere of the Reformed orthodox, and attest to its *unitas in diversitate*. Thus, these case studies suggest that there was more confessional plasticity in the seventeenth century than either contemporary rhetoric or later generations intimated.

English Puritanism, then, should be thought of as a discernable and distinct style among its members, shared across a specific time and in concert with a reform of morals and manners. Their distinctiveness is seen in their experiential weaving of the doctrine of God and humanity, predestination and assurance, covenant of works and grace, justification and sanctification, law and gospel, and the Christian life, which, when considered as a whole, suggest a distinctly Puritan way of reasoning from the Bible and tradition. Though diverse, it is better to speak of *Puritanism* in its mainstream expression rather than *Puritanisms*.

Admittedly, given its limited focus, this book is not the final word on identifying Puritanism in the early modern period. It is a contribution to the ongoing muskeg of Puritan Reformation studies. Due to space restrictions this study was not able to consider the work of Richard Baxter, John Goodwin, John Eaton, John Milton, Lodowick Muggleton, Gerrard Winstanley, Laurence Clarkson, and other “Puritans” to any great extent. It is believed, however, that future studies will not only tap into the Puritan “ethos,” but also will radiate the plasticity of confessional adherence, the social and theological ramifications for transgressing those bounds, and heighten the importance that Puritans placed on solidarity. In the very least, this study has shown that *unitas* and

diversitas are not conflicting ideas, and that there are strong theological resemblances across Puritans of diverse backgrounds. While the results of this study require a broader approach to confessionality among Puritans, more work will need to be done on how *unitas* and *diversitas* relate to those Puritans who were neither strictly “Reformed” nor “orthodox.”

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival

Bodleian Library, Add. MSS 4155, 61683

Bodleian Library, Sloane MSS 292, 826, 1200, 1430, 2531

Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS d.106

Cambridge University Library, Add. MS 3117, Fos. 94v–105v

Printed

Adams, Thomas, *A Commentary, or Exposition vpon the Diuine Second Epistle Generall, Written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter* (London, 1633).

Airay, Henry, *Lectures vpon the VVhole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians, Deliuered in St. Peters Church in Oxford* (London, 1618).

Ambrose, Isaac, *Prima, Media, and Ultima: The First, Middle, and Last Things, in Three Treatises* (London, 1657).

Ames, William, *The Marrow of Sacred Diuinity Drawne out of the Holy Scriptures and the Interpreters Thereof, and Brought into Nethod* (London, 1643).

Baillie, Robert, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637–62*, ed. David Laing. 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1841).

Bakewell, Thomas, *The Antinomians Christ Confovn ded, and the Lords Christ Exalted. In Which Is Contained a Brie fe Confutation of Dr. Crispe and Mr Lancaster* (London, 1644).

Baxter, Richard, *Aphorismes of Justification* (London, 1649).

———, *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter*, ed. William Orne, 23 vols. (London, 1830).

———, *A Treatise of Justifying Righteousness in Two Books* (London, 1676).

Bayly, Lewis, *The Practice of Pietie Directing a Christian How to Walk That He May Please God* (London, 1611).

Baynes, Paul, *A Commentarie Vpon the First Chapter of the Epistle of Saint Paul, Written to the Ephesians* (London, 1618).

Benbrigg, John, *Christ Above All Exalted, As in Justification so in Sanctification, Wherein Severall Passages in Dr. Crisps Sermons are Answered* (London, 1645).

———, *Gods Fury, Englands Fire, or A Plaine Discovery of Those Spirituall incendiaries, Which Have Set Church and State on Fire* (London, 1646).

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

- Beverley, Thomas, *A Conciliatory Discourse upon Crisp's Sermons, on the Observation of Mr. Williams's Dissatisfactions in Them* (London, 1692).
- , *A Conciliatory Judgment Concerning Dr. Crisp's Sermons, and Mr. Baxter's Dissatisfactions in Them* (London, 1690).
- Bunyan, John, *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan: The Doctrine of the Law and Grace Unfolded and I Will Pray With the Spirit*, ed. Roger Sharrock (Oxford, 1976).
- , *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan VII: Solomon's Temple Spiritualized, The House of the Forest of Lebanon, The Water of Life*, ed. Graham Midgley (Oxford, 1989).
- Burgess, Anthony, *The True Doctrine of Justification Asserted and Vindicated* (London, 1644).
- Burgess, Cornelius, *No Sacrilege Nor Sinne To Aliene or Purchase the Lands of Bishops or Others, Whose Offices are Abolished* (London, 1659).
- Calamy, Edmund, *Two solempne covenants made between God and man; that is, the covenant of workes, and the covenant of grace* (London, 1647).
- Cartwright, Thomas, *A Second Replie* (London, 1575).
- Chauncy, Isaac, *Neonomianism Unmask'd: or, The Ancient Gospel Pleaded* (London, 1692).
- Clarkson, Laurence, *The lost sheep found, or, The prodigal returned to his fathers house* (London, 1660).
- Crisp, Samuel, *Christ Made Sin: 2 Cor. 5:21 Evinced from Scripture, Upon Occasion of an Exception Taken at Pinnars-hall, 28 January 1689, at Reprinting the Sermons of Dr. Tobias Crisp* (London, 1691).
- . *Christ Exalted, and Dr. Crisp Vindicated in Several Points Called Antinomian, being Cleared from Neonomian Suggestions Alledged* (London, 1698).
- Crisp, Tobias, *Christ Alone Exalted in Fourteen Sermons Preached in, and Neere London* (London, 1644).
- , *Christ Alone Exalted: Being the Compleat Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D.* (London, 1690).
- , *Christ Alone Exalted; in the Perfection and Encouragements of the Saints, Notwithstanding Sins and Trials, Being the Complete Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D.*, 4th ed., 2 vols (London, 1791).
- Culverwell, Ezekiel, *A Treatise of Faith: Wherein is Declared How a Man May Live By Faith, and Find Releefe in All His Necessaries. Applied Especially unto the Use of the Weakest Christians* (London, 1623).
- Dering, Edward, *A Sermon Preached Before the Queens Maiestie* (Awdely, 1569).
- Donne, John, *The Works of John Donne, D.D., Dean of Saint Paul's 1621–1641*, ed. Henry Alford, 6 vols. (London, 1839).
- Downname, George, *A Godly and Learned Treatise of Prayer* (London, 1640).

- Downname, John, *Additional Annotations Or, A collection of all the Several Additions to the Third . . . Impression of that Most Excellent Work, Intituled Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament* (London, 1658).
- , *Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament* (London, 1645).
- , *A Brief Concordance or Table to the Bible of the Last Translation* (London, 1630).
- , *The Christian Warfare against the Deuill, World, and Flesh, Wherein is Described Their Nature, the Manner of their Fight and Meanes to Obtaine Victorye* (London, 1634).
- , *A Guide to Godlynesse, Or a Treatise of the Christian Life* (London, 1622).
- , *Lectures Vpon the Fovre First Chapters of the Prophecie of Hosea* (London, 1608).
- Durham, William, *The Life and Death of that Judicious and Accomplish'd Preacher, Robert Harris, D.D.* (London, 1662).
- Dury, John, *The Earnest Breathings of Foreign Protestants, Divines, and Others to the Ministers and Other Able Christians of These Three Nations for a Compleat Body of Practicall Divinity* (London, 1658).
- Eaton, John, *The Honey-combe of Free Justification by Christ Alone* (London, 1642).
- Edwards, Thomas, *The First and Second Part of Gangraena: Or, A Catalogue and Discovery of Many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of This Time, Vented and Acted in England in These Four Last Yeers* (London, 1646).
- Eyre, William, *Vindiciae Justificationis Gratuitae* (London, 1654).
- Finch, Henry, *The Summe of Sacred Diuinitie*, ed. John Downname (London, c.1620).
- , *The Worlds Great Restauration. Or the Calling of the Iewes, and (with them) of all the Nations and Kingdoms of the Earth, to the Faith of Christ* (London, 1621).
- Gataker, Thomas, *Gods Eye on His Israel. Or, a Passage of Balaam, out of Numb. 23.21. Containing Matter Very Seasonable and Suitable to the Times; Expounded and Cleared from Antinomian Abuse; With Application to the Present Estate of Things with Us* (London, 1645).
- Geree, John, *The Character of an Old English Puritan* (London, 1646).
- Geree, Stephen, *The Doctrine of the Antinomians by Evidence of Gods Truth, Plainly Confuted* (London, 1644).
- Goodwin, John, *Απολντρωσις Απολντρωσεας Or Redemption Redeemed* (London, 1651).
- Gouge, William, *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1655).
- Greenhill, William, *An Exposition of the Five First Chapters of the Prophet Ezekiel* (London, 1645).
- Hall, Joseph, *Christ Mysticall; Or, The Blessed Union of Christ and His Members* (London, 1647).
- Hartlib, Samuel, *The True and Readie Way to Learne the Latin Tongue* (London, 1654).

- Hooker, Thomas, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: A Critical Edition with Modern Spelling*, ed. Arthur Stephen McGrade, 3 vols. (New York, 2013).
- Jenkyn, William, *An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude* (London, 1652).
- Knott, Edward, *Charity Mistaken, with the Want Wherof* (s.l., 1630).
- Leigh, Edward, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity, Consisting of Ten Books* (London, 1654).
- Montagu, Richard, *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers* (London, 1625).
- Nedham, Marchamont, *The Cases of the Commonwealth of England Stated*, ed. Philip A. Knachel (Charlottesville, 1969).
- Norton, John, *Abel Being Dead, Yet Speaketh; Or, The Life and Death of That Deservedly Famous Man of God Mr John Cotton, Late Teacher of the Church of Christ, at Boston in New-England* (London, 1658).
- Pagitt, Ephraim, *Heresiography, Or a Description of the Heretickes and Sectaries of These Latter Times* (London, 1645).
- Pemble, William, *Vindiciae Gratiae. A Plea for Grace. More Especially the Grace of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London, 1629).
- Pepys, Samuel, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys* (New York, 1893).
- Perkins, William, *A Golden Chaine; or, The Description of Theologie, Containing the Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, According to Gods Woord* (London, 1591).
- , *The Workes of That Famoys and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Unviersity of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins* (Cambridge, Eng., 1616–18).
- Porter, Edmund, *Θέος Ανθρωποφόρος. Or, God Incarnate, Shewing that Jesus Christ is the Onely and the Most High God* (London, 1655).
- Rogers, Richard, *A Commentary Vpon the Whole Book of Iudges* (London, 1615).
- Rous, Francis, *The Ancient Bounds, or Liberty of Conscience, Tenderly Stated, Modestly Asserted and Mildly Vindicated* (London, 1645).
- , *The Art of Happiness* (London, 1619).
- , *The Balme of Love: To Heale Divisions, and the Wounds Made by Them; and to Make the Body of Christ Whole and Entire For Its Owne Beauty, Strength, and Safety* (London, 1648).
- , *The Booke of Psalmes in English-Meeter* (London, 1641).
- , *Catholick Charitie: Complaining, and Maintaining, That Rome is Uncharitable to Sundry Eminent Parts of the Catholic Church, and Especially to Protestants, and is Therefore Uncatholick* (London, 1641).
- , *The Diseases of the Time, Attended by Their Remedies* (London, 1622).
- , *The Heavenly Academie* (London, 1638).
- , *Interiora Regni Dei* (London, 1655).
- , *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government* (London, 1649).

- , *Meditations of Instruction, of Exhortation, of Reprofe: Indeauouring the Edification and Reparation of the House of God* (London, 1616).
- , *Mella Patrum* (London, 1650).
- , *The Mysticall Marriage* (London, 1631).
- , *Mysticum matrimonium quo junguntur Cristus et ecclesia* (London, 1655).
- , *Oile of scorpions. The Miseries of These Times Turned into Medicines and Curing Themselues* (London, 1623).
- , *The Onely Remedy, That Can Cvre a People, When All Other Remedies Faile* (London, 1627).
- , *Testis Veritatis* (London, 1626).
- , *Treatises and Meditations Dedicated to the Saints, and to the Excellent Throughout the Three Nations* (London, 1657).
- , *Thvle, Or Vertues Historie* (London, 1598).
- , *The Trvth of Three Things, viz. The Doctrine of Predestination, Free-Will, and Certainty of Salvation* (s.l., 1633).
- Rutherford, Samuel, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist* (London, 1648).
- Saltmarsh, John, *Free-Grace: Or, The Flowings of Christs Blood Freely to Sinners* (London, 1646).
- Taylor, Thomas, *A Commentarie Vpon the Epistle of S. Paul written to Titvs* (Cambridge, Eng., 1612).
- Trail, Robert, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification, And of its Preachers and Professors, from the Unjust Charge of Antinomianism* (London, 1692).
- Twisse, William, *The Riches of Gods Love unto the Vessells of Mercy, Consistent with His Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the Vessells of Wrath* (Oxford, 1653).
- Ussher, James, *A Body of Divinitie, or the Symme and Svbsance of Christian Religion* ed. John Downame (London, 1645).
- , *Eighteen Sermons Preached in Oxford, 1640* (London, 1660).
- , *The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, with a Life of the Author and An Account of His Writings*, ed. Charles Richard Elrington (Dublin, 1897).
- Wickens, Robert, *A Compleat and Perfect Concordance of the English Bible* (Oxford, 1655).
- Widdowes, Giles, *The Schysmatical Puritan* (London, 1631).
- Wilburn, Percival, *A Checke or Reproffe of M. Howlet's Untimely Screeching* (London, 1581).
- Wotton, Samuel, *Mr. Anthony Wotton's Defence Against Mr. George Walker's Charge, Accusing Him of Socinian Heresie and Blasphemie* (Cambridge, Eng., 1641).

Yates, John, *Ibis ad Caesarem. Or A submissive appearance before Caesar in answer to Mr Mountagues appeale, in the points of Arminianisme and popery, maintained and defended by him, against the doctrine of the Church of England* (London, 1626).

Secondary Sources

- Achinstein, Sharon, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Ahlstrom, Sydney E., ed., *Theology in America: The Major Protestant Voices from Puritanism to Neo-Orthodoxy* (1967; repr. Indianapolis, 2003).
- Ahmed, Arif, ed., *Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010).
- Alford, Stephen, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558–69* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998).
- , *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Allen, J. W., *English Political Thought, 1603–60, Volume 1: 1603–44* (London, 1938).
- Allison, C. Fitzsimons, *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (New York, 1966).
- Almond, Philip C., *Adam and Eve in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Cambridge, Eng., 1999).
- Ames-Lewis, Francis, ed., *Sir Thomas Gresham and Gresham College: Studies in the Intellectual History of London in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Aldershot, 1999).
- Amory, Hugh, and David D. Hall, *A History of the Book in America*, 4 vols. (Chapel Hill, 2007).
- Anderson, Judith H., *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England* (Bronx, 2005).
- Appleby, David J., *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic, and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2008).
- Armstrong, Brian G., *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison, 1969).
- Aston, Margaret, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984).
- Atherton, Ian, and David Como, "The Burning of Edward Wightman: Puritanism, Prelacy, and the Politics of Heresy in Early Modern England," *English Historical Review* 120 (2005), 1215–50.
- Atherton, Ian, and Julie Sanders, eds., *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester, 2006).
- Atkins, Jonathan M., "Calvinist Bishops, Church Unity, and the Rise of Arminianism," *Albion* 18 (1986), 411–27.
- Auchter, Dorothy, *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* (Westport, 2001).

- Auslander, Leora, *Cultural Revolutions: Everyday Life and Politics in Britain, North America, and France* (Berkeley, 2009).
- Bac, J. Martin, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as Against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden, 2010).
- Backus, Irena, *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg* (New York, 2000).
- , *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation, 1378–1615* (Leiden, 2003).
- , *Théodore de Bèze* (Geneva, 2007).
- Backus, Irena, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1997).
- Backus, Irena, and Philip Benedict, eds., *Calvin and His Influence, 1509–2009* (New York, 2011).
- Bagchi, David, and David C. Steinmetz, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004).
- Bailyn, Bernard, *New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).
- Baker, J. Wayne, “*Sola Fide, Sola Gratia*: The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985), 115–33.
- Ball, Bryan W., *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden, 1975).
- Ball, John H., III, *Chronicling the Soul’s Windings: Thomas Hooker and His Morphology of Conversion* (Lanham, 1992).
- Ballor, Jordan J., *Covenant, Causality, and Law: A Study in the Theology of Wolfgang Musculus* (Göttingen, 2012).
- Barbee, David M., “A Reformed Catholike: William Perkins’s Use of the Church Fathers” (PhD. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2013).
- Barber, John, *The Road to Eden: Studies in Christianity and Culture* (Palo Alto, 2008).
- Barbour, Reid, *Literature and Religious Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001).
- Barnard, John, and D. F. McKenzie, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557–1695* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Barton, Stephen C., *Holiness: Past & Present* (London, 2005).
- Bast, Robert J., and Andrew C. Gow, eds., *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late-Medieval and Reformation History* (Leiden, 2000).
- Beach, J. Mark, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin’s Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace* (Göttingen, 2007).
- Beardslee, John W., III, ed., *Reformed Dogmatics: J. Wollebius, G. Voetius, F. Turretin* (New York, 1965).

- Bedford, Ronald, Lloyd Davis, and Philippa Kelly, *Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation, 1500–1660* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Beeke, Joel R., *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York, 1991).
- , “Faith and Assurance in the Heidelberg Catechism and Its Primary Composers: A Fresh Look at the Kendall Thesis,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 27 (1992), 39–67.
- Beeke, Joel R., and Randall J. Pederson, *Meet the Puritans: A Guide to Modern Reprints* (Grand Rapids, 2006).
- Beeke, Joel R., and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids, 2012).
- Bendall, Sarah, Christopher Brooke, and Patrick Collinson, *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999).
- Benedict, Philip, *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven, 2002).
- Bennet, Joan, *Sir Thomas Browne: “A Man of Achievement in Literature”* (Cambridge, Eng., 1962).
- Bennett, Ralph, ed., *Settlements in the Americas: Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (Newark, 1993).
- Bercovitch, Sacvan, *The American Puritan Imagination: Essays in Revaluation* (Cambridge, Eng., 1974).
- , *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (New Haven, 1975).
- , *The American Jeremiad* (Madison, 1978).
- Bernard, G. W., *The King’s Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven, 2005).
- Betteridge, Tom, *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation* (Manchester, 2004).
- Bierma, Lyle D., *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus* (Grand Rapids, 1996).
- , *The Theology of the Heidelberg Catechism: A Reformation Synthesis* (Louisville, 2013).
- Bierma, Lyle D., ed., *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, History, and Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2005).
- Bietenholz, Peter G., *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus: Erasmus’s Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe* (Toronto, 2009).
- Billier, Peter, and Anne Hudson, eds., *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).
- Billings, J. Todd, and I. John Hesselink, eds., *Calvin’s Theology and Its Reception: Disputes, Developments, and New Possibilities* (Louisville, 2012).
- Black, Joseph L., ed., *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008).

- Black, Michael H., *Cambridge University Press, 1584–1984* (Cambridge, Eng., 1984).
- Boase, George Clement, and William Prideaux Courtney, *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis: A Catalogue of the Writings, both Manuscript and Printed, of Cornishmen, and of Works Relating to the County of Cornwall*, 3 vols. (London, 1882).
- Boersma, Hans, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in Its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer, 1993).
- Bolam, C. G., et al., eds., *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Moderate Unitarianism* (London, 1968).
- Bondos-Greene, Stephen A., "The End of an Era: Cambridge Puritanism and the Christ's College Election of 1609," *The Historical Journal* 25 (1982), 197–208.
- Booty, John. "Anglicanism," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans Hillerbrand (New York, 1996), 1:38–44.
- Boran, Elizabethanne, and Crawford Gribben, eds., *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550–1700* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Bossy, John, *Peace in the Post-Reformation* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998).
- Bozeman, Theodore D., *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum Religious Thought* (Chapel Hill, 1977).
- , *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill, 1988).
- , "The Glory of the 'Third Time': John Eaton as Contra-Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996), 638–54.
- , *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill, 2004).
- Brachlow, Stephen, *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570–1625* (Oxford, 1988).
- Braddick, Michael, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London, 2008).
- Bradley, James E., and Richard A. Muller, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works and Methods* (Grand Rapids, 1995).
- Bradshaw, Brendan, and Peter Roberts, eds., *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533–1707* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Brauer, Jerald C., "Francis Rous, Puritan Mystic, 1579–1659: An Introduction to the Study of the Mystical Element in Puritanism" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1948).
- , "Reflections on the Nature of English Puritanism," *Church History* 23 (1954), 99–108.
- , "Types of Puritan Piety," *Church History* 56 (1987), 39–58.
- Brecht, Martin, ed., *Geschichte Des Pietismus* (Göttingen, 1993).

- Breen, Louise A., "Guardians in the Gap: Religious Heterodoxy and the Puritan Officer Corps in Seventeenth-century Massachusetts" (PhD diss., University of Connecticut, 1993).
- , *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630–92* (New York, 2001).
- Breitwieser, Mitchell R., *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning: Religion, Grief, and Ethnology in Mary White Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative* (Madison, 1990).
- Bremer, Francis J., *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610–92* (Boston, 1994).
- , *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards* (Lebanon, 1995).
- , *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father* (New York, 2005).
- , *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York, 2009).
- , *Building a New Jerusalem: John Davenport, a Puritan in Three Worlds* (New Haven, 2012).
- , *First Founders: American Puritans and Puritanism in an Atlantic World* (Durham, 2012).
- Bremer, Francis J., ed., *Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston, 1993).
- Bremer, Francis J., and Lynn A. Botelho, eds., *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England, 1588–1649* (Boston, 2005).
- Bremer, Francis J., and Tom Webster, eds., *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, 2006).
- Bender, Stephen, *Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992).
- Brenner, Robert, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550–1653* (Princeton, 1993).
- Breslow, Marvin A., *Mirror of England: English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618–40* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970).
- Breward, Ian, "The Life and Theology of William Perkins" (PhD diss., University of Manchester, 1963).
- , "The Abolition of Puritanism," *Journal of Religious History* 7 (1972), 20–34.
- Breward, Ian, ed., *The Work of William Perkins* (Appleford, 1970).
- Brewer, Holly, *By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority* (Chapel Hill, 2005).
- Brockway, Robert W., *A Wonderful Work of God: Puritanism and the Great Awakening* (Bethlehem, 2003).
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W., *Historical Theology: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids, 1978).

- Brook, Benjamin, *Lives of the Puritans*, 3 vols. (London, 1813).
- Brooke, John, and Ian Maclean, eds., *Heterodoxy in Early Modern Science and Religion* (New York, 2005).
- Brown, Andrew D., *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England: The Diocese of Salisbury, 1250–1550* (New York, 1995).
- Brown, Keith, "Review of Scottish Puritanism," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002).
- Brown, Matthew P., *The Pilgrim and the Bee: Reading Rituals and Book Culture in Early New England* (Philadelphia, 2007).
- Buchanan, James, *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of Its History in the Church and of Its Exposition from Scripture* (Edinburgh, 1867).
- Burton, Simon J. G., *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's "Modus Theologiae"* (Leiden, 2012).
- Bush, Sargent, *The Writings of Thomas Hooker: Spiritual Adventure in Two Worlds* (Madison, 1980).
- Bush, Sargent, ed., *The Correspondence of John Cotton* (Chapel Hill, 2001).
- Caldwell, Patricia, *The Puritan Conversion Narrative: The Beginnings of American Expression* (Cambridge, Eng., 1983).
- Caldwell, Robert W., III, *The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards: Text, Context, and Application* (Aldershot, 2012).
- Cambers, Andrew, "Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, c.1580–1720," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 796–825.
- , *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript, and Puritanism in England, 1580–1720* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011).
- Cameron, Euan, *The European Reformation* (New York, 1991).
- Campbell, Gordon, *Bible: The Story of the King James Version* (New York, 2011).
- Campbell, Gordon, and Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (New York, 2008).
- Canizares-Esquerria, Jorge, *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550–1700* (Palo Alto, 2006).
- Canny, Nicholas, ed., *The Origins of Empire, Volume 1: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2001).
- Capp, Bernard S. *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London, 1972).
- , *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–60* (New York, 2012).
- Carlson, Leland H., ed., *Elizabethan Non-Conformist Texts, Volume 3: The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587–1590* (New York, 2003).

- Carlton, Charles, ed., *State, Sovereigns, and Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honor of A. J. Slavin* (New York, 1998).
- Casillas, Kenneth, "English Puritan Exegesis as Reflected in Thomas Gataker's Annotations on Isaiah: Toward an Equitable Assessment of Historic Biblical Interpretation" (PhD diss., Bob Jones University, 2001).
- Chan, Simon, "The Puritan Meditative Tradition, 1599–1691: A Study in Ascetical Piety" (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 1986).
- Chapman, Alister, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory, eds., *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion* (Notre Dame, 2009).
- Chase, William, *A Catalogue of a Very Valuable Collection of Books* (Norwich, 1753).
- Christianson, Paul, "Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1970), 463–84.
- Chung, Paul S., *The Spirit of God Transforming Life: The Reformation and Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York, 2009).
- Church, F. Forrester, and Timothy George, eds., *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams* (Leiden, 1979).
- Clark, Donald Lemen, "John Milton and William Chappell," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 18 (1955), 329–50.
- Clark, Peter, ed., *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540–1840* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- Clark, Victoria, *Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism* (New Haven, 2007).
- Clarke, Elizabeth, *Politics, Religion, and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 2011).
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001).
- , *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008).
- Cleveland, Christopher, *Thomism in John Owen* (Aldershot, 2013).
- Cliffe, J. T., *Puritan Gentry: The Great Puritan Families of Stuart England* (New York, 1984).
- , *Puritans in Conflict: The Puritan Gentry During and After the Civil Wars* (London, 1988).
- Coffey, John, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997).
- , "Puritanism and Liberty Revisited: The Case for Toleration in the English Revolution," *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998), 961–85.
- , *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1588–1689* (London, 2000).
- , *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2006).
- , "The Problem of 'Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638,'" in *Enforcing the Reformation in Ireland and Scotland*, eds. Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben (Aldershot, 2007), 68–90.

- Coffey, John, and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008).
- Cogswell, Thomas, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake, eds., *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honor of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Cohen, Bernard, ed., *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis* (New Brunswick, 1990).
- Colacurcio, Michael J., *Godly Letters: The Literature of the American Puritans* (Notre Dame, 2006).
- Collinson, Patrick, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (New York, 1967).
- , "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), 483–88.
- , *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (New York, 1982).
- , *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983).
- , *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York, 1988).
- , *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles, 1989).
- , *Elizabethan Essays* (New York, 1994).
- , *Elizabethans* (New York, 2003).
- , *From Cranmer to Sancroft* (London, 2006).
- , *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013).
- Collinson, Patrick, John Craig, and Brett Usher, eds., *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church, 1582–90* (Woodbridge, 2003).
- Collinson, Patrick, Richard Rex, and Graham Stanton, *Lady Margaret Beaufort and Her Professors of Divinity at Cambridge* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Como, David R., "Women, Prophecy, and Authority in Early Stuart Puritanism," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 61 (1998), 203–22.
- , *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Palo Alto, 2004).
- Como, David, and Peter Lake, "Puritans, Antinomians, and Laudians in Caroline London: The Strange Case of Peter Shaw and Its Contents," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (1999), 684–715.
- Condren, Conal, *The Language of Politics in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1994).
- , *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices* (New York, 2006).
- Conforti, Joseph A., *Jonathan Edwards, Religious Tradition, and American Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1995).

- , *Imagining New England: Explorations of Regional Identity from the Pilgrims to the Mid-Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill, 2001).
- , *Saints and Strangers: New England in British North America* (Baltimore, 2006).
- Coolidge, John S., *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (London, 1970).
- Cooper, Tim, "The Antinomians Redeemed: Removing Some of the 'Radical' from Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Religion," *Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000), 247–62.
- , *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot, 2001).
- , *John Owen, Richard Baxter, and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Aldershot, 2011).
- Corns, Thomas N., ed., *A Companion to Milton* (Malden, 2001).
- Corns, Thomas N., and David Loewenstein, eds., *The Emergence of Quaker Writing: Dissenting Literature in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1995).
- Coster, Will, *Baptism and Spiritual Kinship in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2002).
- Coward, Barry, and Julian Swann, eds., *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern England: From the Waldensians to the French Revolution* (Aldershot, 2004).
- Craig, John, *Reformation, Politics, and Polemics: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns, 1500–1610* (Aldershot, 2002).
- Cross, Claire, *Church and People: England, 1450–1660*, 2nd ed. (Malden, 1999).
- Crawford, Julie, *Marvelous Protestantism: Monstrous Births in Post-Reformation England* (Baltimore, 2005).
- Cressy, David, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987).
- , *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York, 1997).
- , *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York, 2000).
- , *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–42* (New York, 2006).
- , *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Crick, Julia, and Alexandra Walsham, eds., *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004).
- Cromartie, Alan, *Sir Matthew Hale, 1609–76: Law, Religion, and Natural Philosophy* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995).
- Cross, Frank Leslie, ed., *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (New York, 1974).
- Cross, Richard, *The Metaphysics of the Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus* (New York, 2002).
- Cuming, G. J., and Derek Baker, eds., *Popular Belief and Practice* (Cambridge, Eng., 1972).

- Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert, ed., *A History of Christian Doctrine* (London, 1978).
- Cunningham, Andrew, and Ole Peter Grell, eds., *The Four Horseman of the Apocalypse: Religion, War, Famine, and Death in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- D'Addario, Christopher, *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007).
- Dahl, Gina, *Book Collections of Clerics in Norway, 1650–1750* (Leiden, 2012).
- Damrau, Peter, *The Reception of English Puritan Literature in Germany* (London, 2006).
- Daniell, David, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven, 2003).
- Daniels, Bruce C., *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England* (New York, 1995).
- Danner, Dan G., *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1555–1560* (New York, 1999).
- Darton, Frederick Joseph Harvey, *Children's Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life* (Cambridge, Eng., 1932).
- Davies, Brian, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (New York, 1992).
- Davies, Catharine, *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI* (Manchester, 2002).
- Davies, Horton, *Worship and Theology in England*. 2 vols. (Princeton, 1970–5).
- , *The Worship of the English Puritans* (Grand Rapids, 1997).
- Davies, Julian, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625–41* (New York, 1992).
- Davis, J. C., *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1516–1700* (Cambridge, Eng., 1981).
- , *Fear, Myth, and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986).
- , "Puritanism and Revolution: Themes, Categories, Methods and Conclusions," *Historical Journal* 33 (1990), 693–704.
- , *Oliver Cromwell* (New York, 2001).
- De Krey, Gary S., *London and the Restoration, 1659–83* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005).
- De Reuver, Arie, *Sweet Communion: Trajectories of Spirituality from the Middle Ages through the Further Reformation*, trans. James A. De Jong (Grand Rapids, 2007).
- Degler, Carl N., *Out of Our Past: The Forces that Shaped Modern America* (New York, 1984).
- Den Boer, William, *God's Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius, 1559–1609* (Göttingen, 2010).
- Dever, Mark E., *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon, 2000).
- DeVries, Pieter, "Die Mij Heft Liefgehad" *De Betekenis van de Gemeenschap Met Christus in de Theologie van John Owen, 1616–83* (Heerenveen, 1999).

- DeVun, Leah, *Prophecy, Alchemy, and the End of Time: John of Rupecissa in the Late Middle Ages* (New York, 2009).
- Dickens, A. G., *The English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (University Park, 1991).
- Dillon, Jannette, *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400–1625* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010).
- Dixon, C. Scott, *Contesting the Reformation* (Malden, 2010).
- Dixon, Philip, *Nice and Hot Disputes: The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 2003).
- Dobranski, Stephen B., and John P. Rumrich, eds., *Milton and Heresy* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998).
- Dodds, Gregory D., *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto, 2009).
- Doerkson, Daniel W., and Christopher Hodgkins, eds., *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way* (Newark, 2004).
- Donnelly, John P., *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden, 1976).
- Doran, Susan, *Elizabeth I and Religion, 1558–1603* (New York, 1994).
- Doran, Susan, and Christopher Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People: The Church and Religion in England, 1500–1700*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2003).
- Duffin, Ann, *Faction and Faith: Politics and Religion of the Cornish Gentry Before the Civil War* (Exeter, 1996).
- Duffy, Eamon, *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village* (New Haven, 2001).
- , *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, 2005).
- , *Marking the Hours: English People and Their Prayers, 1240–1570* (New Haven, 2006).
- , *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven, 2009).
- Duffy, Eamon, and D. M. Loades, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor: Catholic Christendom, 1300–1700* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Dunan-Page, Anne, *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots, 1660–1750* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Durston, Christopher, *The Family in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1989).
- , *James I* (New York, 1993).
- , *Cromwell's Major Generals: Godly Government During the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2001).
- Durston, Christopher, and Jacqueline Eales, eds., *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700* (New York, 1996).
- Durston, Christopher, and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2007).

- Dutton, Richard, *Licensing, Censorship, and Authorship in Early Modern England* (New York, 2000).
- Dzelzaninis, Martin, and Annabel Patterson, eds., *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2 vols. (New Haven, 2003).
- Eales, Jacqueline, *Puritans and Roundheads: The Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the English Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 1990).
- , *Women in Early Modern England, 1500–1700* (London, 1998).
- , *Community and Disunity: Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640–1649* (London, 2001).
- Egan, Jim, *Authorizing Experience: Refigurations of the Body Politic in Seventeenth-Century New England Writing* (Princeton, 1999).
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (Cambridge, Eng., 1979).
- , *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 1983).
- Elton, G. R., *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government, Papers and Reviews, 1946–72, Volume 2: Parliament [and] Political Thought* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Elwood, Douglas J., *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 1960).
- Emerson, Everett H., *English Puritanism from John Hooper to John Milton* (Durham, 1968).
- Englander, David, et al., eds., *Culture and Belief in Europe, 1450–1600: An Anthology of Sources* (Malden, 1990).
- Erickson, Robert A., *The Language of the Heart, 1600–1750* (Philadelphia, 1997).
- Euler, Carrie. *Couriers of the Gospel: England and Zurich, 1531–58* (Zürich, 2006).
- Evans, G. R., *Alan of Lille: The Frontiers of Theology in the Later Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Eng., 1983).
- , *The University of Cambridge: A New History* (London, 2010).
- , *The University of Oxford: A New History* (London, 2010).
- Fallon, Stephen M., *Milton's Peculiar Grace: Self-Representation and Authority* (Ithaca, 2007).
- Feingold, Mordechai, *History of Universities*, XVII, 2001–2002 (New York, 2002).
- Ferngren, Gary B., ed., *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction* (Baltimore, 2002).
- Ferrell, Lori Anne, and Peter McCullough, eds., *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History, 1600–1750* (Manchester, 2000).
- Fesko, John V., *Diversity within the Reformed Tradition: Supra- and Infralapsarianism in Calvin, Dort, and Westminster* (Greenville, 2001).
- , *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology, 1517–1700* (Göttingen, 2012).
- Fessenden, Tracy, Nicholas F. Radel, and Magdalena J. Zaborowska, eds., *The Puritan Origins of American Sex: Religion, Sexuality, and the National* (New York, 2001).

- Field, David P., *Rigide Calvinisme in a Softer Dresse: The Moderate Presbyterianism of John Howe, 1630–1705* (Edinburgh, 2004).
- Finch, Martha L., *Dissenting Bodies: Corporealities in Early New England* (New York, 2010).
- Fincham, Kenneth, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (New York, 1990).
- , *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–42* (Palo Alto, 1993).
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (Woodbridge, 1998).
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake, “Popularity, Prelacy, and Puritanism in the 1630s: Joseph Hall Explains Himself,” *The English Historical Review* 111 (1996), 856–81.
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006).
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (New York, 2008).
- Finlayson, Michael G., *Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution: The Religious Factor in English Politics Before and After the Interregnum* (Toronto, 1983).
- Finlayson, Michael, “Puritanism and Puritans: Labels or Libels?,” *Canadian Journal of History* 8 (1973), 201–33.
- Fischer, David Hackett, *Historians’ Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York, 1970).
- Fisher, George, *The Reformation* (New York, 1873).
- Fitzgerald, Alan D., ed., *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999).
- Fleming, W. K., *Mysticism in Christianity* (London, 1913).
- Ford, Alan, “Church of Ireland, 1558–1641: A Puritan Church?,” in *As by Law Established: The Church of England Since the Reformation*, ed. Alan Ford, J. I. McGuire, and Kenneth Milne (Dublin, 1995).
- , *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590–1641* (Dublin, 1997).
- , *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early Modern Ireland and England* (New York, 2007).
- Ford, Alan, and John McCafferty, eds., *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005).
- Foster, Stephen, “New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630–60: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 38 (1981), 624–60.
- , *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1996).
- Foxe, John, *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs: Select Narratives*, ed. John N. King (New York, 2009).
- Freedman, Lila, ed., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden, 1992).

- Freeman, Thomas S., and Thomas F. Mayer, eds., *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c.1400–1700* (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Freist, Dagmar, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion, and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637–45* (London, 1997).
- Fritze, Ronald H., and William B. Robison, eds., *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603–1689* (Westport, 1996).
- Fuller, Thomas, *The Church History of Britain, from the Birth of Jesus Christ Until the Year 1648*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1845).
- Games, Alison, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).
- Ganzer, Klaus, and Bruno Steimer, eds., *Dictionary of the Reformation* (New York, 2002).
- Gardiner, Dorothy, ed., *The Oxinden Letters, 1607–42* (London, 1933).
- Gardiner, S. R., *History of England, 1603–42*. 10 vols. (London, 1883–4).
- Garrett, Christina H., *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 1938).
- Garrett, James Leo, *Baptist Theology: A Four-Century Study* (Macon, 2009).
- Gaunt, Peter, *The English Civil Wars, 1642–1651* (Oxford, 2003).
- Gaunt, Peter, ed., *The English Civil War* (Malden, 2000).
- Gavrilyuk, Paul L., and Sarah Coakley, eds., *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011).
- George, C. H., "Puritanism as History and Historiography," *Past & Present* 41 (1968), 77–104.
- Gerstner, Jonathan N., *The Thousand Generation Covenant: Dutch Reformed Covenant Theology and Group Identity in Colonial South Africa, 1652–1814* (Leiden, 1991).
- Gibbons, B. J., *Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought: Behmenism and Its Development in England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Gibson, William, and Robert G. Ingram, eds., *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660–1832* (Aldershot, 2005).
- Gill, John, *Truth Defended in Sermons and Tracts, by the late Reverend and Learned John Gill, D.D. A New Edition* (1814; repr. Streamwood, 1981).
- Gordis, Lisa M., *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* (Chicago, 2003).
- Gordon, Scott Paul, *The Power of the Passive Self in English Literature, 1640–1770* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Goudriaan, Aza, *Reformed Orthodoxy and Philosophy, 1625–1750: Gisbertus Voetius, Petrus van Mastricht, and Anthonius Driessen* (Leiden, 2006).
- Goudriaan, Aza, and Fred van Lieburg, eds., *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt, 1618–19* (Leiden, 2010).
- Gould, Philip, *Covenant and Republic: Historical Romance and the Politics of Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).

- Graebner, Norman Brooks, "Protestants and Dissenters: An Examination of the Seventeenth-Century Eatonist and New England Controversies in Reformation Perspective" (PhD diss., Duke University, 1984).
- Graham, Judith S., *Puritan Family Life: The Diary of Samuel Sewall* (Lebanon, 2000).
- Graham, Michael F., *The Blasphemies of Thomas Aikenhead: Boundaries of Belief on the Eve of the Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 2008).
- Granger, James, ed., *A Biographical History of England, from Egbert the Great to the Revolution*, 4 vols. (London, 1775).
- Grayling, A. C., Naomi Goulder, and Andrew Pyle, eds., *The Continuum Encyclopedia of British Philosophy* (London, 2006).
- Greaves, Richard L., "Puritanism and Science: The Anatomy of a Controversy," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30 (1969), 345–68.
- , *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England* (Minneapolis, 1981).
- , *Saints and Rebels: Seven Nonconformists in Stuart England* (Macon, 1985).
- , *Deliver Us From Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660–63* (New York, 1986).
- , "The Puritan-Nonconformist Tradition in England, 1560–1700: Historiographical Reflections," *Albion* 17 (1987), 449–86.
- , *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford, 2002).
- Greaves, Richard L., and Robert Zaller, eds., *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*, 3 vols. (Brighton, 1982).
- Green, I. M., "‘For Children in Yeeres and Children in Understanding’: The Emergence of the English Catechism under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986), 397–425.
- , *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England, c.1530–1740* (New York, 1996).
- , *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (New York, 2001).
- Green, Robert W., ed., *Protestantism, Capitalism, and Social Science: The Weber Thesis Controversy*, 2nd ed. (Lexington, 1973).
- Greengrass, Mark, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor, eds., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, Eng., 1994).
- Greenspan, Ezra, and Jonathan Rose, eds., *Book History, Volume 4* (University Park, 2001).
- Grell, Ole Peter, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 2011).
- Grell, Ole Peter, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, eds., *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (New York, 1991).
- Gribben, Crawford, *The Irish Puritans: James Ussher and the Reformation of the Church* (Darlington, 2003).

- , “Defining the Puritans? The Baptist Debate in Cromwellian Ireland, 1654–56,” *Church History* 73 (2004), 63–89.
- , “Rhetoric, Fiction, and Theology: James Ussher and the Death of Jesus Christ,” *The Seventeenth Century* 20 (2005), 53–76.
- , *God’s Irishmen: Theological Debates in Cromwellian Ireland* (New York, 2007).
- , *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550–1682*, 2nd ed. (London, 2008).
- , “Puritanism in Ireland and Wales,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 159–73.
- Gribben, Crawford, and David George Mullan, eds., *Literature and the Scottish Reformation* (Aldershot, 2009).
- Griffin, Martin I. J., Jr., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden, 1992).
- Griffiths, Paul, *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England, 1560–1640* (New York, 1996).
- Guibory, Achsah, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 2010).
- Gunther, Karl, “The Origins of English Puritanism,” *History Compass* 4/2 (2006), 235–40.
- , “The Intellectual Origins of English Puritanism, ca.1525–72” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2007).
- Gunther, Karl, and Ethan H. Shagan, “Protestant Radicalism and Political Thought in the Reign of Henry VIII,” *Past & Present* 194 (2007), 35–74.
- Gura, Philip F., *A Glimpse of Zion’s Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620–60* (Middletown, 1984).
- Guy, John, ed., *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995).
- Ha, Polly, *English Presbyterianism, 1590–1640* (Stanford, 2011).
- Ha, Polly, and Patrick Collinson, eds., *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (New York, 2010).
- Haakonssen, Knud, ed., *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge, Eng., 1966).
- Habermann, Ina, *Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2003).
- Hackel, Heidi Brayman, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005).
- Haigh, Christopher, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (Cambridge, Eng., 1975).
- , *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (New York, 1993).

- , *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England* (New York, 2007).
- Haigh, Christopher, ed., *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987).
- Hale, Sir Matthew, *The History of the Common Life of England*, ed. Charles M. Gray (Chicago, 1971).
- Hall, Basil, "Puritanism: The Problem of Definitions," *Studies in Church History* 2 (1965), 283–96.
- Hall, David D., *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century* (Chapel Hill, 1972).
- , *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).
- , *Cultures of Print: Essays in the History of the Book* (Boston, 1996).
- , *Witch-hunting in Seventeenth-Century New England: A Documentary History, 1638–83*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1999).
- , *Ways of Writing: The Practice and Politics of Text-Making in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Philadelphia, 2008).
- , *A Reforming People: Puritanism and the Transformation of Public Life in New England* (New York, 2011).
- Hall, David D., ed., *Puritanism in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts* (New York, 1968).
- , *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636–38: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. (Durham, 1990).
- , *Puritans in the New World: A Critical Anthology* (Princeton, 2004).
- Haller, William, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York, 1955).
- , *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1957).
- Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E., *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill, 1982).
- Hamil, Hannibal, *Psalm Culture and Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004).
- Hamilton, Donna B., and Richard Strier, eds., *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540–1688* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).
- Hamm, Berndt, *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety*, ed. Robert J. Bast (Leiden, 2004).
- Hammond, Jeffrey A., *Sinful Self, Saintly Self: The Experience of Poetry* (Athens, 1993).
- , *The American Puritan Elegy: A Literary and Cultural Study* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- Hampton, Stephen, *Anti-Arminians: The Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (New York, 2008).
- Harris, Johanna, and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, eds., *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558–1680* (New York, 2011).

- Harris, Tim, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, Eng., 1990).
- Harrox, Rosemary, and Sarah Rees Jones, eds., *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communion, 1200–1630* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001).
- Hart, D. G., *Calvinism: A History* (New Haven, 2013).
- Hart, Trevor A., ed., *The Dictionary of Historical Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2000).
- Harvey, Gabriel, *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573–80*, ed. Edward John Long Scott (Camden, 1884).
- Hatch, Nathan O., and Mark A. Noll, eds., *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History* (New York, 1986).
- Hatfield, April Lee, *Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia, 2004).
- Haykin, Michael A. G., ed., *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697–1771): A Tercentennial Appreciation* (Leiden, 1997).
- Haykin, Michael A. G., and Kenneth J. Stewart, eds., *The Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities* (Nashville, 2008).
- Haykin, Michael A. G., and Mark Jones, eds., *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism* (Göttingen, 2011).
- Hazlett, Ian, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland: An Introduction* (London, 2003).
- Heal, Felicity, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (New York, 2003).
- Heimert, Alan, and Andrew Delbanco, eds., *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).
- Helm, Paul, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh, 1982).
- , *John Calvin's Ideas* (New York, 2006).
- , *Eternal God: A Study of God Without Time*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2011).
- Henderson, G. D., *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland* (Cambridge, Eng., 1937).
- Hendrix, Scott H., *Recultivating the Vineyard: The Reformation Agendas of Christianization* (Louisville, 2004).
- Heppe, Heinrich, *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, ed. E. Bizer and trans. G. T. Thomson (1934; repr. Grand Rapids, 1978).
- Hessayon, Ariel, "Gold Tried in the Fire:" *The Prophet TheaurauJohn Tany and the English Revolution* (Aldershot, 2007).
- , "The Making of Abiezer Coppe," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 62 (2011), 38–58.
- Hessayon, Ariel, and Nicholas Keene, eds., *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Hessayon, Ariel, and David Finnegan, eds., *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Aldershot, 2011).

- Hetherington, William, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (Edinburgh, 1843).
- Heyd, Michael, *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1995).
- Heywood, James, and Thomas Wright, eds., *Cambridge University Transaction During the Puritan Controversies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. 2 vols. (1854; repr. Cambridge, Eng., 2009).
- Hill, Basil, "Puritanism: The Problem of Definition," in *Studies in Church History, Volume 2*, ed. G. J. Cuming (London, 1965), pp. 283–96.
- Hill, Christopher. *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in the Interpretation of the Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (1958; repr. New York, 1997).
- , *The Century of Revolution, 1603–1714* (New York, 1982).
- , *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (Madison, 1980).
- , *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*, 3 vols. (Amherst, 1987).
- , *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (1972; repr. London, 1991).
- , *Liberty Against the Law: Some Seventeenth-Century Controversies* (New York, 1996).
- , *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1958; repr. New York, 1997).
- Hillerbrand, Hans J., *The Division of Christendom: Christianity in the Sixteenth Century* (Louisville, 2007).
- Hillerbrand, Hans J., ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, 4 vols. (New York, 1996).
- , *The Protestant Reformation*, rev. ed. (New York, 2009).
- Hindmarsh, D. Bruce, *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England* (New York, 2005).
- Hindson, Edward, ed., *Introduction to Puritan Theology: A Reader* (Grand Rapids, 1976).
- Hirst, Julie, *Jane Leade: Biography of a Seventeenth-Century Mystic* (Aldershot, 2005).
- Hoak, Dale, and Mordechai Feingold, eds., *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution, 1688–89* (Palo Alto, 1996).
- Hoeveler, J. David, *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges* (Lanham, 2002).
- Holden, William P., *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572–1642* (New Haven, 1954).
- Holifield, E. Brooks, *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570–1720* (Eugene, 2002).
- , *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War* (New Haven, 2005).
- Holstun, James, *A Rational Millennium: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America* (New York, 1987).

- , *Ehud's Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution* (New York, 2000).
- Hornbeck, Patrick, II, *What is a Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England* (New York, 2010).
- Hotson, Howard, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution* (Madison, 1980).
- , *Johann Heinrich Alsted, 1588–1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation, and Universal Reform* (New York, 2000).
- , *Paradise Postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism* (New York, 2000).
- , *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543–1630* (New York, 2007).
- Howson, Barry H., *Erroneous and Schismatical Opinions: The Questions of Orthodoxy Regarding the Theology of Hanserd Knollys, c.1599–1691* (Leiden, 2001).
- Huehns, Gertrude, *Antinomianism in English History with Special Reference to the Period 1640–60* (London, 1951).
- Hughes, Ann, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1998).
- , “Anglo-American Puritanisms,” *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), 1–7.
- , *Politics, Society, and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620–60* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- , *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (New York, 2004).
- , “Print, Persecution, and Polemic: Thomas Edwards’s Gangraena (1646) and Civil War Sectarianism,” in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700*, ed. Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), 255–74.
- Hume, David, *The History of Great Britain, Vol. I: Containing the Reigns of James I and Charles I* (Edinburgh, 1754).
- Hunt, Arnold, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010).
- Huntley, Frank Livingstone, *Bishop Joseph Hall and Protestant Meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study with Texts of “The Art of Divine Meditation” (1608) and Occasional Meditations (1633)* [Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies] (Binghamton, 1981).
- Hunter, Michael, *Editing Early Modern Texts: An Introduction to Principles and Practice* (New York, 2009).
- , *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation* (Aldershot, 2010).
- Hutton, Ronald, *Debates in Stuart History* (New York, 2004).
- Hutton, Sarah, ed., *Henry More (1614–1687): Tercentenary Studies* (Dordrecht, 1990).
- Ingelhart, Louis Edward, ed., *Press and Speech Freedoms in the World, from Antiquity until 1998* (Westport, 1998).
- Jackson, Nicholas D., *Hobbes, Bramhill, and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity: A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007).

- Jagodzinski, Cecile M., *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville, 1999).
- James, Frank A., III., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (New York, 1998).
- James, Frank A., III, ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda* (Leiden, 2004).
- Janse, Wim, and Barbara Pitkin, eds., *The Formation of Clerical and Confessional Identities in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, 2005).
- Janz, Denis, *Luther and Late Medieval Thomism: A Study in Theological Anthropology* (Ontario, 1983).
- Jaumann, Herbert, *Handbuch Gelehrtenkultur der Frühen Neuzeit: Band 1: Bibliographisches Repertorium* (Berlin, 2004).
- Jeffs, Robin, ed., *The English Revolution: Fast Sermons* (London, 1972).
- Jenkins, Gary W., *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Johnson, A. M., and John A. Maxfield, *The Reformation as Christianization* (Tübingen, 2012).
- Johnston, Warren, *The Apocalypse in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2011).
- Johnstone, Nathan, *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Jones, Chelsea, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, eds., *The Study of Spirituality* (New York, 1986).
- Jones, J. R., *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (New York, 1972).
- Jones, John, *Balliol College: A History*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2005).
- Jones, Mark, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of the Puritan Reformed Orthodox Theologian, Thomas Goodwin, 1600–1680* (Göttingen, 2010).
- Jones, Normal I., and Daniel Woolf, eds., *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2007).
- Jones, R. Tudor, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds., *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Volume 1: 1550–1700* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Jones, Rufus M., *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1919).
- , *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1919).
- Jones, Stephen, *A New Biographical Dictionary: Containing a Brief Account of the Lives and Writings of the Most Eminent Persons and Remarkable Characters in Every Age and Nation*, 3rd ed. (London, 1799).
- Jonsen, Albert R., and Stephen Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning* (Berkeley, 1988).

- Jordon, W. K., *The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Convention of the Long Parliament to the Restoration, 1640–60: The Revolutionary Experiments and the Dominant Religious Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).
- Jue, Jeffrey K., *Heaven Upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (New York, 2006).
- Kadane, Matthew, “Les bibliothèques de deux théologiens réformés. du XVII^e siècle, l’un puritan anglais, l’autre pasteur Huguenot,” *Bulletin Société de l’Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 147 (2001), 67–100.
- Kamensky, Jane, *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England* (New York, 1997).
- Kamps, Ivo, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).
- Kapic, Kelly M., and Randall C. Gleason, *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics* (Downers Grove, 2004).
- Kapic, Kelly M., and Mark Jones, eds., *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen’s Theology* (Aldershot, 2012).
- Kastan, David Scott, “Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama,” in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), 167–84.
- Katz, David S., *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603–65* (Oxford, 1982).
- , *Sabbath and Sectarianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Leiden, 1988).
- , *The Jews in the History of England, 1485–1850* (New York, 1997).
- , *God’s Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism* (New Haven, 2004).
- Kaufman, Peter Iver, *The “Polytyque Church”: Religion and Early Tudor Political Culture, 1485–1516* (Macon, 1986).
- Kaufmann, U. Milo, *The Pilgrim’s Progress and Traditions in Puritan Meditation* (New Haven, 1966).
- Keding, Volker, *Theologia Experimentalis: Die Erfahrungstheologie beim späten Gottfried Arnold* (Marburg, 2000).
- Keeble, N. H., *Richard Baxter: Puritan Man of Letters* (New York, 1982).
- , *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Malden, 2002).
- , “Milton and Puritanism,” in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Malden, 2001), pp. 124–40.
- Keeble, N. H., ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001).
- Keeble, N. H., and Geoffrey F. Nuttall, eds., *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter, Volume 1: 1638–1660* (New York, 1991).
- , *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter, Volume II: 1660–1696* (New York, 1992).

- Keeler, Mary Frear, Maija Jansson Cole, and William B. Bidwell, eds., *Commons Debates 1628: Volume IV: 28 May–26 June 1628* (Rochester, 1978).
- Keenan, James F., and Thomas A. Shannon, eds., *The Context of Casuistry* (Washington, D.C., 1995).
- Kelley, Donald R., and David Harris Sacks, eds., *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500–1800* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997).
- Kendall, R. T., *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York, 1980).
- Kennedy, D. E., Diana Roberts, and Alexandra Walsham, *Grounds of Controversy: Three Studies in Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century English Polemics* (Melbourne, 1989).
- Kennedy, Gwynne, *Just Anger: Representing Women's Anger in Early Modern England* (Carbondale, 2000).
- Kennedy, Rick, "The Alliance between Puritanism and Cartesian Logic at Harvard, 1687–1735," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51 (1990), 549–72.
- Kerr, Fergus, *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism* (Malden, 2002).
- Kevan, E. F., *The Grace of Law: A Study in Puritan Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1976).
- Kidd, Thomas S., *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism* (New Haven, 2004).
- Kiefer, Barbara, "The Authorship of 'Ancient Bounds,'" *Church History* 22 (1953), 192–6.
- King, John N., *Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Kirby, Torrance, ed., *A Companion to Richard Hooker* (Leiden, 2008).
- Kirby, Torrance, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James III, eds., *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Leiden, 2009).
- Kishlansky, Mark A., *A Monarch Transformed: Britain, 1603–1714* (New York, 1997).
- Knappen, M. M., "The Early Puritanism of Lancelot Andrews," *Church History* 2 (1933), 95–104.
- , *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (1939; repr. Gloucester, 1963).
- Knight, Janice, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–61* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger, ed., *Puritanism and Its Discontents* (Newark, 2003).
- , *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* (New York, 2012).
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger, and Joan B. Landes, eds., *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, 2004).
- Knott, John R., Jr., *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible* (Chicago, 1980).
- Kontos, Alkis, ed., *Powers, Possessions, and Freedom: Essays in Honor of C. B. Macpherson* (Toronto, 1979).

- Kreider, Glenn R., *Jonathan Edwards's Interpretation of Revelation 4:7–8:1* (Lanham, 2004).
- Kries, Douglas, ed., *Piety and Humanity: Essays on Religion and Early Modern Political Philosophy* (Lanham, 1997).
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl, *Providence Island, 1630–41: The Other Puritan Colony* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995).
- Laam, Kevin P., "Borrowed Heaven: Early Modern Devotion and the Art of Happiness" (PhD diss., University of Southern California, 2006).
- Lachman, David C., *The Marrow Controversy, 1718–23: An Historical and Theological Analysis* (Edinburgh, 1988).
- LaFountain, Jason David, "The Puritan Art World" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2013).
- Lake, Peter, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, Eng., 1982).
- , "Puritan Identities," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1985), 112–23.
- , "Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635," *Past & Present* 114 (1987), 32–76.
- , *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London, 1988).
- , "Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson," *Journal of British Studies* 27 (1988), 81–116.
- , *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Stuart Parish in Early Stuart London* (Palo Alto, 2001).
- , *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002).
- , "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 80–95.
- Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier, "Agency, Appropriation, and Rhetoric under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England," *Past & Present* 153 (1996), 64–107.
- , "Puritans, Papists, and the 'Public Sphere' in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context," *The Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000), 587–627.
- Lake, Peter, and David Como, "'Orthodoxy and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of 'Consensus' in the London (Puritan) Underground,'" *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), 34–70.
- Lake, Peter, and Maria Dowling, eds., *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth-Century England* (London, 1987).
- Lake, Peter, and Michael C. Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (London, 2000).
- Lake, Peter, and Steven Pincus, eds., *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007).

- Lambert, Malcolm, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Malden, 2002).
- Lambert, Stella, "Richard Montagu, Arminianism, and Censorship," *Past & Present* 124 (1989), 36–68.
- Lamont, William, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60* (New York, 1969).
- , "Puritanism as History and Historiography: Some Further Thoughts," *Past & Present* 44 (1969), 133–46.
- , *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (London, 1979).
- , *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (Montreal, 1996).
- , *Historical Controversies and Historians* (New York, 1998).
- Lampros, Dean George, "A New Set of Spectacles: The Assembly's Annotations, 1645–1657," *Renaissance and Reformation* 19/4 (1995), 33–46.
- Lane, Anthony N. S., *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (London, 1999).
- Lane, Belden C., "Two Schools of Desire: Nature and Marriage in Seventeenth-Century Puritanism," *Church History* 69 (2000), 372–402.
- , *Ravished by Beauty: The Surprising Legacy of Reformed Spirituality* (New York, 2011).
- Lang, August, *Puritanismus und Pietismus. Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung von M. Butzer bis zum Methodismus* (Neukirchen, 1941).
- Larkin, James F., and Paul L. Hughes, eds., *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1973–1983).
- Larminie, V. M., *Wealth, Kinship and Culture: The Seventeenth-Century Newdigates of Arbury and Their World* (Woodbridge, 1995).
- Laurence, Anne, W. R. Owens, and Stuart Sim, eds., *John Bunyan and His England, 1628–88* (London, 2003).
- Lee, Brian J., *Johannes Cocceius and the Exegetical Roots of Federal Theology: Reformation Developments in the Interpretation of Hebrews 7–10* (Göttingen, 2010).
- Lee, Jason K., *The Theology of John Smyth: Puritan, Separatist, Baptist, Mennonite* (Macon, 2003).
- Lee, Nam Kyu, *Die Prædestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen, 1583–1622* (Göttingen, 2009).
- Leites, Edmund, ed., *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Letham, Robert, "Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology" (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1979).
- , "The Foedus Operum: Some Factors Accounting for Its Development," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 14 (1983), 457–67.
- , *The Westminster Assembly: Reading Its Theology in Historical Context* (Philipsburg, 2009).

- Lewalski, Barbara K., *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).
 ———, *The Life of John Milton* (Malden, 2003).
- Lillback, Peter A., *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2001).
- Lim, Paul C. H., *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden, 2004).
 ———, *Mystery Unveiled: The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York, 2012).
- Lim, Won Taek, "The Covenant Theology of Francis Roberts" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2000).
- Lindberg, Carter, *The European Reformations*, 2nd ed. (Malden, 2010).
- Little, Patrick, ed., *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (London, 2007).
 ———, *Oliver Cromwell: New Perspectives* (New York, 2009).
- Liu, Tai, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution, 1640–60* (New York, 1973).
 ———, *Puritan London: A Study of Religion and Society in the City Parishes* (Newark, 1986).
- Livingstone, David N., D. G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll, eds., *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective* (New York, 1999).
- Livingstone, David N., and Charles W. J. Withers, eds., *Geography and Revolution* (Chicago, 2005).
- Lloyd, S. A., ed., *Hobbes Today: Insights for the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, Eng., 2013).
- Loads, David M., *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999).
 ———, *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 2004).
- Loades, David M., ed., *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (Aldershot, 2004).
- Locke, John, *Vindications of the Reasonableness of Christianity*, ed. Victor Nuovo (Bristol, 1997).
- Loewenstein, David, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001).
 ———, *Treachorous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York, 2013).
- Loewenstein, David, and John Marshall, eds., *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Lohse, Bernhard, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*, trans. Ernest Stoeffler (Minneapolis, 1966).
- Longfellow, Erica, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004).
- Lovegrove, Deryck W., *The Rise of the Laity in Evangelical Protestantism* (New York, 2002).

- Ludwig, Allen, *Graven Images: New England Stonecarving and Its Symbols, 1650–1815* (Middletown, 2000).
- Lugioyo, Brian, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism* (New York, 2010).
- Lund, Roger D., *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660–1750* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995).
- Lutton, Robert, *Lollardy and Orthodox Religion in Pre-Reformation England: Reconstructing Piety* (London, 2006).
- Lutton, Robert, and Elisabeth Salter, eds., *Pieties in Transition: Religious Practices and Experiences, c.1400–1640* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Luxon, Thomas H., *Literal Figures: Puritan Allegory and the Reformation Crisis in Representation* (Chicago, 1995).
- Lynch, Beth, *John Bunyan and the Language of Conviction* (Woodbridge, 2004).
- Lyte, Henry Charles Maxwell, *A History of Eton College, 1440–1884* (London, 1889).
- Maag, Karin, *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560–1620* (Aldershot, 1995).
- Maag, Karin, ed., *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence Beyond Wittenberg* (Grand Rapids, 1999).
- Maccubbin, Robert P., ed., *'Tis Nature's Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality during the Enlightenment* (Cambridge, Eng., 1988).
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English Country, 1500–1600* (New York, 1986).
- , *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* (New York, 1990).
- , "The Impact of the English Reformation," *Historical Journal* 38 (1995), 151–53.
- , *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, 1998).
- , *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley, 2002).
- , *The Reformation: A History* (New York, 2005).
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, ed., *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy, and Piety* (New York, 1995).
- MacDonald, Michael, *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, Eng., 1981).
- Maclean, Ian, *Learning and the Market Place: Essays in the History of the Early Modern Book* (Leiden, 2009).
- Maltby, Judith, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- Manning, James Alexander, *The Lives of the Speakers of the House of Commons, from the Time of King Edward III to Queen Victoria, Comprising the Biographies of Upwards of One Hundred Distinguished Persons, and Copious Details of the Parliamentary History of England, from the Most Authentic Documents* (London, 1851).

- Marsden, George M., "Perry Miller's Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique," *Church History* 39 (1970), 91–105.
- , *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, 1991).
- Marsh, Christopher, *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550–1630* (Cambridge, Eng., 1994).
- Marshall, Alan, *Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II, 1660–85* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Marshall, John, *John Locke, Toleration, and Early Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Marshall, Peter, *The Catholic Priesthood and the English Reformation* (New York, 1994).
- , *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (New York, 2002).
- , *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Marshall, Peter, and Alec Ryrie, eds., *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Marshall, Peter, and Alexandra Walsham, eds., *Angels in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Marshall, Peter, and Geoffrey Scott, "Introduction: The Catholic Gentry in English Society," in *Catholic Gentry in English Society: The Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation*, ed. Peter Marshall and Geoffrey Scott (Aldershot, 2009), pp. 1–30.
- Martin, Catherine Gimelli, *Milton among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism* (Aldershot, 2010).
- Martin, Hugh, *Puritanism and Richard Baxter* (London, 1954).
- Martin, Jessica, and Alec Ryrie, eds., *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain* (Aldershot, 2012).
- Marvell, Andrew, *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell, Volume 1: 1672–73*, ed. Martin Dzelzaninis and Annabel M. Patterson (New Haven, 2003).
- Mascuch, Michael, *Origins of the Individualist Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591–1791* (Palo Alto, 1996).
- Mason, Thomas A., *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon, 1582–1663, Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England, and Archbishop of Canterbury* (Cranbury, 1985).
- Mayes, Benjamin T. G., *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning after the Reformation* (Göttingen, 2011).
- McCabe, Richard A., *Joseph Hall: A Study in Satire and Meditation* (Oxford, 1982).
- McCafferty, John, *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633–41* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007).
- McClendon, Muriel C., Joseph P. Ward and Michael McDonald, eds., *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England* (Manchester, 2005).

- McCullough, Peter E., *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998).
- McCullough, Peter E., ed., *Lancelot Andrews: Select Sermons and Lectures* (New York, 2005).
- McCullough, Peter E., Hugh Aldington, and Emma Rhatigan, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (New York, 2011).
- McDowell, Nicholas, *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630–60* (New York, 2003).
- McEachern, Claire, and Debora Shuger, eds., *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997).
- McElligott, Jason, *Royalism, Print, and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 1997).
- McElligott, Jason, and David L. Smith, eds., *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007).
- McEvoy, James, ed., *Mystical Theology: The Glosses by Thomas Gallus and the Commentary of Robert Grosseteste on De Mystica Theologia* (Leuven, 2003).
- McGee, J. Sears, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620–70* (New Haven, 1976).
- , “On Misidentifying Puritans: The Case of Thomas Adams,” *A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 30 (1998), 401–18.
- , “A ‘Carkass’ of ‘Mere Dead Paper’: The Polemical Career of Francis Rous, Puritan MP,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72 (2009), 347–71.
- McGiffert, Michael, “American Puritan Studies in the 1960s,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 27 (1970), 36–67.
- , “Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982), 463–502.
- , “God’s Controversy with Jacobean England,” *The American Historical Review* 88 (1983), 1151–74.
- , “Who Wrote the Preface and Notes for Henry Finch’s *The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie, 1590?*,” *Albion* 18 (1986), 247–51.
- McGiffert, Michael, ed., *God’s Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard’s Cambridge*, rev. and exp. ed. (Amherst, 2004).
- McGinnis, Timothy Scott, *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort: Puritan Priorities in Elizabethan Religious Life* (Kirkville, 2004).
- McGrath, Alister E., *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998).
- McGregor, J. F., and Barry Reay, eds., *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (New York, 1984).
- McKelvey, Robert J., *Histories that Mansoul and Her Wars Anatomize: The Drama of Redemption in John Bunyan’s Holy War* (Göttingen, 2011).

- McKim, Donald K., ed., *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Downers Grove, 2007).
- McKitterick, David, *A History of Cambridge University Press: Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge, 1534–1698* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992).
- McLachlan, H. John, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1951).
- Maclear, J. F., “New England and the Fifth Monarchy: The Quest for the Millennium in Early American Puritanism,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 32 (1975), 223–60.
- McNeill, John T., *The History and Character of Calvinism* (New York, 1954).
- McRae, Andrew, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004).
- McWilliams, John P., *New England’s Crises and Cultural Memory: Literature, Politics, History, Religion, 1620–1860* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004).
- Mendle, Michael, ed., *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001).
- Middlekauff, Robert, “Piety and Intellect in Puritanism,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 22 (1965), 457–70.
- , *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596–1728* (Berkeley, 1999).
- Miller, Jeffrey Alan, “Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young,” in *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620–42*, ed. Edward Jones (New York, 2013), pp. 72–106.
- Miller, Perry, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, Mass., 1956).
- , *Nature’s Nation* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).
- , *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts* (1933; repr. New York, 1970).
- , *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).
- Miller, Perry, ed., *The American Puritans: Their Prose and Poetry* (New York, 1956).
- Miller, Perry, and Thomas H. Johnson, eds., *The Puritans: A Sourcebook of Their Writings* (New York, 1963).
- Milton, Anthony, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England,” *Historical Journal* 41 (1998), 625–51.
- , *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- , *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007).
- Milton, Anthony, ed., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort, 1618–19* (Woodbridge, 2005).
- Montgomery, Michael S., *American Puritan Studies: An Annotated Bibliography of Dissertations, 1882–1981* (Westport, 1984).
- Moore, Jonathan D., *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, 2007).
- Moore, Rosemary Anne, *The Light in Their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain, 1646–66* (University Park, 2000).

- Moore, Susan Hardman, *Pilgrims: New World Settlers and the Call of Home* (New Haven, 2007).
- More, Ellen, "John Goodwin and the Origins of the New Arminianism," *Journal of British Studies* 33 (1982), 50–70.
- Morgan, Edmund S., *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop* (New York, 1958).
 ———, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea* (Ithaca, 1963).
- Morgan, Edmund S., ed., *The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653–57* (Gloucester, 1970).
 ———, *Puritan Political Ideas, 1558–1794* (1965; repr. Indianapolis, 2003).
- Morgan, Irvonwy, *Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain* (London, 1957).
- Morgan, John, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986).
- Morrill, John S., *Seventeenth-Century Britain, 1603–1714* (Connecticut, 1980).
 ———, *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London, 1991).
 ———, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London, 1994).
 ———, *Stuart Britain: A Very Short Introduction* (New York, 2000).
- Morris, Amy M. E., *Popular Measures: Poetry and Church Order in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts* (Cranbury, 2005).
- Mortimer, Sarah, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010).
- Mortimer, Sarah, and John Robertson, eds., *The Intellectual Consequences of Religious Heterodoxy, 1600–1750* (Leiden, 2012).
- Mullan, David George, *Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of An Idea, 1560–1638* (Edinburgh, 1986).
 ———, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638* (New York, 2000).
- Mullan, David George, ed., *Women's Life Writing in Early Modern Scotland: Writing the Evangelical Self, c.1670–c.1730* (Aldershot, 2003).
- Muller, Patrick, *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-Century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith* (New York, 2007).
- Muller, Richard A., "Perkins' A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo Salutis?," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978), 68–81.
 ———, "Covenant and Conscience in English Reformed Theology: Three Variations on a Seventeenth-Century Theme," *Westminster Theological Journal* 42 (1980), 312–20.
 ———, "Giving Direction to Theology: The Scholastic Dimension," *Journal of Evangelical Theology* 28 (1985), 183–93.
 ———, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (1986; repr. Grand Rapids, 2008).
 ———, "Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology," *Church History* 55 (1986), 193–205.
 ———, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca.1520–ca.1725*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1987–2003).

- , “Arminius and the Scholastic Tradition,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 24 (1989), 263–77.
- , *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids, 1991).
- , “The Covenant of Works and the Stability of Divine Law in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Orthodoxy: A Study in the Theology of Herman Witsius and Wilehmus à Brakel,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994), 75–100.
- , “Scholasticism, Reformation, Orthodoxy, and the Persistence of Christian Aristotelianism,” *Trinity Journal* 19 (1998), 81–96.
- , *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2000).
- , “Reformation, Orthodoxy, ‘Christian Aristotelianism,’ and the Eclecticism of Early Modern Philosophy,” *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 81 (2001), 306–25.
- , *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, 2003).
- , “John Calvin and Later Calvinism: The Identity of the Reformed Tradition,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), 130–49.
- , “The ‘Reception of Calvin’ in Later Reformed Theology: Concluding Thoughts,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011), 255–74.
- , *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, 2012).
- Muller, Richard A., and John L. Thompson, eds., *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation* (Grand Rapids, 1996).
- Muller, Richard A., and Rowland S. Ward, *Scripture and Worship: Biblical Interpretation and the Directory for Public Worship* (Philipsburg, 2007).
- Murdock, Graeme, *Calvinism on the Frontier, 1600–60: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania* (New York, 2000).
- , *Beyond Calvin: The Intellectual, Political, and Cultural World of Europe’s Reformed Churches, c.1540–1620* (New York, 2004).
- Murphy, Andrew R., *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (University Park, 2001).
- Murray, James, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534–90* (Cambridge, Eng., 2009).
- Myers, Robin, and Michael Harris, eds., *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France, 1600–1900* (Winchester, 1992).
- Neal, Daniel, *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Non-Conformists, from the Battle of Edge-Hill, to the Death of King Charles I*, 3 vols. (Boston, 1817).

- Neele, Adriaan C., *Petrus van Mastricht (1630–1706): Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety* (Leiden, 2009).
- Netland, John, "Of Philistines and Puritans: Matthew Arnold's Construction of Puritanism," in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Newark, 2003), 67–84.
- Neuser, Wilhelm, and Brian Armstrong, eds., *Calvinus Sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion* (Kirkville, 1997).
- Neville, Robert C., *The Puritan Smile: A Look Toward Moral Reflection* (Albany, 1987).
- New, J. H., *Anglican and Puritan, the Basis of Their Opposition, 1558–1640* (Stanford, 1964).
- Newcombe, D. G., *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (New York, 1995).
- Nicolson, Adam, *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible* (New York, 2003).
- Noll, Mark A., "Science, Theology, and Society: From Cotton Mather to William Jennings Bryan," in *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, ed. David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll (New York, 1999), 120–41.
- , *Americas God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 2002).
- North, Marcy L., *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England* (Chicago, 2003).
- Notestein, Wallace, and Francis Reif, eds., *Commons Debates for 1629* (Minneapolis, 1921).
- Nuovo, Victor, *Christianity, Antiquity, and Enlightenment: Interpretations of John Locke* (New York, 2011).
- Nuttall, Geoffrey F., *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (1946; repr. Chicago, 1992).
- , *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge: A Study in a Tradition* (New York, 1951).
- , *The Puritan Spirit: Essays and Addresses* (London, 1967).
- Oberman, Heiko A., *Initia Calvini: The Matrix of Calvin's Reformation* (Amsterdam, 1991).
- , *The Two Reformations: The Journey from the Last Days to the New World*, ed. Donald Weinstein (New Haven, 2003).
- , *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications* (New York, 2004).
- O'Day, Rosemary, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (New York, 1986).
- O'Malley, John W., et al., eds., *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773* (Toronto, 1999).
- O'Rourke, Fran, *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas* (Notre Dame, 1992).
- Old, Hughes Oliphint, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture* (Louisville, 2002).
- Ong, Walter J., *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue from the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (1958; repr. Chicago, 2004).
- Op't Hof, Willem, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Netherlands, 1589–1622* (Rotterdam, 1987).

- Orwell, George, *Orwell, As I Please, 1943–45: Essays, Journalism, and Letters*, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (Boston, 2000).
- Overhoff, Jürgen, *Hobbes's Theory of Will: Ideological Reasons and Historical Circumstances* (Lanham, 2000).
- Ozment, Steven E., *Homo Spiritualis: A Comparative Study of the Anthropology of Johannes Tauler, Jean Gerson, and Martin Luther (1509–16) in the Context of their Theological Thought* (Leiden, 1969).
- , *The Age of Reform, 1250–1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of the Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven, 1980).
- Ozment, Steven E., ed., *The Reformation in Medieval Perspective* (Chicago, 1971).
- Packer, J. I., *The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter* (1954; repr. Vancouver, 2003).
- Painter, Borden W., "Anglican Terminology in Recent Tudor and Stuart historiography," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 56 (1987), 237–49.
- Papazian, Mary Arshagouni, ed., *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives* (Detroit, 2003).
- Parker, Charles H., *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008).
- Parker, Kenneth, *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 1988).
- Parker, Kenneth, and Eric Josef Carlson, eds., "Practical Divinity": *The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot, 1998).
- Parnham, David, *Sir Henry Vane, Theologian: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Religious and Political Discourse* (Madison, 1997).
- , "The Covenantal Quietism of Tobias Crisp," *Church History* 75 (2006), 511–43.
- , "The Humbling of 'High Presumption': Tobias Crisp Dismantles the Puritan Ordo Salutis," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2005), 50–74.
- , "Soul's Trial and Spirit's Voice: Sir Henry Vane against the 'Orthodox,'" *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70 (2007), 375–85.
- Pastoor, Charles, and Galen K. Johnson, *Historical Dictionary of the Puritans* (Lanham, 2007).
- Patrick, Millar, *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody* (London, 1949).
- Patrides, C. A., *The Cambridge Platonists* (Cambridge, Eng., 1969).
- Patrides, C. A., and Raymond B. Waddington, eds., *The Age of Milton: Backgrounds to Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Manchester, 1980).
- Patterson, W. B., *King James VI and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, Eng., 1991).
- Paul, Robert S., *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the "Great Debate"* (Edinburgh, 1985).
- Pauw, Amy Plantinga, *The Supreme Harmony of All: The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Grand Rapids, 2002).

- Peacey, Jason, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004).
- Pearson, Andrew F. S., *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535–1603* (1925; repr. London, 1966).
- Pederson, Randall J., “Francis Rous (1580/81–1659) and the Mystical Element in English Puritanism” (ThM thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, 2008).
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Emergence of Catholic Tradition, 100–600* (Chicago, 1971).
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, and Valerie Hotchkiss, eds., *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, 4 vols. (New Haven, 2003).
- Peltonen, Markku, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995).
- Pendrill, Colin, *The English Reformation, 1485–1558* (Oxford, 2000).
- Pennington, Donald, and Keith Thomas, eds., *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978).
- Person, Leland S., *The Cambridge Introduction to Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007).
- Pestana, Carla Gardina, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640–61* (Cambridge, Mass., 2007).
- Peterson, Mark A., *The Price of Redemption: The Spiritual Economy of Puritan New England* (Palo Alto, 1997).
- Pettegree, Andrew, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (New York, 1987).
- , *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot, 1996).
- Pettegree, Andrew, ed., *The Reformation World* (New York, 2001).
- Pettegree, Andrew, Alastair Duke, and Gillian Lewis, eds., *Calvinism in Europe, 1540–1620* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).
- Pettit, Norman, *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven, 1996).
- Phillipson, Nicholas, and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, Eng., 1993).
- Pincus, Steven C. A., *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, 2009).
- Placher, William, *The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking about God Went Wrong* (Louisville, 1996).
- Platt, John, *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575–1650* (Leiden, 1982).
- Poiret, Pierre, *Theologiae Pacificae itemque Mysticae ac hujus Auctorum Idea Brevior* (Amsterdam, 1702).
- Poole, Kristen, “Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46 (1995), 47–75.

- , *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Porterfield, Amanda, "Women's Attraction to Puritanism," *Church History* 60 (1991), 196–209.
- , *Female Piety in Puritan New England* (New York, 1992).
- Prest, Wilfrid R., *The Rise of the Barristers: A Social History of the English Bar, 1590–1640* (New York, 1986).
- Prest, Wilfrid R., ed., *The Professions in Early Modern England* (New York, 1987).
- Primus, John H., *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath* (Macon, 1989).
- , "Lutheran Law and Gospel in the Early Puritan Theology of Richard Greenham," *Lutheran Quarterly* 8 (1994), 287–98.
- , *Richard Greenham: Portrait of an Elizabethan Pastor* (Macon, 1998).
- Prior, Charles W. A., *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603–25* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005).
- Prior, Charles W. A., and Glenn Burgess, eds., *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited* (Aldershot, 2011).
- Quantin, Jean-Louis, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2009).
- Questier, Michael C., "Conformity, Catholicism, and the Law," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (Woodbridge, 2000), 237–61.
- , *Conversion, Politics, and Religion in England, 1580–1625* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).
- , "Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism in England during the 1630s," *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006), 53–78.
- . *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage, and Religion, c.1550–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 2006).
- Questier, Michael C., ed., *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead* (Cambridge, Eng., 1998).
- , *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631–38: Catholicism and the Politics of Personal Rule* (Cambridge, Eng., 2005).
- Quinn, Arthur, *The Confidence of British Philosophers: An Essay in Historical Narrative* (Leiden, 1977).
- Raffe, Alasdair, *The Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660–1714* (Woodbridge, 2012).
- Raven, James, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450–1850* (New Haven, 2007).
- Raymond, Joad, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- , *Milton's Angels: The Early Modern Imagination* (New York, 2010).

- Reay, Barry, *Popular Cultures in England, 1550–1750* (London, 1998).
- Redding, Graham, *Prayer and the Priesthood of Christ in the Reformed Tradition* (Edinburgh, 2005).
- Reeve, L. J., *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Rehman, Sebastian, *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids, 2002).
- Reid, James, *Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of Those Eminent Divines who Convened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster*, 2 vols. (Paisley, 1811).
- Reis, Elizabeth, *Damned Women: Sinners and Witches in Puritan New England* (Ithaca, 1997).
- Remer, Gary, *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration* (University Park, 1996).
- Rex, Richard, *The Lollards* (New York, 2002).
- Reynolds, Matthew, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c.1560–1643* (Woodbridge, 2005).
- Richardson, R. C., *The Debate on the English Revolution*, 3rd ed. (Manchester, 1998).
- Richardson, R. C., and G. M. Ridden, eds., *Freedom and the English Revolution: Essays in History and Literature* (Manchester, 1986).
- Ritschl, Albrecht, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinburgh, 1900).
- Rittgers, Ronald K., *The Reformation of the Keys: Confession, Conscience, and Authority in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).
- Rivers, Isabel, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion in Ethics in England, 1660–1780, Volume 1: Whichcote to Wesley* (Cambridge, Eng., 1991).
- Rivers, Isabel, and David L. Wykes, eds., *Joseph Priestly: Scientist, Philosopher, and Theologian* (New York, 2008).
- Rix, Robert, *William Blake and the Cultures of Radical Christianity* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Robertson, Robert, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (University Park, 2009).
- Rodgers, Dirk W., *John a Lasco in England* (New York, 1994).
- Rogers, Henry, *The Life and Character of John Howe, With an Analysis of His Writings* (London, 1836).
- Rohls, Jan, *Reformed Confessions: Theology from Zurich to Barmen*, trans. John Hoffmeyer (Louisville, 1998).
- Rohrer, S. Scott, *Wandering Souls: Protestant Migrations in America, 1630–1865* (Chapel Hill, 2010).
- Roney, John B., and Martin I. Klauber, eds., *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564–1864* (London, 1998).
- Roper, L. H., and B. van Ruymbeke, eds., *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500–1750* (Leiden, 2007).

- Rose, Eliot, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans Under Elizabeth I and James I* (Cambridge, Eng., 1973).
- Rosemann, Philipp W., *Peter Lombard* (New York, 2004).
- Rosman, Doreen, *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor England* (New York, 1996).
- , *The Evolution of the English Churches, 1500–2000* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Rowe, Karen E., *Saint and Singer: Edward Taylor's Typology and the Poetics of Meditation* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986).
- Rushworth, John, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters of Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments beginning the Sixteenth Year of King James, Anno 1618, and Ending the Fifth Year of King Charles, Anno 1629, Digested in Order of Time and Now Published* (London, 1682).
- Russell, Conrad, *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509–1660* (New York, 1971).
- , *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–29* (New York, 1979).
- , *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York, 1990).
- , *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–42* (London, 1990).
- , *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–42* (New York, 1995).
- , *King James I/VI and His English Parliaments* (New York, 2011).
- Ryrie, Alec, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals and the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- , *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realm, 1485–1603* (London, 2009).
- , *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (New York, 2013).
- Ryken, Leland, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were* (Grand Rapids, 1990).
- Safley, Thomas Max, ed., *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World* (Leiden, 2011).
- Sasek, Lawrence A., ed., *Images of English Puritanism: A Collection of Contemporary Sources, 1589–1646* (Baton Rouge, 1989).
- Savage, Ruth, ed., *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies* (New York, 2012).
- Scarisbrick, J. J., *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford, 1984).
- Schafer, Ann-Stephane, *Auctoritas Patrum? The Reception of the Church Fathers in Puritanism* (New York, 2012).
- Schmidt, Jeremy, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Schofield, John, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Schwanda, Tom, *Soul Recreation: The Contemplative-Mystical Piety of Puritanism* (Eugene, 2012).
- Schweitzer, Don, ed., *Jonathan Edwards as Contemporary: Essays in Honor of Sang Hyun Lee* (New York, 2010).

- Scodel, Joshua, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (New York, 1991).
- Scott, Jonathan, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- Seaver, Paul S., *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560–1662* (Stanford, 1970).
- , *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (Stanford, 1985).
- Seaward, Paul, ed., *Speakers and the Speakership* (Malden, 2010).
- Selderhuis, Herman J., ed., *The Calvin Handbook* (Grand Rapids, 2009).
- , *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy* (Leiden, 2013).
- Sell, Alan P. F., *Philosophy, Dissent, and Nonconformity, 1689–1920* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004).
- Sell, Roger D., and Anthony W. Johnson, eds., *Writing and Religion in England, 1558–1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory* (Aldershot, 2009).
- Shagan, Ethan H., *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- , *Catholics and the "Protestant Nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2005).
- Shapiro, Barbara, *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558–1688* (Stanford, 2012).
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586–1631* (New York, 1979).
- , *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge, Eng., 1990).
- , *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven, 1995).
- , *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, 2000).
- , *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Palo Alto, 1993).
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Steven N. Zwicker, eds., *Reading, Society, and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- , *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England* (New York, 2008).
- Shaw, Ian J., *High Calvinism in Action: Calvinism and the City, Manchester and London, 1810–60* (New York, 2003).
- Sheehan, Jonathan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton, 2005).
- Sheick, William, ed., *Two Mather Biographies: Life and Death and Parentator* (Cranbury, 1989).

- Sheldrake, Philip, ed., *The New Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality* (Louisville, 2005).
- Shell, Alison, *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007).
- Shepard, Alexandra, and Phil Withington, eds., *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, Place, Rhetoric* (Manchester, 2000).
- Sherlock, Peter, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2008).
- Sherman, William H., *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008).
- Shipley, Gregory E., "Turbulent Times, Troubled Isles: The Rise and Development of Puritanism in Bermuda and the Bahamas, 1609–84" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989).
- Shuger, Debora K., *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 2006).
- Siekawitch, Larry, *Balancing Head and Heart in Seventeenth-Century Puritanism: Stephen Charnock's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Milton Keynes, 2012).
- Signori, Gabriela, ed., *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors, 1 and 2 Maccabees in Historical Perspective* (Leiden, 2012).
- Skinner, Quentin, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997).
- , *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Slights, William W. E., *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor, 2001).
- Smeaton, Donald D., *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale* (Kirksville, 1986).
- Smith, Nigel, *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon* (New Haven, 2010).
- Solt, Leo F., *Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell's Army* (Stanford, 1959).
- , *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509–1640* (New York, 1990).
- Song, Young Jae Timothy, *Theology and Piety in the Reformed Federal Thought of William Perkins and John Preston* (Lewiston, 1998).
- Sorkin, David Jan, *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna* (Princeton, 2008).
- Spadafora, David, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven, 1990).
- Spicer, Andrew, *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester, 2007).
- Spraggon, Julie, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (London, 2003).
- Springer, Michael S., *Restoring Christ's Church: John a Lasco and the Forma ac Ratio* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Sprunger, Keith L., "Archbishop Laud's Campaign against Puritanism at the Hague," *Church History* 44 (1975), 308–20.

- . *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982).
- , *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600–40* (Leiden, 1994).
- Spurr, John, *English Puritanism, 1603–89* (New York, 1998).
- , *England in the 1670s: “This Masquerading Age”* (Malden, 2000).
- , *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics, and Society in Britain, 1603–1714* (London, 2006).
- , *Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, 1621–1683* (Aldershot, 2009).
- Stachniewski, John, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (New York, 1991).
- Staloff, Darren, *The Making of an American Thinking Class: Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in Puritan Massachusetts* (New York, 1998).
- Stanglin, Keith D., “Arminius Avant la Lettre’: Peter Baro, Jacob Arminius, and the Bond of Predestinarian Polemic,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 67 (2005), 51–74.
- , *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603–09* (Leiden, 2007).
- Stanglin, Keith D., and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (New York, 2012).
- Stannard, David E., *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change* (New York, 1979).
- Steinmetz, David C., *Calvin in Context* (New York, 1995).
- , *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayersberg to Theodore Beza*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2001).
- , *Luther in Context*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, 2002).
- Steinmetz, David C., ed., *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century* (Durham, 1996).
- Sterry, Wasey, *Annals of the King’s College of Our Lady of Eton Beside Windsor* (London, 1898).
- Stewart, M. A., ed., *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke* (New York, 2000).
- Stoeffler, F. Ernest, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism* (Leiden, 1965).
- Stoever, William K. B., “The Covenant of Works in Puritan Theology: The Antinomian Crisis in New England” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1970).
- , “Nature, Grace, and John Cotton: The Theological Dimension in the New England Antinomian Controversy,” *Church History* 44 (1975), 22–33.
- , *“A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven”: Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown, 1988).
- Stone, John R., *On the Boundaries of American Evangelicalism: The Postwar Evangelical Coalition* (New York, 1997).
- Stone, Lawrence, *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529–1642* (1972; repr. New York, 2005).

- Stone, Lawrence, ed., *Schooling and Society* (Baltimore, 1976).
- Stone, M. W. F., ed., *Reason, Faith, and History: Philosophical Essays for Paul Helm* (Aldershot, 2008).
- Strehle, Stephen, *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: A Study in the Reformed Doctrine of the Covenant* (New York, 1988).
- , *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounter between the Middle Ages and the Reformation* (Leiden, 1995).
- Swan, Bradford F., *Gregory Dexter of London and New England, 1610–1700* (New York, 1949).
- Swanson, R. N., ed., *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (Oxford, 1996).
- Tadmor, Naomi, *The Social Universe of the English Bible: Scripture, Society, and Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2010).
- Taliaferro, Charles, and Alison J. Tepy, eds., *Cambridge Platonist Spirituality* (Mahwah, 2004).
- Thomas, Keith, *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfillment in Early Modern England* (New York, 2009).
- Thomas, Samuel S., *Creating Communities in Restoration England: Parish and Congregation in Oliver Heywood's Halifax* (Leiden, 2012).
- Thompson, E. P., *Witness Against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law* (Cambridge, Eng., 1993).
- Thompson, Roger, *Women in Stuart England and America: A Comparative Study* (New York, 1974).
- Thornton, Helen, *State of Nature or Eden? Thomas Hobbes and His Contemporaries on the Natural Condition of Human Beings* (Rochester, 2005).
- Thornton, Tim, *Wittgenstein on Language and Thought: The Philosophy of Content* (Edinburgh, 1998).
- Thuesen, Peter J., *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (New York, 2009).
- Thuesen, Peter J., ed., *The Works of Jonathan Edwards, Vol. 26: Catalogues of Books* (New Haven, 2008).
- Tittler, Robert, *The Reformation and the Towns in England: Politics and Political Culture, c.1540–1640* (New York, 1998).
- , *English Urban Experience, 1540–1640* (Palo Alto, 2001).
- Tittler, Robert, and Norman Jones, eds., *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Malden, 2004).
- Todd, Margo, "An Act of Discretion': Evangelical Conformity and the Puritan Dons," *Albion* 18 (1986), 581–99.
- , *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- , *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven, 2002).
- Todd, Margo, ed., *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England* (New York, 1995).

- Toomer, G. J., *Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1996).
- , *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship* (New York, 2009).
- Toon, Peter, *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Nonconformity, 1689–1765* (London, 1967).
- , *Puritans, the Millennium, and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600–60* (London, 1970).
- Towers, S. Mutchow, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2003).
- Trevelyan, G. M., *England Under the Stuarts* (1904; repr. New York, 2002).
- Trinterud, Leonard J., "The Origins of Puritanism," *Church History* 20 (1951), 37–51.
- Trinterud, Leonard J., ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York, 1971).
- Trueman, Carl R., *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525–56* (New York, 1994).
- , *The Claims of Truth: John Owen's Trinitarian Theology* (Carlisle, 1998).
- , "John Owen's Dissertation on Divine Justice: An Exercise in Christocentric Scholasticism," *Calvin Theological Journal* 33 (1998), 87–103.
- , "Puritanism as Ecumenical Theology," *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 81 (2001), 326–36.
- , *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* (Aldershot, 2007).
- , *Histories and Fallacies: Problems Faced in the Writing of History* (Wheaton, 2010).
- , "The Reception of Calvin: Historical Considerations," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011), 19–27.
- , "Puritanism," in *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, ed. Karla Pollmann, 3 vols. (New York, 2013), 3:1622–7.
- , "Reformed Orthodoxy in Britain," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (Leiden, 2013), 261–92.
- Trueman, Carl R., and R. Scott Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (London, 1999).
- Turner, Denys, *The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995).
- Tutino, Stefanie, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570–1625* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Tyacke, Nicholas, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (New York, 1987).
- , "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered," *Past & Present* 115 (1987), 201–16.
- , *The Fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603–40* (London, 1990).

- , “Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter-Revolution,” in *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*, ed. Margo Todd, 53–70 (New York, 1995).
- , “Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War,” *Journal of British Studies* 35 (1996), 139–67.
- , “Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism,” in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier (London, 2000), pp. 5–33.
- , *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530–1700* (Manchester, 2001).
- , “The Puritan Paradigm of English Politics, 1558–1642,” *The Historical Journal* 53 (2010), 527–50.
- Tyacke, Nicholas, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (New York, 1997).
- , *England’s Long Reformation, 1500–1800* (New York, 1998).
- , *The English Revolution, c.1590–1720: Politics, Religion, and Communities* (Manchester, 2008).
- Underdown, David, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603–60* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987).
- , *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, 1994).
- Underwood, T. L., *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb’s War: The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1997).
- Underwood, T. L., ed., *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings* (New York, 1999).
- Vallance, Edward, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553–1682* (Woodbridge, 2005).
- Van Asselt, Willem J., *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius, 1603–69* (Leiden, 2001).
- Van Asselt, Willem J., and Eef Dekker, eds., *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Grand Rapids, 2001).
- Van den Berg, Johannes, *Religious Currents and Cross-Currents: Essays on Early Modern Protestantism and the Protestant Enlightenment*, ed. and trans. Jan de Bruijn, Pieter Holtrop, and Ernestine van der Wall (Leiden, 2004).
- Van den Belt, Henk, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden, 2008).
- Van den Brink, G. A., *Herman Witsius en het antinomianisme. Met tekst en vertaling van de Animadversiones irenicæ* (Apeldoorn, 2008).
- , “Calvin, Witsius (1636–1708), and the English Antinomians,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011), 229–40.
- Van Dixhoorn, Chad, “Reforming the Reformation: Theological Debate at the Westminster Assembly, 1643–52,” 7 vols. (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 2004).

- Van Dixhoorn, Chad, ed., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–53*, 5 vols. (New York, 2012).
- Van Eijnatten, Joris, ed., *Preaching, Sermon, and Cultural Change in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, 2009).
- Van Leeuwen, Th. Marius, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma, eds., *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius, 1559/60–1609* (Leiden, 2009).
- Vaughan, Alden T., *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620–75*, 3rd ed. (Norman, 1995).
- Vaughan, Alden T., ed., *Puritans among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676–1724* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).
- , *The Puritan Tradition in America, 1620–1730* (Lebanon, 1997).
- Vern, John A., *Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505–1905* (Cambridge, Eng., 1910).
- Visser, Arnoud S. Q., *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500–1620* (New York, 2011).
- Von Habsburg, Maximilian, *Catholic and Protestant Translations of the Imitatio Christi, 1425–1650: From Late Medieval Classic to Early Modern Bestseller* (Aldershot, 2011).
- Von Rohr, John, "Covenant and Assurance in Early English Puritanism," *Church History* 54 (1961), 195–203.
- , *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (1986; repr. Eugene, 2010).
- Vos, Antonie, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh, 2006).
- Wabuda, Susan, *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Wabuda, Susan, and Caroline Litzenberger, eds., *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students* (Aldershot, 1998).
- Wainwright, William J., *Reason and the Heart: A Prolegomenon to a Critique of Passional Reason* (New York, 1995).
- Wakefield, Gordon S., *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety* (London, 1957).
- Walker, Julia M., ed., *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (Durham, 1998).
- Wall, Alison, *Power and Protest in England, 1525–1640* (London, 2000).
- Wallace, Dewey D., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982).
- , *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660–1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (New York, 2011).
- Wallace, Dewey D., ed., *The Spirituality of the Later English Puritans: An Anthology* (Macon, 1987).
- Wallace, John M., *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge, Eng., 1981).

- Walsham, Alexandra, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1999).
- , *Providence in Early Modern England* (New York, 1999).
- , *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700* (Manchester, 2006).
- , *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (Aldershot, 2009).
- Walton, Heather, ed., *Literature and Theology: New Interdisciplinary Spaces* (Aldershot, 2011).
- Walzer, Michael, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (New Haven, 1982).
- Warlow, William Meyler, *A History of the Charities of William Jones at Monmouth and Newland* (Bristol, 1899).
- Watkin, Edward, *Poets & Mystics* (North Stratford, 1953).
- Watson, George, ed., *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, Volume 1: 600–1660* (Cambridge, Eng., 1974).
- Watt, Tessa, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550–1640* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).
- Watts, Michael R., *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (New York, 1985).
- Weber, Max, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism with Other Writings on the Rise of the West*, trans. Stephen Kalberg (New York, 2009).
- Webster, Charles, ed., *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge, Eng., 1970).
- , *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1974).
- Webster, John, Kathryn Tanner, and Ian Torrance, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology* (New York, 2007).
- Webster, Tom, “Writing to Redundancy: Approaches to Spiritual Journals and Early Modern Spirituality,” *The Historical Journal* 39 (1996), 33–56.
- , *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620–43* (Cambridge, Eng., 2003).
- Weir, David A., *The Origins of Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (New York, 1990).
- Wells, Edward, *An Help for the Right Understanding of the Several Divines Laws and Covenants* (London, 1729).
- Wells, Ronald, *History and the Christian Historian* (Grand Rapids, 1998).
- Wengert, Timothy J., *Law and Gospel: Philip Melancthon’s Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben Over Poenitentia* (Grand Rapids, 1997).
- , *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness: Philip Melancthon’s Exegetical Dispute with Erasmus of Rotterdam* (New York, 1998).
- Wengert, Timothy J., and M. Patrick Graham, eds., *Philip Melancthon (1497–1560) and the Commentary* (Sheffield, 1999).

- White, Micheline, ed., *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500–1625* (Aldershot, 2011).
- White, Peter, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, Eng., 2002).
- Whitford, David M., ed., *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research* (Kirksville, 2008).
- Whiting, Robert, *The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, Eng., 1989).
- Whitney, Dorothy Williams, "London Puritanism: The Haberdashers' Company," *Church History* 32 (1963), 298–321.
- Wiggins, Martin, *Drama and the Transfer of Power in Renaissance England* (New York, 2012).
- Wilby, Emma, *The Visions of Isobel Gowdie: Magic, Witchcraft, and Dark Shamanism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Eastbourne, 2010).
- Willen, Diane, "Thomas Gataker and the Use of Print in the English Godly Community," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70 (2007), 343–64.
- Williams, Mark, and Stephen Paul Forrest, eds., *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History, 1600–1800* (Woodbridge, 2010).
- Wilson, John F., *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640–48* (Princeton, 1969).
- Winship, Michael P., *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment* (Baltimore, 1996).
- , "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s," *Church History* 70 (2001), 462–81.
- , "Were there any Puritans in New England?," *New England Quarterly* 74 (2001), 118–38.
- , *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636–41* (Princeton, 2002).
- , *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson: Puritans Divided* (Lawrence, 2005).
- , "Defining Puritanism in Restoration England: Richard Baxter and Others Respond to 'A Friendly Debate,'" *The Historical Journal* 54 (2011), 689–715.
- , *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012).
- Wippel, John F., *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas: From Finite Being to Uncreated Being* (Washington, D.C., 2000).
- Wisse, Maarten, Marcel Sarot, and Willemien Otten, eds., *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt* (Leiden, 2011).
- Witte, John, Jr. *The Reformation of Rights: Law, Religion, and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008).

- Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford, to which Are Added The Fasti, or Annals of the Said University, Volume 3*, ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1817).
- Woodward, Walter A., *Prospero's America: John Winthrop, Jr., Alchemy, and the Creation of New England Culture, 1606–76* (Chapel Hill, 2010).
- Woolf, Daniel R., *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000).
- Woolrych, Austin, *England without a King, 1649–60* (New York, 1983).
- , *Britain in Revolution, 1625–60* (New York, 2004).
- Woolsey, Andrew A., *Unity and Continuity in Covenantal Thought: A Study of the Reformed Tradition to the Westminster Assembly* (Grand Rapids, 2012).
- Worden, Blair, *The Rump Parliament, 1648–53* (Cambridge, Eng., 1974).
- , *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (New York, 2002).
- , *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (New York, 2007).
- Wormwald, Jenny, ed., *The Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2008).
- Woudhuysen, H. R., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558–1640* (New York, 1996).
- Wrightson, Keith, *English Society, 1580–1680* (London, 1990).
- Wrightson, Keith, and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525–1700* (New York, 1995).
- Wroughton, John, *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age, 1603–1714* (New York, 2006).
- Yerxa, Donald A., *Recent Themes in American History: Historians in Conversation* (Columbia, 2008).
- Young, Michael B., *Charles I* (New York, 1997).
- Yuille, J. Stephen, *Puritan Spirituality: The Fear of God in the Affective Theology of George Swinnock* (London, 2008).
- Yule, George, "Presbyterians and Independents: Some Comments," *Past & Present* 47 (1970), 130–3.
- Zagorin, Perez, *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution* (New York, 1966).
- , *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago, 1985).
- Zakai, Avihu, "Orthodoxy in England and New England: Puritans and the Issue of Religious Toleration, 1640–50," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 135 (1991), 401–44.
- , *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992).

- Zaret, David, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Princeton, 2000).
- Ziff, Larzer, *Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience* (Princeton, 1962).
- Zuidema, Jason, and Theodore Van Raalte, *Early French Reform: The Theology and Spirituality of Guillaume Farel* (Aldershot, 2011).

Index

- Abbot, George 114, 166n52
Act of Uniformity 51–2, 64, 289n16
Adams, Thomas 12n36, 116, 302, 305
Adderly, William 116n117
Agricola, John 75n155, 76n158, 80
Ahlstrom, Sydney E. 22
Ainsworth, Henry 19, 267n15
Airay, Henry 116, 171n80
All Hallows the Great 99, 105
Alleine, Joseph 244n150
Almond, Philip C. 194n195
Alsop, Vincent 229, 231n97
Alsted, Johann Heinrich 101n54, 146n233, 250n175
Alting, Johann Heinrich 297n47
Ambrose of Milan 169, 189
Ambrose, Isaac 67, 73, 129, 304n74
Ames, William 16n54, 19n62, 30–1, 56n68, 67, 79, 101n54, 106n75, 134, 136n94, 141, 145, 152, 160, 174, 191, 196n206, 227, 256, 267n15, 276–7, 279, 296n46, 296n47, 298n55, 306n79, 313
Amyraut, Moïse 83
Andrewes, Lancelot 7, 305–6
Anglican, Anglicanism 6–7, 21, 24, 33, 52, 57n77, 272, 289n16, 290n20, 295n41
Anselm of Canterbury 189, 200
anti-popery 45, 180, 183
antinomism, antinomians 37–8, 41–2, 67–8, 75–85, 147, 211n7, 212, 213n16, 214–5, 217, 218n34, 220n47, 222n54, 224–8, 229n87, 230n92, 235–6, 238, 249–50, 254, 257, 259, 268, 271–2, 274–5, 311–2
Apetrei, Sarah 17n56
Apostle's Creed 130n169
Aquinas, Thomas 69, 130n169, 132, 157, 169, 178, 189–90, 196, 200, 238, 239n126, 277, 283, 294n36
Aretius, Benedictus 297n47
Aristotle 239n126, 181
Arminianism, Arminians 8n23, 8n23, 28n103, 34, 58–9, 66, 93, 135, 145, 154, 155n6, 162–3, 165n47, 167, 169–71, 177, 180, 206, 217, 221, 229, 236, 269, 273, 278, 288, 290n20, 307
Arminius, Jacobus 8n23, 35n120, 58n80, 66, 70n129, 136n93, 160, 163, 169, 263n2
Armstrong, Brian G. 314
Arnold, Gottfried 178
Arnold, Matthew 5
Ash, William 111n95
Ashe, Simeon 100n49
assurance 17, 76, 78n168, 85, 89n1, 94, 110–2, 119, 127, 129, 131, 135–41, 145, 148–9, 151, 196, 200–3, 211, 215, 222, 225, 230, 237–8, 241–4, 252, 257, 266, 268, 276, 278–80, 283, 291, 294, 300, 312–3, 315
Aston, Margaret 47
Athanasius 169
Athrow, Thomas 155n5
Augustine 9n25, 58n82, 69, 77n166, 135n190, 137n197, 169, 178, 184, 189–91, 194, 196–7, 199–200, 209, 235, 238n126, 239, 267n15, 294n36
Augustinianism. *See* Augustine
Bac, J. Martin 239n126
Bachelor, John 103
Baillie, Robert 162n35, 174
Bailyn, Bernard 18
Bakewell, Thomas 214, 222–4, 226
Ball, John 115n116, 143–5, 203, 267n15
Balliol College 251
Balmford, James 97
Baptists 13n42, 21n71, 219, 313
Barbee, David M. 10n29
Barber, Sarah 156n9
Barebones Parliament 175
Barnard, John 123
Baro, Peter 58n82
Basil of Caesarea 189
Bastingius, Jeremias 115n116
Bates, William 229n86, 253n196
Baxter, Richard 18, 28, 34, 64, 66, 68, 82–4, 86, 92, 94n20, 98, 115n112, 122n144, 178, 195, 214n18, 220n47, 221n49, 222, 227–8, 231–3, 239n126, 249–50, 259, 269n22, 270, 273–4, 277n57, 297, 299, 303, 315
Bayly, Lewis 11n34, 72
Baynes, Paul 116, 227

- beatific vision 73, 153, 188–9, 195, 197
 Beeke, Joel R. 67n118, 265
 Behmenism. *See* Jacob Boehme
 Bellarmine, Robert 58n82, 166n54
 Benbrigge, John 63, 222, 225
 Benedict, Philip 106n74
 Bernard of Clairvaux 157, 169, 182, 189–90, 273
 Bernard, Nicholas 101n54
 Bernard, Richard 109
 Beumler, Mark 101n54
 Beverley, Thomas 221n49, 230–1
 Beza, Theodore 9n25, 58n82, 70–1, 80n174, 115n116, 116, 122–3, 127, 136n194, 137n197, 138, 169, 171, 200, 219, 227, 265, 267n15
 Bilton, Edward 58n79
 Bishop's Bible 57
 Boehme, Jacob 74, 190, 194n195
 Bolton, Robert 77n166, 91n11, 110n88, 297
 Bolton, Samuel 247n161
 Book of Common Prayer 48, 53n56, 91n11
 Book of Sports 59, 60n88
 Booty, John 7n20
 Bourne, Immanuel 103n62
 Boyle, Robert 164n42
 Bozeman, Theodore D. 16, 65n115, 80, 236n114, 254n198, 257n215
 Bradshaw, William 55, 147, 295
 Bradstock, Andrew 21n71
 Bradwardine, Thomas 169, 178
 Braudel, Fernand 33
 Brauer, Jerald C. 34n118, 154n3, 200, 202
 Brearley, Roger 62, 68n120
 Breward, Ian 115, 290
 Bridge, William 116n117, 160
 Brightman, Thomas 227
 Broadgates Hall 159, 275
 Bronowski, Jacob 301
 Brook, Benjamin 27, 31n109, 217n33
 Brooks, Thomas 111
 Browne, Samuel 160n24
 Browne, Thomas 103n62, 160
 Bruce, Robert 227
 Bucer, Martin 48, 50, 53, 243n142
 Buckeridge, John 307
 Bulkeley, Peter 16n54
 Bullinger, Henry 45n22, 50, 53, 71, 116, 122, 142, 243n142, 279
 Bunny, Edmund 89n1
 Bunyan, John 19, 26n95, 40, 64, 109n86, 120n134, 178, 245n153
 Bures, Richard 229n86
 Burgess, Anthony 97n38, 147, 222, 225–6, 250n175, 255–6
 Burgess, Cornelius 115n116, 122n142
 Burgess, Daniel 229
 Burgess, Glen 17, 302–3
 Burroughs, Jeremiah 116n117, 162, 174n100, 246n161, 269, 297n47
 Burton, Henry 100, 165n47
 Burton, Simon J. G. 239n126, 277n57
 Byfield, Adoniram 100
 Byfield, Nicholas 247n161
 Calamy, Edmund 31n109, 100n49, 103, 143, 229n86, 246n161
 Calvin, John 7n21, 9n25, 31–2, 34n116, 50–1, 53n58, 57n77, 58n82, 71, 77n166, 78, 79, 80, 116, 122, 137n196, 142–3, 174, 178, 189, 197n209, 227, 229n89, 235, 240n126, 241n138, 242–3, 250n177, 255, 265–7, 271n35, 279, 297n47, 314
 Cambers, Andrew 92
 Cambridge University 42, 52, 216
 Cameron, John 247n161
 Campbell, Kenneth L. 20, 294n38
 Campi, Emidio 263n1
 Canons of Dort 167–8
 Capel, Richard 249n172, 297n47
 Capp, Bernard S. 18, 52
 Carter, John 103, 115n116
 Cartwright, Thomas 4, 54, 116, 128, 160, 227, 295, 300, 307
 Caryl, Joseph 84, 100n49, 103, 211n7
 Casaubon, Meric 122
 Cassander, George 169
 Cassian, John 191
 Cathari, Catharism 3, 4n2, 26
 Catholicism, Catholics 35, 43n11, 44, 46, 48, 53, 55, 58–9, 75, 148, 155n6, 162, 164, 167, 170, 171n79, 177, 180, 272–4
 Chaderton, Laurence 55, 95, 133n178, 295, 299–300
 Chamier, Daniel 235, 250, 259
 Charles I 21n71, 57–8, 103, 156, 164, 170, 216n28

- Charles II 63, 160n24, 176, 216n28, 307n83
 Charnock, Stephen 31, 276
 Charron, Pierre 191
 Chauncy, Isaac 83, 230n92, 231n97
 Chillingworth, William 171
 Christ's College 90, 95, 275
 Christian Life 60, 70, 113, 129, 140, 143, 150–2,
 188n173, 195–6, 207–8, 213, 238, 245, 257–8,
 272, 276, 282–3, 296–7, 313, 319
 Christianson, Paul 12, 13n42, 19n62, 290
 Chrysostom, John 9n25, 189
 Cicero 191
 Clarendon Code 64
 Clarke, Elizabeth 158n18, 193
 Clarkson, Laurence 21n71, 210n3, 220, 315
 Clement of Alexandria 189
 Cleveland, Christopher 277n57
 Cliffe, J. T. 61n92
 Clifford, Lady Anne 92
 Cocceius, Johannes 106n75, 203, 279, 280n5,
 296n46
 Coffey, John 3n1, 8, 12, 28n103, 29n104,
 61n92, 63, 73n145, 156n7, 236n116, 248n166,
 264n6, 271n33, 290, 302, 304
 Cohen, Charles 93n19, 314
 Cole, Thomas 221n50, 235, 253n196, 259
 Collinson, Patrick 6, 12, 18, 19n62, 20, 24,
 25n90, 30n107, 46, 64, 96n30, 171n82,
 284n2, 288n14, 289n15, 290, 292n30, 314
 Como, David R. 17, 65n115, 79, 248, 281, 290,
 292
 Condren, Conal 175
 Conventicle Act 64
 Cooper, Tim 79n173, 215n26, 220n47,
 232n100
 Coppe, Abiezer 304n74
 Cotton, Clement 107, 108n82, 119
 Cotton, John 68, 103n62, 136n193, 223n61,
 243, 250–1, 280, 293n32
 covenant 16, 67n118, 68, 70–1, 86, 91, 107, 118,
 126, 133–4, 142–6, 152, 190–1, 203–5, 237,
 241, 243–8, 252, 255, 258, 267n15, 268,
 269n24, 273, 278–80, 283, 287, 291, 296, 300,
 313, 315
 Cradock, Walter 68n120, 73, 105n72, 192,
 220n47, 255n206
 Crandon, John 82, 84n197, 242n139, 250
 Cranford, James 103
 Cranmer, Thomas 45, 48–9, 166n52
 Crell, Johann 104n68
 Cressy, David 52n56, 63, 306n79
 Crisp, Ellis 216
 Crisp, Nicholas 216
 Crisp, Samuel 231–4, 251–3
 Crocius, Ludwig 101n54
 Cromwell, Oliver 35, 60, 155, 162, 175,
 176n109, 224n64
 Cromwell, Richard 61, 63, 175
 Culverwell, Ezekiel 248
 Culverwell, Richard 100
 Cyprian 169, 189
 Daillé, Jean 172
 Damrau, Peter 305n74
 Daniel, Curt 78, 81n183, 251n178, 254, 258
 Daniell, David 46
 Danner, Dan G. 50
 Davenant, John 80n174, 147
 Davis, David J. 306n78
 Davis, J. C. 12, 210n3
 De Koeijer, R. W. 91n8, 113
 Defoe, Daniel 40
 Del Coro, Antonio 169
 Dell, William 35n118, 36, 42, 68n120, 220n47,
 226, 304n74
 Den Boer, William 8n23
 Denk, Hans 74
 Denne, Henry 68n120, 214n21, 220n47, 226,
 229
 Dennison, Stephen 299
 Dent, Arthur 55, 72, 89n1, 115n116
 Dering, Edward 31, 54, 227, 295
 Dever, Mark 73n145
 Dickens, A. G. 22, 43–4
 Diggers 33n111
 Dod, John 89n1, 141, 227
 Dodds, Gregory D. 58, 59n83
 Donne, John 36–7
 Doran, Susan 12
 Dort. *See* Synod of Dort (1618–19)
 Downname, George 80n174, 90, 101, 110n89,
 147, 216, 302n67
 Downname, William 95
 Downing, Calybutte 103
 Drake, Francis 170
 Drake, Joan 140–1

- Draxe, Thomas 124n152
 Dryness, William A. 293
 Dudley, John 48
 Duffy, Eamon 44
 Durston, Christopher 12, 93n19
 Dury, John 100–1, 128n164, 160
 Dyke, Daniel 96, 115n116, 297n47
 Dyke, Jeremiah 96n30, 297n47
- Eales, Jacqueline 13, 23, 93n19
 Eaton College 155n5, 172, 176–7
 Eaton, John 9n25, 31, 36, 63, 68, 79–80, 214n21, 217–20, 223, 226, 229, 236, 253, 254n198, 271, 281, 312, 315
 Edward VI 43, 47, 50–1, 85
 Edwards, John 222, 228
 Edwards, Jonathan 313
 Edwards, Thomas 31, 77, 82, 174, 226, 297n47
 Eedes, John 242n139
 Elias, Norbert 20, 287, 298, 311
 concept of “configuration” 20–1, 298
 Elizabeth I 43, 54, 56
 Ellis, Brannon 70n129
 Ellis, John 103
 Elton, G. R. 6, 305
 Emmanuel College 42n8, 95, 303
 English Reformation 41, 43–8, 49n39, 63n105, 65, 85, 116, 166, 205, 274, 301, 314
 English Revolution 11, 17, 21, 22n71, 41–2, 60–3, 65, 68, 78, 83, 119, 160, 174, 184, 209, 233, 259, 286, 295, 300, 308, 312
 Erasmus, Desiderius 59
 Erbery, William 42, 63
 Everard, John 62, 68n120, 74, 216, 218
 Eyre, Adam 220
 Eyre, William 82–3, 146n233, 223n61, 242n139, 250, 252
- Fairfax, Thomas 224n64
 Faustus of Riez 191
 Featley, Daniel 62n97, 108n84, 122, 302n67, 306–7
 Fenner, Dudley 101n54, 132n174, 297n47
 Fesko, John V. 232n100, 248n166, 271n35
 Fessenden, Tracy 9
 Field, John 55, 169, 200
 Finch, Henry 89, 106n75, 123–7, 133n178
 Fincham, Kenneth 13, 57n77, 288n14
- Finlayson, Michael 12, 20, 290
 Firmilian 189
 Fisher, Edward 66n117, 143
 FitzGeoffrey, Alexander 179
 Five Mile Act 64
 Flavel, John 222, 228, 230n91, 248
 Ford, Alan 14n44, 101, 127–8
 Foster, Stephen 16, 46, 285n5, 290, 291n27
 Fox, George 74, 304
 Foxe, John 9n25, 47, 49, 58, 65, 79n174
 Frijhoff, Willem 134
 Fuller, Thomas 12
- Gammon, John 231n97
 Gataker, Thomas 96n32, 97–8, 103, 108n84, 117, 122
 Geneva Bible 50, 57n75, 107, 108n84, 116, 120–1
 George, C. H. 12, 13n42, 290, 311
 George, Timothy 19n62, 160n24
 Geree, John 26, 249n172
 Geree, Stephen 213n16, 222, 224
 Gerson, Jean 189
 Gerhard, Johann 297n47
 Gifford, George 42n8, 55
 Gill, John 232, 236, 251n180, 256n209, 258
 Gillespie, Patrick 146
 Gilpin, Richard 111
 Glanvill, Joseph 176
 glorification 70, 143, 154n3
 Golding, Arthur 55
 Gomar, Francis 136n194, 138, 243n142
 Goodrich, Thomas 48
 Goodwin, John 8n23, 11n35, 12n36, 28, 34, 59, 83n192, 98, 147, 271, 302–3, 312, 315
 Goodwin, Thomas 66, 77n166, 116n117, 146–7, 223n61, 234–5, 243, 251n180, 252, 313
 Gordon, John 123
 Gordon, Scott Paul 203
 Gottschalk 137n197
 Gouge, William 31, 66–7, 89n1, 91n11, 96–7, 100, 108n82, 108n84, 109n86, 116, 120, 122, 124–5, 180, 191, 211n7, 235
 Graunt, John 103n62
 Great Ejection 29, 33, 64
 Greaves, Mary 220
 Greaves, Richard 118, 275, 300n63

- Green, Ian 89n2, 119
 Greenham, Richard 31, 54, 67–71, 89n1, 191, 227, 301n64
 Greenhill, William 116
 Gregory Naziansen 189
 Gregory of Nyssa 189
 Grell, Ole Peter 106n74, 159n22
 Gribben, Crawford 13, 14n44
 Griffiths, George 99
 Grindal, Edwin 49
 Guibbory, Aschah 79, 290n18
 Gun Powder Plot 44
 Gurnall, William 111, 297n47
- Haak, Theodore 160
 Haberdashers' Company 98–9
 Haigh, Christopher 44, 291n27
 Hale, Sir Matthew 27
 Hall, Basil 12, 290
 Hall, David D. 213n16
 Hall, Joseph 12n36, 106n75, 115n116, 193, 216, 302–5
 Haller, William 70n130, 109
 Hammond, George 229n86
 Hammond, Henry 123n146
 Hampton Court Conference 56–7
 Hampton, Stephen 132n175
 Harleys of Brampton Bryan 19, 229
 Harpius, Henry 189
 Harris, Robert 216
 Harrison, Joan 105
 Harrison, Thomas 224n84
 Hart, John 103n62
 Hartlib, Samuel 103n62
 Harvard College 111
 Harvard, John 111
 Harvey, Gabriel 24
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel 5
 Heath, Thomas 103n62
 heaven 26n95, 111–2, 128n161, 150, 161, 172, 180–1, 183, 188n173, 194, 202, 225, 238, 251n178, 253, 283
 Heidelberg Catechism 126, 267n14
 Heigham, John 165–6
 hell 23n76, 80, 128n161, 193, 225, 259n228
 Hemmingius, Niels 58n82
 Henrietta Maria 57
 Henry VIII 43, 46–9, 166
- Herbert, George 74
 Hessayon, Ariel 154n3
 Heylyn, Peter 307
 Heywood, Oliver 299
 Hicckes, William 97
 Hildersham, Arthur 117, 227
 Hill, Christopher 12, 40, 46, 159n22
 Hillary of Poitiers 169
 Hobbes, Thomas 40, 59, 272
 Hobson, Paul 36, 68n120, 110n88, 214n21, 220n47
 Hooker, Richard 4n3, 40, 52
 Hooker, Thomas 16n54, 21n71, 31, 141, 141n215, 145, 280
 Hooper, John 47, 53n58, 142
 Hornbeek, Johannes 221
 Howe, John 11n35, 31, 229n86, 230, 232n99, 233n100, 253n196, 259
 Hughes, Ann 13, 15, 20
 Hughes, George 100
 Hughes, Sean F. 69n125
 Hume, David 4
 Humphrey, Laurence 23, 49, 53
 Hunt, Arnold 55, 91, 292
 Hutchinson, Anne 37n129, 78, 141n218, 218n34, 244n151
 Hutchinson, George 116n117
- Irenaeus 169, 189
 Ireton, Henry 224n64
 Irish Articles 169
 Isidore of Seville 137n196
- Jackson, Arthur 225
 Jacomb, Thomas 233
 James I/VI 29, 56–7, 117, 124, 155, 160n24, 167–70
 James, Frank A., III 169n71
 Janse, Wim 30n106
 Jeake, Samuel 92, 123
 Jenison, Robert 248
 Jenkyn, William 116
 Jerome 9n25, 169, 277n57
 Jones, J. R. 155n6
 Jones, Mark 8n23, 67n118
 Jones, William 98
 Jue, Jeffrey K. 13
 Junius, Franciscus 116, 121, 138

- justification 9n25, 38, 67n118, 70, 76, 77, 80,
 82–4, 86, 97–8, 111, 126, 129, 146–9, 152,
 154n3, 163, 168, 180, 192, 196, 205–6, 208,
 218–9, 222, 227, 229–30, 233, 235, 237–8,
 241, 242n139, 245–54, 258–9, 271–2, 274–6,
 280–3, 296, 300, 303, 313, 315
 Justin Martyr 169, 189, 200
- Kaufman, Peter Iver 18
 Keeble, N. H. 13, 228, 292, 304n74
 Kelsey, Sean 175n106
 Kempe, Elizabeth 105
 Kendall, George 250
 Kendall, R. T. 7n21, 69n125, 265, 272n35, 293,
 314
 Kendall thesis. *See* R. T. Kendall
 Kentish, Thomas 229n86
 Kenyon, J. P. 27
 Kidd, Thomas 29n104
 Kiffin, William 116n117
 King James Bible 57, 120–1
 King, John 302n67
 Kishlansky, Mark 13
 Knappen, M. M. 55
 Knight, Janice 16, 287n12
 Knollys, Francis 49
 Knollys, Hanserd 231n97
 Knott, Edward 164–5, 171–2
 Knox, John 51, 227
 Koelman, Jacobus 161, 178, 190
- Lake, Peter 13–4, 18, 20, 45n21, 69n125, 79,
 97–8, 284n2, 288n14, 290, 292, 295–7,
 299–300, 313–4
 Lamont, William 13, 18, 211n4
 Lane, Belden C. 153n1, 193n190, 272n36
 Lasco, John a 50
 Latimer, Hugh 47, 49
 Latitudinarianism 42n8
 Laud, William 6, 58, 102, 103n62, 164, 218n34,
 307
 law/gospel 36, 67, 68n122, 82, 149–50, 196,
 206–7, 213–4, 221, 236, 238, 241n133, 254–7,
 271, 276, 281–2, 315
 Leade, Jane 74, 219–20
 Leiden University 42–3, 159–61, 275
 Leigh, Edward 30–1, 106n75, 123n146,
 131n171, 222
- Leighton, Alexander 59n84
 Leveller, Levellers 60n90
 Ley, John 108n84, 122, 211n7
 Libertines of Geneva 78
Lichtmetaphysik 197, 200
 Lightfoot, John 123n146
 Lim, Paul C. H. 13, 29n104, 248n166
 Lirinensis, Vincentius 169
 Littell, Franklin H. 33
 Llwyd, Morgan 73
 Locke, John 120n135, 229
 Loewenstein, David 17n56, 30n105, 204n74
 Lohse, Bernhard 169n71
 Lollards, Lollardy 29, 46–7, 85
 Lombard, Peter 132, 169, 190n176, 196
 Longfellow, Erica 162n34
 Loscher, Valentin Ernst 146n233
 Love, Christopher 174, 307n83
 Lucius, Ludwig 101n54
 Lushington, Thomas 104
 Luther, Martin 9n25, 31, 46, 48, 75n156,
 78n169, 79–81, 146n233, 178, 182, 189, 191,
 214–5, 218n34, 223, 226–7, 229n89, 235,
 270
- Maccovius, Johannes 70n129, 136n194, 138,
 251n180
 Maltby, Judith 6n16
 Manton, Thomas 75n155, 233, 235
 Manwaring, Roger 164–5
 Marsden, George M. 129n167, 142n219
 Marshall, Peter 43n11, 63
 Marshall, Stephen 63
 Marshall, William 231n96
 Martel, James R. 272
 Mary Tudor 48–51, 58, 65
 McGee, J. Sears 18, 154n4, 164n44, 173n91,
 302n67
 McGiffert, Michael 89n2, 91n8, 109n85, 118,
 126n54, 145–6
 Marian exiles 29, 49–51, 85
 Martin, Catherine Gimelli 4
 Marvell, Andrew 102n57, 176n112
 Maastricht, Petrus van 297n47
 Mather, Cotton 19, 293, 296n47, 313
 Mather, Increase 230, 231n97, 259
 Mather, Nathaniel 231n97
 Mather, Samuel 246n161

- Mazlish, Bruce 301
 McKelvey, Robert J. 81n183, 254
 Mede, Joseph 124n152
 Meisnar, Balthasar 146n233
 Melancthon, Philip 31, 59, 76, 255
 Mencken, H. L. 5
 Merton thesis 9n26
 Middle Temple 159, 161
 Millenary Petition 56
 Miller, Perry 16, 31n107, 32, 36n127, 37n129,
 71n133, 129n167, 197n209, 204, 244n151, 267,
 287
 Milton, Anthony 13, 45n21, 166, 307
 Milton, John 8n23, 28n103, 75n156, 95,
 103-4, 288, 302-4, 306, 312, 315
 Monck, Nicholas 177
 Montagu, Richard 164-70, 307
 Montague, James 117
 More, Ellen 28n103
 Morgan, John 71, 91n9, 186, 290n19
 Morrill, John 13, 35n119
 Morton, Nicholas 100
 Muggleton, Lodowick 18, 21, 22n76,
 259n228, 302, 312, 315
 Muller, Richard A. 8n22, 35n120, 89n2, 91n8,
 135, 265, 269, 314
 Musculus, Wolfgang 127
 mysticism, mystics 34-5, 37, 41, 66-7,
 68n122, 72-5, 86, 94, 129n166, 153, 154n3,
 156-8, 160-2, 172, 177-80, 183-8, 190, 192-6,
 200, 202, 204-5, 207, 208-9, 214, 219, 222,
 227, 245, 271-3, 279, 282, 300, 311-3, 315
 union/*unio mystica* 37, 73-5, 153, 154n3,
 158n18, 178, 186-8, 190, 192-5, 202,
 204-5, 208-9, 245, 250n175, 252, 271-3,
 275, 279, 282, 315

 Nahum, Jodocus 101n54
 Neal, Daniel 27, 31n109, 126n155
 neonomism, neonomians 37, 41, 66, 68,
 82-4, 230n92, 271, 311
 Netland, John 519
 New College 249
 Newenham, Frederick 155n5, 162n34, 192
 Newman, Samuel 107
 Nichols, Josiah 125
 North, Marcy L. 24
 Nuttall, Geoffrey F. 17n56, 18, 75, 153n2, 313

 Oberman, Heiko A. 69n124
 Olevianus, Caspar 143
 Op't Hof, Willem 92, 178n120
 Origen 189
 Ormerod, Oliver 4
 Orwell, George 5
 Owen, John 8n23, 67, 82, 147, 196n206,
 234-5, 239n126, 242n139, 245, 250, 252, 273,
 297, 313
 Oxenbridge, John 176
 Oxford University 42

 Padget, William 48
 Pagitt, Ephraim 77, 174
 Palmer, Henry 77n166
 Parker, Henry 4
 Parker, Kenneth L. 301n64, 306n80
 Parr, William 48
 Parry, Graham 114n111
 Partridge, Nicholas 45
 Payne, John 109n88, 114n108
 Peacey, Jason 103, 176n109, 222n54
 Pelagius, Pelagianism 191, 207, 234
 Pelikan, Jaroslav 136n195, 169n71
 Pemberton, [Mr.] 122
 Pemble, William 147, 223n61, 227, 235,
 249-52, 259
 Pembroke College 155n5, 156, 176
 Pepys, Samuel 102n57
 Perkins, William 9n25, 10n29, 16n54, 25-6,
 31, 54, 56n68, 66n115, 67-72, 77n166,
 80n174, 89n1, 101n54, 114, 114n110, 115n116,
 116-7, 127, 134, 136n194, 137n196, 138, 141,
 145, 152, 178n120, 180, 191, 227, 233, 235, 242,
 256, 265, 267n115, 279, 297n147, 306n78
 Pestana, Carla 61
 Pinnell, Henry 220
 Piscator, Johannes 97
 Placher, William 240n127
 Plato 74, 186
 Pointer, Richard 16n53
 Polanus, Amandus 80n174, 101n54, 138, 235
 Poole, Kristen 5n13, 63n105
 Poole, Matthew 123n146
 Pooley, Roger 216n29
 Porter, Edmund 103n62, 104-5
 Porterfield, Amanda 46
 Potter, Christopher 171

- Poullain, Valérand 50
 Powell, Thomas 231n97, 235
 Powell, Vavasor 73
 precisianism, precisianists 4n5, 25, 34, 36–8,
 41, 65–72, 76–82, 85–6, 89, 91, 93–4, 106–8,
 114, 129, 140–1, 149, 151–3, 201, 210, 213–4,
 217, 221, 225, 235–6, 243–4, 249, 252–3, 257,
 259, 269, 281, 296, 300, 311, 315
 predestination 53n58, 59n83, 67n118, 68, 70,
 86, 106n74, 113, 126, 128n161, 129, 135–42,
 152, 163–4, 167–9, 182, 196, 200–3, 205, 219,
 237–8, 241–4, 267n14, 269, 273, 276, 278–9,
 283, 293–4, 296, 303, 313, 315
 Preston, John 11n35, 31, 66, 77n166, 138n205,
 141n215, 216, 227, 247n161
 Price, John 103n66
 Primasius of Hadrumetum 189
 Primus, John H. 20, 71n133, 255, 287n11,
 290n19, 301n64
 Prior, Charles W. A. 286n8, 294n39
 providence 68, 72, 126, 180, 190n180, 208, 283
 Prynne, William 18, 59n84, 61, 163, 177, 299
 Pseudo-Dionysius 74, 157, 189–90
 Pym, Alexander 159n20
 Pym, John 35, 61, 154, 159n20, 162–3, 165, 171,
 177, 180
 Pynchon, William 267n15

 Quantin, Jean-Louis 135n190

 Radel, Nicholas F. 9
 Rainolds, John 23
 Rainsborough, William 60n90
 Raitt, Jill 265n9
 Ramus, Peter 95, 133–4
 Randall, Giles 21n71, 74, 192, 230
 Randall, John 97
 Ranterism, Ranters 21n71, 23n76, 33n111,
 60n90, 179, 210, 220, 259, 288
 Reading, John 108n84, 122
 Reformed orthodoxy 8n23, 11n35, 22, 29, 32,
 36, 55n64, 65–6, 67n119, 86, 93n17, 96,
 98n40, 100, 106, 130n68, 135–7, 147, 149, 196,
 200, 210n1, 215, 226n72, 238, 248, 253–4,
 259, 263n1, 266, 270n30, 276, 282, 286,
 302–3, 311–2, 314–5
 Reformed Thomism, Thomist 132n175, 238,
 239n126, 277, 283, 294n36
 Rehnman, Sebastian 239n126

 Reynolds, Edward 116n117, 122, 235
 Rhemish Testament 307
 Richard of St. Victor 189
 Richard, Guy 136n195
 Richardson, John 122, 123n146
 Richardson, Samuel 224n64
 Ridley, Nicholas 48–9
 Roberts, Francis 143, 146, 203, 279
 Robertson, William 223n61
 Rogers, Daniel 100n49
 Rogers, Henry 233n101
 Rogers, John 169, 200
 Rogers, Richard 67, 68n123, 77n166, 89n1,
 115n116, 293n32
 Rogers, Samuel 293n32
 Rohls, Jan 263n2
 Rohrer, S. Scott 10n28
 Rothwell, Richard 248
 Rous, Anthony 159
 Rous, Arthur 177
 Rous, Francis, Jr. 177
 Rous, Philippa 177
 Rupert of Deutz 189
 Russell, Conrad 12, 13n42, 159n20, 286n10,
 311
 Rutherford, Samuel 8n23, 31, 73, 77n166,
 80–1, 136n194, 174, 217n33, 220n47, 222,
 226–7, 229, 241n133, 241n138, 246, 254,
 270n30, 272
 Ryrie, Alec 44

 St. Bartholomew Exchange 98
 St. Margaret's, Lothbury 95–6
 St. Olave Jewry 95
 St. Paul's Cross 46
 St. Savior's Southwark 99
 St. Stephen's Walbrook 105
 Saltmarsh, John 31, 35n118, 36, 42, 67,
 68n120, 77n166, 81, 157n12, 211n4, 220n47,
 226, 228–9, 247, 250n174, 255n206, 272
 Sampson, Margaret 55n67
 Sampson, Thomas 53
 sanctification 4n2, 67n119, 70, 76, 111, 126,
 129, 146–9, 154n3, 196, 205, 208, 215, 217n33,
 237–8, 243n143, 248–54, 276, 280–1, 283,
 296, 313, 315
 Sandys, Edwin 49
 Sarpi, Paolo 191
 Sasek, Lawrence A. 20

- Savonarola, Girolamo 189–90
 Saxby, Robert 110n90
 Scarisbrick, J. J. 44
 scholasticism 10n29, 32, 35n120, 51, 200, 204, 280
 Schwanda, Tom 73n145, 75
 Sclater, William 9n25
 Scodel, Joshua 165
 Scotism, Scotist 84n195, 130n169, 239n126, 241n138, 277n57
 Scotus, John Duns 132, 239n126, 277n57
 Scudder, Henry 72, 297n47
 Seaman, Lazarus 104n67
 Sedgwick, Obadiah 100, 103, 241n161
 Sedgwick, John 214
 Seneca 191
sensus unitatis 9, 11n31, 19n61, 30, 38, 62, 100, 159, 167, 208, 235, 260, 264, 267, 298, 310, 314
 Seymour, Edward 47
 Sharpe, Kevin 172
 Shaw, Ian J. 219
 Shaw, Peter 62
 Shepard, Thomas 16n54, 18, 190, 244, 293n32
 Showers, John 229n86
 Sibbes, Richard 66n115, 67, 73, 77n166, 116n117, 186, 192, 194n197, 227, 297n47
 Sidney Sussex College 117
 Simpson, John 21n71
 Simpson, Sidrach 100, 116n117, 143n224
 Schlichting, Jonas 104
 Schmalkald Articles 146n233
 Sion College 225
 Sixtus, Rippertus 238n123
 Slater, Samuel 229n86
 Smallwood, [Mr.] 122
 Smith, Henry 89n1
 Smith, Samuel 116n117
 Snecanus, Gellius 59n82
 Snoddy, Richard 250n176, 252n184
 Socinianism 62, 93, 199, 263, 269, 276
 Sohn, George 58n82
 Solemn League and Covenant 64
 Solt, Leo F. 50–1
 Sprigge, Joshua 173
 Sprunger, Keith L. 160n22, 291
 Spurr, John 13, 28n103, 291, 302
 Spurstowe, William 100n49, 111
 Stanglin, Keith D. 34n120, 58n82, 66n116, 139n206
Statenvertaling 108n84
 Steinmetz, David C. 7, 8n22, 13, 311
 Sterry, Peter 34, 67, 74, 157n12, 192, 220n45, 269, 313
 Stock, Richard 96–7, 304n74
 Stoeffler, F. Ernest 153n2, 190
 Stoever, William K. B. 92, 93n17, 256
 Stoughton, John 100
 Stout, Harry S. 129n167
 Strehle, Stephen 78n168
 Stuart Restoration 5, 7n20, 28n103, 29, 40–1, 58n79, 63–5, 103, 216n28, 295n41
summum bonum 130, 190, 197, 207
 Sutton, Thomas 99, 103n62, 235
 Sutton, Thomas, Jr. 105
 Symonds, Joseph 100
 Synod of Dort (1618–19) 58, 167–8

 Tany, Thomas (Theaurau John) 18, 104
 Tauler, John 74, 157
 Taylor, Francis 108n84, 122
 Taylor, Thomas 66n115, 67, 79n174, 80n174, 116, 216, 223, 226, 279n30
 Teellinck, William 25n91
 Temple, Thomas 103
 Tertullian 189
 Thomas à Kempis 157, 182, 189, 273
 Thomism. *See* Thomas Aquinas
 Thornton, Helen 90n4
 Thuesen, Peter J. 135n191
 Todd, Margo 13, 18n58, 23, 286
 Torshell, Samuel 116n117
 Towers, S. Mutchow 183
 Towne, Robert 68n120, 220n47, 226, 247
 Trail, Robert 82, 147, 228–9, 235n111
 Traske, John 68n120, 230, 247
 Travers, Walter 55
 Trelcatius, Lucas 101n54
 Trinity College Dublin 42, 95, 127
 Trinterud, Leonard J. 12, 23–4
 Trueman, Carl R. 8n23, 19n61, 48n37, 67n119, 84, 121, 189n175, 245, 250n177, 265, 302n69
 Tuckney, Anthony 297n47
 Turner, Denys 74
 Turner, John 231n97
 Turretin, Francis 107n78, 279

- Twisse, William 83n192, 100n49, 136n193,
 136n194, 137n197, 216, 221, 223n61, 230, 235,
 239n126, 240, 241n138, 249–52, 259
 Tyacke, Nicholas 7, 13, 20, 35n120, 44,
 58, 64, 69n125, 168n68, 268n20, 271,
 288n14
 Tyndale, William 46, 47n32, 142

 Udall, John 54, 116
 Underdown, David 7n20, 12n37, 13
 Ursinus, Zacharias 115n116, 143
 Ussher, James 12n36, 26n93, 31, 35, 37, 90,
 100–2, 122, 127–8, 133n178, 139n208, 141n215,
 216, 235, 250n176, 305

 Van Asselt, Willem 204, 263n1, 265, 277n57,
 279, 280n69
 Van den Belt, Henk 78n167
 Van den Berg, Johannes 153n2, 178n120,
 183n146, 184
 Van Dixhoorn, Chad 22n73
 Van Est, Willem Hessels 80n174
 Vane, Henry 31, 74
 Vasquez, Gabriel 189
 Vermigli, Peter Martyr 48, 50, 53, 132n175,
 241n138, 267n15, 277n57, 306n78
 Vestiarian controversy 52–3
via media 52, 58
 Vicars, John 306n78
viva vox Evangelii 55
 Voetius, Gisbertus 4, 136n194, 296, 297n47
 Vos, Antonie 239n126

 Wakefield, Gordon 6, 75n152
 Walker, George 96–8, 100
 Wallace, Dewey D. 75, 153n2, 156n10,
 196n206, 264n4
 Wallington, Nehemiah 18, 299
 Wallis, John 216
 Walsingham, Francis 49
 Walzer, Michael 17–8
 Ward, Samuel 248, 293n32
 Watts, Michael R. 26n95
 Waucquier, Mateo Martinez 101n54
 Weber thesis 9n26, 106n74
 Webster, Tom 13, 28n103, 96n32, 288n14, 302
 Wendelin, Markus Friedrich 101n54, 296n47
 Westfield, Thomas 97
 Westminster Assembly (1643–52) 21–2, 29,
 31n109, 62, 82, 83n191, 86, 90n4, 98, 100n49,
 105, 108n84, 112n96, 122, 143n224, 156, 158,
 161, 164, 211, 222n54, 224, 228, 230n90,
 251–2, 264n4, 266, 268, 270, 300, 305–7,
 309, 312–3
 Wheelwright, John 226–7, 250n175
 Whitaker, William 54–55, 80n174, 295, 300
 White, Francis 167
 White, John 123n146
 White, Peter 58, 168n68, 177
 White, Thomas 102
 Whitgift, John 3
 “Wicked” Bible 119n131
 Widdowes, Giles 4, 12n38
 Wigglesworth, Michael 19, 293n32
 Wilburn, Percival 15
 Wilkinson, John 234
 Willet, Andrew 31, 45n21, 59n83, 147, 171n79
 William Jones Lecture 98–9
 Williams, Daniel 82–3, 222, 228, 229n86, 231,
 240
 Wilson, Thomas 235, 248
 Winship, Michael P. 12, 15, 250n175, 266n12,
 267n15, 295n41
 Winstanley, Gerrard 230, 304, 315
 Winthrop, John 16n54
 Winwood, Ralph 160n24
 Witsius, Herman 143, 178n120, 251n80,
 297n47
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig 15n48, 20, 287,
 296n45
 concept of *Familienähnlichkeit* 15n48,
 20, 287, 294, 296n45, 298
 Wollebius, Johannes 101n54, 296n47
 Wood, Anthony 31n109, 161, 216n29, 218
 Wood, Thomas 49–50
 Woodward, Walter W. 36n127
 Woolrych, Austin 18
 Worden, Blair 13, 158n18, 174, 183n146
 Wotton, Anthony 96–8
 Wrightson, Keith 13

 Yates, John 4, 12n38, 116n117
 Young, Thomas 49
 Yule, George 183n146

 Zaborowska, Magdalena J. 9
 Zanchi, Jerome 9n25, 58n82, 80n174,
 132n175, 277n57
 Zaret, David 46
 Zwingli, Ulrich 142, 243, 279

Unity in Diversity presents a fresh appraisal of the vibrant and diverse culture of Stuart Puritanism, provides a historiographical and historical survey of current issues within Puritanism, critiques notions of Puritanisms, which tend to fragment the phenomenon, and introduces *unitas* within *diversitas* within three divergent Puritans, John Downname, Francis Rous, and Tobias Crisp. This study draws on insights from these three figures to propose that seventeenth-century English Puritanism should be thought of both in terms of *Familienähnlichkeit*, in which there are strong theological and social resemblances across Puritans of divergent persuasions, and in terms of the greater narrative of the Puritan Reformation, which united Puritans in their quest to reform their church and society.

Randall J. Pederson, Ph.D. (2013) in History of Christianity, Leiden University, is Research Fellow at the Jonathan Edwards Centre at University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa, and author of numerous articles and reviews on English Puritanism and the Post-Reformation.

ISBN: 978-90-04-27326-9



9 789004 273269

ISSN 1572-4107

brill.com/BSCH