Studies in Puritanism and Piety Journal

CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITORS

In this third issue of the *Studies in Puritanism and Piety Journal*, both the articles and the book reviews focus on the multifaceted nature of Puritanism—particularly Puritan theology and piety—within its diverse post-Reformation British, North American, and Continental context. They explore a broad range of figures from a variety of ecclesiastical backgrounds on a diversity of subjects. In these ways, they further the vision of the *Studies in Puritanism and Piety Journal* to foster research on the Puritans in the post-Reformation and to make Puritan scholarship accessible to readers while providing opportunities for scholars to present their research.

In his article entitled "The Judeo-Centric Eschatology of Thomas Case," Lawrence Rabone (PhD student, the University of Manchester) analyzes Thomas Case's (1598–1682) ecclesiology and eschatology in all its complexity, particularly in connection with the restoration of the Jews. Second, in "'Everything…Was Typical of Gospel Things!' A Reconsideration of Jonathan Edwards's Biblical Typology: A Study of His *Blank Bible*," Cameron Schweitzer (PhD student, Gateway Theological Seminary) corrects some scholarly misunderstandings of Jonathan Edwards's exegetical typology by probing the inner workings of Edwards's interpretive mind through a careful study of Edwards's *Blank Bible* (volume 24 of the *Works of Jonathan Edwards*). Then, in his article "The Plain Man's Pathway to Wisdom: The Fear of God in John Bunyan's Spirituality," Matthew Stewart (Christ Community Church) explores the influence of Arthur Dent's *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* on John Bunyan, particularly Bunyan's conception of the fear of God. In "Wilhelmus à Brakel's Understanding of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*: Faith as Voluntary Trust in God and Habituation in the Christian Life," Sam Hyeong Rae Jo (PhD student, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) examines how Wilhelmus à Brakel (1635–1711) was in both continuity and discontinuity with other Reformed theologians in his emphasizing the *actus fidei* over the *habitus fidei*. Finally, in his article "The Marrow Doctrine and the Extent of the Atonement: Focal Points Within

the Context of Some Theological Positions Within Scottish Marrow The-
ology," Leen van Valen (independent scholar) investigates Edward Fisher's
Marrow of Modern Divinity in connection with the later eighteenth-century
Scottish controversy over antinomianism and its relationship with English
hypothetical universalism.

Book Review contributions include Eric Beech, PhD student at the Uni-
versity of Oxford (Wolfson College), reviewing three books: Richard A.
Muller, *Grace and Freedom: William Perkins and the Early Modern Reformed
Understanding of Free Choice and Divine Grace* (New York: Oxford Univer-
sity Press, 2020); Andrew S. Ballitch, *The Gloss and the Text: William Perkins
on Interpreting Scripture with Scripture* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press,
2020); and *The Oxford Handbook of John Bunyan*, edited by Michael Davies
and W. R. Owens (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018); David G.
Whitla, Professor of Church History at Reformed Presbyterian Theologi-
cal Seminary (Pittsburgh, PA), reviewing Whitney G. Gamble, *Christ and
the Law: Antinomianism at the Westminster Assembly* (Grand Rapids, MI:
Reformation Heritage Books, 2017); Jonathan Baddley, PhD student at
Vanderbilt University, reviewing *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissent-
ing Traditions, Volume 1: The Post-Reformation Era, 1559-1689*, edited by
John Coffey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); and Andrew Juchno,
Yale Divinity School, reviewing *The Oxford Handbook of Jonathan Edwards*,
edited by Douglas A. Sweeney and Jan Stievermann (Oxford: Oxford Uni-
versity Press, 2021).

The Judeo-Centric
Eschatology of Thomas Case

LAWRENCE RABONE
lawrence.rabone@manchester.ac.uk
The University of Manchester

Puritan pamphlets and sermons from the 1640s often focus on ecclesiology and eschatology, which were two of the most important contemporary issues for ministers seeking to reform England.[1] This article explores the complexity of the relationship between ecclesiology and eschatology in Puritan theology through a study of the works of the English Presbyterian Thomas Case (1598–1682). During his long life, which passed through the reigns of four different monarchs as well as the English Commonwealth (1649–60), Case published twenty different collections of sermons and books. However, little secondary literature exists on Case.[2] This article shows for the first time that Case's eschatology included belief in the restoration of the Jews.

In 2003, Richard Cogley introduced the term "Judeo-centric eschatology" to describe Christian belief in the ingathering of the Jews as a nation to the Land of Israel.[3] Andrew Crome, building upon Cogley's work, has documented just how widespread Judeo-centric eschatology was in

---

1. For an introduction to ecclesiology in the period see: Youngkwon Chung, "Ecclesiology, Piety, and Presbyterian and Independent Polemics During the Early Years of the English Revolution," *Church History* 84, no. 2 (2015): 345–68. For an introduction to seventeenth-century eschatology see: Andrew Crome, *Christian Zionism and English National Identity, 1600–1850* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2018), 29–104.

2. David Cressy has written on Case's role as a historian of his own times: David Cressy, "Remembrancers of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68, no. 1–2 (2005): 257–68. Edward Vallance has written about Case and the covenant: Edward Vallance, "An Holy and Sacramentall Paction: Federal Theology and the Solemn League and Covenant in England," *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 465 (2001): 67–68.

3. Richard W. Cogley, "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the 'Judeo-Centric' Strand of Puritan Millenarianism," *Church History* 72, no. 2 (2003): 304–32.

England, particularly in the 1640s and 1650s.[4] Crome correctly observes that Judeo-centric eschatology was "more than Hebraism or a generalised belief in an end time Jewish conversion, but a detailed focus on the importance of both the Jewish people and the Holy Land itself as both a political and sacred space."[5] Such a belief helped to contribute to the phenomenon of Puritan philosemitism, which culminated when Oliver Cromwell unofficially readmitted the Jews to England in 1655 following the Whitehall Conference in London.[6]

Puritan Judeo-centric eschatology is worthy of attention as it stands apart from earlier Protestant eschatological beliefs. As part of a general prolegomenon, and in order to provide a point of comparison, I begin by briefly outlining Martin Luther's attitude toward a Jewish restoration to the Land of Israel. A century before Case, Luther, in his vitriolic diatribe *On the Jews and Their Lies* (1543), specifically devoted a section to countering the Jewish claim that God had given the Jews the Land of Israel and the city of Jerusalem.[7] Luther wrote:

> […] they pride themselves tremendously on having received the land of Canaan, the city of Jerusalem, and the temple from God, […but] they were exterminated and devastated by the Romans over fourteen hundred years ago—so that they might well perceive that God did not regard, nor will regard, their country, city, temple, priesthood, or principality […] They remain stone-blind, obdurate, immovable, ever hoping that God will restore their homeland to them and give everything back to them.[8]

---

4. Andrew Crome, "The Proper and Naturall Meaning of the Prophets: The Hermeneutic Roots of Judeo-Centric Eschatology," *Renaissance Studies* 24, no. 5 (2010): 725–41; *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2014); "The Restoration of the Jews in Transatlantic Context, 1600–1680," *Prophecy and Eschatology in the Transatlantic World, 1550–1800*, ed. Andrew Crome (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 127–50; *Christian Zionism*.

5. *Restoration of the Jews*, 2.

6. The definitive study on this remains David S. Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).

7. Martin Luther, "On the Jews and Their Lies, 1543," *Luther's Works: The Christian in Society 4*, ed. Trans. Martin H. Bertram, Jaroslav Pelikan, and Helmut Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 172–74. Kenneth Austin, *The Jews and the Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020), 64.

8. Luther, "On the Jews and Their Lies, 1543," 172–73.

Luther continued, "By virtue of their own merits they still hope to return there [the Land] again. But they have no such promise with which they could console themselves other than what their false imagination smuggles into Scripture."[9]

One reason Luther gave why God had rejected the Jews was their dispersal from the Land: "Why, even today they cannot refrain from their nonsensical, insane boasting that they are God's people, although they have been cast out, dispersed, and utterly rejected for almost fifteen hundred years."[10]

Luther also rejected belief in a future Jewish conversion. In *On the Ineffable Name and On Christ's Lineage* (1543), he wrote that "although there are many who derive the crazy notion from the 11th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans that all Jews must be converted, this is not so. Saint Paul meant something quite different."[11] For Luther, writing at the end of his life in the grip of anti-Judaism, the Jews were beyond redemption. By contrast, we will see that Case valorised the Jews by maintaining that they would yet be objects of divine mercy. What accounts for these differing attitudes toward Jewish Messianism? A full answer goes beyond the scope of this article, but I demonstrate in this article that a century after Luther some Reformed Orthodox theologians such as Case had come a long way in applying consistently a literal hermeneutic.

Having contextualised Case's eschatology in a broader context, it also needs to be situated in the much narrower context of intra-Puritan divisions in Civil War England. It is particularly significant that Case was a Presbyterian. Scholars have correctly noted that Judeo-centric eschatology was most common among Independents such as Thomas Goodwin, John Owen, William Bridge, and John Goodwin.[12] However, some scholars have

---

9. Luther, "On the Jews and Their Lies, 1543," 174.

10. Luther, "On the Jews and Their Lies, 1543."

11. Martin Luther, "Vom Schem Hamphoras," *The Jew in Christian Theology: Martin Luther's Vom Schem Hamphoras, Previously Unpublished in English, and Other Milestones in Church Doctrine Concerning Judaism*, ed. Gerhard Falk (Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland, 1992), 167.

12. John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism During the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 223–40; G. F. Nuttall, *Visible Saints: The Congregational Way, 1640–1660* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), 146–48; Lawrence Rabone, "John Goodwin on Zechariah 13:3: Toleration, Supersessionism and Judeo-Centric Eschatology," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 96, no. 2 (2020): 45–66; Stanley P. Fienberg, "Thomas Goodwin's Scriptural Hermeneutics and the Dissolution of Puritan Unity," *Journal of Religious History* 10, no. 1 (1978): 32–49. Though Fienberg only devotes

made inaccurate and sweeping statements asserting that all Presbyterians rejected Judeo-centric eschatology.[13] For example, Nabil Matar, in an otherwise excellent article demonstrating John Milton's belief in the restoration of the Jews, states:

> Understandably, criticism of the idea of the Restoration [of the Jews] came from those who neither viewed Cromwell's ascendancy to power as divinely legitimized, nor identified Interregnum England with the shortly-expected kingdom of Christ. Specifically, Presbyterians in the Assembly of Divines were hostile to Cromwell's regime and to the whole millenarian heresy on which the justification of the civil wars, Pride's Purge, the regicide, and Cromwellian dictatorship rested […] By opposing Cromwell, Presbyterians and Anglicans rejected all the theological arguments which he and his aides used to justify their revolutionary and sectarian actions—specifically the argument of the Jews' Restoration.[14]

Matar's claim that the Independents used Judeo-centric eschatology to justify the violence of the Puritan Revolution is highly contentious. Furthermore, his generalization that Presbyterians *in toto* rejected Judeo-centric eschatology is incorrect. Whilst Matar does provide examples of Presbyterians, such as Robert Baillie, who opposed both Cromwell and Judeo-centric eschatology, Case's Judeo-centric eschatology is a notable exception. While such a bifurcation of eschatologies occurred later in the decade, it is important to note that during the early years of the Long Parliament, and at the convening of the Westminster Assembly in 1643, Judeo-centric eschatology was not limited to the Independents. It was not until the breakdown of the Puritan brotherhood, following the end of the First Civil War in 1646, that a sharp distinction between the eschatologies of the Puritans and the

---

a few sentences to Case, he correctly mentions that Case and other Presbyterians in the early 1640s exhibited apocalyptic thought, though it was more moderate than that of the Independents (p. 45).

13. David Walker has also emphasised an antithesis between Presbyterian anti-millenarianism and Independent millenarianism. David Walker, "Thomas Goodwin and the Debate on Church Government," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34, no. 1 (1983): 93.

14. N. I. Matar, "Milton and the Idea of the Restoration of the Jews," *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 27, no. 1 (1987): 115.

Independents developed.[15] Until then, belief in Judeo-centric eschatology had both Presbyterian and Independent advocates.[16]

Before analysing Case's writings, it is important to contextualize the sermonic genre of Case's writings. Scholars have widely emphasized the importance of sermons in the 1640s as a tool for conveying both theological and political positions to both the leaders of the English nation and local parishioners.[17] The most important subcategory of sermonic literature in the period was the Puritan parliamentary sermon, and these form a major part of the corpus of Case's printed sermons. Puritans preached approximately 240 sermons before Parliament in the 1640s, both on days of fasting and days of thanksgiving.[18] John Wilson's monograph, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism During the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648* (1969), demonstrated comprehensively the importance of parliamentary sermons in providing an insight into how the tumultuous events of the decade were perceived by leading clergy. Case preached six sermons before Parliament;[19] on average

---

15. For the chronology of the Presbyterian–Independent rift, see Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640–1660* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 29–56.

16. Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 16.

17. *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600–1750*, ed. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter E. McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); David Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter E. McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

18. Wilson, *Pulpit*, 7.

19. Thomas Case, *Two Sermons Lately Preached at Westminster before Sundry of the Honourable House of Commons by Thomas Case* (London: Luke Fawne, 1641). Case preached just after the Battle of Edgehill: *Gods Rising, His Enemies Scattering; Delivered in a Sermon before the Honourable House of Commons, at Their Solemne Fast, 26. Octob. 1642. But, through Many Occasions and Hinderances, Not Printed Till This 25. Of May 1644* (London: Luke Fawne, 1644); *A Model of True Spiritual Thankfulnesse. Delivered in a Sermon before the Honourable House of Commons, Upon Their Day of Thanksgiving, Being Thursday, Feb. 19. 1645, for the Great Mercy of God, in the Surrender of the Citie of Chester into the Hands of the Parliaments Forces in Cheshire, under the Command of Sir William Brereton* (London: Luke Fawne, 1646); *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at Westminster, August 22. 1645. Being the Day Appointed for Their Solemn Thanksgiving Unto God for His Several Mercies to the Forces of the Parliament in Divers Parts of the Kingdome, in the Gaining of the Towns of Bath and Bridgewater, and of Scarborough-Castle, and Sherborn-Castle, and for the Dispersing of the Clubmen, and the Good Successe in Pembroke-Shire* (London: Luke Fawne, 1645); *Deliverance-Obstruction: Or, the Set-Backs of Reformation. Discovered in*

ministers preached around two sermons each before Parliament.[20] Case therefore preached to Parliament with above average frequency, a fact that demonstrates Case's prominence. The circulation of Puritan fast sermons, which were often printed after being delivered to Parliament, is an area that has not been extensively studied. That said, Christopher Hill has noted that parliamentarians were in general better than royalists at circulating their political messages to the wider population, and Michael A. G. Haykin estimates that the print run for Puritan fast sermons was around two to three thousand copies.[21]

The importance of parliamentary sermons, then, is beyond question. However, Ann Hughes has recently helped to sharpen analysis of these sermons by emphasizing the importance of contextualizing parliamentary sermons, which is something that I will do by briefly outlining Case's biography.[22]

Case was born into a godly household in Kent in 1598 and was converted at the age of six.[23] In 1616, he entered Christ Church, Oxford, graduating BA in 1620 and MA in 1623.[24] Case was then ordained at some point in the 1620s by Presbyterians in Norwich.[25] He first pastored for a decade in Erpingham, Norfolk, and it was here that, in light of Bishop Matthew Wren's anti-Puritanism, he first came into trouble with the religious authorities.[26]

---

a Sermon before the Right Honourable the House of Peers, in Parliament Now Assembled. Upon the Monthly Fast, March 25. 1646 (London: Luke Fawne, 1646). Wilson, *Pulpit*, 113.

20. James C. Spalding, "Sermons before Parliament (1640–1649) as a Public Puritan Diary," *Church History* 36, no. 1 (1967): 25.

21. Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1991), 22. Haykin made this estimate in an unpublished talk entitled "John Owen" at the Delighting in God and His Word conference, held at the Old Meeting House, Norwich on March 13, 2017.

22. Ann Hughes, "Preachers and Hearers in Revolutionary London: Contextualising Parliamentary Fast Sermons," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 24 (2014): 57–77.

23. James Reid, *Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of Those Eminent Divines, Who Covened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster, in the Seventeenth Century* (Paisley: Stephen and Andrew Young, 1811) 1:204.

24. Joel R. Beeke and Randall Pederson, *Meet the Puritans: With a Guide to Modern Reprints* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006), 138.

25. Kirsteen M. MacKenzie, *The Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Kingdoms and the Cromwellian Union, 1643–1663* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), 160.

26. Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c. 1560–1643* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005), 171–72.

Persecuted in Norfolk, Richard Heyrick (1600–1667), a Presbyterian minister and Case's old school friend, invited Case to minister in Manchester around 1636.[27] Heyrick had previously moved from Norfolk to Manchester and was the warden of the Manchester Collegiate Church. On August 8, 1637, Case married Anne Mosley, a widow, in the Parish Church of Stockport.[28] This marriage to a pious woman in a notable Puritan family opened many doors for Case's preaching ministry.[29] However, he continued to encounter strong resistance during what were the final years of the Laudian persecution: in 1638–1639, he was accused at the Consistory Court of a range of offenses including leading conventicles, possessing "scandalous and offensive books," failing to kneel at communion, and speaking against the "sicknesses" of the Church of England, notably at Didsbury Church, Manchester.[30]

In 1642, Case was summoned to the Westminster Assembly as one of the two Cheshire delegates.[31] He effectively became an unofficial parliamentarian envoy to Manchester, distributing money to parliamentary forces in the North West on behalf of Parliament.[32] On July 31, 1645, following the parliamentarian successes in the North West, the Committee

---

27. R. C. Richardson, *Puritanism in North-West England: A Regional Study of the Diocese of Chester to 1642* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972), 54, 64. For Heyrick, see Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590–1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), 132.

28. Henry Heginbotham, *Stockport: Ancient and Modern* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1882), 1:303.

29. Robert S. Paul, *The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'Grand Debate'* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985), 91.

30. Chester. Consistory Court papers. EDC 5, 1638. Miscellaneous. Quoted in Richardson, *Puritanism*, 31, 54–55.

31. Anon, *The Names of Those Divines That Are Nominated by the Knights and Burgesses of Each County, for the Consultation, or Assembly* (London: Joseph Hunscot and Edward Blackmore, 1642), 1.

32. *Five Speciall Orders of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament 1. Concerning Great Resort of People Unto This City of London, of Which Some Are Suspected to Be Persons Ill-Affected to the Peace of This City and Kingdome: Also That No Victuals or Other Provision Be Suffered to Be Carried out of London, without Licence: And That No Officer or Souldier of His Excellencies Army Be Permitted to Come into This City without a Certificate: 2. For the Reliefe of Manchester and Other Parts in Lancaster, against the Rising of the Papists There: 3. Concerning Some Souldiers Lately Come out of Ireland: 4. For a Search to Be Made in London, the Suburbes, and Townes Adjacent, for Armes: 5. That a Search Be Made for Horses, or Any Other Ammunition, Which Have Bin Sold or Pawn'd by Any of the Souldiers of the Army, Raised by the Parliament* (London: Iohn Wright, 1642), sig.A3r.

for Plundered Ministers appointed Case to the Rectory of Stockport.[33] However, he remained the rector of St. Mary's, Stockport, for only nine months.[34]

With the ascendancy of the Presbyterian cause in London, he received a call to St. Mary Magdalene Church, Milk Street, London. According to Elliot Vernon, Case's Milk Street pastorate in the 1640s shone as "a beacon of godly reformation."[35] However, in 1650 he suffered persecution again as he refused to take the Engagement and was sequestered.[36] He became involved in the opposition to the regicide that culminated in the execution of Christopher Love in 1651. Case was imprisoned and, during his six-month arrest in the Tower of London, wrote *Correction, Instruction; Or, A Treatise off Afflictions* (1652).[37] Following his release, he became the incumbent of St. Giles in the Fields, where he remained throughout the Interregnum.[38] Case supported the Restoration by both signing a declaration to Charles II upon his ascension in 1660 and traveling to Breda to accompany the monarch back to England.[39] However, though he was appointed a royal chaplain, he refused to subscribe to the Act of Uniformity and was ejected on August 24, 1662.[40] He continued to write and minister until his death in 1682.[41]

---

33. Heginbotham, *Stockport*, 1:303.

34. Edward W. Bulkeley, *The Parish Registers of Saint Mary Stockport, Containing the Baptisms, Marriages and Burials from 1584–1620, with Notes* (Stockport: Swain and Co., 1889), 2.

35. Elliot Vernon, "Godly Pastors and Their Congregations in Mid-Seventeenth-Century London," *Church Life: Pastors, Congregations, and the Experience of Dissent in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Michael Davies, Anne Dunan-Page, and Joel Halcomb (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 58.

36. Vernon, "Godly Pastors," 58.

37. Ann Hughes, "Print and Pastoral Identity: Presbyterian Pastors Negotiate the Restoration," *Church Life: Pastors, Congregations, and the Experience of Dissent in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Michael Davies, Anne Dunan-Page, and Joel Halcomb (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 167.

38. Reid, *Memoirs*, 1:213–14. Thomas Jacombe, *Abraham's death, the manner, time, and consequent of it: opened and applied in a funeral sermon preached upon the death of the Reverend Mr. Thomas Case… June 14th, 1682: with a narrative of his life and death* (London: Brabrazon [sic] Aylmer, 1682), 42.

39. Anon, *To the Kings Most Excellent Maiesty. The Humble and Grateful Acknowledgement of Many Ministers of the Gospel in, and About the City of London, to His Royal Majesty for His Gracious Concessions in His Majesties Late Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affaires* (London: Joh. Rothwel, 1660).

40. Beeke, *Meet the Puritans*, 140.

41. Reid, *Memoirs*, 1:216.

Case's ministry certainly agrees with the observations of Polly Ha and Kirsteen MacKenzie on the vibrancy of Puritanism in Cheshire and Lancashire.[42] Though the Puritan movement was concentrated predominantly in the south and east of England, Case found a ripe field for ministry in Manchester and Stockport. Case thus integrated into an important godly network of English Presbyterians with contacts in Norfolk, London, and the North West. These Presbyterians supported one another through the difficult days of Laud's persecution, the Civil War, the triumph of Independency during the Cromwellian era, and, finally, the persecution of all dissenters from 1662 to 1688.

Two sermons lately preached at Westminster, before sundry of the Honourable House of Commons (1641)

Case's *Two Sermons* contains the first two of the six sermons that Case preached to Parliament. They were also some of the earliest Puritan fast sermons preached before the House of Commons.[43] Preached in May 1641, they were strongly political in content.[44] Case's first sermon was on Ezekiel 20:25 and did not cover any eschatological or Judeo-centric themes.[45] His second sermon was on Ezra 10:2–3. In the latter, Case called for a further reformation: "Reform the Universities…Reform the Cities, reform the Countries, reform inferiour Schools of Learning; reform the Sabbath, reform the Ordinances, the worship of God, &c."[46] In particular, he warned against the "vaine Doctrines of Poperie and Arminianisme."[47] Case also stated that the reformation would advance most effectively if believers took a solemn covenant.[48] Judeo-centric eschatology is also absent in this sermon.

It is important to start our survey of Case's writings here because these sermons have a strong "apocalyptic vein," as Michael Mullett notes.[49] These sermons also show that Case's plan for the nation's reformation was grounded in the covenant concept. Tai Liu has described this emphasis on

---

42. Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 129; MacKenzie, *Solemn League*, 20–22.

43. Wilson, *Pulpit*, 240, 242, 245–47, 249, 278.

44. John Walter, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 88.

45. Case, *Two Sermons*.

46. Case, *Two Sermons*, 21–22.

47. Case, *Two Sermons*, 28.

48. Case, *Two Sermons*, 23. For background to taking the covenant see MacKenzie, *Solemn League*, 3–5, 10–14. For Case and the covenant see Case, *Two Sermons*, 47.

49. Michael Mullett, "Case, Thomas (Bap. 1598, D. 1682), Clergyman and Ejected Minister," *ODNB* (2004).

God choosing a nation and keeping covenant with them as "the embodiment of a Puritan millenarianism in the early stages of the English Revolution when the concept of the Kingdom of Christ was still understood primarily in the religious sense."[50] Case's theology, rooted as it was in the importance of a national covenant, also included a Jewish restoration to the Land as Case saw God's covenant with Israel having an ongoing place in the divine plan.

Gods Waiting to be Gracious unto His People (1642)

Apart from the aforementioned two sermons, *Gods Waiting* is Case's earliest work. Based on sermons preached in Milk Street, London, the title page explains that it was printed in the capital, to be sold at Thomas Smith's shop in Manchester. Smith had been selling Puritan works in Manchester throughout the 1630s, for which he had been brought before the Consistory Court in 1638.[51] Hence, Case's publishing network illustrates that, even while he was ministering in London, he still used his contacts in Manchester to promote godliness in Lancashire. Case's main text was Isaiah 30:18, "And therefore will the Lord wait that he may be gracious unto you, and therefore will he be exalted, that he may have mercy upon you: for the Lord is a God of judgment. Blessed are all they that wait for him."

The tone of this eschatological sermon is optimistic as Case encouraged England to wait for the Lord. Case stated that "the righteous salvation of God toward his poor people in England is comming, and that not farre off."[52] He continued, "God certainly, my Brethren, intends to doe good to England, and (I could beleeve) it is neer, even at the very door."[53] In seeking to understand where England was situated on "the clock of providence," Case listed twelve reasons why God was blessing England. His explanation of these reasons runs to almost eighty pages.[54] Helpfully, he also listed his twelve reasons in a condensed bullet point form.[55] The first bullet point has three sub-points and reads:

---

50. Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 26.

51. Richardson, *Puritanism*, 10; Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580–1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 193.

52. Thomas Case, *Gods Waiting to Be Gracious Unto His People, Together with Englands Encouragements and Cautions to Wait on God* (London: Thomas Smith, 1642), 55.

53. Case, *Gods Waiting*, 56.

54. Case, *Gods Waiting*, 57–136.

55. Case, *Gods Waiting*, 137–38.

1. The neere approach of Babylons downefall, witnes

    1. The probability of the drawing neer of the calling of the Jewes.
    2. The cold sweat that stands on Antichrists limbs.
    3. Gods call of his people out of Babylon.[56]

Thus, the calling of the Jews is the first piece of evidence Case presented for the first reason that he gave for why he believed that God was blessing England. That his readers might "observe wherabout the finger of God is in the Diall of Providence,"[57] Case then exegeted Daniel 12. According to Case, in this chapter "we find a Prophesie of the finall restauration of the Jewes." He focused particularly on verse 11, which reads, "And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abominable desolation set up, there shall be a thousand, two hundred and ninety days."[58]

Case's reasoning that God's deliverance for England was near is as follows: the ceasing of the daily sacrifice, and the setting up of the abomination of desolation took place under the emperor Julian, who tried to rebuild the Jewish Temple in 360 AD; adding 1290 to this date gives the year 1650. Case concluded, "And before this full and finall restauration of the Jewes (whenever it comes) Babylon must [fall] down, Rome must be destroyed, and it is very probable that these may be the beginnings of that glorious work."[59] Thus, in 1642 Case was suggesting that the Jews might be called by 1650. He further noted that the seven vials of Revelation 16 were at his time of writing being poured out on the Roman anti-Christian system, a judgement that would one day give way to the reign of Christ.[60] Case hence ties in his belief in the calling of the Jews with the fall of Babylon (the Ottoman Empire) and Rome (the Roman Catholic Church). His emphasis on this triad of eschatological events fits in with Richard Cogley's work on Judeo-centrism, which argues that belief in the ingathering of the Jews in the early modern period entailed an expectation that other imminent and monumental geo-political events would happen, notably the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.[61]

Case then referred to an interpretation of Revelation 16:18 given by the Presbyterian Thomas Brightman (1562–1607). This verse on the

---

56. Case, *Gods Waiting*, 137.
57. Case, *Gods Waiting*, 56.
58. This translation is from the 1599 Geneva Bible.
59. Case, *Gods Waiting*, 57.
60. Case, *Gods Waiting*, 67.
61. Cogley, "Fall of the Ottoman Empire," 304–32.

fourth vial of judgment describes an angel pouring out his bowl on the sun such that the inhabitants of the earth are scorched. In 1611, Brightman had linked this to Isaiah 30:26, which prophesies of a time when "the light of the Sun shall be seven-fold as the light of seven dayes."[62] Case also linked Revelation 16:18 and Isaiah 30:26.[63] Herein we see that Case's apocalypticism was indebted to the exegesis of Brightman. Indeed, Case's emphasis on the year 1650 as marking a prophetic watershed was a view first put forward by Brightman in his posthumously published commentary on Daniel 11:26–45 and Daniel 12.[64] Case clearly read Brightman attentively and in another sermon referred to him by name.[65] In sum, in 1642 Case stated that the first reason why his English hearers could be assured that God was showing them favour was that He was preparing to regather the Jews, something that would likely be accomplished by 1650. Brightman, whom Crome has shown was so influential in diffusing such Judeo-centric eschatological ideas in England, influenced Case in this interpretation.[66]

The Quarrell of the Covenant (1643)

Judeo-centric eschatology is also present in Case's sermons on the Solemn League and Covenant. The Solemn League and Covenant summarized Parliament's military and political alliance with the Scots and promised a Presbyterian settlement. The Covenant was an important theme in Case's early works. However, as Edward Vallance notes, the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643 has received far less scholarly attention than, for example,

---

62. Thomas Brightman, *A Revelation of the Apocalyps, That Is, the Apocalyps of S. Iohn Illustrated Vvith an Analysis & Scolions Where the Sense Is Opened by the Scripture, & the Events of Things Foretold, Shewed by Histories. Hereunto Is Prefixed a Generall View: And at the End of the 17. Chapter, Is Inserted a Refutation of R. Bellarmine Touching Antichrist, in His 3. Book of the B. Of Rome.* (Amsterdam: 1611), 434–35.

63. Case, *God's Waiting*, 62.

64. Thomas Brightman, *A Most Comfortable Exposition of the Last and Most Difficult Part of the Prophecie of Daniel from the 26. Verse of the 11. Chap, to the End of the 12. Chapter. Wherin the Restoring of the Iewes and Their Callinge to the Faith of Christ, after the Utter Over-throw of Their Three Last Enemies, Is Set Forth in Livelie Colours* (Amsterdam: 1635), 103. For a discussion of Brightman's view see Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatalogical Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 117. Crome, *Restoration of the Jews*, 103.

65. Thomas Case, *Spirituall Vvhordome Discovered in a Sermon Preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament, Upon the Solemn Day of Humiliation, May 26. 1647* (London: Luke Favvne, 1647), 7.

66. Crome, *Restoration of the Jews*.

the Scottish National Covenant of 1638.[67] Case's sermons on the Covenant illustrate how, in the early modern period, politics and theology were not kept in separate spheres but, rather, God was seen as providentially at work through current events. In this section, I develop the connection between the Covenant and radical eschatology already established by other scholars. Liu, for example, has noted that "to the Puritan divines, the Covenant represented another stage in the providential design towards the final triumph of the Kingdom of Christ on earth."[68] Crawford Gribben has also noted that when the English Parliament took the Covenant they saw it as a step towards 'eschatological victory'.[69] I demonstrate that, for Case at least, this strong eschatological expectation expressed at the signing of the Covenant also included belief in the imminent calling of the Jews.

The Quarrell of the Covenant contains three of Case's sermons on the Covenant. The first sermon discusses how the Covenant could be violated, the second answers objections to subscribing to the covenant, and the third gives guidance on how to keep the Covenant. In the second sermon, Case cited Jeremiah 50:4–5, in which the Jewish nation takes the covenant, and offered an interpretation relating to the future calling of the Jews.[70] Jeremiah 50:4–5 reads, "In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the Lord their God. They shall ask the way to Zion with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten."

For Case, the passage has a three-fold fulfilment:

1. The Literal or Inchoative Day,
2. The Evangelical or Spiritual Day,
3. The Universal or Perfect Day.[71]

Case related the first of these days to the day when, after seventy years of exile in Babylon, the Jews returned from exile, crossing the River Ahava after a fast day (Ezra 8). He noted that "this was the first day wherein this

67. Vallance, "An Holy and Sacramentall Paction," 50.

68. Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 27.

69. Crawford Gribben, "The Church of Scotland and the English Apocalyptic Imagination, 1630 to 1650," *The Scottish Historical Review* 88, no. 225 (2009): 47.

70. Thomas Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant, with the Pacification of the Quarrell. Delivered in Three Sermons on Levit. 26. 25. And Jere. 50. 5.* (London: Luke Fawne, 1643), 28–29.

71. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 29.

Prophesie began to be fulfill'd in the very letter thereof."[72] For Case, the evangelical day is the day in which this promise was "fulfilled in a Spirituall Sence," when people who once lived in Paganism or "'Antichristian superstitution," including Popery, came to "the pure way of Gospel worship."[73] Case adds that "this was fulfilled in Luthers time, and in all those after Separations which any of the Churches have made from Rome…."[74] Finally, "the third day wherein this Prophesie or Promise is to be made good, is that Universall day, wherein both Jew and Gentile shall convert unto the Lord."[75] For Case, this is "that Day of the Restitution of all things [Acts 3:21], as some good Devins conceive, When 'ten men out of all Languages of the Nations, shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you' (Zechariah 8:23)."[76] Case then cited Zechariah 8:20–22 to further illustrate his point about the universal day in which all peoples, cities, and nations shall join "together in an holy League and Covenant, to seek the Lord."[77] In that perfect day, Case outlined that Isaiah 30:26, which we have previously noted Brightman emphasised, would have its fulfilment. This verse reads, "The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound."[78]

Case posits that chronologically the first fulfilment of this verse, the literal day, had already been fulfilled, but the third one, the universal day, was still to be fulfilled. Thus, he situated himself and his readers in the evangelical day, though he gave his sermon a strong eschatological thrust by stating his conviction that he and his hearers were "upon the dawning of the third day."[79] Overall, Case applied a three-fold interpretation to restoration passages, seeing a primary historical meaning, a present application, and a future fulfilment. In this way, Case employed a literal hermeneutic, though he allowed for typological interpretations of Scripture.

Case then read before his congregation in its entirety the Solemn League and Covenant and explained why his congregants should take the

---

72. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 29.
73. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 30.
74. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 30.
75. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 30.
76. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 30.
77. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 31.
78. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 31.
79. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 31.

covenant.[80] One reason that he gave was that the calling of the Jews would take place soon:

> The calling of the Jews, and the fulnesse of the Gentiles, is not farre behinde; in as much as God begins now to poure out this promise in the Text, upon the Churches, in a more eminent manner, then ever we, or our fathers saw it, in a Gospel sence; And surely, Gospel performance must make way for that full and universall accomplishment thereof, which shall unite Israel and Judah, Jew and Gentile, in one perpetuall Covenant unto the Lord that shall never be forgotten.[81]

In summary, *The Quarrell of the Covenant* provides further examples of Case's Presbyterian Judeo-centrism. Case's defence of the crown rights of King Jesus was matched with a belief in a future Jewish conversion.

Jehoshaphat's Caveat to His Judges (1644)

A year later, in *Jehoshaphat's Caveat*, Case preached to the Commissioners for the Court-Martial on 2 Chronicles 19:6–7. These parliamentarian judges in the Council of War listened to Case's sermon on August 17, 1644, the day after martial law was legislated in London.[82] Case called for these leaders of the city, as servants of God, to judge royalists justly.[83] The final paragraph of this sermon is eschatological. Case stated:

---

80. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, pp. 34–38, 59–66.

81. Case, *The Quarrell of the Covenant*, 62.

82. Thomas Case, *Jehoshaphats Caveat to His Judges. Delivered in a Sermon before the Honourable the Commissioners for the Court Martiall, by Vertue of an Ordinance of Parliament Dated the 17th of August 1644* (London: Luke Fawn, 1644), 1. For background to the "Ordinance for the establishment of Martial Law within the Cities of London and Westminster and the lines of communication," adopted on August 16, 1644, see John M. Collins, "Hidden in Plain Sight: Martial Law and the Making of the High Courts of Justice, 1642–60." *Journal of British Studies* 53, no. 4 (2014): 866–67. This is printed in John Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in 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. Containing the Principal Matters Which Happened from the Meeting of the Parliament, November the 3d, 1640. To the End of the Year 1644* (London: D. Browne et al., 1721), 5:723–24.

83. Mullett writes that Case "preached against mercy for royalists." Mullett, "Case, Thomas." This is incorrect. Case says that those who have acted willingly to obstruct the Reformation should be punished severely (pp. 12–19), but those who have acted in ignorance should be shown mercy (pp. 19–22). Overall, the sermon's tone is moderate and does not call for bloodlust. See also Reid, *Memoirs*, 1:209–10.

There is a promise worth your reading; "And Saviours shall come up on mount Zion, and shall judge the mount of Esau, and the King-dome shall be the Lords" [Obadiah 1:21]. Literally it respects the times of the calling of the Iewes and Gentiles; When God will raise saviours and Deliverers to rescue them out of the power and captivity of all their enimies […] upon these Edomites God strengthneth the hands of those Saviours to doe execution, and then the Kingdome (i.e. Iudah and Israel made into one Kingdome againe as at the first, as vers. 17. 18. 19. 20.) should be the Lords: he would raigne over them immediately himself […] this is the Literall sense.[84]

This is a good illustration of Judeo-centric eschatology, as Case sees this passage as having a future fulfilment for Israel. Case is not explicit about a restoration to the Land of Israel, though his reference to the Jews being rescued from "captivity" would suggest that Case had a physical res-toration in mind. Case then applied Obadiah 1:21 to the judges' current situation, challenging them to enforce justice and so act as the saviors of England: "But there is also a Gospell sense, which respects deliverances of the Church in the time of the Gospell, from the tyranny and oppression of cruell Edomites, hatefull and blood-thyrsty Antichristian enimies."[85]

So again, Case made a contemporary application of the text to exhort his hearers. However, Case put forward the literal meaning first, namely that the Jews shall be restored.

Spirituall Whordome Discovered (1647)

The final sermon to be surveyed in this study was based on Hosea 9:1. It was preached at a critical juncture in the English Civil War before the House of Commons on a day of humiliation. Case's focus was not on the restoration of the Jews but rather on the need for godliness in England. In passing, he referred to Judeo-centric eschatology as he addressed Members of Parliament:

And for your encouragement know, that though your troubles and distractions be great; yet you have a mighty God to stand by you, who hath promised that Jerusalem shal be built, and the wall shal be raised, even in troublous times [Daniel 9:25]. It relates as wel to

---

84. Case, *Jehoshaphats Caveat*, 30–31.
85. Case, *Jehoshaphats Caveat*, 31.

Gospel-Reformation, as *to the full and final* return of the Jews: and the Lord make it good to you, and by you [*emphasis mine*].[86]

Here Case cited Old Testament Scriptures that prophesy the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the return of the Jews in order to encourage his hearers that God could yet restore and rebuild England. Yet, he acknowledged that in the first instance these passages apply to a future calling of the Jews. Significantly, with his reference to Jerusalem and the return of the Jews, Case alluded to a physical Jewish restoration to their land and a rebuilt city of Jerusalem. Michael Mullett has asserted that Case's "earlier millenarianism dulled" by 1645.[87] However, this example of Judeo-centric eschatology from 1647 shows that Case's preaching was still strongly apocalyptic even as the influence of the Independents was rising, and that of the Presbyterians waning.

Sensus Literalis and the Analogy of Faith

Case's Judeo-centric eschatology is even more striking when one considers how unlikely it is that he ever met a Jew. How, then, can his Judeo-centric beliefs be explained? We have already seen that he read Brightman and was influenced by his eschatology. Another reason is that Case generally favored a literal hermeneutic over an allegorical one.[88] This is particularly evident in *Jehoshaphat's Caveat*, where Case stated explicitly in his Judeo-centric interpretation of Obadiah 1:21 that he read it according to the literal sense. Raymond Brown has defined the *sensus literalis* hermeneutic as "the sense which the human author intended and which his words convey."[89] Case's emphasis of the *sensus literalis* follows the principles of Puritan hermeneutics that developed from the hermeneutics of Martin Luther, William Tyndale, and John Calvin.[90] These Reformers broke, to a greater or lesser

---

86. Case, *Spirituall Vvhordome*, 37–38.

87. Mullett, "Case, Thomas."

88. Crome makes a similar argument about Puritan hermeneutics in general: Crome, "Proper and Naturall Meaning," 725–41.

89. Raymond E. Brown, "The Literal Sense of Scripture," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Joseph Fitzmeyer Raymond Brown, and Jerome Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968).

90. For Luther's hermeneutic see Charles J. Scalise, "The Sensus Literalis: A Hermeneutical Key to Biblical Exegesis," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 42, no. 1 (1989): 58–59. For Tyndale see William Tyndale, *The Obedie[N]ce of a Christen Man and How Christe[N] Rulers Ought to Governe, Where in Also (If Thou Marke Diligently) Thou Shalt Fynde Eyes to Perceave the Crafty Conveyance of All Iugglers* (Antwerp: 1528), cxxxii-cxxxiii. For Calvin

extent, with the Roman Catholic hermeneutic known as the *quadriga*.[91] This four-fold method, which permeated medieval exegesis, taught that the Scriptures had a literal, allegorical, tropological (moral), and analogical (mystical or eschatological) sense.[92]

For example, Martin Luther emphasized a literal hermeneutic and, in 1520, he largely rejected the *quadriga*.[93] Luther described his hermeneutic in his *Reply to Emser* (1521):

> Origen received his due reward a long time ago when his books were prohibited, for he relied too much on this same spiritual meaning, which was unnecessary, and he let the necessary literal meaning go. When that happens Scripture perishes and really good theologians are no longer produced. Only the true principal meaning which is provided by the letters can produce good theologians. The Holy Spirit is the simplest writer and adviser in heaven and on earth. That is why his words could have no more than the one simplest meaning which we call the written one, or the literal meaning of the tongue.[94]

This emphasis on the literal interpretation instilled within the nascent Protestant movement a dynamic that fostered a close reading of the text studied in its original context and language. This paved the way for discontinuity in the way in which interpreters related to biblical passages ostensibly relating to Israel's restoration. Because Case did not read Scripture through the *quadriga*, which favored the development of figurative interpretations of Scripture, he thus was more likely to interpret Israel not as referring to the church, which would be a spiritual reading of the text, but as referring to the Jews. As we have seen in the introduction, however, Case's vision of Judeo-centric eschatology would not have been endorsed by Luther. Yet both Luther and Case largely rejected the *quadriga*. So there must be other factors that caused Case to embrace Judeo-centric eschatology. I posit that

---

see Richard Burnett, "John Calvin and the Sensus Literalis." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57 (2004): 1–13.

91. Wilson, *Pulpit*, 145.

92. Walter C. Kaiser, "A Short History of Interpretation," *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*, ed. Walter C. Kaiser and Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 222.

93. *History*, III: Renaissance, Reformation, Humanism, 86–87.

94. Martin Luther, "Answer to the Hyperchristian, Hyperspiritual, and Hyperlearned Book by Goat Esmer in Leipzig—Including Some Thoughts Regarding His Companion, the Fool Murner, 1521," *Luther's Works*, ed. Eric W. Gritsch and Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), 178.

one reason for this was that Luther was influenced more strongly than Case by medieval anti-Judaism. A century after Luther, Case was somewhat more removed from the traditions and stereotypes held by the medieval church against the Jews. Crucially, in the hundred years between Luther and Case, Christian Hebraism had flourished amongst the Puritans, which gradually helped to overturn anti-Jewish prejudices.[95] Case was thus ministering in an intellectual milieu that was more willing to see positive promises concerning the future of Israel in Scripture.

An example of Case emphasizing the *sensus literalis* can be found in his exposition of 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18, entitled *Movnt Pisgah, or, a Prospect of Heaven* (1670). Commenting on the trumpet of God which is sounded when the Lord descends from heaven to raise believers who have died (verse 16), Case advocated the *sensus literalis*. He first outlined the metaphorical (analogical) sense, which sees the trumpet as a metaphor for the "Vertue and Power of Christs Voyce and Proclamation."[96] However, he rejected this interpretation, stating, "But why we may not take it literally and in propriety of speech, I see no reason, so for the voyce of an audible Trump, which shall be lowder than all the former."[97] Case followed standard Puritan hermeneutics, which favored the literal sense unless there was good reason why a verse's literal sense could not be the correct interpretation.[98] Case also supported his literal interpretation by adding, "Our Lord calls it, The great sound of a Trumpet."[99] This is an allusion to the dominical prophecy in Matthew 24:31. Bringing in another Scripture from elsewhere in the canon to confirm the interpretation is an example of the analogy of faith.[100]

---

95. For a survey of Puritan interest in Hebrew and Jewish books see Lawrence Rabone, "The Circulation of Menasseh ben Israel's Works in Puritan Libraries in England: The Testimony of Late Seventeenth-Century Library Auction Catalogues," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (Forthcoming).

96. Thomas Case, *Movnt Pisgah, or, a Prospect of Heaven Being an Exposition on the Fourth Chapter of the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, from the 13th Verse, to the End of the Chapter, Divided into Three Parts* (London: Dorman Newman, 1670), 81.

97. Case, *Movnt Pisgah*, 81–82.

98. See Crome, *Restoration of the Jews*, 30–36, 42–55. Mark Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of the Puritan Reformed Orthodox Theologian, Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 90–92.

99. Case, *Movnt Pisgah*, 82.

100. For the place of the analogy of faith in the history of Christian hermeneutics see H. Wayne Johnson, "The 'Analogy of Faith' and Exegetical Methodology: A Preliminary Discussion on Relationships," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31, no. 1 (1988): 69–80.

The analogy of faith is a Reformed hermeneutic which states that the meaning of a particular Scripture can be determined by comparing different Scriptures which shed light on the Scripture one is interpreting.[101] Case referred several times to this hermeneutic and employed it repeatedly as he sought to make his interpretations of individual verses consistent with the whole tenor of Scripture.[102] The analogy of faith hermeneutic fosters a very close reading of any individual biblical text, seen within the context of the rest of the canon of Scripture. It also places less emphasis on traditional interpretations of the Scripture. Case applied the analogy of faith to verses such as Obadiah 1:21 and therefore interpreted "Mount Zion" as literally Mount Zion in Jerusalem. Thus, his emphasis on the *sensus literalis* and the analogy of faith helps to explain why he came to believe in Judeo-centric eschatology.[103] In this way, Case and many early modern Puritan exegetes began to adopt a hermeneutic that in many ways marked the beginning of the development of the historical–grammatical method.

Another reason why Puritans such as Case adopted Judeo-centric eschatology is due to the importance of typology in Puritan hermeneutics.[104] Case saw biblical events as real historical events which were also types and shadows prefiguring events yet to take place at the end of history. We saw this particularly in *The Quarrell of the Covenant* where Case saw Jeremiah 50:4–5 as having three fulfilments. If one reads a biblical prophecy about Israel's restoration purely from a historical–grammatical or historical–critical hermeneutic one may conclude that the passage was fulfilled in the Jewish restoration from the Babylonian exile; or, from a supersessionist perspective, it has been claimed that because of Jewish disobedience, the Jews have forfeited the right to such promises of restoration. However, typology provides a way for the interpreter to hold on to the promises of Scripture yet to be fulfilled, while also seeing these same scriptures partially fulfilled in the first coming of Christ or the experience of the church.

As Brian McNeil notes, "typology is distinct from the allegorical interpretation of the OT which claims that the "real" meaning of the OT text is

---

101. Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 88–90.

102. See for example Case, *Movnt Pisgah*, Part 3, pp. 14, 26, 34.

103. The general relationship between eschatology and the analogy of faith is discussed in Robert L. Thomas, "A Hermeneutical Ambiguity of Eschatology: The Analogy of Faith," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23, no. 1 (1980): 45–53.

104. Austin, *The Jews and the Reformation*, 99. Thomas M. Davis, "The Exegetical Traditions of Puritan Typology," *Early American Literature* 5, no. 1 (1970): 11–50.

something with no continuity with the historical intention of its writer."[105] Rather, "typology argues for a continuity in God's plan such that the OT is a true "prefiguration"…of what God would do in the NT."[106] Typological interpretations emphasize key themes running through Scripture from Genesis to Revelation.[107] So, while some Reformers, particularly Lutherans, made an antithesis between law in the Old Testament and grace in the New Testament, others, particularly Reformed Genevans, divided the Bible into a covenant of works in Genesis 1–3 and a covenant of grace running in continuity from Genesis 4 to the culmination of God's plan with the gathering of the redeemed in the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21–22). Key New Testament themes such as redemption and atonement through the blood of Christ were seen according to this interpretive framework to be foreshadowed in the Levitical sacrificial rites. Because typology allows for multiple fulfilments of prophetic texts, the interpreter could see passages about the restoration of the Jews as applying to the restoration from Babylon, the spiritual restoration of the Christian to God, *and* a future eschatological restoration of Israel. Allegory, in contrast to the literal sense, makes void the historicity of the text. In contrast, typology preserves the literal sense, while also allowing room for a spiritual interpretation. Modern readers may find Case's understanding of three different applications of one verse, all with a different temporal scope, out of place with modern approaches to biblical interpretation claiming to be literal. And yet, his approach is not allegorical. Typology is thus an aspect of the *sensus literalis*, and the importance of typology in Puritan hermeneutics is one factor to be considered when trying to account for Puritan belief in Judeo-centric eschatology. For Puritans such as Case, God was ultimately a God of continuity, working out His eternal purposes in the historical realm. With such an interpretive and theological framework, we can better understand how Case came to believe that God had not broken His promises and covenant with Israel.

---

105. Brian McNeil, "Typology," *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden (London: SCM Press, 1990), 713.

106. McNeil, "Typology," 713.

107. For a classic example of the typological approach of a moderate Puritan see Thomas Taylor, *Christ Revealed: Or the Old Testament Explained, a Treatise of the Types and Shadowes of Our Saviour Contained Throughout the Whole Scripture: All Opened and Made Usefull for the Benefit of Gods Church. By Thomas Tailor D.D. Late Preacher at Aldermanbury. Perfected by Himselfe before His Death*, ed. William Jemmat (London: R. Dawlman and L. Fawne, 1635).

Conclusion

Belief in the ingathering of the Jews before the second coming of Christ has waxed and waned in different contexts in church history. Before Case, leading continental Reformers who greatly influenced the English theological scene, such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, had given no place in their theological systems for the restoration of the Jews.[108] However, by the 1640s there were many Puritans in England. With their emphasis on the *sensus literalis*, the plain interpretation of Scripture led to a greater interest in the Jewish people whose history is told in Scripture. As the allegorical hermeneutic central to the *quadriga* drifted out of usage in Puritan England, it was no longer so easy for Christians to interpret Jewish restoration passages without referring to Jews. Rather, prophetic texts that speak of a Jewish return to the Land of Israel began to take on deep significance when read through a *sensus literalis* hermeneutic. Thomas Case is thus another London minister who needs to be considered in future surveys of Judeo-centric eschatology.

Case's Judeo-centric eschatology is important for historians of theology and historical theologians but should also be of interest to general historians of Protectorate politics. Case was not directly involved in the movement for the readmission of the Jews to England. This was because the peak of his prominence as a national figure had passed a decade before readmission debates reached their peak in 1655. However, the philosemitic sentiments that flowered in the 1650s were already growing in the 1640s and Case was involved in propagating a form of eschatology that often led to a sympathy for living Jews.

Besides showing that Judeo-centric eschatology could be found amongst proponents of the Covenanting movement, this study has also shown how Case's ministry encompassed London, Norfolk, Lancashire, and Cheshire. His dynamic ministry, which continued even after the national demise of Presbyterianism as a political force in the 1650s, demonstrates the vitality

---

108. Luther's "The Prologue to the Romans" dealt with the Judeo-centric chapters 9–11 of the same epistle in just two paragraphs and made no reference to the Jews whatsoever. This preface had an important influence in England, being printed in the first translation of the New Testament printed in English, by William Tyndale. William Tyndale, *The Newe Testament* (Antwerp: Marten Emperowr, 1534), ccxv–ccxvi. Martin Luther and Andrew Thornton (trans.), "Vorrede Auff Die Epistel S. Paul: An Die Romer," *Martin Luther: Die Gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch 1545 Aufs New Zugericht*, ed. Hans Volz and Heinz Blanke (Munich: Rogner & Bernhard, 1972), 2254–68. For Calvin on Judeo-centric eschatology see Rabone, "John Goodwin."

of English Presbyterianism. This is in keeping with recent scholarly findings as historiography of English and Scottish Presbyterianism in the 1640s and 1650s has gradually moved away from the older narrative which largely only emphasized the "failures and fragmentation" of the movement.[109] To quote Ann Hughes, a leading proponent of this revisionist approach, "While it is obvious that the highest hopes of the Covenant were never fulfilled, the pessimistic account of English Presbyterianism needs to be modified."[110] Hughes adds that Presbyterianism's "failures at the formal, institutional level can be balanced by opportunities for preaching, publishing, and pastoral efforts in parishes, and by the range of informal associational activity facilitated by the combination of godly reformation and religious liberty established in England in the 1650s."[111] Case succeeded in all these areas in ministering to his flock and leaving a rich legacy of devotional literature. In sum, to quote Anthony Wood, Thomas Case was "a great…firebrand in the church" and this article has shown that he should be considered in future studies of Judeo-centric eschatology.[112]

---

109. Ann Hughes, "The Remembrance of Sweet Fellowship: Relationships between English and Scottish Presbyterians in the 1640s and 1650s," *Insular Christianity: Alternative Models of the Church in Britain and Ireland, c. 1570–c. 1700*, ed. Robert Armstrong and Tadhg Ó Hannracháin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 172; Elliot Vernon, "A Ministry of the Gospel: The Presbyterians During the English Revolution," *Religion in Revolutionary England*, ed. Christopher Durston and Judith D. Maltby (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 115–16; MacKenzie, *Solemn League*, 1.

110. Hughes, "Remembrance," 172–73.

111. Hughes, "Remembrance," 173.

112. Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses, an Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the Most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford, from the Fifteenth Year of King Henry the Seventh, Dom. 1500, to the End of the Year 1690 Representing the Birth, Fortune, Preferment, and Death of All Those Authors and Prelates, the Great Accidents of Their Lives, and the Fate and Character of Their Writings : To Which Are Added, the Fasti, or, Annals, of the Said University, for the Same Time* (London: Tho. Bennet, 1692), 2:529.

Everything…Was Typical of Gospel Things! A Reconsideration of Jonathan Edwards's Biblical Typology: A Study of His *Blank Bible*

CAMERON SCHWEITZER

cameronschweitzer@gs.edu

Gateway Seminary

Biblical typology enamored Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758).[1] He once opined, speaking of the Hebrew Bible, that nearly everything it recorded "was typical of gospel things. Persons were typical persons, their actions were typical actions, the cities were typical cities…nations were typical nations, the land was a typical land, God's providences towards them were typical providences…and indeed the world was a typical world."[2] Douglas Sweeney comments that this exegetical practice was Edwards's lifelong, "all-pervasive interpretive passion," which "permeates nearly all of his manuscripts and published treatises." Furthermore, it serves as a "synecdoche for all his exegesis."[3]

Given such sentiment, is it interesting that scholars have done little work to investigate Edwards's exegetical synecdoche—especially given all that authors have written on his *ontological* typology.[4] Though these two

---

1. For biographies of Edwards, see Samuel Hopkins, *The Life and Character of the Late Reverend, Learned, and Pious Mr. Jonathan Edwards, President of the College of New Jersey. Together with Extracts from his Private Writings & Diary* (Northampton, 1804); George Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

2. Jonathan Edwards, *The "Miscellanies": (Entry Nos. a–z, aa–zz, 1–500)*, vol. 13 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Thomas A. Schafer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 434–35. When citing from Edwards's work in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, this article will provide the full bibliographic information in the first citation, while consequent citations will be abbreviated "WJE" along with the volume and page number.

3. Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete: Biblical Interpretation and Anglo-Protestant Culture on the Edge of the Enlightenment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 71; Sweeney, "Jonathan Edwards, the Harmony of Scripture, and Canonical Exegesis," *Trinity Journal 34* (Fall 2013): 195. Robert Brown agrees with Sweeney. He comments that "Edwards's predilection for typological interpretation permeates nearly all of his manuscripts and treatises." Brown, *Jonathan Edwards and the Bible* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002), 185.

4. For Edwards's ontological typology, see Perry Miller, "Introduction," in *Images or Shadows of Divine Things*, ed. Perry Miller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948); Miller,

typologies are related, they ought not to be confused—as is a common oversight in the literature. Stephen Stein, for example, has made some of these less-than-accurate statements. In his introduction to *The Blank Bible*, he comments that "much has been written regarding Edwards's use of typology as a way of linking the Old and New Testaments." In the footnote to this comment, Stein tells the reader to look at his editorial introduction to *Notes on Scripture* where he provides a short bibliography on Edwards's

"The Rhetoric of Sensation," in *Errand into the Wilderness*, ed. Perry Miller (New York: Harper and Row, 1956); Robert Boss, *God-Haunted World: The Elemental Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Dallas: JESociety Press, 2015); Brian Fehler, "Jonathan Edwards on Nature as a Language of God: Symbolic Typology as Rhetorical Presence," in *Religion in the Age of Reason: A Transatlantic Study of the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Kathryn Duncan (New York: AMS Press, 2009); Mason Lowance, *The Language of Canaan: Metaphor and Symbol in New England from the Puritans to the Transcendentalists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980); Lowance, "Typology and Millennial Eschatology in Early New England," in *Literary Uses of Typology: From the Late Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Earl Miner (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977); Lowance, "Images or Shadows of Divine Things: The Typology of Jonathan Edwards," *Early American Literature* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1970): 141–81; Lowance, "Jonathan Edwards and the Platonists: Edwardsean Epistemology and the Influence of Malebranche and Norris," *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality* II (Jan. 1992): 129–52; Thomas Davis, "The Traditions of Puritan Typology," (PhD diss., University of Missouri, 1968); Barbara Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); *Typology and Early American Literature*, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972); Janice Knight, "Learning the Language of God: Jonathan Edwards and the Typology of Nature," *William and Mary Quarterly* 48 (October 1991), 531–51; Ursula Brumm, *American Thought and Religious Typology* (Rutgers University Press, 1970), 86–108; Jennifer Leader, *Knowing, Seeing, Being: Jonathan Edwards, Emily Dickinson, Marianne Moore, and the American Typological Tradition* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016); Leader, "'In Love with the Image': Transitive Being and Typological Desire in Jonathan Edwards," *Early American Literature* 41, no. 2 (2006): 153–81; Rowena Revis-Jones, "Edwards, Dickinson, and the Sacramentality of Nature," *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality*, 1 (Dec. 1990): 225–53; Conrad Cherry, *Nature and the Religious Imagination: From Edwards to Bushnell* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); Sang Hyun Lee, "Mental Activity and the Perception of Beauty in Jonathan Edwards," *Harvard Theological Review* 69, no. 3/4 (1976): 369–96; Diana Butler, "God's Visible Glory: The Beauty of Nature in the Thought of John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards," *Westminster Theological Journal* 52 (1990): 13–26; Lisanne Winslow, *A Great and Remarkable Analogy: The Onto-Typology of Jonathan Edwards* (Göttingen: V&R Publishing, 2020); Stephen Daniels, *The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards: A Study in Divine Semiotics* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 41–65; John Gatta, *Making Nature Sacred: Literature, Religion, and Environment in America from the Puritans to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 55–70; Thomas Holbrook, "The Elaborated Labyrinth: The American Habit of Typology" (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1984); Christopher Grasso, "Images and Shadows of Jonathan Edwards," *American Literature History* 8 (December 1996): 683–98.

biblical typology.[5] Problematically, though, the works Stein lists nearly all investigate Edwards's *ontological* typology, and rarely—if ever—discuss his *exegetical* typology. This inaccurate equation is common among works that mention Edwards's typology.[6]

Another common oversight is that works broadly devoted to Edwards's typology usually focus on his *ontological* typology while almost entirely neglecting his *biblical* typology.[7] Consequently, there are only a handful of treatments that have *exclusively* investigated Edwards's employment of typology as a method of interpreting the Bible.[8]

---

5. Stein, "Editor's Introduction," in *The Blank Bible*, vol. 24 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 30; idem., "Editor's Introduction," in *Notes on Scripture*, vol. 15 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 2n7.

6. For example, Michael McClymond makes this oversight when he says "the literature on Edwards's typology is especially rich." He then provides a brief bibliography in which the authors he cites *exclusively* detail Edwards's *ontological* typology. McClymond, *Encounters with God: An Approach to the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 143n23. James Bryd makes this same, incorrect equation in his essay "Jonathan Edwards, War, and the Bible," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture: Biblical Exegesis in British North America*, ed. David Barshinger and Douglas Sweeney (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 206n45. Harry Stout also makes this same mistake in his "Preface to the Period," in *Sermons and Discourses: 1739–1742*, vol. 22 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Harry Stout (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 19n4.

7. For example, see Winslow, *A Great and Remarkable Analogy*; Winslow, "A Great and Remarkable Analogy: Edwards's Use of Natural Typology in Communicating Divine Excellencies," in *Regeneration, Revival, and Creation*, ed. Chris Chun and Kyle Strobel (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2020), 220–34. Her work, while incredibly important for clarifying our knowledge of Edwards's ontological typology, still exemplifies this point by exclusively investigating Edwards's "onto-types." One can also consult Margaret Batschelet's dissertation, "Jonathan Edwards' Use of Typology: A Historical and Theological Approach" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1977). Her dissertation only devotes seven pages to Edwards's "Pauline typology" (117–23), while the rest examines his natural typology. The same thing occurs in Gerald McDermott and Michael McClymond's chapter "Typology: Scripture, Nature, and All of Reality," in their *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 116–29. See also William Schweitzer's dissertation, "Interpreting the Harmony of Reality: Jonathan Edwards' Theology of Revelation" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2008). Here, however, this omission of Edwards's biblical typology is particularly conspicuous, since Schweitzer treats his theology of *revelation*—with an emphasis on Scripture.

8. For works—or parts of them—which focus on Edwards's *biblical* typology, see Mason Lowance and David Watters, "Editor's Introduction," *Typological Writings*, vol. 11 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Mason Lowance and Wallace Anderson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 157–182; Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete*, 53–136; Stephen R. C. Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards's Bible* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 58–107;

This lack of serious treatment of Edwards's exegetical typology has led a host of scholars to describe it inaccurately. Writers have usually made these statements in passing while discussing his ontological typology. This began with Perry Miller's Introduction to his publication of Edwards's "Images or Shadows of Divine Things." Miller argues that there was a competing dialectic in the pastor's thought. He asserts that, on one hand, "the new science and psychology" fueled Edwards's *ontological* typology, while, on the other hand, his *biblical* typology followed the Puritan tradition of viewing the Old Testament as a "series of prophetical adumbrations of Christ." This bifurcation leads Miller to conclude that Edwards's "originality is not that he led a typological revival in America; his readings of the types within the Bible seem to be quite traditional. What gives his undertaking a wider interest was his effort to extend the method into nature and history."[9]

Miller's supposition of a disjunction in Edwards's typological thinking and its relationship to his tradition set the scholarly trajectory for some time, as authors, following Miller, state or assume that Edwards's exegetical typology was "traditional" or "conservative" (i.e. cohering with "traditional" Puritan hermeneutics), while also claiming that his ontological typology

---

Nichols, "Jonathan Edwards' Principles of Interpreting Scripture," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*, 32–50; Barshinger, *Jonathan Edwards and the Psalms: A Redemptive-Historical Vision of Scripture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 164–217; Brandon Withrow, *Becoming Divine: Jonathan Edwards's Incarnational Spirituality Within the Christian Tradition* (Eugene, Ore.: Cascade, 2011), 179–88; Benjamin Wayman, "Women as Types of the Church in the Blank Bible: The 'Feminine' Ecclesiology of Jonathan Edwards," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* vol. 2, no. 2 (2012): 56–78; Drew Hunter, "Hebrews and the Typology of Jonathan Edwards," *Themelios* 44.2 (2019): 339–52; Tibor Fabiny, "Edwards and Biblical Typology," in *Understanding Jonathan Edwards: An Introduction to America's Theologian*, ed. Gerald McDermott (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 91–108; and, in the same volume, Gerald McDermott, "Alternative Viewpoint: Edwards and Biblical Typology," 109–12; Nelson Kloosterman, "The Use of Typology in Post-Canonical Salvation History: An Orientation to Jonathan Edwards' *A History of the Work of Redemption*," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 14 (January 2003): 59–96; Mark Noll, "Jonathan Edwards' Use of the Bible, A Case Study (Genesis 32:22–32) with Comparisons," in *Jonathan Edwards Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1 (2012): 30–46; James Detrich, "A Recital of Presence: Christological use of Scripture in *A History of the Work of Redemption*" (PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2016), 176–267; Douglas Landrum, *Jonathan Edwards' Exegesis of Genesis: A Puritan Hermeneutic* (Mustang, Okla.: Tate Publishing, 2015), 81–120; Linda Munk, "Jonathan Edwards: Types of the Peaceable Kingdom," in *Millennial Thought in America: Historical and Intellectual Contexts, 1630–1860*, ed. Bernd Engler, Joerg Fichte, and Oliver Scheiding (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2002), 215–28; Munk, "His Dazzling Absence: The Shekinah in Jonathan Edwards," *Early American Literature* 27, no. 1 (1992): 1–30.

9. Miller, "Introduction," 6, 27.

was "untraditional" or "liberal" (i.e. neither his forbearers nor contemporaries interpreted nature or secular history in the same way).[10]

Mason Lowance rearticulated Miller's framework for opposing Edwards's "conservative" biblical typology with his "liberal" ontological typology. Lowance argued that Edwards applied typology's nomenclature to both the "historical scheme established between the testaments" and "external representations and the ideas they shadow forth." Lowance labels the former Edwards's "conservative typology" and the latter his "liberal typology." He notes that Edwards's "conservative" method is clearest in his *A History of the Work of Redemption*, while he uses his "liberal" method in "Images of Divine Things." In addition, there is a kind of "spectrum of conservative-to-liberal typology" in Edwards's "Miscellanies." Lowance argues that this shows the inconsistencies of Edwards's attempts to reconcile his "orthodox typological correspondences with his liberal Platonic allegorizing."[11]

Other authors furthered this trend Lowance and Miller set by continuing to speak of Edwards's "liberal" or "untraditional" typology and his "conservative" or "traditional" biblical schema of typological interpretation.[12] These authors of the "Miller–Lowance line" have rearticulated that

---

10. Interestingly, Miller recognized that Edwards's ontological typology was not *entirely* without historical precedent. He points out the Puritans "were spiritualizing everyday life" by using "tropes" as "lively notion(s)" of the day-to-day for instruction, which illustrated spiritual things the mind already knows. But, Miller claims, Edwards went beyond this metaphorical, pedagogical practice by asserting that these natural "images" must "be that of which the spiritual reality consists in itself." Miller concludes, therefore, that Edwards understood the "image [to be] truth," rather than a helpful *illustration* of the truth. Miller, "Introduction," 18–20, 32. Other authors argue that Edwards's ontological typology did not lack the sort of historical precedent that Miller claims. See, Boss, *God-Haunted World*, 12, 23, 88; Batschelet, "Jonathan Edwards' Use of Typology," 89–90; McDermott, *Everyday Glory: The Revelation of God in all Reality* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018); Avihu Zakai, "The Theological Origins of Jonathan Edwards's Philosophy of Nature," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 60 (2009): 708–24.

11. Lowance, "'Images or Shadows of Divine Things' in the Thought of Jonathan Edwards," in *Typology and Early American Literature*, 219, 231, 233. For additional places in which Lowance argues similarly, see his "Typology and Millennial Eschatology in Early New England," in *Literary Uses of Typology*, 228–73, 263–64; Lowance, "Typology, Millennial Eschatology, and Jonathan Edwards," in *Critical Essays on Jonathan Edwards*, ed. William Scheick (Boston: Hall Publishing, 1980), 189–90; Lowance, *The Language of Canaan*, 251–52; Lowance, "Editor's Introduction," WJE 11:162–64, 173, 175; Lowance, "Jonathan Edwards and the Platonists: Edwardsean Epistemology and the Influence of Malebranche and Norris," *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality* 2 (Jan. 1992): 130–31, 146.

12. Cherry, "Symbols of Spiritual Truth," 268–69; Stephen Holmes, *God of Grace and*

the "liberal" and "conservative" strands of Edwards's typology are two differ-ent typologies and do not relate to the Christian, interpretive tradition in the same way.

The key take-away from these scholars' thesis is the oft-repeated—or assumed—point that Edwards's *biblical* typology was "conservative" and fell in line with the Christian, interpretive tradition. Miller, Lowance, and the authors following them have typically defined "conservative" in one of two ways. Some define it more broadly as an interpreter's exegetical connection of an Old Testament type with *any* New Testament antitype.[13] Others in the Miller–Lowance line define this key phrase more narrowly as an exegete's linkage of an Old Testament type with a *specifically* Christological antitype.[14]

God of Glory: An Account of the Theology of Jonathan Edwards (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 107; Stephen Yarbrough, "Jonathan Edwards on Rhetorical Authority," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47.3 (1986): 403; Grasso, "Images and Shadows of Jonathan Edwards," 684; Anna Svetlikova, "Jonathan Edwards on Typology as Language," *Theologica Wratislaviensia* 7 (2012): 159; Stephen Stein, "The Quest for the Spiritual Sense: The Biblical Hermeneutics of Jonathan Edwards," *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (January-April 1977): 111–12; William Wainwright, "Jonathan Edwards and the Language of God," in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 48.4 (1980): 527; Sang Lee, "Edwards on God and Nature: Resources for Contemporary Theology," in *Edwards in Our Time: Jonathan Edwards and the Shaping of American Religion*, ed. Sang Lee and Allen Guelzo (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 15; Wallace Anderson, "Editor's Introduction," WJE 11:6; Davis, "The Traditions of Puritan Typology," 378, 381; Michael Clark, "The Eschatology of Signs in Cotton Mather's 'Biblia Americana' and Jonathan Edwards's Case for the Legibility of Providence," in *Cotton Mather and Biblia Americana—America's First Bible Commentary: Essays in Reappraisal,* ed. Reiner Smolinski and Jan Stievermann (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 432; Richard Hunt, "Refiguring an Angry God: The Nature of Jonathan Edwards," *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 4 (Spring 2003): 24–25; Gatta, "Intimations of an Environmental Ethic," 56, 63; Harold Simonson, "Typology, Imagination, and Jonathan Edwards," in *Radical Discontinuities: American Romanticism and Christian Consciousness* (East Brunswick, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1983), 20–21; Zakai, *Jonathan Edwards's Philosophy of History: The Reenchantment of the World in the Age of Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 37; Ji Hyuk Kim, "A Reappraisal of Religious Experience in Expository Preaching in Light of Jonathan Edwards's Sense of the Heart" (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013), 135–40.

13. Lowance, "Jonathan Edwards and the Platonists," 131; Lowance, "Typology, Millennial Eschatology, and Jonathan Edwards," 189; Fehler, "Edwards on Nature as a Language of God," 181; Ava Chamberlain, "A Fish Story: Jonathan Edwards and Cotton Mather on Jonah's Whale," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*, 158; Winslow, "A Great and Remarkable Analogy," 222; Thomas Davies, "The Traditions of Puritan Typology," in *Typology and Early American Literature*, 12; Simonson, "Typology, Imagination, and Jonathan Edwards," 20; Marc Lee, "A Literary Approach to Selected Writings of Jonathan Edwards" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1973), 52.

14. Miller, "Introduction," 4–6; Gatta, "Intimations of an Environmental Ethic," 63;

The Miller–Lowance line's thesis has not gone unchallenged.[15] Stephen Nichols argues, for example, that "Edwards does not pursue [Samuel] Mather's approach when interpreting Scripture and departs from it only in his exegesis of the natural world and history," since, for Edwards, "types are not simply Old Testament prefigurations of the Messiah."[16] Robert Brown and Douglas Sweeney concur with Nichols's sentiments. They highlight that Edwards's antitypes do not always absolve in Christ or the New Testament, but can include fulfillments like the heavenly kingdom, the bifurcation between the hypocritical and true church, or an individual's struggle with sin.[17]

Nichols, Brown, and Sweeney are not alone in their thoughts regarding the fecundity of Edwards's biblical typology. Others have noted that Edwards's typological exegesis uncovers various antitypes that burst the "conservative" definitional banks with which the Miller–Lowance line circumscribed it.[18] To use the language of the Miller–Lowance line, authors

---

Holbrook, "The Elaborated Labyrinth," 16; Lee, "Edwards on God and Nature," 37; Grasso, "Images and Shadows of Jonathan Edwards," 683.

15. Another group of authors have argued against Miller and Lowance's thesis of Edwards's "bifurcated" typological system via their work on the pastor's ontological typology. These authors have shown the broad biblical, theological, philosophical, linguistic, and historical similarities inherent within Edwards's system that indicate he both understood and intentionally held his ontological and biblical typologies in tandem. For treatment, see Paula Cooey, *Jonathan Edwards on Nature and Destiny: A Systematic Analysis*. Studies in American Religion 16 (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1985): 7–9, 12. Knight, "Learning the Language of God," 549; Knight, "Typology," in *The Princeton Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Sang Lee (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 194; Leader, "In Love with the Image," 157–58; Leader, *Knowing, Seeing, Being*, 3–57; Daniels, *The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards*, 64–65.

16. Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards's Bible*, 92–93, 103.

17. Brown, *Edwards and the Bible*, 186; Brown, "The Bible," in *The Princeton Companion*, 97. Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete*, 70–74. For similar statements, see his "Edwards and the Bible," in *Understanding Jonathan Edwards*, 74; Sweeney, "The Harmony of Scripture," 201–3.

18. Barshinger, *Edwards and the Psalms*, 129–30, 142, 219–30, 313–17; Batschelet, "Jonathan Edwards' Use of Typology," 120–23; Noll, "Edwards' Use of the Bible," 43; McDermott, *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods: Christian Theology, Enlightenment Religion and Non-Christian Faiths* (Oxford University Press, 2000), 120–21; Cooey, *Edwards on Nature and Destiny*, 7–8; Landrum, *Edwards' Exegesis of Genesis*, 81–120; Karl Dieterich-Pfisterer, "The Prism of Scripture: Studies on History and Historicity in the Work of Jonathan Edwards" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1973), 147–56; Holbrook, "The Elaborated Labyrinth," 221ff; Corne Blaauw, "Redemptive History as a Paradigm for Jonathan Edwards' Exposition of Miracles," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* vol. 4, no. 1 (2014): 4–20; Mark Valeri and John Wilson, "Scripture and Society: From Reform in the Old World to Revival

like Nichols, Brown, and Sweeney could assert, therefore, that Edwards's exegetical typology is "novel." In other words, on the Miller–Lowance line's own terms, Edwards's ontological typology *and* biblical typology are both "liberal."

As these dissenting authors have tried to employ better terms to categorize Edwards's exegetical typology, authors like Glenn Krieder and Stephen Nichols have argued that "Christological" better characterizes Edwards's exegetical typology.[19] Others have pointed out, though, that "Christological"—while better than the Miller-Lowance line's terms—still does not accurately portray Edwards's richly diverse, typological understanding of the Scriptures.[20]

Scholars clearly disagree over the nature of Edwards's biblical typology and how to describe it best. There is a need, therefore, to consider additional evidence to adjudicate between these competing interpretations of Edwards's typological exegesis. This essay intends to do this through an inductive survey of Edwards's longest and most-beloved exegetical-notebook, *The Blank Bible.* His 5,500 entry, exegetical manuscript

---

in the New," in *The Bible in American Law, Politics, and Political Rhetoric*, ed. James Johnson (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 30.

19. Glenn Kreider, *Jonathan Edwards's Interpretation of Revelation 4:1–8:1* (Dallas: University Press of America, 2004), 287–89; Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards's Bible*, 103–4, 106; Nichols, "Jonathan Edwards and the Bible: Christ, the Scope of Scripture," in *Jonathan Edwards for the Church: The Ministry and the Means of Grace*, ed. William Schweitzer (Welwyn Garden City, United Kingdom: Evangelical Press, 2015), 183–204; McClymond, *Encounters with God*, 68; Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards*, 77; Holmes, *God of Grace*, 107; William Tooman, "Edwards's Ezekiel: The Interpretation of Ezekiel in *The Blank Bible* and *Notes on Scripture*," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 3, no. 1 (2009): 17–39; Brown, "The Bible," 97; Knight, "Typology," 197; Knight, "Learning the Language of God," 539–40; Hunter, "Hebrews and the Typology of Jonathan Edwards," 344–45; Sean Lucas, *God's Grand Design: The Theological Vision of Jonathan Edwards* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2011), 49–50; Lucas, "A History of the Work of Redemption," in *A Reader's Guide to the Major Writings of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Nathan Finn and Jeremy Kimble (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2017), 175–92; Stephen Clark, "Jonathan Edwards: The History of Redemption" (PhD diss., Drew University, 1986), 144; Detrich, "A Recital of Presence," 340–41; Withrow, *Becoming Divine*, 185–86.

20. Sweeney, "Edwards and the Bible," 74; Sweeney, "The Harmony of Scripture," 184, 201–203; McDermott, *Edwards Confronts the Gods*, 120–21; Barshinger, "Making the Psalter One's 'Own Language': Jonathan Edwards Engages the Psalms," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* vol. 2, no. 1 (2012): 3–29; Noll, "Edwards' Use of the Bible," 34–35, 43; Stein, "The Spirit and the Word: Jonathan Edwards and Scriptural Exegesis," in *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, ed. Nathan Hatch and Harry Stout (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988): 118–30.

outnumbers, in terms of published page count, the combined totals of his *Notes on Scripture*, his typological notebooks, and his commentary on Revelation in his *Apocalyptic Writings* (his next three largest exegetical notebooks). The *Blank Bible* is a fitting subject for this essay, therefore, because it best helps readers probe the inner workings of Edwards's interpretive mind by providing the clearest portrait of how he understood and interpreted the Bible—the entire canon over.[21]

This essay's thesis is two-fold. It will argue, first, that those in the Miller–Lowance line who have either stated or implied that Edwards's biblical typology is "conservative"—on either the "narrower" or "looser" definition of the term—have overlooked evidence that suggests otherwise.[22] The *Blank Bible's* evidence will strongly suggest that Douglas Sweeney, Stephen Nichols, Robert Brown, and others may be correct in stating that

---

21. Edwards, *The "Blank Bible,"* vol. 24 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006). Edwards's brother-in-law gave Edwards this Bible as a gift in the early 1730s. The *Blank Bible* is a small King James Version, which Edwards interspersed with blank pages to provide ample space for notations he would make on the adjacent biblical texts. Edwards also referred to the "Blank Bible" as his "Miscellaneous Observations on the Holy Scriptures" and "Interleaved Bible." Each designation helps the reader understand something unique about the document. This volume is one of the most important and yet peculiar pieces in Edwards's corpus. Its importance lies in its centrality within his study. Namely, in the last three decades of his life, this private notebook became the logistical center of Edwards's various biblical/theological reflections. Its peculiarity also resides in its only ever being a private, exegetical manuscript that Edwards did not intend for outside eyes. Thus it lacks any overall structure. Further, its abbreviations, lack of punctuation, grammatically incomplete sentences, obscuring symbols and cross references make it an intimidating primary source. Even though it does not approach the polished thought of his public works, the *Blank Bible* is still an important document which allows the reader to dive deeply into Edwards's exegetical mind. Interestingly, many of its notations—especially the longer ones—served as the seed-bed of Edwards's public works. The modern reader can liken it to a kind of Jonathan Edwards study bible—one, though, that totals over 1,000 pages. Until its release in 2006, only a few of its entries ever appeared in print. For more on the *Blank Bible*, see Stein, "Editor's Introduction" WJE 24:1–117; Robert Caldwell, "The 'blank Bible,'" *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 52, no. 2 (2010): 166–71; Richard Bailey, "The 'blank Bible,'" *Fides Et Historia* 39, no. 2 (September 2007): 144–46; Francis White, *The Reformation Roots and Edwardsean Fruits of the Missiology of Jonathan Edwards' Interleaved Bible* (ThM Thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1991); Wilson Kimnach and Kenneth Minkema, "The Material and Social Practices of Intellectual Work: Jonathan Edwards's Study," *William and Mary Quarterly* 69 (Oct. 2012): 683–730.

22. The "looser" definition of biblical typology refers to those who define this interpretive practice as one's connecting an Old Testament type with a New Testament antitype, while the "tighter" definition of this exegetical practice defines it as an interpreter's connecting an Old Testament type with a *Christological* antitype.

Edwards's biblical typology is not "conservative." This article will argue, second, that the *Blank Bible's* typological notations underscore that one cannot accurately categorize his biblical typology as "Christological" either.

In other words, the forthcoming evidence will suggest that the "Interleaved Bible's" typological notes are too diverse in their assignment of antitypes, as well as the *manner* and *time* in which Edwards asserts types find fulfillment, for one to accurately refer to his exegetical typology as "conservative" or "Christological." This implies, therefore, to borrow the terms of the Miller–Lowance line, that Edwards "broadens" the "nomenclature" of "orthodox typology" not only when typologically interpreting nature, but also while engaging in biblical exegesis.[23] Thus a reconsideration and recategorization of his exegetical typology is in order.

The present essay will survey the 210 notations in the *Blank Bible* in which Edwards uses a word from the "type" family (type, types, typify, typifies etc.) to connect a redemptive–historical sign with its signification.[24] Within these 210 notations, Edwards speaks of thirteen distinct antitypes to which various types point. These categories include Christology, soteriology, the church, "intra"-Old Testament, "intra"-New Testament, eschatology, the world, Christian spirituality, the demonic, sin, Christian ministry/ministers, and the Holy Spirit, as well as redemption/redemptive history generally.

Granted the present essay's constraints, this paper will only provide a brief summary for each of these antitypical categories, in addition to citing and analyzing one notation from each. This will allow the reader, at minimum, to appreciate the diversity of Edwards's typological exegesis. Footnotes will provide the other notations from that antitypical category in the *Blank Bible*.[25] After surveying Edwards's typological exegesis in the *Blank Bible*, the essay will then summarize its findings, highlight the inadequacy

---

23. Lowance and Watters, "Editor's Introduction," WJE 11:178.

24. Edwards does not number his *Blank Bible* like he does *Notes on Scripture* or "Miscellanies." Rather, he appends each note, whether it be a few sentences or a few pages, to the scriptural text that gave rise to that particular reflection. Thus the easiest way to delineate one note from the next is to refer to it as the text to which it is connected; i.e. his note on Genesis 27:5, or his exegetical musings appended to Matthew 11:11. Many of the *Blank Bible's* 210 typological notes have more than one such connection within them.

25. For a full analysis of all these examples, see my "Towards a Clearer Understanding of Jonathan Edwards's Exegetical Typology: A Case Study in *The 'Blank Bible'*" (PhD diss., Gateway Seminary, 2022).

of the terms "conservative" and "Christological," and suggest more accurate definitions for categorizing Edwards's biblical typology.

Christological Types in the *Blank Bible*

When restricting oneself to Edwards's specific use of words from the "type" family to connect the Old Testament to a New Testament truth regarding Christ's person, one finds thirty such notations in the *Blank Bible*.[26] These notations occur in fourteen different biblical books: ten in the Old Testament and four in the New (in which Edwards looks back to the Old).[27] Edwards claims that the Old Testament anticipates various aspects of the New Testament's Christology: simple statements about Jesus's identity, His incarnation, His identity as prophet, priest, king, and shepherd, His divine nature, His suffering and exalted states, as well as His role as the church's head. The various types Edwards locates in the Old Testament story are similarly diverse. They include important persons and institutions, significant words and phrases, as well as key objects and events—even *seemingly* insignificant details.

In one representative note, Edwards makes two connections between Christ and Jacob's prophecy in his comments attached to Genesis 49:24 in the *Blank Bible*.[28] Edwards focuses on Jacob's comment that Joseph's "arms… were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob," and the authorial aside that "thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel."[29] Edwards states

---

26. For Edwards's Christology, see Christian T. George, "Christology," in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, ed. Harry Stout, Kenneth Minkema, and Adriaan Neele (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 89–92; Michael Bush, "Jesus Christ in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards," (PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 2003); McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 244–61; James Carse, "The Christology of Jonathan Edwards," (PhD diss., Drew University, 1967); John Gerstner, *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Powhatan, Va.: Berea, 1992). 2.368–423; Robert Jenson, "Christology," in *The Princeton Companion*, 72–86.

27. These books include Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Esther, Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel, Matthew, Mark, Acts, and Revelation.

28. For Edwards's other Christological types in the *Blank Bible*, see his notes on Gen. 24:14; Gen. 28:11–12; Ex. 3:2–3; Ex. 25:10; Deut. 9:5; Deut. 12:5; Deut. 18:15; Deut. 24:9; Deut. 33:8; Deut. 33:16; Judg. 5:10; Judg. 13:19; 1 Sam. 23:26–28; 1 Ki. 11:3; Est. 8:2; Ps. 59; Ps. 77:15; Ps. 78:69; Ps. 78:71; Ps. 80:1; Ps. 82:8; Isa. 29:2; Isa. 53:2; Dan. 9:25; Mt. 11:11; Mk. 9:33–34; Acts 7; Acts 7:25–27; Rev. 19:13.

29. All scriptural citations are from the Authorized Version of 1611, as it was the Bible Edwards "hid in his heart." Douglas Sweeney reminds readers that Edwards "knew the Bible's contents better than most." And likely "knew the bulk of them by heart." Sweeney, "Edwards and the Bible," 71.

that this prophecy had remarkable verification in Joshua (Numbers 13:8) and Gideon (Judges 6:11), who, Edwards notes, were Joseph's progeny and had remarkable success in war.

Edwards contends that Joshua remarkably fulfills the parenthetical statement about "the shepherd," for he led Israel like a shepherd into Canaan where he swiftly defeated their enemies. It is notable, Edwards point out, that this "rock of Israel's salvation" bears Christ's name— *Yeshua*. For the latter, Joshua also defeated the spiritual enemies of God's people and leads them into the heavenly Canaan. For this reason, Joshua "was a remarkable type of Christ, who had Christ with him, and acted by his influence, and fought by his strength, and had his spirit to guide him."[30] For Edwards, therefore, Christ is the true Joshua.

Soteriological Types in the *Blank Bible*

When focusing on Edwards's employment of "type" and its derivatives to connect the Old Testament to a New Testament truth regarding Christ's saving work, one finds thirty-seven such notations in the *Blank Bible*.[31]

---

30. WJE 24:202–3. It is likely that Edwards is here obliquely referring to the *shekinah* glory that led Israel during their wilderness sojourn. For the best treatment of Edwards's Christological interpretation of the glory-cloud, see Munk, "His Dazzling Absence." Edwards ends his typological comments by vaguely referring to how "it"—though he does not specify that to which "it" refers—"may also have respect to the ark and tabernacle being kept at Shiloh, as it was till the days of Samuel….The ark was the type and symbol of Christ, the shepherd and rock of Israel; and the tabernacle and the mercy seat over the ark was the place of his presence." Though the "it" that causes Edwards to connect the prophecy to the tabernacle in Shiloh remains unclear, it is clear that Edwards typologically connects both the ark and Joshua to Christ, given their "rocky" and "pastoral" natures.

31. For Edwards's soteriology, see Michael J. Plato, "Atonement," in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*: 51–55; Gerstner, *Jonathan Edwards: A Mini-Theology* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 1987), 51–60; McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 244–61; Craig Biehl, *The Infinite Merit of Christ: The Glory of Christ's Obedience in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Jackson, Miss.: Reformed Academic Press, 2009); Daniel Cooley and Douglas Sweeney, "The Edwardseans and the Atonement," in *A New Divinity: Transatlantic Reformed Evangelical Debates during the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Mark Jones and Michael A. G. Haykin (Göttingen, V&R Publishing, 2018), 109–25; Oliver Crisp, "The Moral Government of God: Jonathan Edwards and Joseph Bellamy on the Atonement," in *After Jonathan Edwards: The Courses of the New England Theology* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 78–90; Obbie Todd, "Purchasing the Spirit: A Trinitarian Hermeneutic for Jonathan Edwards's Doctrine of the Atonement," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 10.2 (2018): 146–67; Brandon Crawford, *Jonathan Edwards on the Atonement* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2017); S. M. Hamilton, "Re-Thinking Atonement in Jonathan Edwards and New England Theology," *Perichoresis* 15.1 (2017): 85–99.

These reflections occur in seventeen biblical books.[32] Edwards asserts that the Old Testament does not only anticipate several aspects of Christ's saving work on the cross (like His role as salvific victor or penal sacrifice), but it also adumbrates His ascension into heaven and regal exaltation. He also believes that Old Testament types prefigured certain soteriological doctrines, like the Son's role in election. These soteriological types in the Old Testament include important events like the flood, persons such as David and Joseph, significant things like manna, and *apparently* insignificant minutia like the priestly means of procuring olive oil.

A representative note for this category is Edwards's brief note on the soteriological significance of God's provision of clothing in Genesis 3:21.[33] He notes that Adam and Eve were clothed only "at the expense of life." These beasts "were slain…to afford them clothing to cover their nakedness." The skin of these animals, Edwards believes, was a metonymy for their life. So that, just as Job speaks of "life" given "for life" (Job 2:4), these animals were killed as a substitute for Adam and Eve. Edwards concludes, therefore, that these "beasts slain in sacrifice"—whose skins God used as clothing—typified Jesus's substitutionary death.[34]

Edwards clarifies the specificities of this typological connection in his *Blank Bible* note appended to Exodus 26:14. There, speaking of God's same interaction with Adam and Eve, he points out that the animals' skins signified "the righteousness of Christ" with which God clothes His people. For this righteousness is obtained only by Christ "laying down his life," because He could "give us that righteousness no otherwise than giving us his own life." Thus just as the skins of slain animals clothed Adam and Eve, so, too, Christ gives "his own skin for our covering" at the expense of His own life.[35]

---

32. These biblical books include Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, Psalms, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Matthew, Romans, Hebrews, and 1 Peter.

33. The text says, "Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them." For Edwards's other soteriological types in the "Interleaved Bible," see Gen. 14:5–6; Gen. 19:20–22; Gen. 28:11–12; Gen. 29:20; Gen. 33:19; Gen. 37:31; Gen. 41:40–57; Gen. 47:12; Gen. 49:18; Ex. 16:25–27; Ex. 27:20; Num. 16:48; Deut. 4:21–22; Judg. 14:5–6; Judg. 15:15; Judg. 15:18; 1 Sam. 5:4; 2 Sam. 6:12–23; 2 Sam. 8:2; 1 Ki. 14:14–15; 1 Ki. 18:33–35; 2 Ki. 2:9–13; 2 Ki. 13:21; 1 Chr. 15–16; Ps. 30; Ps. 68; Eze. 22:30; Zech. 10:11; Mt. 2:15; Rom. 5:14; Heb. 9:19–22; 1 Pet. 3:19–21.

34. WJE 24:139. For further discussion of this passage, see Steven Borgman, "Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758) On the Book of Genesis" (ThM thesis, Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary, 2020), 85–86.

35. WJE 24:241–42.

Edwards implies, therefore, that this story adumbrates Christ's giving up His life in order to clothe His church with His righteousness.

The *Blank Bible's* Ecclesiological Typology

After Edwards's Christological/soteriological types, his notes that connect an Old Testament type to an ecclesiological antitype are his next largest grouping of notations in the "Interleaved Bible."[36] Edwards's ecclesiological typology accounts for forty-seven notations in his note-taking Bible.[37] There are four categories into which these notations broadly fall: general types of the church, types of the Gentile church, types of the Jewish church, and "functional" ecclesiological antitypes. This last group of notations are functional in the sense of what Edwards believes the church should do, what God has done with/in it, or what events may transpire in the church. The types Edwards locates in this category are quite diverse. He asserts that events like the infant Moses's preservation in the Nile, seemingly insignificant things like the Law's rules for leprous houses, and important women like Rebecca, Rachel, and Mary all typify the church.

An interesting example from this group is the note Edwards appends to Stephen's speech in Acts 7.[38] Edwards focuses on the part of Stephen's

---

36. Benjamin Wayman also addresses this topic in his "Women as Types of the Church." He argues that Edwards's ecclesiological typology in the *Blank Bible* overwhelmingly focuses on female types. This is why he refers to Edwards's typology as "feminine." This author believes, though, that Wayman's conclusions are over-stated and off-base since his research missed a significant amount of other notes in the *Blank Bible* that speak of non-feminine, ecclesiological types. For a full treatment of his work, see the fifth chapter of my dissertation.

37. For Edwards's ecclesiology, see Sweeney, "The Church," in *The Princeton Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, 167–89; Rhys S. Bezzant, *Jonathan Edwards and the Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014); Amy Plantinga-Pauw, "Jonathan Edwards' Ecclesiology," in *Jonathan Edwards as Contemporary: Essays in Honor of Sang Hyun Lee*, ed. Don Schweitzer (New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 175–86; Holmes, *God of Grace*, 169–97; Thomas Schafer, "Jonathan Edwards' Conception of the Church," *Church History* 24 (1955): 51–66; Krister Sairsingh, "Jonathan Edwards and the Idea of Divine Glory: His Foundational Trinitarianism and its Ecclesial Import" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986), 214–81.

38. For Edwards's other ecclesiological-typological notes in the *Blank Bible*, see Gen. 2:22; Gen. 3:7–8; Gen. 4; Gen, 7:1; Gen. 11:14; Gen. 15:5; Gen. 16:4; Gen. 16:9; Gen. 19:20–22; Gen. 24; Gen. 28:11–12; Gen. 29:9–10; Ex. 2:10; Ex. 3:13; Ex. 4:22; Ex. 7:11; Ex. 14:22; Ex. 24:1–11; Ex. 25:10; Ex. 26:14; Lev. 14:34; Num. 10:10; Num. 21:18; Num. 24:17; Num. 24:23–24; Num. 35:11–15; Jos. 2:18–19; Judg. 14:20; 1 Ki. 4:34; 1 Ki. 10:1–14; 1 Ki. 11:3; 1 Chr. 4:9–10; 1 Chr. 21:18; 1 Chr. 25:9–31; Neh. 4:2; Neh. 8:16–17; Ps. 37:11; Cant. 1:9; Isa. 28:9–11; Isa. 61:8; Jer. 22:19; Eze. 5:1–14; Amos 6:6; Mk. 6:40; Lk. 1:35; Acts 7:16.

speech where he mentions Israel's placing the bodies of their deceased patriarchs in Abraham's burial plot (Acts 7:16). Edwards muses over the typological significance of the deceased patriarchs having been laid to rest in Canaan after first sojourning through the wilderness.[39]

Edwards points out that this "was the only land [Abraham] owned in Canaan," since he was still a landless "stranger and sojourner," even after he purchased the field. This seemingly insignificant detail is the soil from which Edwards's typological thinking springs. He writes that "the patriarchs' being buried there, and being carried up out of Egypt to Canaan… [to] rest there, seems to typify that the saints, when they die, go to heaven, the true Canaan, and rest there." So Jacob's desire to be buried in Canaan was an "earnest to his posterity that they should have [it] for a possession."

Edwards then compares Jacob's actions to Jesus. He writes that Christ was also "an earnest" to His spiritual progeny "that they should have [heaven] for a possession," since He first entered into it on account of His death. In Edwards's mind, therefore, just as the Israelites entered into Canaan with their forefathers' bones, "so the spiritual Israel enters into heaven by Christ's death." Edwards thus argues that not only can one find general, ecclesial types buried in the Hebrew Scriptures, but one can unearth truths regarding the saints' ultimate resting place as well. Edwards's close reading of the Hebrew Scriptures allows the reader to appreciate that his "typological readings of Scripture were not detached from the literal" but were extensions of it.[40]

Edwards's "Intra"-Old Testament Typology in the *Blank Bible*

In the "Interleaved Bible," Edwards states that not only do Old Testament types look forward to New Testament antitypes, but some have a shorter antitypical gaze. That is to say, Edwards composed fifteen notations in the *Blank Bible* in which he states that an earlier part of the Old Testament typified a later part of the Old Testament. He speaks of these Old Testament type/antitype pairs in eleven Hebrew books.[41]

---

39. The relevant verses read, "So Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he, and our fathers. And were carried over into Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem."

40. WJE 24:973; Barshinger, "'The Only Rule of Our Faith and Practice': Jonathan Edwards' Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah as a Case Study of His Exegetical Boundaries," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52 (December 2009): 823–24.

41. These are Exodus, Genesis, and Numbers, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah.

These notations fall into two broad categories. Eight notes speak of typical things/events that absolve in later antitypical things/events, while seven others speak of types that absolve in later prophecies. The types of the first group include, for example, Melchizedek's blessing, Jacob's injured thigh, and the infant Moses's preservation in the Nile. This section's antitypes include events like Abram's God-centered blessing, Jacob's afflicted life, and Israel's preservation in Egypt. In the latter seven examples, Edwards's types include events like the stricken rock of Exodus 17, Hannah's song in 1 Samuel, and the sun-filled day of Joshua 10. The antitypical prophecies to which they look include the writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah.

An interesting example from this set of notations is Edwards's compact, but significant, "intra"-Old Testament connection in his inter-textual treatment of Exodus 17:6.[42] Edwards writes, "The rock was smitten in order to afford water; so Christ was smitten and suffered in order to afford us his blood and [the] Holy Spirit.… What we have an account of in this verse is also typical of what is prophesied of in Isaiah 35:6–7, and Isaiah 41:18, and Isaiah 43:19–20, and is also typical of 'rivers of living water' flowing out of the heart when it is smitten (Jn. 7:38–39)." He then notes that these waters are akin to the waters proceeding from Ezekiel's temple (Ezek. 47:1) and the "river of water of life" in Revelation 22, for in each of these places water pours forth from God's throne.[43]

Edwards believes that Moses's smitten rock has enduring typological value, since, on his interpretation, the prophets and New Testament writers employ this story's language and imagery to convey the theological significance of the "new thing" God would do in the "latter days." Where modern authors might refer to this phenomenon of "textual development" as "intertextuality" or "inner-biblical exegesis," Edwards employs the word "typical" to describe this relationship of the Old Testament's earlier and later texts.[44]

---

42. God says "I will stand before thee upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink." For Edwards's other "intra"-Old Testament types, see his notes on Gen. 15:1; Gen. 32:21; Gen. 39:4–6; Ex. 2:10; Ex. 34:1; Num. 10:35–36; Judg. 14:20; 1 Sam. 2:1–10; 2 Sam. 8:13; Ps. 51:18–19; Isa. 37:7; Eze. 46:15; Joel 3:2; Zech. 6:14–15.

43. WJE 24:229–30. For modern arguments concerning later biblical authors' typological interpretation of Exodus, see John Day, "Prophecy," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 39–55; Bernhard Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg,* ed. Bernhard Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York: Harper Brothers, 1962), 177–95.

44. It is not surprising to find Edwards describing intertextuality in this manner, since

Edwards "hypothesized a gradual typological unfolding through the Old Testament" which yet "typified future events of some magnitude."[45]

In the texts to which Edwards appeals (Isa. 35:6–7, 41:18, and 43:19–20), Isaiah employs language that recalls Exodus's smitten rock, the wilderness wanderings, and divine visitation to describe the similar, yet distinct, way in which God will work in the "latter days." Edwards believes, therefore, that Isaiah typologically interpreted Exodus's events and borrowed its language to describe God's future salvation.[46] In addition, Edwards states that *both* the smitten rock and Isaiah's prophecies looked forward typologically and prophetically to God's "new thing" in the eschatological era. This, on this interpretation, one best understands in view of God's provision of flowing water from a smitten rock, since they both anticipate God's eschatological throne from whence He will satisfy the souls of His saints with spiritual water.

Edwards's "Intra"-New Testament Typology in the *Blank Bible*

The *Blank Bible* also unveils another peculiar aspect of Edwards's biblical typology. That is, America's theologian believes that types *are not* only the purview of the Old Testament, *nor* antitypes *exclusively* the New Testament's purview either. In seventeen notes within the "Interleaved Bible," Edwards speaks of type–antitype pairs that the New Testament strictly

---

the prophets' "intensified" employment of Exodus 17's language and imagery exemplifies their belief that God was working, or would work, in a way comparable to earlier stages of redemptive history. Seen from this perspective, "intertextuality" sounds like biblical typology, given its similar and dissimilar employment of "sacred history" to describe events or persons in later contexts. For treatments of typology and intertextuality, see Paul Koptak, "Intertextuality" in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Kevin Vanhoozer, et. al (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 332–34; G. K. Beale, "Positive Answer to the Question: Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 391–98; Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14–33; Bryan Estelle, *Echoes of Exodus: Tracing a Biblical Motif* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2018), 8–60; D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

45. Batschelet, "Jonathan Edwards' Use of Typology," 121–22.

46. Isaiah prophecies, "In the wilderness shall waters break out…And the parched ground shall become a pool…I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the valleys; I will make…the dry land springs of water…I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth…I will make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert…I give…rivers in the desert to give drink to my people."

contains within itself. Edwards left two such notes in his notes on the Old Testament, which looked forward to New Testament events. The other fifteen are found in the latter Testament.[47] These notations situate into eight general categories. These include his principled statements about New Testament typology, New Testament types in Old Testament notes, types of Christ's preaching, the typological witness of Christ washing His disciples' feet, types of Christ's redemption, ecclesiological types, and types of heaven and sin.

A helpful example to consider is one of Edwards's notes that justifies his conception of New Testament typology by appealing to the New Testament authors' figurative interpretations of the events of their own era. His note on John 9:7 highlights his conviction.[48] In John 9:7, Christ commands a blind man to wash his eyes in the "pool of Siloam." The apostle John then parenthetically adds "which is by interpretation, Sent." Edwards focuses on the apostle's etymological interpretation of the pool's name, and draws two principles from this brief verse. First, he postulates that "the facts related in the history of Christ in the New Testament are typical or mystical, as well as the facts of the history of the Old Testament." Second, he states that "the Holy Spirit makes account of the signification of names in order to instruct the church in divine matters."[49] Much to the reader's consternation, though, Edwards does not clarify why John 9:7 confirms his observation about the New Testament's typological witness.

However, in his other exegetical notebook, "Types," Edwards provides a small window into his thinking.[50] Edwards begins by glossing the text. He renders it "which is by *signification*, Sent." He then states that "evidently

---

47. The Old Testament books are Psalms and Isaiah; the New Testament biblical books include Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and 1 Corinthians.

48. For a helpful treatment of Edwards's treatment of this verse, see Michael McClymond, "'Of His Fullness Have All We Received': Johannine Themes in Jonathan Edwards' Interpretation of Scripture," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*, 169. McClymond comments that this text shows that for Edwards "there is a fullness of meaning in the events of Jesus' life."

49. WJE 24:945. For Edwards's other type–antitype pairs in the New Testament, see Ps. 93:3; Isa. 7:14; his first note before Mt. 1:1; Mt. 11:5; Mt. 11:11; Mt. 27:7; Mt. 27:26; Mt. 27:35; Mk. 9:33–34; Mk. 14:3; Lk. 1:35; Lk. 22:50–51; Jn. 5:1–4; Jn. 13:4; Jn. 18:8; 1 Cor. 5:7.

50. One finds "Types" in WJE 11:146–54. For an introduction to this small notebook, see the "Editor's Introduction" in that same volume, WJE 11:3–33. For a treatment of this notebook's importance in discussions about Edwards's biblical typology, see my "How Scripture Justifies Jonathan Edwards's Typological View of the Old Testament," in *The Miscellanies Reader, Volume 2*, ed. Robert Boss (Dallas: JESociety Press, 2021).

weight is laid on the interpretation of the word 'signified.'" Edwards believes, therefore, that John *intended* for his readers to find typological significance in the pool's name, given his authorial insertion. Further, drawing on the context of John's ninth chapter in which he ironically contrasts physical and spiritual blindness/sight, Edwards deduces that this pool "was typical of that fount of grace and mercy that is in Christ." As Edwards says in the *Blank Bible* note he appends to Isaiah 8:6, Christ, like "the pool of Siloam," is "living water" who "restores sight to the blind."[51]

On Edwards's read, therefore, this story underscores, given how John tries to bring out the "spiritual significance" of the pool's name, that New Testament authors found typological significance in things of their own day. For this reason, Edwards believes it reasonable to "observe" that John 9:7 proves that the "history of Christ in the New Testament" is also "typical." Just as is "the history of the Old." So, for Edwards "the life of Christ in the New Testament also contains typological significance."[52]

The Eschatological Typology of the "Interleaved Bible"

Jonathan Edwards's fascination with the eschatological is well documented.[53] It is not as well known that Edwards's eschatological curiosity extended to his typological understanding of the Jewish scriptures. The *Blank Bible* highlights that Edwards's Old Testament types did not only point forward to the New Testament's events and persons, but also to antitypes that will appear in the "last days" of the present era and in the heavenly age to come.

---

51. WJE 11:146; WJE 24:638. Edwards likely makes this connection between a cleansing pool and a spiritual "fount" in Christ because he finds that the blind man's physical ocular washing prefigured his spiritual ocular washing, since he was the only one in the chapter to believe in Jesus. For a treatment of Edwards's thoughts on Isaiah 8:6, see Yoo, "Edwards' Interpretation of the Major Prophets," 177–78.

52. Yoo, "Edwards' Interpretation of the Major Prophets," 174–75.

53. For Edwards's eschatology, see Stein, "Editor's Introduction," in *Apocalyptic Writings*, vol. 5 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), 1–94; Stein, "Eschatology," in *The Princeton Companion*, 226–42; McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 566–79; C. C. Goen, "Jonathan Edwards: A New Departure in Eschatology," *Church History* 28 (1959): 25–40; John Wilson, "History, Redemption, and the Millennium," in *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, 131–41; McDermott, *One Holy and Happy Society: The Public Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 37–92; Brandon Withrow, "A Future of Hope: Jonathan Edwards and Millennial Expectations," *Trinity Journal* 22 (Spring 2001): 75–98; Zakai, *Edwards's Philosophy of History*, 182–306; Mark Rogers, "A Missional Eschatology: Jonathan Edwards, Future Prophecy, and the Spread of the Gospel," *Fides et Historia* 41 (Winter 2009): 23–46.

When concentrating on Edwards's use of "type" and its derivatives to connect the Old Testament to the eschaton, one finds twenty-nine such notations in the *Blank Bible*. This makes eschatology Edwards's third-most favored antitype behind Christ's person and work (sixty-seven notes) and ecclesiology (forty-seven notations). These twenty-nine notations occur in nineteen biblical books.[54] Edwards's antitypes include events and persons in the "last days," eschatological judgment and hell, and heaven and its eternal rest. His types include events like the flood; places like Egypt, Mount Sinai, and Daniel's lions' den; and people such as Absalom. The space Edwards devotes to these types suggests that typology informed a critical "aspect" of his theology of the "millennial era" and the one to come.[55]

One of Edwards's most interesting typological connections from this group is his four page note on the eschatological–typological significance of Absalom's usurpation of David's throne.[56] He extrapolates at length about the various ways in which "Absalom seems to be a type of [the] Antichrist." In all, Edwards draws fourteen comparisons between them. To ground these comparisons in the biblical text, Edwards quotes and/or cites Scripture fifty times.

Edwards connects several of the comparisons to Absalom and the Antichrist's shared personality traits. First, for example, Edwards notes that just as Absalom was a "son of David," so too will the "man of sin" be a "son of Christ," for he will have formally been "one of the minsters of the gospel."[57] Furthermore, just as Absalom was known for his distinguished beauty, so too others will admire the Antichrist for his extravagance, for he will appear

---

54. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Judges, 2 Samuel, 2 Chronicles, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, Romans, Hebrews, 2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation.

55. Munk, "Types of the Peaceable Kingdom," 218.

56. For Edwards's other eschatological types in the *Blank Bible*, see his notes on Gen. 7; Gen. 23; Gen. 41:40–57; Ex. 9:10; Ex. 24:10; Ex. 34; Lev. 9:22–23; Deut. 2:34; Deut. 4:36; Judg. 5:14; Judg. 5:20; 2 Sam. 23:39; 2 Chr. 5:12–14; Job 26:5; Isa. 11:10; Isa. 21:1; Isa. 34:5; Jer. 16:13; Dan. 3:1; Dan. 6:22; Zech. 14:4–5; Rom. 8:23; Heb. 9:24; 2 Pet. 3:6–7; Jude 4; Rev. 4:4; Rev. 15:3.

57. Edwards implies that the Antichrist will have once been a Protestant minister who eventually joins the Catholic Church. For Edwards and the Catholic Church, see Stein, "A Notebook on the Apocalypse by Jonathan Edwards," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 29 (1972): 623–34; Stein, "Jonathan Edwards' Reflections on the Virgin Mary," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*; Clyde Holbrook, *Jonathan Edwards, the Valley and Nature: An Interpretive Essay* (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1987), 89–91; Helen P. Westra, "Confronting Antichrist: The Influence of Jonathan Edwards's Millennial Vision," in *The Stowe Debate: Rhetorical Strategies in Uncle Tom's Cabin*, ed. Mason Lowance (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 141–58.

"in exceeding external pomp and glory, decked with gold and silver." Even Absalom's "exceeding fruitful" hair—in which he gloried—prefigured the Antichrist's exceedingly subtle and mischievous dealings. This hair, however, proved to be "his destruction." In much the same manner, the Antichrist, though he will glory in his craftiness, will "finally be ruined" by it.

Edwards also notes various points in Absalom's story that typify the Antichrist's actions in his era of sin. For example, just as Absalom was David's son by a Gentile woman, so the Antichrist will mix Christianity with heathenism. Furthermore, the Antichrist—whom Edwards identifies as the pope—will try to usurp Christ's authority in the "spiritual Jerusalem," just as Absalom stole his father's kingdom.[58] Edwards also points out that Absalom "cloaked" this rebellion "with a pretense of religion." So, too, the Antichrist will pretend "service to God."[59]

Further, when Absalom rebelled against his father, he drove David and his followers from Jerusalem. In a similar manner, when the Antichrist rebels he will "cast out of the church all the true and faithful followers of Christ." In so doing, Absalom drove his father and his men out into the wilderness. Edwards notes that the church is also "represented as flying away into the wilderness" to take shelter during the Antichrist's reign (Rev. 12:14). After Absalom succeeded in this endeavor, Jerusalem was "given up to [him] and his multitude," who trod it down. Edwards points out that this is "agreeable to the description of the time of Antichrist," when Christ's enemies "shall tread under foot" the "holy city" (Rev. 11:2).

Absalom slept with his father's concubines. So too, will the Antichrist defile "the church that is bound to Christ as his spouse." But, just as Absalom only slept with his father's concubines—not his "true wives"—so, too, during the Antichrist's reign, he will not defile Christ's "true followers." The Antichrist will successfully smite the church, though, with "great affliction and sorrow," just as "the time of Absalom's usurpation is represented as a time of great affliction." Part of David's intense affliction was the great

---

58. Stephen Stein points out that Edwards's identification of the pope with the Antichrist was "traditional" for Protestant interpreters of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Stein, "Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards on the Number of the Beast: Eighteenth Century Speculation about the Antichrist," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 84 (October 1974): 293–315.

59. For Edwards's understanding of the pope's role in the "last days," see Fred Beuttler, "Jonathan Edwards and the Critical Assaults on the Bible" (MA thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1988), 143–44.

reproaches with which others maligned him. These, Edwards points out, aptly prefigure "the great blasphemies of [the] Antichrist."

Absalom did not finally succeed, though, and was eventually killed and "cast into a great pit." David's men piled a great heap of stones over this pit as a lasting monument to his ruin. Edwards believes that this prefigured the bottomless pit into which God will cast the Antichrist, from which the smoke of its torment will ascend forever.[60]

Edwards's Ontological Typology in the *Blank Bible*

In his "Interleaved Bible," Edwards left several notations which underscore that his ontological typology is not solely the purview of his other notebook, "Images of Divine Things."[61] In his *Blank Bible*, he left a large handful of notations that fuse his ontological and biblical typologies. Edwards scattered eighteen such notations across his note-taking Bible, placing them in twelve biblical books from Genesis to Revelation.[62] The biblical–ontological types he locates include the stars, hair, the Nile, grapes, wheat, and the sun. He asserts that these types find their antitypical fulfillment in Christ's person and work, institutions like the church, or places like hell. These eighteen notations fall into five categories: Edwards's luminary types, the sun's various antitypes, types of Christ's person and work, natural types of the church and Christian life, and types of hell and final judgement.[63]

Edwards's thoughts on God's promise to Abram in Genesis 15 are an important and representative notation from this group. In this note,

---

60. WJE 24:365–69. Edwards ends by noting how David's "joyful triumphant song of praise" (2 Sam. 22) "agrees much better with the description of the great things God did for his church in the destruction of Antichrist" than anything of his own day.

61. WJE 11:50–142.

62. Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 2 Kings, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Luke, and Revelation.

63. In "Images" no. 156, Edwards provides two additional categories into which the reader can group these reflections. He notes, on the one hand, there are "spiritual mysteries" that are "typified in the constitution of the natural world," which rely on the interpreter's eye with Scripture's aid. Ten of these notations fall into this category. On the other hand, one finds "onto-types" when Scripture "makes application of the signs and types in the book of nature as representations of spiritual mysteries." Six of his notations discuss such biblical application of "onto-types." These categories highlight the different ways Edwards appropriated the Scriptures in his musings on natural typology, emphasizing Scripture's critical role in his theology of ontological typology. Paul Helm comments similarly that Edwards "took seriously the Bible's imagery," and regarded "biblical language not as rhetorical embellishment, but as types intended to convey truth." Helm, "Introduction," in *Treatise on Grace and other Posthumously Published Writings*, ed. Paul Helm (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971), 17.

Edwards reflects on God's "making application" of worldly types in His promise to Abraham in which He likens the patriarch's descendants to the stars (Gen. 15:5).[64] Edwards, writing of the luminaries' typological significance, states, "The stars were designed to be a type of the saints, the spiritual seed of Abraham. The seeming multitude of them, which is much greater than the real multitude of visible stars, was designed as a type of the multitude of the saints." Three things here are worthy of note. First is Edwards's comment that the stars typified Abraham's "spiritual seed" *in and of themselves*. Second is how Edwards implies that the stars suitably signify the saints. That is, just as the "real multitude" of stars outnumbers "the visible stars," so too, the "real multitude" of saints outnumbers Christians "visible" to the eye.[65]

Third, Edwards states significantly that God *designed* the stars to communicate this truth. Edwards helps the reader understand what "designed" means in "Images" no. 130. Speaking of Paul's use of the human body to describe the church, Edwards asserts that Paul argues "from what is in the body to what should be in the mystical body…[to] show that something further than mere illustration is intended. It shows that [one] is a real type…of the other; otherwise his arguments can't be so forcible."[66] Edwards is thus claiming that Paul does not employ this metaphor *merely* because it corresponds with what he *already* had in mind about the church. Rather, Paul speaks this way about the "embodied" church because there *is* a divinely intended semantic connection between the human body and the church.

If one has the eyes to see, therefore, he will perceive in the "shadowy" human body a picture of the "true spiritual understanding" of the unity and diversity of God's ecclesial body.[67] Paul compares the church to a body,

---

64. Genesis states, "God brought Abram abroad, saying, 'Look toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them.' And he said unto him, 'So shall thy seed be.'" For Edwards's other ontological types in the *Blank Bible*, see his notes on Gen. 24:25; Gen. 32:24–30; Ex. 4:9; Ex. 20:25; Num. 6:5; Num. 10:10; Deut. 20:19; Deut. 21:23; Deut. 32:14; Josh. 3:16; Josh. 10:13; 2 Ki. 4:41; Job 38:13; Ps. 68:18; Prov. 30:15–16; Isa. 38:5–8; Lk. 23:43; Rev. 19:17.

65. WJE 24:157. A text like Revelation 7:9 likely informs Edwards's conviction of the type's biblical basis: "I beheld a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, people, and tongues, standing before the throne, and before the Lamb."

66. WJE 11:98.

67. Ryan Hoselton, "Jonathan Edwards, The Inner Witness of the Spirit, and Experiential Exegesis," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* 5, no. 2 (2015): 90–120. Hoselton helpfully argues that "Edwards' point was that the spiritual sense gave the interpreter new access to

therefore, because the body "is a real type" of the church. The Corinthians *ought* to live as a united, diversified whole, consequently, because in so doing they "actualize" their bodies' "semantic," typological destinies.[68]

Returning to Edwards's *Blank Bible*, this entails that Edwards believes God pointed Abram to the stars not *merely* because they helpfully analogized His promise, but because He *designed* the stars to communicate this truth about His spiritual progeny.[69] Then, as Abram believed God's promise, God counted it to him as righteousness, which served as the means of his and the luminaries' "actualization." There was a kind of "sermon [written] in the stars," therefore, regarding Abraham's descendants.[70]

Types of "Christian Spirituality" in the *Blank Bible*

Not all of Edwards's Old Testament types looked forward to historical, concrete antitypes in the "Interleaved Bible." In a few different places in his *Blank Bible*, Edwards details how the Hebrew Scriptures adumbrated transtemporal, spiritual truths about the Christian life and experience. These are Edwards's types for "Christian spirituality." This grouping of notations underscores that just as "spirituality was central to [Edwards's] life," so, too, Christian spirituality played an important role in his biblical typology.[71]

---

the experience of Scripture's divine moral and aesthetic qualities—*not* to understanding Scripture's hidden spiritual meaning."

68. Sang Lee, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards: Expanded Edition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 92–93. Lee argues that "only via human perception [do] all the relations to which a material entity itself tends become explicit. So when Edwards writes about…types of certain divine things, he is functioning as a medium through which material entities [actualize]."

69. Lisanne Winslow similarly says that for Edwards "types are not mere human assignments, but are ontologically real since they represent ideas in God's mind, which are also real…they point to the divine things they foreshadow." Winslow, "A Great and Remarkable Analogy," 223.

70. Gerald McDermott, "Jonathan Edwards, John Henry Newman, and Non-Christian Religions," in *Jonathan Edwards, Philosophical Theologian*, ed. Paul Helm and Oliver Crisp (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2003), 128.

71. William Van Vlastuin, "Spirituality," in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, 543–45. For an introduction to Edwards's spirituality and spiritual practices, see Jonathan Edwards, *Spiritual Writings: The Classics of Western Spirituality*, eds. Kyle Strobel, Adriaan Neele, and Kenneth Minkema (New York: Paulist Press, 2019); Kyle Strobel, *Formed for the Glory of God: Learning from the Spiritual Practices of Jonathan Edwards* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2013); C. J. Viscardi, "Signs of Authenticity: A Study in the Spirituality of Jonathan Edwards" (STD diss., Pontifical Gregorian University, 1979); David Weddle, "The Melancholy Saint: Jonathan Edwards's Interpretation of David Brainerd as a Model of Evangelical Spirituality," *Harvard Theological Review* 81 (July 1988): 297–318; Gerald McDermott,

When concentrating on Edwards's employment of a word from the "type" family to connect the Hebrew Scriptures to an aspect of Christian spirituality, one finds fourteen such notations. These exegetical notes occur in seven biblical books across the Jewish Canon, as well as one note in a Gospel that looks back to the Old Testament.[72] There are four broad antitypical categories to which these types point: a Christian's experience of regeneration and conversion, the believer's practice of repentance, the Christian life's journey-like nature, and the place of faith in Christian practice. His types include events like Lot's wife becoming a salt pillar, the golden calf, and Elisha's miracles, as well as individuals such as Ittai the Philistine or Ruth the Moabite, and even the Rechabite Jonadab's abstinent command to his descendants.

One of Edwards's more detailed notes from this group is his thoughts on the typological significance of Moses's statement that the Israelites's clothing "waxed not old" during their wilderness journey (Deut. 8:4).[73] Edwards argues that this statement's peculiar nature, granted Israel's wilderness wanderings, makes it very likely that God's preservation of Israel's clothing and feet "was a type of the durableness of the spiritual clothing of the spiritual Israel in their journey through the wilderness of this world towards the heavenly Canaan."

Edwards provides several lines of reasoning for this typological connection's legitimacy. First, he notes that "the saints' righteousness is often represented as their clothing."[74] Next, he highlights the peculiarity of the statement "neither did thy foot swell." He notes that if the peoples' feet had swollen "they would not have been able to go any further." But, he points out, "it seems no very remarkable thing that their foot did not swell," for a great lot of the time "they lay still" and did not set foot out of camp. And when they did set out with God at their head, "it is probable it was not by long journeys," but only as long as the "women and children could bear." So,

---

"Jonathan Edwards on Revival, Spiritual Discernment, and God's Beauty," *Reformation and Revival* 6 (Winter 1997): 103–14; and McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 60–76.

72. These are Genesis, Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Matthew.

73. For Edwards's other types of "Christian spirituality," see his notes on Gen. 3:16; Gen. 19:26; Gen. 28:11–12; Deut. 8:4; Deut. 9:21; Deut. 21:11–13; 2 Sam. 15:21; 2 Ki. 4:34; 2 Ki. 5:14; Isa. 30:2; Jer. 35:6–8; Jer. 50:8; Mt. 24:17–18.

74. Edwards did not provide any such citations, but it is not for lack of examples. There are several places in the New Testament in which the authors figuratively link clothing itself, or one's "putting on clothing," with the Christian life (Rom. 13:14; Gal. 3:27; Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 2:11, 3:12–14; 1 Thess. 5:8).

Edwards reasons, it is probable that the Israelites traveled such distances during those forty years "that is common for men of settled habitation to travel in such a space of time."

Edwards deduces, therefore, that the "chief reason" Moses made this remark about God's preservation is "because it was a type." This preservation, given the nature of their journey, therefore, "was in itself remarkable on no other account" than its typological witness. So Moses highlights that God kept their feet from "swelling" in order to typify that Christians "shall be enabled to hold on his way." For God will "keep the feet of his saints, and establish their goings." Further, their journey was portrayed as "exceeding rough" in order to adumbrate the rough "way of the saints towards heaven," for this path is "full of difficulties and obstacles." But God will work in their spirits and wills such that He "will enable 'em to go through 'em all."[75] For Edwards, therefore, "the entire scope of the Christian's journey—from bondage in the hands of God's enemies to the warm embrace of divine redemptive presence in Christ—is envisioned in [his] interpretation of Israel's voyage."[76]

The Demonic and Satanic Types of the *Blank Bible*

One of Edwards's more intriguing antitypical categories in his "Interleaved Bible" are his ten notes that typologically connect the Hebrew Bible with Satan and his demons.[77] Edwards's typological eye focuses on a few Old Testament characters: the pharaohs, the leviathan, and the prince of Tyre. He highlights that the former testament does not only adumbrate Satan himself, but it even typifies his defeat at the cross and his kingdom's final destruction. These notations therefore solidify Christopher Reaske's thesis that the Bible is Edwards's "most important source" for understanding Satan."[78]

In an intriguing constellation of notations, Edwards typologically connects the leviathan with Satan. In his note summarizing the fortieth and forty-first chapters of Job, he asserts that the leviathan signifies "water monsters" which Job cannot subdue.[79] These great beasts of the deep, Edwards

---

75. WJE 24:291.

76. Detrich, "A Recital of Presence," 235.

77. For Edwards on Satan, see Kamil Halambiec, "Satan," in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, 509–10; Christopher Reaske, "The Devil and Jonathan Edwards," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (January 1972): 123–38; Amy Plantinga-Pauw, "Where Theologians Fear to Tread," *Modern Theology* 16 (January 2000): 38–59.

78. Reaske, "The Devil and Jonathan Edwards," 124.

79. For Edwards's other devilish type–antitype pairs, see his notes on Gen. 14:5–6; Ex. 1:16, 22; Josh. 3:16; Dan. 6:22; Hos. 2:15; Mt. 18:10.

states, are "types of the Devil…the chief of God's proud and haughty enemies," who is "king over all the children of pride" (Job 41:34). Edwards notes that this is a peculiar moral description of an amoral animal.[80]

Edwards states in his other note on that verse (Job 41:34) that one should therefore understand this phrase "mystically." Namely, one should interpret it as a reference to "he whom the leviathan was a type of, Satan, [who] is king over all the children of pride."[81] This is reasonable given Edwards's "depiction of the devil," since he views him as the ultimate "confluence of pride and hatred."[82]

In another note on Job's forty-first chapter, Edwards states explicitly why Job's language makes this typological connection likely. He appends his thoughts to God's statement about the leviathan that "who hath prevented me, that I should repay him" (Job 41:11). Edwards points out that this is a moral injunction spoken to a beastly animal. And "no leviathan was ever subject to God's moral government, or ever rebelled against him that God should repay him." Thus Edwards concludes that "these words are great evidence that leviathan is a type of the devil."[83]

Edwards then provides the scriptural scaffolding for these typological connections in his fourth note on the leviathan and Satan. He appends these thoughts to Psalm 74:13–14, focusing on the psalmist's description of God as the one who, in the exodus, "brakest the heads of leviathan in pieces."[84] Edwards asserts that the psalmist clarifies that God "obtained a signal victory over Satan, that old serpent, the leviathan, that crooked serpent, when he overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea."[85]

Edwards then ties these various serpentine characters together. He comments that the language of "breaking the head" of a serpent-like character partially "fulfilled that curse on the old serpent" (Gen. 3:15). For the "dragon is a serpent."[86] He also points out that the "leviathan"—whose head God also "brakest"—is a serpent. Edwards appeals to Isaiah 27:1 for proof,

---

80. WJE 24:470.

81. WJE 24:471.

82. Plantinga-Pauw, "Where Theologians Fear to Tread," 47.

83. WJE 24:472.

84. For more of Edwards's further reflections on the typological connections of the leviathan/serpent with the Devil, see WJE 10:78; 11:212; 15:449; 18:56, 273, 303, 507; 20:183; 25:213.

85. WJE 24:511. For additional treatment of Edwards's confluence of sea-creature imagery with the Devil, see Chamberlain, "A Fish Tale," 159–161.

86. Edwards also appeals to Isaiah's description of God as He who "cut Rahab, and wounded the dragon" (Isa. 51:9).

since here the prophet describes the leviathan as "the piercing, crooked ser-
pent." So, Edwards reasons, the cursed serpent in Genesis 3 is "the same
serpent whose head God is said to have broken," which "was the devil."
Thus, Edwards deduces, the "pharaoh of Egypt was typically that dragon
and leviathan" whom God triumphed over while redeeming his people."[87]

This is why, Edwards reasons, the psalmist likens Pharaoh to the levi-
athan and dragon. God did not merely triumph over the North-African
king, but God actually triumphed over the Devil in the exodus—whom the
pharaoh typified. Edwards asserts, therefore, that this incipiently fulfilled
the "bruising of his head that was threatened" in Genesis 3. So, Edwards
believes, the psalmist describes the type (Pharaoh) in the language meta-
phorically applied to the antitype (Satan), to further solidify the typological
connection. In Edwards's reading, consequently, he finds a constellation
of similar language describing Satan and Pharaoh, who are typologically
connected through the leviathan–dragon imagery. He believes that this is
exemplified in Scripture's employment of such imagery to describe Satan
and the pharaohs in divers places. This entails that the leviathan, dragon,
and the pharaohs are types of the devil.[88]

Types for Sin in the *Blank Bible*

In five "Interleaved Bible" notes, Edwards speaks of various types for sin.[89]
He twice appeals to leaven as an embodiment of sin's multiplying, souring
corruption. He also believes that blood, Egyptian task-slavers, and sexual
intimacy are types of sin.

One of this group's more detailed notes is Edwards's reflection on the
typological connection of leaven with sin.[90] Edwards details leaven and
sin's typological connections in his "Interleaved Bible" note appended to the
prophet Hosea's likening of Israel to a baker's baking of bread (Hos. 7:4).
Edwards points out that here, "as is common in Scripture," the author com-
pares sinful Israel to two things: "an oven heated," and "the dough leavened,
and kneaded, and so fitted to be cast into the hot oven."

87. WJE 24:511.

88. WJE 24:511.

89. For an introduction to Edwards's hamartiology, see his *Original Sin*, vol. 3 of
The Works of Jonathan Edwards, ed. Clyde Holbrook (New Haven: Yale University Press,
1970), 102–437; Clyde Holbrook's "Editor's Introduction," WJE 2:1–67; McClymond and
McDermott, *Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 339–56; and Oliver Crisp, *Jonathan Edwards
and the Metaphysics of Sin* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2005).

90. For Edwards's other types for sin, see his notes on Ex. 4:9; Ex. 12:15; Hos. 2:15;
Isa. 7:14.

Edwards then draws out the comparisons' appropriateness. First, Israelites are like a hot oven "because their hearts are heated with lust." Second, they are likened to "dough leavened" because Scripture uses it "as a type of wickedness." For just as dough is leavened and kneaded so as "to be cast into the oven," so, too, men "ripen in wickedness" throughout their souls and are "fitted for destruction." Edwards draws this point out by comparing Hosea's implied baker with Satan. He asserts that just as the baker mixes leaven into the lump and kneads it, waiting on the dough "to be thoroughly fermented" that he may cast it into the oven, so the devil casts "the leaven of wickedness into men's hearts" and thoroughly works it through their soul so as "to establish the heart in sin." Thus the baker of sinful souls "waits till the measure of their sin be filled" and casts them into hell's oven.[91]

Types of Christian Ministers and Ministry in the *Blank Bible*

In four *Blank Bible* notes Edwards typologically connects the Old Testament to Christian ministers/ministry and the sacraments.[92] Edwards points out that the Hebrew Scriptures adumbrate Christian ministers themselves, as well as important aspects of their office like preaching, prayer, and the administration of the sacraments. He finds these types in a dug-out well, Moses's intermediation, and David's slinging smooth stones.

In one of his notes, Edwards comments on the Old Testament's witness to the Christian minister's intercession in his note on Jabez's prayer (1 Chr. 4:9–10).[93] Edwards points out that Jabez "was probably a scribe" of esteemed honor who excelled in "learning and piety"—which he deduces from these verses and 1 Chronicles 2:55.[94] Granted Jabez's profession and status, Edwards concludes that his prayer recorded here "especially [made him] a type of the ministry." God's responding to his request to "enlarge [his] coast," embodies "God's enlarging the church in answer to the prayers of gospel ministers." For it is through the prayers of faithful ministers,

---

91. WJE 24:782–783.

92. For Edwards and the ministry, see Schweitzer, *Jonathan Edwards for the Church*; and Douglas Sweeney, *Jonathan Edwards and the Ministry of the Word: A Model of Faith and Thought* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2009).

93. The text says "Jabez called on God, saying, 'Oh that thou wouldest bless me, and enlarge my coast, that thine hand might be with me, and that thou wouldest keep me from evil!' And God granted him [his] request." For Edwards's additional three notes on this type, see Gen. 24:13; Ex. 34:1; 1 Sam. 17:50.

94. This verse states that the "families of the scribes dwelt at Jabez." Edwards reasons that the city "likely took its name from him" given his esteemed excellence. For Edwards and prayer, see Noll, "A Case Study."

Edwards implies, that God expands His church's "coasts," as He did for Jabez,[95] since only through prayer will God "remarkably pour out" an "effusion of the Spirit."[96]

Types of the Holy Spirit in the *Blank Bible*

Edwards typologically connects the Old Testament to the Holy Spirit in five *Blank Bible* notes.[97] Leaning on the New Testament's metaphorical depictions of the Spirit, Edwards finds types in the Old Testament's first-fruit offering as well as its connection of water with God's presence.

In one of his notes that he appends to Daniel's vision of "Messiah the prince" in the prophet's ninth chapter, Edwards typologically reflects on the Old Testament's use of anointing oil. Edwards believes this was a typological witness to the Holy Spirit.[98] He begins this page-long notation by pointing out that Gabriel refers to the prince as "the Messiah," for he "had been spoken of as to be anointed." In four "respects," Edwards then shows why Jesus is truly "the Messiah, or Christ, or the anointed"—all of which he ties to the Spirit,[99] since the Scripture typifies the Holy Spirit "by oil."[100]

---

95. WJE 24:403–404. Edwards believed strongly in prayer's importance in the ministry. It was so important to him that he devoted an entire treatise to underscoring its importance in bringing Christ's kingdom to bear. See his *An Humble Attempt* (WJE 5:309–437).

96. Detrich, "A Recital of Presence," 208–209.

97. For Edwards and the Holy Spirit, see Caldwell, *Communion in the Spirit: The Holy Spirit as the Bond of Unity in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Eugene, Ore: Wipf & Stock, 2007); Benjamin Carver, "The Development of the Redemptive Role of the Holy Spirit in the Reformed Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards" (ThM thesis, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 2010); Barshinger, *Edwards and the Psalms*, 218–72; R. A. Leo, "Holy Spirit," in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, 298–300; McClymond and McDermott, *Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 262–72; Michael Haykin, *Jonathan Edwards: The Holy Spirit in Revival* (Darlington, U.K.: Evangelical Press, 2005).

98. He focuses on Dan. 9:25, which states, "Understand that from the going forth of the commandment to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks." For Edwards's other notes on types of the Spirit, see Lev. 23:17; Num. 21:18; Deut. 9:21; 1 Sam. 17:40.

99. Edwards ties Jesus's four-fold anointing by the Spirit to His divine and human natures, to His mediation, and to "every believing soul." Edwards asserts, first, that Jesus is anointed "in his divine nature…as the Father doth eternally pour forth the Spirit of love upon him." Second, He was anointed "in his human nature…as the Spirit [was] given not by measure to him…and dwelt in him from the first moment of his existence in union with the eternal *Logos* so as to be the same person." Third, God anointed Jesus by the Spirit at His baptism so as "to consecrate him for his [mediatorial] work." Fourth, Jesus is anointed "by every believing soul, by the exercise of the grace of the Holy Spirit towards him…pouring out his soul in divine love upon him."

100. For the Bible's connection of anointing oil with the Holy Spirit, see Isa. 61:1; Acts

In other words, the Old Testament's description of leaders being "anointed by oil" prefigured the Holy Spirit's anointing Jesus to fulfill His God-given, messianic role,[101] as it is only through His Spirit that God anoints people for His sanctified purposes.[102]

Types of "Gospel Things" in the *Blank Bible*

The last antitypical category is Edwards's most general in his "Interleaved Bible." In ten notations, Edwards makes general comments about the Old Testament's typological witness to "gospel things" or "redemption." These notations do not detail the specificities of these "gospel things" or these aspects of "redemption," nor do they detail the nature of the connection between type and antitype. Edwards uncovers these types in seven biblical books, finding them in the Old Testament's description of the patriarch's blessings, the exodus, the flood, the sacrificial system, and "rest."[103]

In one of Edwards's more interesting notes in this category, he makes a brief comment about the Old Testament's typification of God's redemption through its description of covenant meals in his note on Genesis 27:4.[104] Here the aging Isaac asks Esau to kill a deer that they might enjoy a final meal together in which he will bless his son. Edwards comments that "in those days" when a parent "expected to die" they would likely "make a feast with their children" so as to give "them their dying charges." This "dying testament" was "something like a covenant." During the covenant ratification it was common for the parties "to eat together."

10:38; 1 Jn. 2:20, 27. This note strengthens Ryan Hoselton's assertion that for Edwards "simply reading passages that contained imagery of 'oil' thus excited ideas of the work of the Spirit…. Such readings were fully legitimate because God designed the mind to reflexively associate sensations with ideas." Hoselton, "Spiritually Discerned: Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and Experiential Exegesis in Early Evangelicalism" (PhD diss., Ruprecht-Karls-Universitat Heidelberg, 2019), 205.

101. David Barshinger helpfully provides insight into Edwards's thinking on this matter. He notes that for Edwards "casting oil as a type of the Holy Spirit confirmed the description of the Spirit's nature, for oil comes from the olive tree and the olive branch signifies 'love, peace, and friendship.'" This is fitting for the Spirit since His nature is one of "excellency, joy, and love." Barshinger, *Edwards and the Psalms*, 221–22.

102. WJE 24:767–68.

103. These books are Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, and John.

104. Isaac says to Esau, "Make me savoury meat, as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die." For Edwards's other types of "gospel things," see his first entry in the *Blank Bible*—occurring before Gen. 1:1—as well his notes on Ex. 12:14; Deut. 4:32–34; Ps. 29:10; Ps. 78:2; Prov. 25:11; 25:25; Isa. 43:21–28; Jn. 5:17.

Edwards then connects these actions with God's covenant ratifications. He points out that when God "makes his covenant with us" He also "doeth as it were at a feast." For when Israel covenanted with God "they were wont to make a feast before the Lord." This leads Edwards to conclude that "the patriarchs' thus blessing their children before their death exhibits to us a type of the covenant of grace, which is as it were Christ's last testament to his people."[105] This brief notation strengthens Gilsun Ryu's thesis that through the biblical covenants Edwards solidified "a Christocentric relationship between the Old and New Testaments."[106]

Conclusion

This essay has accomplished several things. First, it surveyed an important but little-known debate about the best way to describe Edwards's exegetical typology. This section underscored that there are significant differences as to whether scholars should define Edwards's biblical typology as "conservative" or "Christological." Second, this paper also provided a general overview of 210 notations in the *Blank Bible* wherein Edwards uses a word from the "type" word-family to connect a redemptive–historical sign with its signification. This essay noted that the types within these 210 notations find fulfillment in one of thirteen distinct antitypical categories: Christology, soteriology, the church, "intra"-Old Testament, "intra"-New Testament, eschatology, the world, Christian spirituality, the demonic, sin, Christian ministry/ministers, the Holy Spirit, and redemption/redemptive history generally. This essay then provided a representative notation from each of these categories that the reader might get a sense of Edwards's wide-ranging typological exegesis in the *Blank Bible.*

This survey of Edwards's biblical typology in his "Interleaved Bible" highlights five significant problems for authors like Perry Miller and Mason Lowance who describe this aspect of Edwards's exegesis as "conservative." Similarly, it presents a challenge to authors like Glenn Kreider and Stephen Nichols who categorize Edwards's typological exegesis as "Christological."[107] This notebook highlights, first, that Edwards does not

---

105. WJE 24:171. For Edwards's understanding of the covenants, see Gilsun Ryu, *The Federal Theology of Jonathan Edwards: An Exegetical Perspective* (Bellingham, Wash.: Lexham Press, 2021); Paul Hoehner, *The Covenant Theology of Jonathan* Edwards (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick, 2021); Reita Yazawa, *The Covenant of Redemption in the Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick, 2019).

106. Ryu, *Federal Theology*, 164.

107. Miller, "Introduction," 6, 27; Lowance, "'Images or Shadows of Divine Things,'"

connect only Old Testament types to Christological antitypes in the New Testament. Second, Edwards asserts that there are Old Testament types that point to Old Testament antitypes. Third, Edwards claims that there are strictly New Testament type/antitype pairs. Fourth, Edwards finds Old Testament types that adumbrate eschatological antitypes. Lastly, Edwards connects historical types to ahistorical antitypes that embody ahistorical theological/spiritual principles.

It seems, therefore, that the exegetical evidence of Edwards's *Blank Bible* strongly suggests that the authors of the Miller–Lowance line have inaccurately described Edwards's biblical typology as "conservative."[108] Likewise, this evidence underscores that it seems less than accurate for Krieder, Nichols, Michael McClymond, Stephen Holmes, and others to categorize his exegetical typology as "Christological,"[109] since Edwards's array of antitypes are too diverse to fit within such confining strictures. The manner and time in which Edwards asserts that types find fulfillment resist these restricting confines. It seems appropriate, therefore, to replace the imprecise and inaccurate words "conservative" and "Christological" with more accurate and less semantically-loaded terms to describe Edwards's biblical typology.

Granted that Edwards has both Christological and non-Christological antitypes, as well as type–antitype pairs that do not follow the Old to New Testament fulfillment schema, in addition to types that find fulfillment in the Christian's lived experience, one needs to suggest terms that are sufficiently broad to encapsulate all the evidence, but not too general so as to say nothing of significance. This essay would like to put forward the following framework to best make sense of Edwards's manifold way of typologically interpreting the Bible. That is, Edwards's interpretive practices in his "Interleaved Bible" suggest that he understands biblical typology as a kind of historiographical lens by which he interprets the world and redemptive history as a constant movement towards its God-ordained, eschatological, and teleological fulfillment.[110]

209–44; Kreider, *Edwards's Interpretation of Revelation*, 287–89; Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards's Bible*, 103–104, 106.

108. See footnote 12.

109. See footnote 19.

110. For those few authors who provide aspects of this definition, see Joseph Cochran, "Jonathan Edwards's Harmonic Interpretation of Hebrews 12:22–24," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* 10, no. 1 (2020): 25; Holbrook, "The Elaborated Labyrinth," 226–27; Leader, "In Love with the Image," 157; Clark, "The History of Redemption," 134–35, 138.

These three important concepts best encapsulate Edwards's biblical typology: spiritual, teleological, and eschatological. His typology can be called "spiritual" because he believes that God sovereignly unites types with their antitypes. For Edwards, "types" are God's intentionally designed historical harbingers of greater and/or future redemptive–historical realities (antitypes).[111] Types and antitypes, in Edwards's worldview, therefore, are "ontologically real" things that exist in explicit relationship because God intended for them to exist in relation.[112]

One can also call Edwards's biblical typology "teleological." As far as the present researcher has observed, in all of Edwards's type-antitype relationships, he always states that the antitype is the "greater" and more "significant" entity to which the "lesser" and less "significant" type points. One can also call Edwards's exegetical typology "eschatological." In *most* of Edwards's type–antitype relationships that this author has seen, he states that the type precedes its antitype in redemptive history.[113] To summarize, Edwards's actual, exegetical practices preserved in the *Blank Bible* suggest that it is most accurate *not* to refer to the pastor's biblical typology as either "conservative" or "Christological," but as his spiritual, eschatological, and teleological framework for interpreting God's unified orchestration of redemptive history.

---

111. An example of a type–antitype relationship that is "future" *and* "greater," is David and Christ. Christ arrives later in history than David and is also Israel's "greater" King. An example of a type–antitype relationship that is simply "greater" is Edwards's connection of leaven with sin. Leaven does not precede sin in redemptive history, but its sour, spreading nature is eclipsed by sin's "greater," spiritually souring, infecting nature.

112. Winslow, *A Trinitarian Theology of Nature*, 55.

113. Those type–antitype pairs that cannot be considered both teleological *and* eschatological include some of his types of Christian spirituality in which the type does not precede the antitype in time (like leaven and sin), as well as some of his biblical–ontological types in which the type exists both before and after its antitype (i.e. the rising and setting sun, which typifies Jesus's death and resurrection).

The Plain Man's Pathway to Wisdom:
The Fear of God in John Bunyan's Spirituality

MATTHEW STEWART
matts@christcommunity.com
Christ Community Church

In his dedication to *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* (1601), Arthur Dent (1552–1607) noted of his work, "As concerning the manner, heere is no great matter in learning, wit, art, eloquence, or ingenious invention; (for I have heerein specially respected the ignorant and vulgar sort, whose edification I doe chiefly aime at) yet somewhat there is, which may concern the learned, and give them some contentment."[1] To do so, Dent created an imaginary dialogue between the characters Theologus (a Divine), Philagathus (an honest man), Asunetus (an ignorant man), and Antilegon (a caviller).[2] Dent hinted at the purpose of the conversation when Theologus and Philagathus noticed the other interlocutors approaching:

> *Phila.* But behold yonder cometh two men towards us, what be they I pray you?
>
> *Theol.* They be a couple of neighbours of the next Parish, the one of them is called Asunetus, who in very deed is a very ignorant man in Gods matters: the other is called Antilegon, a notable Atheist, and caviller against all goodnesse.
>
> *Phila.* If they be such, it were good for us to take some occasion to speake of matters of religion: It may be we shall do them some good.[3]

---

1. Arthur Dent, *The Plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven. Wherein every man may clearly see, whether he shall be saved or damned. Set for Dialogue wise, for the better understanding of the simple* (London: Robert Dexter, 1601), x, Early English Books Online. All quotations from primary sources reflect the author's grammar and style.
2. Dent, *The Plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven,* 1.
3. Dent, *The Plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven,* 2.

By using an imaginary dialogue, then, Dent charted the way for people of various backgrounds to travel the path of wisdom. As if overhearing a conversation taking place on the street, the common man was given the opportunity to find life and wisdom by taking up Dent's story and listening to dialogue partners discuss eternal matters.

One such "ignorant and vulgar" fellow who benefited from Dent's book was John Bunyan (1628–1688). By way of his first wife's dowry, Bunyan read *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven*, which played an important role in his eventual conversion and in his own writings. Both *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678, 1684)[4] as well as *The Holy War* (1682)[5] reflected the kind of dialectical conversation Dent incorporated in his own work. Like his Puritan predecessor, Bunyan aimed to reach the common man. Using allegory, then, Bunyan painted a picture of how the most disadvantaged could receive salvation and journey toward the Celestial City with divine wisdom—a wisdom that began with and was maintained by the fear of God.[6]

Thus, this article will argue that the fear of God served as the compass by which Bunyan guided his readers through the moral mazes of his most influential allegorical works. As Bunyan understood it, godly fear is the disposition of the believer's soul that enables him to make right returns of his affections to God.[7] However, as his works demonstrated, the believer's worship is not confined to religious services. Rather, the right return of his affections is evidenced in the daily choices he makes along life's path. In arguing this thesis, then, this article will give a brief overview of Bunyan's work, *A Treatise of the Fear of God* (1679), survey both *The Holy War* and *The Pilgrim's Progress* to demonstrate this theme in action, and conclude with a

---

4. John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress From This World to That Which Is to Come*, 2nd ed., ed. Roger Sharrock (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

5. John Bunyan, *The Holy War Made by Shaddai upon Diabolus. For the Regaining of the Metropolis of the World. Or, the Losing and Taking Again of the Town of Mansoul*, ed. Roger Sharrock and James F. Forrest (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980).

6. "Bunyan's interests here are personal and pastoral. In *The Pilgrim's Progress* he wrote a journey allegory on salvation; in *The Holy War* he wrote a battle allegory on sanctification or godliness." Daniel V. Runyon, "*The Holy War*: Sanctification as Spiritual Warfare," *Bunyan Studies* 12 (2006/2007): 105.

7. My thanks to Dr. J. Stephen Yuille for introducing me to the concept of "the right return of the affections to God" in his 2021 Reformation and Puritan Spirituality PhD seminar at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. See J. Stephen Yuille, preface to *Christ and His Threefold Office*, by John Flavel (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2021).

summary of how Bunyan's spirituality of fear aids the believer in his relationship with God.

Overview of *A Treatise of the Fear of God*

Bunyan produced several of his most important and enduring works during the years between 1678–1684. While political turmoil in England may have played a role in the production of these works, as *A Treatise of the Fear of God* showed, Bunyan sought to help struggling believers experience the fullness of a relationship with God.[8] More specifically, Bunyan described the fear of God as a special grace God works in the hearts of the elect.[9] Thus, arguing from Revelation 14:7 ("Fear God, and give glory to him"), Bunyan stated, "I call it the highest duty, because it is as I may call it, not only a duty in it self, but, as it were, the SALT that seasoneth every duty. For there is no duty performed by us, that can by any means be accepted of God, if it be not seasoned with *godly fear*."[10] The fear of God, then, is essential for the life of faith.

However, Bunyan labored to distinguish godly fear from the various forms of ungodly fear. Godly fear is neither a mere acknowledgment of God's right to judge men's sins that fails to produce a change of heart, nor is it a dread of God's wrath that drives the sinner away from God.[11] Such "slavish fear" cannot bring about a right relationship with God that exults in His goodness. While the fear of God does include trembling at His majesty, it also entails rejoicing in His grace.[12] As Michael Reeves argues,

> The living God is infinitely perfect and quintessentially, overwhelmingly beautiful in every way: his righteousness, his graciousness, his majesty, his mercy, his all. And so we do not love him aright if our love is not a trembling, overwhelmed, and fearful love. In a sense, then, the trembling "fear of God" is a way of speaking about the intensity of the saints' love for and enjoyment of all that God is.[13]

---

8. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, ed. Richard L. Greaves, *A Treatise of the Fear of God, The Greatness of the Soul, A Holy Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 9:xix.

9. As in *The Holy War*, Bunyan uses the "fort" imagery in his treatise to describe the heart: "It is seated in the heart, and the heart is, as I may call it, the main FORT in the mystical world, *man*…But when the heart, *this principal fort*, is possessed with the fear of God, then he is safe, but not else." See *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:124.

10. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:5.

11. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:22–23.

12. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:10–11.

13. Michael Reeves, *Rejoice and Tremble: The Surprising Good News of the Fear of the Lord* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2021), 52.

God births this fear in the life of the believer by first working in him a "spirit of bondage," by which the Holy Spirit convicts him of sin and reveals the futility of his efforts to please God.[14] This form of fear, however, is only temporary, as it eventually gives way to a "spirit of adoption" wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit.[15] As a result, the believer no longer needs to dread the wrath of God because his sins have been atoned for through the cross of Christ. Thus, Bunyan stated, "I would not have them *fear* with the fear of slaves, for that will add no strength against sin, but I would have them *fear* with the reverential *fear* of Sons, and that is the way to depart from evil."[16] Indeed, the fear of God "*flows from the distinguishing love of God to his elect.*"[17]

Once the sinner is made a son, the fear of God guides him in the path of wisdom, doing so principally through the Word of God, which serves as the "Rule and Director of our FEAR."[18] "*This fear* is called, *The beginning of Wisdom* (Job 28:28; Ps. 111:10)," Bunyan argued, "because then and not till then, a man begins to be truly spiritually wise; what wisdom is there where the fear of God is not?"[19] Thus, the fear of God produces tenderness of heart toward the things of God, bears the fruit of self-denial, cuts to the core of pride, makes the believer fearful of offending his wonderful Creator, King, and Father, and leads the saint to make use of all spiritual means to cultivate godliness.[20] In doing so, godly fear protects the Christian from making shipwreck of his faith and assures him of the Father's everlasting mercy and love.[21] "There is no greater signe of wisdom than to grow in this blessed grace," Bunyan stated.[22] Thus, the man who cultivates and perseveres in the fear of the Lord will, by the grace of God, endure to the end.

As Bunyan explained, godly fear is the "darling grace" because it is a gift of God planted in the heart of anyone and everyone who would look to Christ in faith.[23] A regenerated heart that puts its hope in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus and fears God is all that is needed to have eternal peace with God. Notably, Bunyan exclaimed near the end of his treatise,

---

14. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:31.
15. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:34.
16. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:49.
17. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:56.
18. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:6.
19. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:53.
20. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:67–68, 71, 73, 105.
21. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:83.
22. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:104.
23. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:103.

Poor Christian man, thou hast scarce been able to do any thing for God all thy daies, but only to fear the Lord. Thou art no Preacher, and so canst not do him service that way: Thou art no rich man and so canst not do him service with outward substance: Thou art no wise man, and so canst not do any thing that way: But here is thy mercy, thou fearest God. Though thou canst not preach, thou canst fear God. Though thou hast no bread to feed the belly nor fleece to cloth the back of the poor, thou canst fear God. O how blessed is the man that feareth the Lord, because this duty of fearing of God is an act of the mind, and may be done by the man that is destitute of all things, but that holy and blessed mind.[24]

In summary, the fear of God played a central role in Bunyan's spirituality. As Bunyan conveyed throughout his *Treatise*, the grace of godly fear leads the spirit of bondage to give way to the spirit of adoption, in which the believer is united to Christ in faith. Godly fear also cultivates communion with God as the believer is exposed to His Word, creating a disposition of heart that leads the believer to both rejoice and tremble before his Father. However, just as Bunyan concluded his treatise with a word of comfort to "the least of these," so he aimed with a pastor's heart to show the common man how godly fear is worked out in the heart and life of the believer through his allegorical works, *The Holy War* and *The Pilgrim's Progress*.[25]

The Fear of God in *The Holy War*

In *The Pilgrim's Progress*, Bunyan used story to describe the Christian's journey through life. In *The Holy War*, however, Bunyan drew attention to the drama unfolding in the human heart.[26] Bunyan told the story of the town of Mansoul which dwelt on the Continent of Universe. Mansoul was built and established by one Shaddai. However, the vile Diabolus, along with his

---

24. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:129.

25. I was first made aware of the theme of the fear of God in Bunyan when I read Pooley's helpful introduction in the Penguin Classics edition, in which he shows Bunyan's pastoral concern that his readers walk in the fear of God. See Roger Pooley, introduction to *The Pilgrim's Progress*, by John Bunyan, ed. Roger Pooley (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), xxi.

26. Rosenfeld rightly notes, "The main literary source for all Bunyan's fictional texts was the Bible; indeed, one would not wish to argue with the perceived centrality of the Holy Scripture in his writings." Yet, it's also possible that Bunyan, as Rosenfeld notes, may have been aware of and influenced by Milton's *Paradise Lost*. See Nancy Rosenfeld, "The Holy War (1682)," in *The Oxford Handbook of John Bunyan*, ed. Michael Davies and W. R. Owens (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 277–78.

legion of Diabolonians, captured the town, seized its castle, and brought her under their sway. In his might and mercy, Shaddai sent His Son, Emanuel, to win back the town which belonged to them both by creation as well as by purchase through Emanuel's sacrifice.[27] In doing so, Emanuel and His forces captured the town and took up residence in Mansoul's castle. Though a struggle ensued for the affections of the Mansoulians, Emanuel triumphed in the end.

The principal means by which Diabolus captured Mansoul in the first place was through the alluring of the peoples' affections. He accomplished this by gaining entry through the senses, most specifically, through Ear-gate and Eye-gate. In short time, the Lords of the town gave way to Diabolus's promises, beginning with Lord Willbewill. "For as at first," Bunyan explained, "he was willing that *Diabolus* should be let into the Town; so *now* he was willing to serve him there."[28] Thus, Diabolus made Willbewill "*Captain* of the *Castle*, Governour of the *Wall*, and keeper of the Gates of *Mansoul*," by which Bunyan referred to the heart, flesh, and senses respectively.

Nevertheless, Shaddai would not stand to see Mansoul lost. Both He and Emanuel entered into an agreement by which they would win back their town. "The purport of which agreement was this," Bunyan noted, "To wit, *that at a certain time prefixed by both, the Kings Son should take a journey into the Countrey of* Universe, *and there in a way of Justice and equity, by making of amends for the follies of* Mansoul, *he should lay a foundation of her perfect deliverance from* Diabolus, *and from his Tyranny*."[29] Thus, Emanuel and his forces besieged the town of Mansoul, calling for her to submit to Shaddai and escape from Diabolus and his lies. The town, however, would have none of Emanuel's entreaties. In the end, Lord Mayor Incredulity responded by stating, "To conclude, we dread you not, we fear you not, nor will we obey your summons."[30] Through this episode, Bunyan showed how the human heart responds to God apart from true, godly fear.

---

27. Morden makes the careful observation that, "Bunyan's work also exhibits a thoroughgoing commitment to the cross of Christ. True, his epic allegory, *The Holy War*, has surprisingly little place for the cross, a point which has drawn criticism from evangelical writers. But elsewhere he insists that the cross is the place where sin is dealt with. Those who received salvation did so only through the sacrifice of Christ; they were justified only by his blood and reconciled to God only by his death." See Peter J. Morden, "John Bunyan: A Seventeenth-Century Evangelical?" *International Congregational Journal* 15, no. 2 (2016): 84.

28. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 22.

29. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 29.

30. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 49.

Yet, Emanuel's victory was immanent, despite Mansoul's hesitancy to acquiesce to His demands. Both Incredulity and Willbewill tottered back and forth on whether they should give in, while Diabolus raged at the thought of losing his prize. This conflict in Mansoul led to "perplexing fears," as they considered whether they should give themselves up to Emanuel, or if Emanuel should be taken at His word.[31] This ungodly fear, as Bunyan explained in *A Treatise of the Fear of God*, was the result of a hard heart. "If by the fear that thou hast, thy heart is not united to God and to the love of his Son, Word, and People," Bunyan explained, "thy fear is nothing worth."[32] Thus, Mansoul's fear was ungodly because it refused to be united to Shaddai, His Son, and His rule, and to believe in Emanuel's offer of pardon.

However, Emanuel's forces did not call upon the Mansoulians to respond with servile fear. In fact, upon their unsuccessful invasion of the town, Emanuel's captains sent for reinforcements. In their correspondence, they stated, "And send, Lord, as we now desire more forces to *Mansoul*, that it may be subdued; and a man to head them, that the Town may both love and fear."[33] Their request, therefore, reflected the nature of godly fear. That is, godly fear endears sinners to God as they behold both His majesty and grace. As Bunyan's allegory implied, the taking of Mansoul and her castle (the heart) was about man being captivated by God's glory and goodness in the person of Jesus Christ, so that he turned from his wicked ways and willingly submitted to His lordship.

Nevertheless, as was the case for Bunyan himself, Mansoul's transition to lasting godly fear took time. Only when Emanuel himself arrived with reinforcements did Mansoul begin to give way. Even the Recorder himself (the conscience) began to fear his ensuing destruction at the enemy's hands. Finally, when Emanuel broke through the gates (the senses), Mr. Desires-awake fell on his face and exclaimed, "*O that Mansoul might live before thee!*"[34] As the scene unfolded, the Mansoulians began to consider whether they should agree to Emanuel's terms, though Diabolus had already been cast out. They petitioned Emanuel several times to have mercy but each time the messengers were turned away, until at last they came with true

---

31. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 54.
32. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:98–99.
33. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 65.
34. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 96.

contrition and a willingness to be Emanuel's loyal and loving subjects. In His mercy, He consented to come in and dwell among them as their King.[35]

It did not take long, however, for Mansoul to go wayward once again. Though the town and her castle had been taken, the Lord Secretary now resided within her (the Holy Spirit), and the Diabolonians (the lusts of the flesh) were executed or driven out, some of Diabolus's forces remained hidden within Mansoul. Notably, Mr. Carnal Security began to wreak havoc among the Mansoulians. He was, after all, the offspring of Mr. Self-conceit and Lady Fear-nothing. Though Mansoul belonged to Emanuel once more, her citizens began to live as they had under their former bondage because of the growing influence and activity of Mr. Carnal Security.[36]

Thus, Bunyan introduced Mr. Godlyfear, an old gentleman who was "one *now* but little set by, though formerly one of great request."[37] Carnal Security invited Godlyfear to a banquet, where he hoped to ruin him and so silence his voice once and for all. However, Godlyfear rejected Carnal Security's attempts and beckoned the Mansoulians to wake up from their slumber. As a result, Mr. Conscience, that is, the Subordinate Preacher (once the Lord Recorder), also began to rouse the citizens of Mansoul. Amid their frivolity, they were unaware that Emanuel left Mansoul, though His forces remained. They began petitioning the Lord Secretary, but he refused to give them a hearing for the grief he felt over their unfaithfulness.[38] The townspeople came to realize how foolish they had been and so gave heed to Godlyfear, whom they came to consider as a prophet.[39] In turn, "that reverend Mr. *Godlyfear*" exhorted them to petition their Prince no matter how many times they may be turned away, "*For*, said he, *it is the way of the wise* Shaddai *to make men wait and to exercise patience, and it should be the way of them in want, to be willing to stay his leisure.*"[40]

Mansoul's repentance was nearly ruined by the disguise attacks of the remaining Diabolonians. Even Godlyfear was fooled for some time by Lord Anger, who addressed himself as Good-zeal. Yet, Mr. Godlyfear came to his senses, or as Diabolus said in his letter, "*The peevish old Gentleman took pepper in the nose and turned our companion out of his house. Nay he has informed us since, that he ran away from him, or else his old master had hanged him up for*

---

35. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 113.
36. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 152.
37. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 154.
38. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 157.
39. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 158.
40. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 161.

his labour."[41] This seems to be a muffled confession that even godly fear can be stunted when the believer does not watch and pray against the lusts of the flesh, such as anger. Though the fear of God amongst the Puritans has often been portrayed as a cold and unfeeling religious duty, Bunyan modeled a fear that, when controlled by the Spirit, was filled with love and joy.[42]

As it turned out, one Mr. Prywell learned of the enemy's intentions to take back the town of Mansoul. Thus, he alerted Mr. Conscience of the plot, who in turn roused the captains and elders of Mansoul to action. They began hunting down all remaining Diabolonians, petitioned Shaddai, humbled themselves through fasting, and with Lord Willbewill in the lead, fought against Diabolus and his hordes. As Willbewill and the captains went to battle with the Diabolonians, Mr. Godlyfear played the man at the castle gates. Bunyan described the scene:

> The Captains also from the Castle did hold them in continual play with their slings, to the chafing and fretting of the minds of the enemies. True, Diabolus made a great many attempts to have broken open the Gates of the Castle, but Mr. Godlyfear was made the Keeper of that; and he was a man of that courage, conduct and valour, that 'twas in vain as long as life lasted within him, to think to do that work though mostly desired, wherefore all the attempts that Diabolus made against him were fruitless; (I have wished sometimes that that man had had the whole rule of the Town of Mansoul.)[43]

Thus, Bunyan revealed the preeminence of godly fear in the spirituality of the believer. Godly fear fortifies the heart against the lusts of the flesh and the assaults of the devil in order to preserve the soul in obedience. It is "seated in the heart of man" because the heart is the control center of the will and affections. Only by protecting these vital components and ridding them of sinful influences and disordered desires can the Christian experience ongoing communion with Christ. Bunyan explained, "By the fear of the Lord men depart from evil, that is, in their Judgment, will, mind, and affections: not, that by the fear of the Lord, sin is annihilated, or has lost

---

41. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 170.

42. Reeves clarifies godly fear's true nature when he states, "This right fear of God, then, is not the minor-key, gloomy flip side to proper joy in God. There is no tension between this fear and joy. Rather, this trembling 'fear of God' is a way of speaking about the sheer intensity of the saint's happiness in God. In other words, the biblical theme of the fear of God helps us to see the *sort* of joy that is most fitting for believers." See Reeves, *Rejoice and Tremble*, 61.

43. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 206.

its being in the soul, *there* still will those *Canannites* be, but they are hated, lothed, abominated, fought against, prayed against, watcht against, strove against, and mortified, by the soul, *Rom.* 7."[44]

As he kept the castle gates, Mr. Godlyfear encouraged the people to, in contrast to their own petitions, ask the Lord Secretary to write up his own petition to Emanuel. Working with the people, then, the Lord Secretary wrote a petition to Emanuel to rescue them from the assaults of the enemy. Meanwhile, Diabolus approached the castle gates and ordered them to be opened, but Godlyfear refused his demands, stating that "*the Gate should not be opened unto him, nor to the men that followed after him.* He said moreover, *That* Mansoul *when she had suffered a while should be made perfect, strengthened, settled.*"[45] Just as Godlyfear stated, the castle gates remained shut until Emanual arrived with his forces to defeat Diabolus and his legions.[46]

In the final scene, Emanuel addressed the town of Mansoul, reminding them of his great love for them and exhorting them to walk in faithfulness to their King. As He addressed them, Emanuel drew their attention to the sovereign grace He worked in them from the very beginning. He states:

> 'Twas I that made thy sweet, bitter; thy day, night; thy smooth way, thorny, and that also confounded all that sought thy destruction. 'Twas I that set Mr. Godlyfear to work in Mansoul. 'Twas I that stirred up thy Conscience and Understanding, thy Will and thy Affections, after thy great and woful decay. 'Twas I that put life into thee, O Mansoul, to seek me, that thou mightiest find me, and in thy finding find thine own health, happiness and salvation.[47]

For Bunyan, then, salvation from sin was an act of God's mercy and grace toward the undeserving. Godly fear is the means the Lord uses to draw the sinner to Himself that he might encounter the living, holy, and majestic God through faith in Christ and come to rejoice in His kindness and love. Thus, Bunyan used *The Holy War* to teach the true nature of the fear of God, using the tool of allegory to capture the attention of the plain man.[48]

---

44. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:55.

45. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 210.

46. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 212.

47. Bunyan, *The Holy War*, 246.

48. Walker argues, "Bunyan knew that he was writing for a discerning readership that could interpret his allegory politically. Unlike the very broad appeal of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, *The Holy War* attracted the cultivated taste of a more sophisticated elite." See David Walker, "Militant Religion and Politics in *The Holy War*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Bunyan*, ed. Anne Dunan-Page (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 114. Without

The Fear of God in *The Pilgrim's Progress*

Other than the Bible, *The Pilgrim's Progress* has had a wider impact on the history of the English-speaking world than any other book. Bunyan's "similitude of a dream" portrayed the Christian's pilgrimage as one filled with trials and struggles, all through the mode of allegory.[49] By helping his readers develop a "sanctified imagination," Bunyan led his readers on a journey of discovery not only of the Celestial City but also of the fear of God.[50]

The First Part (1678)

Bunyan began The First Part by explaining to his readers that he had a dream. In his dream, he saw a man named Christian who lived in the City of Destruction. Christian began reading from a book, and as he read, he "wept and trembled."[51] Christian's family did all they could to assuage his pain, but to no avail. Eventually, Christian set out from home, much to the discouragement of his family and neighbors, in search of "Life, Life, Eternal Life."[52] As he fled, he met a man named Evangelist, who asked Christian why he was crying. Christian replied, "Sir, I perceive, by the Book in my hand, that I am Condemned to die, and after that to come to Judgment; and I find that I am not willing to do the first nor able to do the second."[53] This preparatory fear, however, was followed by a slavish fear when Christian fell into the Slough of Despond. "*Fear* followed me so hard," said Christian, "that I fled the next way, and fell in."[54] Thus, the slavish fear of judgment and the weight of his burden drove Christian on in his search for relief.

Unfortunately, Christian's freedom was delayed when he took the advice of Mr. Worldly-Wiseman to venture to the house of Mr. Legality,

---

dismissing the political background or the possibility that he may have had some political motivation in writing his stories, it seems more likely that Bunyan's aim was pastoral in nature. Both the marginal notes relating his work to Scripture and the spiritual themes found throughout these stories further emphasize his pastoral intent.

49. As Davies puts it, "*The Pilgrim's Progress* is not just an allegorical 'fable': it is a simulator for the mind's flight into Gospel '*Truth*,' and into the realm of things unseen." See Michael Davies, "The Pilgrim's Progress (1678): Chasing Apollyon's Tale," in *The Oxford Handbook of John Bunyan*, ed. Michael Davies and W. R. Owens (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 252.

50. J. I. Packer, *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2010), 334.

51. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 8.

52. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 10.

53. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 9.

54. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 15.

whom he claimed could help Christian with his burden. However, as Christian ascended the hill to Mr. Legality's home, he was overwhelmed by the difficulty of the climb and feared for his life as fire began to pour forth from the mountain so that "he did quake with fear."[55] To Christian's shame, Evangelist arrived and rebuked him for leaving the path and attempting to climb Mt. Sinai in his own strength.

The nature of Christian's fear began to change, however, when he reached the Wicket-gate. When Christian knocked, a man named Good-will met him. After hearing his plea, Good-will granted him entrance and pulled him through. When Christian asked why he was pulled in, Good-will informed him that Beelzebub and his servants shot arrows at those seeking entrance at the Wicket-gate. Upon hearing his explanation, Christian stated, "I rejoyce and tremble."[56] This, for Bunyan, was the effect of godly fear. While conviction of sin and fear of judgment accompanies the initial stages of the Spirit's drawing, it gives way to a sweeter experience of the person and grace of Jesus Christ.

Fear was personified for the reader when Christian arrived at the Interpreter's house and encountered the man in the Iron Cage of Despair. This man's persistence in sin rendered him unable to repent so that "there now remains to me nothing but threatnings, dreadful threatnings, fearful threatnings of certain Judgement and firy Indignation, which shall devour me as an Adversary."[57] This example of ungodly fear and the failure to repent, however, served as a warning for Christian to watch, be sober, and pray. In a similar but more positive light, Christian was taught to both "hope and fear" when he heard a man recount a terrible dream of God's coming judgment and of how the Judge "had always his eye upon me."[58] However, in sending Christian on his journey, the Interpreter said, "The Comforter be always with thee good *Christian*, to guide thee in the way that leads to the City."[59] Thus, Christian was moved to perseverance in the faith by the fear of God and the coming judgment, while at the same time he was reminded that the Holy Spirit's presence and power will lead him safely home.

Following his encounter with Apollyon, Christian passed through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, through which he was harassed by sights, sounds, and smells that were meant to drive him back to the City

---

55. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 20.
56. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 25.
57. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 35.
58. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 37.
59. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 37.

of Destruction. At a crucial moment, however, Christian thought he heard someone quoting from Psalm 23:4, "I will fear no ill, for thou art with me." As a result, Christian was comforted by the thought "that some who feared God were in this Valley as well as himself," and that "God was with them."[60] In an important development of his spirituality, then, Bunyan emphasized that the fear of God was rooted in the knowledge of His presence in and with His people as they journeyed together. Communion with God and growth in godliness, then, took place in community, a truth which came to center stage in the Second Part.[61]

After the death of Christian's companion, Faithful, at Vanity Fair, he was joined by Hopeful, who had been converted after seeing Christian and Faithful endure suffering. As Christian and Hopeful journeyed together, they managed to avoid Demas and his Silver-Mine, into which many would-be pilgrims fell for the love of money. Shortly thereafter, they came across a Pillar of Salt, which was Lot's Wife. This monument stood by the side of the path to warn pilgrims against the sin of covetousness. Upon reflection, Hopeful noted, "This ministreth occasion to us to thank God, to fear before him, and always to remember *Lot's* Wife."[62] Just as fear prepares the sinner to receive God's grace, so it is a grace in and of itself intended to encourage believers to watch and pray against sin.[63]

As such, godly fear drives out slavish fear. This is evidenced when Hopeful encouraged Christian not to give in to the fear of Giant Despair when they sat captive in Doubting-Castle. Christian, in fact, was tempted to take his own life because of his desperate emotional condition. However, Hopeful reminds Christian, "*Remember how thou playdest the man at Vanity-Fair, and wast neither afraid of the Chain nor Cage; nor yet of bloody Death: wherefore let us (at least to avoid the shame, that becomes not a Christian to be found in) bear up with patience as well as we can.*"[64] In recalling Christian's endurance through Vanity Fair, Hopeful reminded him of God's past faithfulness. This reminder encouraged both men to patiently wait

---

60. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 64.

61. "It is possible that his pastoral experience during the decade before Part II was published led Bunyan to give more attention to the life and purpose of a local congregation." Bethany Joy Bear, "Fantastical Faith: John Bunyan and the Sanctification of Fancy," *Studies in Philology* 109, no. 5 (2012): 683.

62. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 110.

63. Joel R. Beeke and Paul M. Smalley, *John Bunyan and the Grace of Fearing God* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 2016), 90–91.

64. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 117.

for deliverance. Thus, God's past faithfulness strengthened their faith and deepened their fear of God.[65]

The notion of ungodly fear was made more explicit when Christian and Hopeful interacted with the Shepherds at the delectable Mountains. The men were shown the side of a hill in which lay a door that opened to a horrific scene of flames and the cries of torment. The Shepherds explained that this was the By-way to Hell. This sight provoked Christian and Hopeful to continue their journey. However, the Shepherds first invited them to look through their Perspective Glass, by which they could see all the way to the Gate of the Celestial City. As they looked, however, their vision was blurred because their hands shook with fear from the scene at the By-way to Hell. Bunyan noted in the margin that this trembling was "the fruit of slavish fear."[66] Thus, Bunyan showed that true godly fear was meant to drive Christians to delight in God rather than fear the torments of hell. In fact, godly fear was the springboard to joy in Christ, who delivers those, "who through feare of death were all their life time subject to bondage (Hebrews 2:15)."[67]

Perhaps one of the clearest descriptions of godly fear followed a conversation Christian and Hopeful had with Ignorance. Time and time again, Ignorance foolishly rejected their warnings about the wretchedness of his sin. In reflecting on Ignorance's refusal to accept their counsel, Hopeful stated to Christian, "I do believe as you say, that fear tends much to Mens good, and to make them right, at their beginning to go on Pilgrimage."[68] Indeed, as Christian noted about godly fear, "It is caused by saving convictions for sin. It driveth the soul to lay fast hold of Christ for Salvation," and "it begetteth and continueth in the soul a great reverence of God, his word, and ways."[69] Though Hopeful seemed to move on to another subject, Christian elaborated on the subject of fear, explaining how the ignorant avoid the fear of God by rejecting conviction of sin. They do so by thinking that

---

65. Beeke and Smalley, *John Bunyan and the Grace of Fearing God*, 49.

66. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 123.

67. "The Puritans agree that the difference between 'servile' and 'filial' fear is determined by the individual's view of God. Ungodly fear is the result of viewing God as a potential source of harm. It caused people to take steps to minimize the perceived threat whilst remaining steadfast in their sin…. In marked contrast, godly fear is the result of viewing God as the greatest good. Such a view of God's greatness and goodness causes the faculties of the soul to function in their proper sequence, resulting in changed behavior." J. Stephen Yuille, *Puritan Spirituality: The Fear of God in the Affective Theology of George Swinnock*, Studies in Christian History and Thought (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2008), 76–77.

68. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 150.

69. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 150.

"those fears are wrought by the Devil, that these fears tend to the spoiling of their faith," thus they "presume they ought not to fear, and therefore, in despite of them, wax presumptuously confident," and they "see that these fears tend to take away from them their pitiful old self-holiness, and therefore they resist them with all their might."[70]

When Christian and Hopeful reached their journey's end, Bunyan made two important moves that rounded out his understanding of fear. First, he noted that as the men were brought to the gate of the Celestial City, the Angels announced, "These Pilgrims are come from the City of *Destruction*, for the love that they bear to the King of this place."[71] In doing so, he showed that fear of God and love for God complemented each other. Second, he gave a final warning to his reader by conveying Ignorance's denied entrance at the gate. Unable to produce a Certificate, Ignorance was carried by the Shining Ones to the By-way to Hell. Bunyan concluded, "Then I saw that there was a way to Hell, even from the Gates of Heaven, as well as from the City of *Destruction*."[72] In a similar vein, Bunyan explained in *A Treatise of the Fear of God*,

> Work out your salvation with fear. Not that work is meritorious, or such that can purchase eternal life, for eternal life is obtained by hope in Gods mercy, but this hope if it be right, is attended with this godly fear, which fear putteth the soul upon a diligent use of all those means that may tend to the strengthening of hope, and so to the makeing of us holy in all manner of conversation, that we may be meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light. For hope purifieth the heart, if fear of God shall be its companion, and so maketh a man a vessel of mercy prepared unto glory.[73]

The Second Part (1684)

Bunyan indicated in his introduction that the Second Part was a response to the spread of several counterfeit editions of his work. In addition, the positive reception of the first part encouraged him to fill in gaps in the narrative and give his readers an answer as to what happened to Christian's family.[74] Though many of his contemporaries disagreed with his use of allegory,[75]

---

70. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 151.
71. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 161.
72. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 163.
73. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:74.
74. Bear, "Fantastical Faith: John Bunyan and the Sanctification of Fancy," 686.
75. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 171.

Bunyan defended his method by grounding it in both biblical examples as well as in the fact that, while not all would accept his delivery, many would greatly benefit from it, especially those who sought to walk by faith.[76]

As was the case with Christian in The First Part, Christiana, Mercie, and the children arrived at the Wicket-Gate, where they contemplated how they should knock for admittance. Bunyan noted in the margin, "*Prayer should be made with Consideration and Fear; As well as in Faith and Hope*."[77] When they began knocking, a large dog growled as if it were getting closer and closer. Finally, Good-will permitted Christiana and her children entrance, but Mercie was left outside. As they talked, Mercie beat on the door so loudly that it scared Christiana. When Good-will opened to her, Mercie fainted from fear. Yet, Good-will took her by the hand and said, "Fear not, but stand upon thy Feet, and tell me wherefore thou art come."[78] In this episode, Bunyan conveyed how the "spirit of bondage" drove sinners to flee from the wrath to come. Once again, however, this served only as the beginning stage of godly fear. As Good-will later explained, though the dog does not belong to him, nevertheless, "shall a Dog, a Dog in an other Mans Yard: a Dog, whose barking I turn to the Profit of Pilgrims, keep any from coming to me? I deliver them from the Lions, their Darling from the power of the Dog."[79] Thus, Christiana sang, "*Our Tears to joy, our fears to Faith Are turned, as we see: Thus our beginning, (as one saith,) Shews what our end will be.*"

Before setting out from the Interpreter's house to continue their journey, he insisted that the whole company should go to the Garden "to the *Bath*," where they were to be made "clean from the soil which they have gathered by traveling."[80] As Bunyan noted in the margin, this was "*The Bath* Sanctification." Having received their washing, the company set out and began singing, "*To move me for to watch and pray, To strive to be sincere, To take my Cross up day by day, And serve the Lord with fear.*"[81] However, it is important to see that Bunyan placed the pilgrims' justification before their

---

76. "What we are invited to learn from the allegorical '*Method*' of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, then, is that faith itself is something that requires us to perceive a reality based, in a Pauline sense, in things 'unseen.'" Davies, "The Pilgrim's Progress (1678): Chasing Apollyon's Tale," 251.

77. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 188.

78. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 190.

79. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 193.

80. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 207.

81. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 209.

sanctification.[82] In doing so, he showed that salvation was accomplished through Christ's atoning death, while the believer's growth in holiness took place through sanctification as the progressive work of God in and through his obedience.[83] Thus, only those who continually experienced this transformative power truly walked in the fear of the Lord.

It is especially interesting to note the time and space Bunyan gave to describing Mr. Fearing. This Mr. Fearing experienced trouble with fear from the start. He was almost consumed in the Slough of Despond, could barely knock at the Gate, and lay outside the door of the Interpreter's house until Great-heart brought him inside. "Only he seemed glad," Great-heart recounted, "when he saw the Cross and the Sepulcher. There I confess he desired to stay a little, to look; and he seemed for a while after to be a little *Cheary*."[84] However, as Great-heart made clear, his "trouble *was not about such things as those*, his Fear was about his Acceptance at last."[85] Despite his struggle with slavish fear, Mr. Fearing reached the River of Death, where Great-heart noted, "And here also I took notice of what was very remarkable, the Water of that River was lower at this time, than ever I saw it in all my Life; so he went over at last, not much above wet-shod."[86]

Bunyan seemed to anticipate the reader's confusion about the coexistence of godly and slavish fear with Great-heart's response to Hopeful: "There are two sorts of Reasons for it; one is, The wise God will have it so. Some must *Pipe*, and some must *Weep*: Now Mr. Fearing was one that

---

82. After permitting them entrance at the Wicket-Gate, the Keeper of the gate told Christiana and Mercie, "I grant Pardon by word and deed; by word in the promise of Forgiveness: by deed in the way I obtained it. Take the first from my Lips with a kiss, and the other, as it shall be revealed." The "deed" that the Keeper revealed was the sight of Christ crucified—a sight which would serve also as a comfort throughout the pilgrims' journey. See John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, ed. Roger Pooley (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), 193.

83. Greaves notes, "Elsewhere in his writings Bunyan argued at length that baptism was *not* compulsory; to make it so in *The Pilgrim's Progress* would go against the position he defended in the 1670's." See Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2002), 509.

84. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 251. In a similar vein, Bunyan noted in his treatise on the fear of God, "If thou wouldst be rid of an hard heart, that great enemy to the growth of the grace of fear, *Be much with Christ upon the Cross in thy Meditations*; For that is an excellent remedy against hardness of heart: a right sight of him, as he hanged there for thy sins, will dissolve thy heart into tears, and make it soft and tender. *They shall look upon me whom they have pierced and mourn* (*Zech*. 12. 10,11). Now a soft, a tender, and broken heart, is a fit place for the grace of fear to thrive in." See *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:119.

85. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 251.

86. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 253.

play'd upon *this Base*…Only here was the imperfection of Mr. *Fearing*, he could play upon no other Musick but this, till towards his latter end."[87] According to Bunyan, then, the all-wise God ordained some to wrestle with such fear; nevertheless, the same believers feared God more than most. "No fears, no Grace," said Christiana's son, James. "Though there is not always Grace where there is fear of Hell; yet to be sure there is no Grace where there is no fear of God." To which Great-heart replied, "*Well said*, James, *thou hast hit the Mark, for the fear of God is the beginning of Wisdom; and to be sure they that want the* beginning, *have neither* middle *nor* end."[88] Through Mr. Fearing's story, Bunyan encouraged his readers to distinguish between slavish and godly fear so that they would live with both reverence and confidence.[89] Bunyan himself knew from experience how devastating slavish fear could be to the believer's faith. He wrote, then, not merely as a storyteller, but as one who had experienced the grace of fearing God.[90]

Near the end of the story, the reader meets Valiant-for-Truth. Though confronted by three men who threatened to do him harm, Valiant-for-Truth fought them off. After meeting the company of pilgrims and recounting those recent events, Mr. Great-heart and the rest of the travelers welcomed him gladly, and so Valiant-for-Truth rejoiced, "Hobgoblin, *nor foul* Fiend, *Can* daunt *his Spirit: He knows, he* at the end, Shall Life Inherit. *Then Fancies fly away, He'l fear not what men say, He'l labour Night and Day,* To be a Pilgrim."[91]

Of course, the adversity the pilgrims were met with included temptations to sin. While making their way through the mist of the Enchanted Ground, the pilgrims came across Mr. Stand-fast, whom they found kneeling in prayer. As he explained, he had been approached by one Madam Bubble, who offered "her *Body*, her *Purse*, and her *Bed*."[92] Nevertheless, Mr. Stand-fast rejected her seductions. She persisted, however, with her temptation, leading Mr. Stand-fast to fall to his knees in prayer. Just as he did,

---

87. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 254.

88. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 254–55.

89. "For if God shall come to you indeed, and visit you with the forgiveness of sins, that visit removeth the guilt, but increaseth the sense of thy filth, and the sense of this that God hath forgiven a filthy sinner, will make thee both rejoyce and tremble." *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 9:10–11.

90. Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 717.

91. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 295.

92. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 300.

the pilgrims arrived, and the temptress was driven away. When Mr. Stand-fast asked his old friend Mr. Honest what he thought when they came upon him while he was on his knees, Mr. Honest answered that he was encouraged to find "an honest Man upon the Road, and therefore should have his Company by and by." To which Stand-fast replied, "*If you thought not amiss, how happy am I! But if I be not as I should, I alone must bear it.*"[93] Thus, showing his concern to be found blameless, Honest responded to his friend, "That is true…but your fear doth further confirm me that things are right betwixt the Prince of Pilgrims and your Soul. For he saith, *Blessed is the Man that feareth always.*"[94] Thus, Bunyan emphasized the role the fear of God played in resisting temptation and walking in blamelessness. Note, however, the sense of joy and relief conveyed in this episode. Mortifying the flesh means exchanging temporary pleasures for eternal joy. As the saint cultivates this sin-crucifying fear of God, his desire to be found blameless and to experience the joy of his Master grows.[95]

Having arrived at the Land of Beulah, the pilgrims waited expectantly for the Shining Ones to bring news of their impending departure to the Celestial City. Christiana was the first to be called home, but before she passed through the River, she spoke a few final words to her family and fellow pilgrims. In particular, she exhorted Much-afraid: "Be ye watchful, and cast away Fear; be sober, and hope to the End."[96] Similarly, she urged Mr. Feeble-Mind to "repent thee of thy aptness to fear and doubt of his Goodness before he sends for thee, lest thou shouldest when he comes, be forced to stand before him for that Fault with Blushing."[97] In both cases, the pilgrims were exhorted to put off slavish fear and put on hope, which they would do if they remembered the goodness of God. Thus, Bunyan focused the reader's attention on the need to recognize *who* was to be trusted. In Bunyan's spirituality, then, the fear of the Lord cleared the believer's gaze to behold the King in His beauty. In doing so, the Christian's affections were rightly ordered, enabling him to trust the character of God and so obey Him in thought, word, and deed.[98]

---

93. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 300.
94. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 300.
95. Packer, *A Quest for Godliness*, 114.
96. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 306.
97. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 306.
98. What Yuille notes of George Swinnock was true of Bunyan's own spirituality: "For Swinnock, this means the soul embraces God—'his will chooseth him, his affections love him, his desire is after him, his delight is in him, his fear is of him, his trust is on him, his

Conclusion

Bunyan's use of story played a pivotal role in his pastoral aim to make the gospel known to the common man and to shepherd believers in godliness. As this article shows, the fear of God was central to Bunyan's allegorical works and his understanding of true spirituality—a spirituality directed according to Scripture, established by the gospel, and lived out through renewed affections. To experience communion with Christ, the believer must distinguish between slavish fear and godly fear. The former leads the sinner away from God, while the latter draws him toward God's majesty and beauty in humble and hope-filled worship.

For Bunyan, then, true spirituality was about coming to enjoy life with God as He intended. The fear of God is not, as Michael Reeves puts it, "the gloomy theological equivalent of eating your greens." Instead, "It frees us from our crippling fears, giving us instead a most delightful, happy, and wonderful fear."[99] The Christian who desires to enjoy God, then, must cultivate godly fear through a growing knowledge of God as revealed through His Word and in the person of Jesus Christ. By meditating on God's self-revelation, the Christian fortifies his heart against the lusts of the flesh and the lies of the enemy, giving room for the nurturing of his affections. As a result, the believer's will is both encouraged and equipped to walk in wisdom throughout life's journey.

To be sure, the believer will continue struggling against the world, the flesh, and the Devil for the rest of his life. However, as Bunyan conveyed in *The Holy War*, the fear of God unites the believer's heart in loyalty to the King and in opposition against the enemy, enabling him to turn away from evil and continue walking in the truth (Job 28:28; Ps. 86:11). Because the believer's victory over sin and death is certain through the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, he has ample reason to press on in the fear of God, or as the apostle Paul stated, "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. 7:1). True godly fear, then, leads the believer to mortify the lusts of the flesh because his affections are being continually cultivated in holy love for the God before whom he both rejoices and trembles. Thus, title, talent, and treasure are not necessary for a life pleasing to God—only faith in Christ and the fear of God.

---

care and endeavour is to walk worthy of the Lord unto all well-pleasing.' This sensible (or inclinational) knowledge of God is the fear of God." Yuille, *Puritan Spirituality*, 74–75.

99. Reeves, *Rejoice and Tremble*, 16.

Wilhelmus à Brakel's Understanding of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*: Faith as Voluntary Trust in God and Habituation in Christian Life

SAM HYEONG RAE JO

samhjo@hotmail.com

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

One of the chief concerns of pastors and theologians during the post-Reformation era was the nature of saving faith and its relation to the assurance of salvation. Reformed theologians conceived faith as the sole instrument of receiving salvation. They wanted to clarify that the act of faith does not originate in human beings, and they wanted to affirm that righteousness is not imputed through the act of believing. In contrast with Reformed theologians, Jacobus Arminius (1560–1609), a leading figure of the Counter-Reformation movement, hesitated to proclaim faith as the receiving instrument of justification. Arminians argued faith as a work or principle of good work, while the Reformed believed that faith was the only instrument for receiving justification.[1] While the Reformed devotees believed faith to be a gift of God that enabled believers to rest upon Christ with their will and heart, Arminianism believed faith to be a human act of believing as a means of acquiring justification.[2] This tendency on the

---

1. Jacob Arminius, *The Works of Arminius*, trans. James Nichols and W. R. Bagnall (Auburn, Buffalo: Derby, Miller and Orton, 1853), 1:363–65 (articles XXVI), 2:474; Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 4:114; Henri A. Krop, "Philosophy and the Synod of Dordt. Aristotelianism, Humanism, and the Case against Arminianism," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011), 62–63; James T. Dennison, Jr., ed., *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*, 1–4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008), *Canons of Dort*, 3–4.2.6; *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 11.2; John V. Fesko, *The Theology of the Westminster Standards: Historical Context and Theological Insights* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2014), 218–22.

2. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 14,1–2; *Heidelberg Catechism*, Q. 20–21; *Canons of Dort*, 1.1.5–6, 2.2.4; Arminius, *The Works of Arminius*, 1:365–66 (articles XXVII); Aza Goudriaan, "Justification by Faith and the Early Arminian Controversy," in *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt*, ed. Maarten Wisse, Marcel Sarot, and Willemien Otten (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 155–78, see particularly at 156–58, 163.

understanding of the nature of saving faith led Reformed theologians to conceive the ideas of *actus fidei* (act of faith) and *habitus fidei* (habit or disposition of faith).

The idea of conceptualizing faith as both an act and a habit originates in Thomistic theology.[3] Reformed (orthodox) theologians employed the concepts of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei* to understand the active and passive role of human agents in salvation. Reformed theologians preferred to argue for *habitus fidei* in opposition to the Arminians.[4] But there was both continuity and discontinuity on the understanding of the nature of faith among the Reformed theologians. Since *actus fidei* offers a nuanced concept of faith in which salvation is received through human actions and works, many Reformed theologians, particularly Dutch ones, tended to understand faith exclusively as *habitus fidei*.[5] However, not all Reformed theologians understood faith as *habitus*, and some emphasized *actus fidei* over *habitus fidei*, including Wilhelmus à Brakel (1635–1711), one of the important figures in the *Nadere Reformatie* (c. 1600–1750).[6] Hence, it is notable to investigate continuity and discontinuity on the understanding of the nature of faith among Reformed theologians.

While Reformed theologians contended on the distinction between *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*, the discussion of the distinction between *actus*

---

3. Tad W Guzie, "The Act of Faith According to St. Thomas: A Study in Theological Methodology," *The Thomist: A Speculative Quarterly Review* 29, no. 3 (1965): 239–80; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of English Dominican Province (Notre Dame, Ind.: Christian Classics, 1948), 2a2ae 2.1.

4. Maarten Wisse, "*Habitus Fidei*: An Essay on the History of Concept," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 56, no. 2 (2003): 187; Bavinck, *RD*, 4:114.

5. Bavinck, *RD*, 4:114; Abraham Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (New York, London: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1900), 396; Alexander Comrie, *Stellige En Praktikale Verklaring van Den Heidelbergschen Catechismus* (Minnertsga: J. Bloemsma, 1856), 386; Gisbertus Voetius, *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum* (Ultrajecti, 1648), 2:499; Joel R. Beeke, "Gisbertus Voetius: Toward a Reformed Marriage of Knowledge and Piety," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, Studies in Christian History and Thought (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 235–36; Besides Dutch theologians, English and Scottish theologians including Robert Rollock (1555–1598), John Davenant (1572–1641), John Preston (1587–1628), John Owen (1616–1683), and Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680) understood faith as an infused habit. See John V. Fesko, "Aquinas's Doctrine of Justification and Infused Habits in Reformed Soteriology," in *Aquinas Among the Protestants*, ed. Manfred Svensson and David VanDrunen (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2018), 253–55.

6. The term *nadere* is difficult to translate into English. *Nadere Reformatie*, however, is being translated as "continuing reformation," "further reformation," and "second reformation."

and *habitus* has received minimal attention in the literature.[7] Furthermore, few studies have been conducted in English on *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*.[8] Although several studies have explored the concept of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*, à Brakel's understanding of faith and his accentuation of *actus fidei* have not been deeply investigated.

This paper explores à Brakel's understanding of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei* in his theology, assessing the reasons that drove him to accentuate *actus fidei*. His understanding of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei* is dubious when he explains the nature of faith as a disposition. Despite his preference for *actus*, he did not utterly discard the concept of *habitus*.[9] He attempted to strike a balance between *actus* and *habitus* by arguing that faith is a voluntary trust in God that must be continued throughout the Christian life. While he strongly stressed his argument based on *actus fidei*, he continued to rely on the concept of *habitus* in his discussion of faith and sanctification. À Brakel strongly affirmed the necessity of an active confession of

---

7. Many studies have been done on *habitus fidei*, but there are fewer studies on the distinction between *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei* than the studies on *habitus fidei*. For studies on *habitus fidei*, see Wisse, "*Habitus Fidei*: An Essay on the History of Concept," 172n3.

8. Recently, Maarten Wisse wrote an article that surveys the historical concept of *habitus fidei* and compares the Reformed view of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*. He observes the distinction between the habits and acts of faith and provides a theoretical basis for pastoral practice. Wisse, "*Habitus Fidei*: An Essay on the History of Concept," 172–89. Gerrit van den Brink also compares the concept of *actus* and *habitus* in the theology of Alexander Comrie (1706–1774) and John Cotton (1585–1652). By investigating Comrie's interpretation of Heidelberg Catechism Q. 20, van den Brink finds similarities between Comrie and Cotton. Although he did not explore the view of à Brakel, van den Brink's article is noteworthy to understand the surrounding debates on the concept of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei* in Reformed theology. Gerrit A. van den Brink, "The Act or Habit of Faith? Alexander Comrie's Interpretation of Heidelberg Catechism Question 20," in *Reformed Orthodoxy in Scotland: Essays on Scottish Theology 1560–1775*, ed. Aaron Clay Denlinger (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 253–69. Joel Beeke surveys the distinction between *actus* and *habitus* in Reformed orthodox theologians, and he proposes à Brakel as a representative theologian who accentuated *actus* over *habitus*. He also compares the views of Comrie and Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680) regarding *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*. Beeke observes that the Puritans were inclined to stress *actus fidei*, while Dutch theologians tended to accentuate *habitus fidei*. Joel R. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 147, 188–89, 284–85, 370. See 285n29. "Specifically, they [the debate between van Thuyen and Driessen] were being influenced by à Brakel's heavy accent on faith as an act (*daad*) at the expense of the principle (*habitus*) of faith."

9. Wilhemus à Brakel, *Christian's Reasonable Service.*, trans. Bartel Elshout, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Book, 2012), 2:266; K. Exalto, "Genadeleer en Heilsweg," in *Theologische Aspecten van de Nadere Reformatie*, ed. T. Brienen (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993): 151–208, see at 180.

faith, and he stressed *habitus* in terms of fitting habituation instead of the capacity to believe. Therefore, an investigation of the historical context of the seventeenth-century Netherlands must be undertaken to understand à Brakel's perspective. The distinction between the two concepts considers the theological controversies related to the Arminians and the historical context and pastoral concerns of à Brakel. There was both continuity and discontinuity among *Nadere Reformatie* theologians and post-Reformation Reformed theologians on the view of faith. Some accentuated *actus fidei*, but others emphasized *habitus fidei*. Therefore, it is noteworthy to investigate how à Brakel emphasized *actus fidei*.

Understanding *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*

The concept of and distinction between *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei* were derived from the theology of Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274).[10] Although the concept of habit originated in Aristotelian philosophy, Aquinas adopted it into his theology. Initially, the concept of *habitus* consisted of two characteristics: disposition, and habits formed by repeated actions. In this mode, habit as a disposition forces one's will to perform certain actions, and these actions could become the habit of a person who acts in repetition. Aristotle stressed the concept of habit (*hexis*) as a state or disposition of human action obtained by repeatedly acting in a certain manner.[11] Furthermore, habit can be acquired and developed over time through training.[12] Habit also consists of the characteristics of inclination and disposition.[13] The concept of habit initiates the disposition and inclination of the will to operate upon the heart to perform certain actions.[14] Bonnie Kent has noted that "a *hexis* or *habitus*…is a durable characteristic of the agent inclining to certain kinds of actions and emotional reactions, not the actions and reactions themselves. Acquired over time, habits grow to be 'second nature' for the individuals."[15] In brief, the Thomistic view of *habitus* indicates a duplex

---

10. Aquinas, *ST*, 2a2ae 2.1–8.

11. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library 73 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926): 1103a14–19; Christopher Cleveland, *Thomism in John Owen* (London: Routledge, 2013), 70–71.

12. Wisse, "*Habitus Fidei*: An Essay on the History of Concept," 175–76.

13. Aristotle, *NE*, 1103a14–25; Muller, *PRRD*, 1:355.

14. Aquinas, *ST*, 1a2ae 51.1; Brian Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 225.

15. Bonnie Kent, "Habits and Virtues Ia-IIae, Qq. 49–70," in *Ethics of Aquinas*, ed. Stephen J. Pope (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2002), 116.

nature of habit.[16] On the one hand, habit is acquired by repeated action over time. On the other hand, habit is also a disposition, and an operative power of the will produces one's actions. These distinctions of habit led Christian theologians to distinguish between acquired habit and infused habit. Aquinas and other theologians understood infused habit as a gift from God that allowed people's impotence to attain good habits before God.[17] Reformed theologians acknowledged habit as both a God-given disposition and a product of repeated action.[18]

Aquinas explored the logic and order of faith in regard to *habitus fidei* and *actus fidei*. He explained that disposition acts as a habit and that one's habit is known by actions.[19] Following the Aristotelian understanding of habit, Aquinas also conceived habit as having the characteristics of both disposition and repeated actions. In sum, habit as a disposition produces an act of faith, and the continuation of the act produces a particular habit of faith. Thus, faith must be actualized in believers. The act of faith is related to the will and the rational power of the soul. One must know the object of faith, and one must consent to what one knows about faith. The act of faith, as a God-given disposition, agrees (*assensus*) with divine truth.[20]

Petrus van Mastricht (1630–1706), a proponent of *actus*, explored the logic and order of the nature of faith. He defined faith as an act, and he listed the nature of saving faith in the following order: (1) seminal faith, (2) the disposition or state of faith, (3) habitual faith, and (4) actual faith.[21] A reciprocal relationship could illuminate the relationship between *habitus* and *actus*, yet considering *habitus fidei* in the seed or seminal form and disposition as a predecessor to *actus fidei* is easier.

---

16. Thomas Aquinas interpreted Aristotle's view of habit in the context of grace. Aristotle, *NE*, 1103a19–25; Aquinas, *ST*, 1a2ae 1.1; Cleveland, *Thomism in John Owen*, 77–78; Jean Porter, "Virtues and Vices," in *The Oxford Handbook of Aquinas*, ed. Brian Davies and Eleonore Stump (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 266–67; Fesko, "Aquinas's Doctrine of Justification and Infused Habits in Reformed Soteriology," 249–66.

17. Aquinas, *ST*, 1a2ae 51.4; Wisse, "*Habitus Fidei*: An Essay on the History of Concept," 176.

18. Wisse, "*Habitus Fidei*: An Essay on the History of Concept," 176; Voetius, *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum*, 2:499; Muller, *PRRD*, 1:355–59.

19. Aquinas, *ST*, 2a2ae 4.1–2.

20. Aquinas, *ST*, 2a2ae 2.1; 2.9–10.

21. Petrus van Mastricht, *Theoretical-Practical Theology*, ed. Joel R. Beeke, trans. Todd M. Rester (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2018), 2:7. Van Mastricht understood faith as an act of believing. See Van Mastricht, *TPT*, 2:4.

Theologians during the *Nadere Reformatie* made a *habitus–actus* distinction in their views of faith. Following Aquinas, Reformed theologians understood *habitus fidei* as having the disposition or capacity to have faith and *actus fidei* as the act of actualizing the operation of faith. *Habitus fidei* was conceived as a seminal form and disposition for belief, yet repeated actions also produce habit. According to Muller, "a person does not simply know a fact—he must first be *disposed* to know it."[22] Furthermore, *habitus fidei* signifies that faith is not a natural capacity within people; instead, God gives them the grace to have faith that has the potency and ability to make the act of believing possible.[23] According to this concept of *habitus fidei*, the general working of the Holy Spirit on faith and regeneration may precede any human act and habits.[24] Certainly, *habitus fidei* does not precede God's grace, nor does it prepare for the act of faith; rather, God bestows grace upon people to assent to the truth revealed by God.[25] In other words, one cannot have sufficient knowledge of salvation and sincerely believe in God if God has not granted the disposition to do so. Reformers also affirmed man's impotence to know and believe the divine truth. Therefore, *habitus fidei* refers to the passive receiving of divine truth.

In contrast to *habitus fidei*, *actus fidei* is the act of actualizing the operation of faith, through which the intellect and will appropriate and assent to the object of faith. This concept refers to the person who has already been regenerated through God's Word and Spirit and who exercises these powers in the acts of believing and loving.[26] The actualization of faith consists of three aspects of faith known as *notitia* (knowledge), *assensus* (assent), and *fiducia* (trust). One must have knowledge of salvation, assent to that knowledge, and trust in Christ. While *habitus fidei* was understood as a seminal form of faith and entailed the disposition to have faith, *actus fidei*

---

22. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:356.

23. Van den Brink, "The Act or Habit of Faith?" 254; Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1985), 134.

24. T. Brienen, *Theologische Aspecten van de Nadere Reformatie* (Amsterdam: Bolland, 1974), 185.

25. Joseph R. Laracy, "A Comparative Analysis of the Actus Fidei in Neo-Scholastic and Transcendental Thomism: An Investigation of the Theologies of Johann Brunsmann, SVD and Pierre Rousselot, SJ," *Journal of Religion and Theology* 3, no. 3 (2019): 37.

26. Bavinck, *RD*, 4:114, 150; Muller, *DLGTT*, 21–22, 134. Muller writes, "The act or *actus* of faith, although it may be defined as an operation, is not an activity in the sense of a deed or a work, but an operation in the sense of an actualization in which faith comes to be faith or, in other words, moves from potency to actuality." See Laracy, "A Comparative Analysis of the Actus Fidei in Neo-Scholastic and Transcendental Thomism," 37, 39–41.

is actualized faith that transitions from *habitus* to action. In other words, *actus fidei* signifies the activeness of believing, and *habitus fidei* refers to the passiveness and seminal form of believing.

Historical Context of the Netherlands in the à Brakel's Context

As a result of the Great Revolt in 1572, the church in the Netherlands successfully continued the reformation of the medieval church.[27] The Reformed church was settled in the Netherlands by the end of the 1580s, and the followers of the Reformed church significantly grew by the 1600s. However, the process of reformation was difficult, as it confronted many challengers from the Arminians and Counter-Reformation, including Anabaptists and Catholics.[28] The confessionalization of Reformed faith theologically triumphed over the Arminians at the Synod of Dort (1618–19), and this victory imparted superiority to the Reformed church "over its rivals in public life, education, publishing, welfare, and preaching to large congregations."[29] However, the process continued to progress as the life and culture of Dutch society was entirely different from the Reformed faith. Reformed devotees recognized the need for further reformation of the Dutch church.[30] Their main method of reform was carried out through preaching, which was centered upon the Bible and Reformed confessions.[31] Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676) was one of the well-known leading figures of this reform movement, known as the *Nadere Reformatie*, which emerged from the tension between sound doctrine and its application.[32] Although Dutch Reformed theologians thought their doctrine was sound and biblical, they recognized the gap between the Reformed doctrine and the impious Christian life. As a counterpart to English Puritanism, *Nadere Reformatie* theologians sought "to foster biblical and God-glorifying experiential piety and ethical precision

27. C. Graafland, W. J. op 't Hof, and F. A. van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie: Opnieuw een poging tot begripsbepaling," *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie* 19 (1995): 123.

28. Jonathan I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 361–449; Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 123–24, 132–33.

29. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 653.

30. Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 125–26.

31. Brienen, *De Prediking van de Nadere Reformatie*, 200–203; C. Graafland, "Schriftleer en Schriftverstaan in de Nadere Reformatie," in *Theologische Aspecten van de Nadere Reformatie*, ed. T. Brienen (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993), 29.

32. Arie de Reuver, "Wat Is Het Eigene van de Nadere Reformatie?" *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie* 18, no. 2 (1994): 146–47.

in the life of individuals, churches, and the entire nation."[33] The *Nadere Reformatie* was a reformation movement aimed at reforming Christian life, church, and society.[34] *Nadere Reformatie* theologians exhorted Christians through Bible-centered preaching and the Reformed confessions, hoping that their audience would have personal experience of the Christian faith and piety.

While the Synod of Dort brought great privileges to the Reformed church, the ensuing outcome did not mean that Calvinism conquered the Netherlands. Calvinists were still few regardless of their dramatic growth, and a considerable portion of the population began to be attracted to Reformed Christianity.[35] The Synod of Dort was decided inside the church, while the influence of Calvinism in the Netherlands was outside the church. The Reformed church confessed its faith in light of Calvinism, and it began to influence society. By the second half of the seventeenth century, the number of Reformed Christians grew significantly, and approximately one-third of the Dutch population identified as Reformed once the state accepted the Reformed church as the national church. However, in the Reformed church a considerably large number of inauthentic churchgoers or "lovers" of the Reformed religion existed.[36] According to Willem van Asselt and Paul Abels, such churchgoers "were people who would listen to the Sunday sermon but would not or could not (yet) confess because they could not endorse Reformed doctrine unconditionally and did not wish to accept a far-reaching involvement of the church in their daily activities (discipline or censorship)."[37]

Furthermore, while civil magistrates and cultural elites were interested in studying theology, the Cartesian movement had created a broad intellectual milieu, which led many in Holland "not to make much of religion," which led them to leave the religious faith.[38] Van Asselt and Abels note, "The increase in the number of complaints about apostasy to other religions in the second half of the [seventeenth] century shows that the large group

---

33. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith*, 383–413, see particularly at 383–85; Cornelis Pronk, "The Dutch Puritans," *The Banner of Truth*, no. 154–55 (July–August 1976): 3.

34. Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 108–10.

35. Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 125.

36. Willem J. Van Asselt and Paul H.A.M. Abels, "The Seventeenth Century," in *Handbook of Dutch Church History* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 282–83.

37. Van Asselt and Abels, "The Seventeenth Century," 282.

38. Van Asselt and Abels, "The Seventeenth Century," 291; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 925; Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 129–30.

of people not united to any church or religion had been greatly reduced."[39] Apostasy and spiritual dryness of Christians were important concerns for Reformed devotees.

Although the Synod of Dort limited the Arminians's preaching to their congregations, thereby leading to a decrease in their power, the Arminians took control of the government of Holland in the 1640s as Dutch society began to depart from the Reformed faith.[40] The *Nadere Reformatie* addressed the theological controversy related to the Arminians and admonished against adultery, prostitution, drunkenness, frivolity, ribaldry, ostentation, and the violation of the Sabbath.[41] While the provinces of the Netherlands supported the Reformed church, the Dutch society was considerably different from the expectations of the representatives of the *Nadere Reformatie*.[42] The Reformed devotees had faced the challenges posed by Arminianism, and they felt the need to exhort Christians with no pietistic experience of Christianity, weak professions of faith, and morally corrupted lives.

À Brakel was sensible to the historical and ecclesiastical context of the Dutch church and society, and he deliberated the moral corruption of the Christians. He spoke against sexual sins that were widely practiced in the Netherlands. In his discourse on the seventh commandment of the Decalogue, he listed the sins that are prohibited. He spoke against sexual sin and common situations in society that may lead to sexual sin, warning against adultery, incest, sodomy, fornication, polygamy, premarital intercourse, verbal unchastity, lustful thoughts, dancing, and idleness.[43] These corrupt lifestyles engendered a lack of faith among Christians, and even the Reformed church did not represent an ideal Christianity.[44] Therefore, the Labadists, a seventeenth-century Protestant religious community that emphasized spiritual purity of the church, criticized the moral corruption of both the ministers and members of the church. Labadists left the church and became separatists, intending to become a pure community that

---

39. Van Asselt and Abels, "The Seventeenth Century," 292.

40. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 462–65, 474, 661; Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 125.

41. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 475, 661, 682, 692.

42. Van Asselt and Abels, "The Seventeenth Century," 281–82; Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 125, 145.

43. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:206–13; Joel R. Beeke and Paul M. Smalley, "Wilhelmus à Brakel's Biblical Ethics of Spirituality," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 8, no. 2 (2016): 114–16; Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 145.

44. Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 147.

sought the perfection of the visible church.[45] Labadists sought to reform both private and public life with an intense asceticism and with chiliastic tendencies. Labadists were dissatisfied with spiritual declension and moral corruptions in the church, forming a community separated from the world. Due to their extreme view of separation, Labadist gatherings were officially prohibited throughout the Dutch Republic.[46] Initially, à Brakel was attracted to Labadism, but later he criticized the doctrinal and spiritual aspects of the Labadists.[47]

In contrast to the Labadists, à Brakel stressed that God was the keeper of His church. Although corruptions fluctuated within the visible church, à Brakel claimed that the church's existence did not depend on sinful people's piety or corruption. Rather, the church existed by God's grace and is founded on His covenant.[48] The Labadists and their critics proved that moral decline was evident in the church.[49] In opposition to the Labadists, à Brakel observed that purity of doctrine was the first mark of the church, and the holiness of the members was its second mark. He believed that the objective of true believers is to discern and experience divine truth in their hearts.[50] À Brakel also observed that both the unregenerated and the regenerated exist in the visible church.[51] In this manner, he believed that many are called, but few are chosen. If one is elected, then one should experience and practice faith rather than merely attending the church. For this reason, à Brakel accentuated *actus fidei*, and, in line with the goal of *Nadere Reformatie*, he emphasized the importance of heartful experience of the faith.

---

45. Fred van Lieburg, "Warning against the Pietists: The World of Wilhelmus à Brakel," in *Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic*, ed. Joke Spaans (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019), 351.

46. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 669–71.

47. Willem van Vlastuin, "Inleiding," in *Redelijke Godsdienst* (Apeldoorn: De Banier, 2016), 11–45.

48. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:23–25, 60–63, 71–72, 83; Van Lieburg, "Warning against the Pietists," 351.

49. Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 126–27. See Wilhelmus à Brakel, *Leere en Leydinge der Labadisten* (Reinier van Doesburgh, 1685). He also criticized several doctrinal and spiritual aspects of the Labadists.

50. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:14, 29–37, 315; Willem van Vlastuin, "Spiritual Marriage: A Key to the Theology and Spirituality of Wilhelmus à Brakel (1635–1711)," *Journal for the History of Reformed Pietism* 2, no. 2 (2016): 27–53.

51. T. Brienen, *De Prediking van de Nadere Reformatie.* (Amsterdam: Bolland, 1974), 119.

It is noteworthy to examine why à Brakel placed a strong emphasis on *actus fidei*. There were agreements and disagreements among *Nadere Reformatie* theologians and even among the post-Reformation Reformed theologians. While both groups of theologians agreed that faith is a gift of God and a received instrument of salvation, their concerns caused disagreements in their views of faith. Those who accentuated *actus fidei* considered faith as active confessions and the outcome of the sincere heart. In contrast, those who underlined *habitus fidei* were afraid of Arminianism, and they thought defining faith as an act leaves room for an Arminian understanding of the faith. Hence, many Reformed theologians conceived *habitus fidei* at the expense of *actus fidei*, but some theologians, notably à Brakel, held *actus fidei* due to their pastoral concerns.

In discussing personal experience of faith and salvation, Reformed theologians carefully examined the Reformed views of assurance of salvation and the *ordo salutis* (order of salvation), following discussions of *actus fidei* and *habitus fidei*.[52] While it is probable that his experience of moral corruptions and lack of faith in the church led à Brakel to underline *actus fidei*, there was discontinuity and discord among the *Nadere Reformatie* theologians. In other words, regardless of the moral corruptions and lack of faith in the church, *Nadere Reformatie* theologians had disagreements in their views of faith.

For continuity, *Nadere Reformatie* theologians agreed upon faith as a gift of God and a receiving instrument of justification.[53] For them, justification was grounded in God's grace, and they believed that good works were insufficient to receive salvation. However, there were disagreements in the *actus–habitus* distinction.

On the one hand, à Brakel, Van Mastricht, Johannes Verschuir (1680–1737), Francis Turretin (1623–1687), Herman Witsius (1636–1708), and William Ames (1576–1633) upheld *actus fidei* as they emphasized the activeness of faith, believing faith to be one of the fundamental principles of living in the presence of God. For them, saving faith was an act, and *habitus* was insufficient.[54] Because many were staying in the church instead of being the church, à Brakel wanted to exhort Christians to actively confess their

---

52. Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 134–35.

53. C. Graafland, *De Zekerheid van Het Geloof* (Amsterdam: Bolland, 1977), 197; Brienen, *De Prediking van de Nadere Reformatie*, 185.

54. Adriaan Cornelis Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht (1630–1706): Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009), 110, 119; Van Mastricht, *TPT*, 2:3–4, 7.

faith in Christ.[55] À Brakel believed that faith precedes justification, and he exhorted believers to join and remain in the church.[56]

Strong emphasis on *actus fidei* is commonly seen in those who believe that Christians ought to live unto God. Abraham Kuyper (1837–1920) worried about the voluntaristic and subjective approach in which the context of faith disappeared in the emphasis on *actus fidei*.[57]

---

55. Though they argued *actus fidei* slightly differently, it is evident that they emphasized *actus fidei* in their accentuation of Christians' sincere obedience to the Lord. Van Mastricht understood faith as a receiving act (*actus fidei*) that comprehends the person and work of Christ. He realized how papists, Remonstrants, and Socinians understood faith as work in the matter of justification, so he claimed that Reformed theologians should reject faith as a work or an act of obedience in receiving justification. See Van Mastricht, *TPT*, 2:3–6, 18; Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht*, 118–20. Verschuir asserted faith as the key principle of the Christian life, for the righteous shall live by his faith (Hab. 2:4). To him, faith enabled Christians to participate in the covenant of grace, and the Lord preserves the faithful. For faith is living and true; justifying faith brings the act as its fruit. See Johannes Verschuir, *Waarheid in Het Binnenste, of, Bevindelijke Godgeleerdheid in Veertien Zamenspraken, Benevens Eene Heilige Oefening, of, Alleenspraak Der Ziel En Eene Belijdenispredikatie*, trans. Hendrik Nieuwhuis (Appingedam: H. C. Mekel, 1862), 163–64. Turretin understood faith as man's answer to the call of God. He defined faith as a direct and reflex act of humans, consisting of knowing, assenting, and trusting. He rejected any notion of synergism for he affirmed the impotence of the corrupted faculties of man. He recognized the danger of defining faith as an act, nevertheless he carefully discussed dangerous arguments of synergism and argued *actus fidei*. See Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, 15.4.13–16, 15.5.1–6, 15.5.10, 15.5.13–21, 15.6.1–35, 15.7.1, 15.8.1–14, 15.10.1. Witsius stressed that faith is a certain complex thing that consists of various acts. He recognized that there could be various kinds and degrees of successful acts. He observed that the act of faith could exist in incomplete forms and faith in Christians could be shaken by circumstances. But true Christians will triumph with their faith in Christ, and so Witsius exhorted Christians to have the assurance of faith in Christ. See Herman Witsius, *The Economy of the Covenants between God and Man: Comprehending a Complete Body of Divinity*, trans. William Crookshank, vol. 1 (London: T. Tegg & Son, 1837), 337, 340–42, 348–53. Ames also argued imperfection of *habitus*, and so he understood faith as the first act of the Christian life whereby Christians live to God in Christ. See William Ames, *The Marrow of Theology*, trans. John D. Eusden (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997), 81–82 (Book 1.3.6, 1.3.18).

56. Willem van Vlastuin, "Rechtvaardiging," in *Reformatie, toen en nu. Over rechtvaardiging, Schriftgezag en vreemdelingschap*, by Willem van Vlastuin, P. de Vries, and R. van Kooten (Apeldoorn: Labarum Academic, 2018), 38; Willem van Vlastuin, "The Fruitfulness of a Paradox: The Doctrine of the Covenant in Wilhelmus à Brakel (1635–1711) Reapplied" (International Conference Researchgroup BEST, Apeldoorn, March 30, 2017); forthcoming; à Brakel, *CRS*, 2:55.

57. Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 396. Kuyper noted that à Brakel's view of faith came from a slight deviation of Ames from Calvin and Beza, and that à Brakel's view of faith inclined too much toward subjectivity. Kuyper observed that à Brakel's view of faith was "right in opposing the petrified dogmatism of his day. But when he systemized his

On the other hand, Comrie and Voetius stressed the more passive aspect of faith by accentuating *habitus fidei*. While they were also concerned about the historical/spiritual and doctrinal context of the church in the Netherlands, they were aware of the Arminian notion of faith being work, and they thought it safer to underline *habitus fidei* rather than *actus fidei*.[58] Comrie observed that those who always spoke of faith as an act or acts distorted question twenty-one of the Heidelberg Catechism.[59] For Comrie, true faith was not in the act or acts but in the habit or capacity to believe. His understanding of faith was closely associated with his doctrine of justification, and he understood the *habitus* for sinners as utterly passive in receiving God's salvation.[60] Willem van Vlastuin has argued that Comrie placed justification completely outside of man to underline *sola gratia*.[61] According to Beeke, Comrie emphasized the implanting work of the Holy Spirit upon godless and faithless sinners. Comrie believed that faithless sinners were justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and nothing in the sinner deserved God's grace. Hence, implanting the *habitus* could be considered both foundational and sufficient for salvation, for imputation of righteousness implied nothing from the sinner.[62] For Comrie, justification

---

opposition he went too far in that direction." See Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht*, 111–13, 135; Johannes Cloppenburgh, *Theologica Opera Omnia* (Amsterdam: Gerardus Borstius, 1684), xii.2, xxxii–liv, 1045–50.

58. Abraham Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (New York, London: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1900), 395–96.

59. Alexander Comrie, *Heidelberger Catechismus* (Amsterdam: Nicolaas Byl, 1753), 447; Kuyper, *The Works of the Holy Spirit*, 393. But Cloppenburgh observed that the Heidelberg Catechism saw faith as an act of the will consisting of *fiducia*. There were various views and interpretations of the Heidelberg Catechism. While Comrie interpreted faith in Heidelberg Catechism Q. 21 as *habitus fidei*, Zacharias Ursinus explained faith as doing. Zacharias Ursinus, *The Commentary of Dr. Zacharias Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism* (Cincinnati, Ohio: Elm Street Printing Company, 1888), Q. 21.

60. Exalto, "Genadeleer En Heilsweg." 184–85, 196–97. In light of Thomistic scholasticism, Comrie stated that there must be a *habitus* first; only then *actus* could be followed as an outcome and practice of faith. He avoided the notion of "preparations" in receiving salvation, for the notion of preparation could give a nuance of synergism.

61. Van Vlastuin, "Rechtvaardiging," 39.

62. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith*, 284–291, see particularly at 286. Similar to Comrie, Voetius also argued that the *habitus* itself could be considered as faith. He said, "This [principle] cannot be called faith except by analogy and improperly by metonymy of the cause or of the principle: formally this is no more faith than a seed is a tree, or an egg a chicken, or a bulb a flower." Voetius, *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum*, 2:499, quoted in Bavinck, *RD*, 4:114. Though *habitus* itself is considered as faith, Voetius believed that *habitus* could be more advanced in the exercise of piety. According to Voetius, the acts of faith have different

and God's saving work precede one's faith. The Holy Spirit works upon the elect so that the elected believer will have disposition of faith. Hence, while the *actus* is necessary and consequently follows as the aftereffect of *habitus*, *habitus* itself is sufficient for salvation, though believers will have work (*actus*) as fruit.[63] In other words, as Beeke observes, "anyone who lacks the capacity (*habitus*) will never be able to exercise believing or seeing (*actus*). The *habitus* is foundational, and the *actus* is dependent upon it, though it necessarily follows."[64] Kuyper also noted, "Hence the reality or sincerity of the imparted faith does not depend upon the acts of faith, but the sincerity of these acts depends upon the reality and sincerity of the faculties or habit from which they spring."[65]

Furthermore, Comrie hesitated to speak of the *actus fidei* as defining faith as work or act of the Christian because it might imply that faith is primarily a human response, an Arminian definition of faith.[66] Comrie understood that *actus fidei* indicates a human role in salvation whenever an active role was assigned to faith. Therefore, understanding the nature of faith as *actus* implies a heretical error made by Arminianism.[67] Certainly, Comrie was also worried about those who emphasized works righteousness in receiving justification (i.e., Pelagians, Remonstrants, Roman Catholics, and Neonomians). He thought that every work of humans is unclean and

degrees, and the acts of faith could be incomplete; further acts of faith could be confused with sanctification. Hence, he observed *habitus* itself could be considered as faith. See Voetius, *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum*, 2:499–501.

63. Van Vlastuin, "Rechtvaardiging." 38–39; Alexander Comrie, *The Abc of Faith*, trans. J. Marcus Banfield (Grand Rapids: Zoar, 1978), 32l; Beeke, *Assurance of Faith*, 288–89; Comrie, *Heidelberger Catechismus*, 561.

64. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith*, 285. See Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 393–94.

65. Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 393–94.

66. Exalto, "Genadeleer En Heilsweg," 197; Wisse, "*Habitus Fidei*: An Essay on the History of Concept," 184; Bavinck, *RD*, 4:114, 150; Van Vlastuin, "Rechtvaardiging," 39; Graafland, Hof, and van Lieburg, "Nadere Reformatie," 127–28; C. Graafland, "Alexander Comrie (1706–1774)," in *De Nadere Reformatie. Beschrijving van Haar Voornaamste Vertegenwoordigers*, ed. T. Brienen ('s-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1986), 337–39; Comrie, *Heidelberger Catechismus*, 39–40, 428–29, 447; Alexander Comrie, *Brief over de Regtvaardigmaking Des Zondaars* (Ede: Westfriese Boekhandel, 1990), 144–45.

67. Graafland, "Alexander Comrie," 339. Coming from England and Scotland, Comrie knew about the Marrow Controversy and a danger of neonomianism. See Van den Brink, "Comrie En Het Antinomianisme," 133; Dirk Baarssen, "Owen in Een Nederlandsch Gewaat: Enkele Opmerkingen over de Receptie van de Geschriften van John Owen (1616–1683) Door Alexander Comrie (1706–1774)," *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie* 38, no. 1 (2014), 36, 41, 45.

imperfect, so the act of faith does not deserve righteousness and merit.[68] Though he was not antinomian, he was inclined to put his position close to the antinomian position, for he repudiated any role of human action in receiving justification.[69] To him, faith was merely a receiving instrument or pipe that connects the source to the fountain.[70]

There were agreements and disagreements among Reformed theologians. Though à Brakel was considered a representative theologian who was often compared with Comrie, à Brakel was not the only one who accentuated *actus fidei*. There were disagreements and discontinuity among the *Nadere Reformatie* theologians and among the post-Reformation Reformed theologians. Reformed theologians and Reformed confessions tended to follow *habitus fidei* rather than *actus fidei*, as accentuating *habitus fidei* avoided the notions of works righteousness in salvation.[71] The difference between Comrie and à Brakel was whether the nature of saving faith was enough with the habit and disposition of faith or whether the faith must be confessed and actualized in the Christian walk of faith.

Furthermore, while à Brakel was sensitive to historical and ecclesiastical circumstances, it does not mean that Comrie was not aware of these as well. Rather, their focus and theological reasoning were different. Comrie opposed Arminianism, while à Brakel opposed spiritual declension in the same church. Theological disharmony does not mean that one is not Reformed; instead, they emphasized their point of view according to their chief concerns—whether it was to exhort Christians or to avoid the Arminian notion of understanding faith as work.

---

68. Van den Brink, "Comrie En Het Antinomianisme," 133–35; Comrie, *Heidelberger Catechismus*, xxxvi–xxxviii, xl–xli.

69. While van den Brink asserts Comrie as a doctrinal antinomian, Baarssen and van Vlastuin argue that Comrie is a Reformed Orthodox theologian, instead of antinomian. See van den Brink, "Comrie En Het Antinomianisme." 112–56; Dirk Baarssen and Willem van Vlastuin, "Alexander Comrie Als Orthodox Gereformeerd Theoloog: Een Onderzoek Naar Antinomisme in Comries Theologie," *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie* 35, no. 2 (2011): 132–59.

70. Van den Brink, "Comrie En Het Antinomianisme," 133, 135–37; Comrie, *Heidelberger Catechismus*, xxxvi; Baarssen, "Owen in Een Nederlandsch Gewaat," 42–44; Baarssen and Van Vlastuin, "Alexander Comrie Als Orthodox Gereformeerd Theoloog," 138–39, 143–145; Comrie, *Brief over de Regtvaardigmaking Des Zondaars*, 31, 44–46, 151.

71. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 14.1–3; *Canons of Dort*, III–IV.1.11–14; Bavinck, *RD*, 4:114–15; Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 396. Comrie observed the faith in the Heidelberg Catechism Q. 21 as referring to *habitus fidei*, but there are various views. See n59 of this article.

À Brakel's Understanding of the Nature
of Faith and *actus fidei*

As a pastor–theologian, à Brakel intended for his writing to edify his congregation.[72] Regarding the membership of the church, à Brakel believed that faith must be active. According to à Brakel, a significant difference exists between being *in the church* and being *of the church*.[73] An external call, a historical or temporal faith, external holiness, or external participation do not constitute true membership of the church.[74] À Brakel warned against cheap grace, and he exhorted Christians to promote spiritual life and experiences in their confession of faith in Christ.[75]

In his discussion of faith, à Brakel rigorously illustrated four different types of faith: historical, temporal, miraculous, and saving.[76] For à Brakel, historical and temporal faith were not sufficient to be considered as saving faith, and miraculous faith only existed in the time of the apostles. Historical faith pertained to the knowledge of the history of the Word of God and concerned a mere knowledge (*notitia*) of the Word of God. Temporal faith, of course, is merely assent to the truth. Though temporal faith generates some affections of the soul and motivates external behavior, it does not unite one with Christ unto justification and sanctification. Based on these shortcomings, historical and temporal faith are insufficient for salvation. The third type, miraculous faith, is a heartfelt conviction generated by the immediate and supernatural operation of God. This faith was especially prevalent in the days of Christ and the apostles.

Moreover, according to à Brakel, miraculous faith ceased after the time of the apostles. Therefore, he believed that the fourth category of faith was the only sufficient faith that could be considered as saving faith. À Brakel focused on saving or justifying faith in his discussion surrounding the nature of faith. To him, saving or justifying faith must consist of three aspects of faith: *notitia*, *assensus*, and, particularly, *fiducia* (trust). While historical and temporal faith consist of *notitia* and *assensus*, respectively, they

---

72. Joel Beeke and Bartel Elshout, "Preface," in *Christian's Reasonable Service* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), xx–xxi; à Brakel, *CRS*, 1:cxiii–cxv.

73. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:14.

74. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:7.

75. Willem van Vlastuin, *Catholic Today: A Reformed Conversation about Catholicity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020), 189; Van Lieburg, "Warning against the Pietists," 350–54.

76. Verschuir, *Waarheid in Het Binnenste, of, Bevindelijke Godgeleerdheid*, 165–66. Verschuir also stressed the same points to emphasize his view of *actus fidei*.

do not exhibit *fiducia* in Christ. À Brakel, therefore, claimed that true saving faith and the act of faith must have *notitia, assensus,* and *fiducia*.[77] For à Brakel, faith entails an active belief and trust in God.[78]

À Brakel did not discard the concept of *habitus fidei*, because he believed that the capacity and disposition to believe existed in peoples' hearts. However, à Brakel's understanding of *actus* and *habitus* in his view of faith was ambiguous when he spoke of faith as propension. While he understood faith as an act, his language often implies that faith is the capacity to believe or disposition to believe. He asserted that "unless a person is in such a frame, he will not be desirous to come [to faith]."[79] He also understood the nature of faith as a propensity and disposition, proclaiming that

> the genus or very nature of faith is that it is a *propensity*. Propensities complement the functioning of the intellect and the will. Such propensities are either acquired by much exercise, or *implanted* in the soul of man by God. The latter is true for faith, hope, love, etc. All of man's activity to obtain faith is not in the least degree sufficient to enable him to acquire faith. God initially gives it, God preserves and increases it, and God finishes it.[80]

À Brakel stressed that faith is essentially inclination, and thus, there is a disposition of faith. On the surface, this sounds like à Brakel is teaching *habitus fidei*—as a capacity and disposition to believe. Nevertheless, when we consider à Brakel's view of faith as a whole, his understanding of faith was more heavily weighted toward *actus fidei* rather than *habitus fidei*. God grants the disposition to believe, but that disposition alone is not enough. Faith must be enforced by actual confession. À Brakel noted that "God justifies man by faith, and thus once upon the first act of faith, but is made as frequently and as often as man exercises faith in Christ unto justification. This is not an assurance that they are justified once and for all, but it constitutes an actual and daily act of forgiveness."[81] When no sincere voluntary confession of faith occurs, one cannot be considered a genuine Christian. For à Brakel, professing Christian faith and trusting in God were not merely a disposition or a capacity; instead, it was the actual and sincere act of trusting in God.

---

77. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:263–65.
78. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:265.
79. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:297.
80. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:266.
81. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:358.

The reason that à Brakel used such expressions of the first act of faith is notable. He asserted that receiving an act of faith is followed by hearing the Word, and he avoided the notion of the natural capacity of people to exercise their trust in God.[82] He posited that "prior to the first act of faith, man is spiritually dead, irrespective of how many preparatory exercises he may have had."[83] Based on this condition of total depravity and the incapability of people to achieve salvation, à Brakel rejected the notion of the seed of faith or faith in seminal form.[84] For à Brakel, "if the seed of faith were to be the beginning of faith, they would actually possess it already," even before their actual confession of faith.[85] Prior to regeneration, men are spiritually dead, so it is inappropriate to consider a seed of faith having existed in men. À Brakel asserted that one receives faith only by hearing (Rom. 10:17, Gal. 3:2).[86]

Furthermore, à Brakel claimed that even the elect are not saved unless they exercise faith for the first time.[87] One must come to Christ through the act of faith that is accompanied by conviction.[88] The first act of faith is closely associated with regeneration, and the first act of faith is the mark that distinguishes Christians from unbelievers.[89] À Brakel observed affectations in the church, and he argued that a believer is best known by his personal experience of conversion, prayer, belief in Christ, struggle with faith, the subtle delusions and assaults of Satan, the sealing work of the Holy Spirit, and the mortification of sin.[90] Then, this first act must be repeated throughout the Christian life. Therefore, Christians will have habits of faith, but such habits follow the first act of faith.[91] In this way, à Brakel accentuated *actus fidei* rather than *habitus fidei*. In other words, à Brakel declared that Christians

---

82. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:293.

83. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:245.

84. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:268.

85. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:268.

86. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:268–69.

87. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:247–48.

88. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:245.

89. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:261.

90. W. Fieret, "Wilhelmus à Brakel," in *CRS*, 1:xxxiv; See à Brakel, *CRS*, 2:72, 297. À Brakel was concerned with sinners and called them to faith. He lists such sinners including "murderers, adulterers, fornicators, unjust persons, thieves, drunkards, you who revel in sin, gamblers, dancers, you criminals who have been given over to yourself, liars, backbiters, perjurers (p. 297)." See Jonathan Holdt, "Wilhelmus à Brakel's Use of Doctrine in Calling Sinners to Repentance and Faith," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 3, no. 2 (2011): 275–78.

91. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:244–45.

are regenerated by sincere confessions of the faith (or, at least, confession is the mark of the sincere faith) and sustained by repeated confession of faith.

À Brakel's view of *actus fidei* was more crystalized when he understood the nature of faith as trust.[92] He affirmed *fiducia* as the sufficient component of saving faith. According to à Brakel, even unbelievers could have temporal faith with knowledge and assent, but they fall short unless they trust and confess their faith in Christ. He further argued that faith is an act of will, which "consists in a heartfelt trust to be brought to salvation by Christ."[93] In discussing the marks of saving faith, à Brakel regarded saving faith as sincere trust in Christ.[94] À Brakel used Agrippa and Simon Magus as examples of having faith, but he mentioned that their faith was temporal and insincere.[95] Faith is not merely knowing or assenting; instead, faith is believing and trusting in God and His promise.

Furthermore, faith is trusting in God "as being true, omnipotent, and faithful," and it strongly moves the heart of the believer.[96] Such a faith, which commences with the first act of faith, is exercised throughout the entire life of a Christian. For this reason, though he accentuated the act of faith, à Brakel's view of faith was not merely a formal act, but it advocated that faith is founded on the truth that bears the fruits of the Holy Spirit. À Brakel asserted that "salvation is thus promised upon the fruits of faith (cf. Matt. 5:3–16).... Therefore, *to believe in God* is to believe as God has commanded us to believe. When faith is called a *brief of the truth*, this does not pertain to the formal act of faith, but it indicates that faith is founded upon truth."[97] Therefore, the act of faith is not a formal act of receiving and confessing Christ. Rather, the act of faith refers to the voluntary participation and heartfelt trust in God and His promise. Thus, à Brakel stressed the act of faith as a sincere trust of the heart in Christ, and he considered such an act of faith to be sufficient for saving faith.[98]

Although à Brakel accentuated *actus fidei*, he did not regard *actus* as the cause of salvation; rather, he understood it as a receiving instrument of salvation.[99] He argued that "faith, as the means whereby the righteousness of Christ is received, which unites itself to Christ, and by which one

---

92. Graafland, *De Zekerheid van Het Geloof*, 191.
93. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:278, 282, 286.
94. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:315.
95. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:321.
96. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:285.
97. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:284.
98. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:323ff.
99. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:667.

is translated into Christ, was counted unto him for righteousness; that is, not the act of faith, but the righteousness of Christ of which he became a partaker of faith."[100] The righteousness of Christ is eventually the object of faith that justifies Christians. À Brakel's accentuation of the act of faith does not mean that the human act of trust can attain salvation. Rather, salvation is attained through the active receiving of Christ as prophet, priest, and king.[101] À Brakel also mentioned that "faith cannot be considered as a work, but must rather be viewed as a means…. Faith must thus be viewed as a means—and not as a work—whereby the believer receives the righteousness of Christ as his own righteousness…. The act of faith cannot be understood any other way but as a being united with that which one receives, since the very nature of faith consists in receiving."[102] In addition, he also rejected the notion of faith as work. Since à Brakel understood faith as the act of will and not of the body, he did not consider faith as work.[103] He further stressed that true faith is distinguished from works, arguing that "works and faith are contrasted with each other."[104] Since true faith is the foundation of good works, he avoided viewing faith as works. Rather, good works are the fruits and characteristics of faith.[105] When he spoke of the act of faith, à Brakel never undermined faith as works to receive salvation. Instead, he understood faith as a gift of God that leads man to assent to and trust in divine truth and commandment.

The historical context of the Netherlands sheds light on why à Brakel emphasized *actus fidei* over *habitus fidei*. While many people stayed in the church and were devotees of the Reformed faith, they did not sincerely dedicate and confess their faith in Christ. As a result, à Brakel highlighted that the first act of faith for Christians is repeated in the daily exercise and experience of believers.

À Brakel's View of *Habitus Fidei* in Christian Life and Sanctification

For à Brakel, "faith cannot exist without holiness for faith purifies the heart."[106] In other words, true faith is evident in believers' holiness and

---

100. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:354.
101. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:326.
102. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:375.
103. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:270.
104. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:275.
105. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:276.
106. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:329.

good works. À Brakel argued that temporal believers are motivated by their desire to perform good works, but the sanctification of true believers succeeds faith.[107] True believers wholeheartedly, unreservedly, and continually trust in Christ.[108] This ongoing voluntary act of trust repeatedly formulates habits of faith in Christians. Although à Brakel hesitated to state that *habitus* is the disposition and capacity to believe, he understood *habitus* in terms of fitting habituation of the voluntary trust in Christ.

À Brakel used the phrase "the first act of faith" to refer to *actus fidei* as a way people receive salvation. The use of "first" implies that an ongoing, repeated action of faith occurs. À Brakel asserted that *habitus* was fitting habituation through repeated actions in the Christian life and sanctification. For à Brakel, a true and saving faith always consists of a heartfelt trust, inclination, and disposition to believe in God.[109] In this manner, he understood faith as *habitus fidei* or *habitus credendi* (a disposition to believe).[110] Faith does not culminate in a singular action; it consists of continuous, habitual practice. Furthermore, à Brakel acknowledged different degrees of faith and intermission of faith among Christians by noting that

> many are slow of heart to believe and frequently neglect the exercises of faith. Intermissions are frequent and of long duration, albeit that faith is not entirely absent, for faith does not cease. Sometimes it occurs that the godly are overwhelmed and are swept away by the lusts of flesh, laziness, or lack of desire. Sometimes it is due to discouragement, fearing that they will prove to be no partaker of Christ, or at times due to the violent assaults of Satan.[111]

Since the faith of Christians could be weakened, à Brakel exhorted Christians to increase their faith in Christ.[112] The act of faith produces the habit of faith, and *habitus* consists of both disposition and accommodated actions or fitting habituation. À Brakel implored Christians to "elevate your heart to a higher level of godliness, which consists in having the glory of God as your objective in your entire conduct. Focus continually upon this goal so that by continual exercise you may attain to a habitual tendency in this

---

107. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:331–33.
108. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:305, 325.
109. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:3–4.
110. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:355–57.
111. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:304.
112. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:305.

respect."[113] À Brakel acknowledged that those who have true faith possess a new disposition of the heart to exercise their trust in God, and this new habit and disposition of the heart drives Christians to holiness.[114]

À Brakel acknowledged the impotence of people's effort to attain salvation, and he asserted that a person "must habitually endeavor to discern his impotence."[115] The habitual tendency is not only related to sanctification but is also associated with mortification. Christians habitually recognize their sinfulness, and they habitually grow in grace. However, the habitual tendency toward holiness never arises in people through their own effort. Rather, habitual grace is infused at the moment of regeneration, and it is confirmed by the act of receiving Christ.[116] À Brakel stressed the repetitive nature of the exercise of faith by proclaiming that "by the act of receiving Christ, one's spiritual state and inner peace are more and more confirmed."[117] The repetitive act of receiving Christ produces habits of trusting in Christ. Believers in Christ have a new heart and a habit inclined to follow the Word of God and "to perform thy statutes always, even unto the end (Psa. 119:97, 103, 14, 15, 111–12)."[118] He also professed habitual grace in the work of regeneration and sanctification. He noted,

> However, no one can understand rightly (except the person who has such a disposition), what manner of heart disposition this holiness is and the manner in which holy deeds flow forth out of this disposition, just as no virtue can be rightly known except by those who practice it. Since holiness is the image of God, how then can anyone know holiness who does not know God?[119]

The Holy Spirit infuses habitual grace so that Christians have a habitual disposition and tendency toward godliness and Christ.[120] Thus, a disposition toward holiness, which is infused by the work of the Holy Spirit, is necessary for the believer.

The habitual tendency is also a key to spirituality for à Brakel. God infuses habitual grace on believers so that Christians can incline their

---

113. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:255.
114. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:16–17.
115. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:607.
116. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:5.
117. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:244.
118. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:15.
119. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:17.
120. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:332, 421.

hearts to keep God's commandment. Christians do not walk in their faith alone, but God upholds them with His hand.[121] À Brakel believed that the spiritual strength of a Christian is found in the faculties of the soul, which may be fortified habitually. He clarified that

> It [spiritual strength] is not a physical activity…but rather an activity of the soul. It is not merely an activity of the intellect, observing this virtue in its beauty, but all faculties are active. It is not an activity which is occasionally engaged in, but rather it is a *propensity*, a habitual disposition and competence, which initially is infused by God, but which is exercised by the influence of the Holy Spirit, and by much exercise improves and becomes stronger.[122]

Since God offers habitual grace, the true believer's spiritual life never disappears, and he never again comes under the dominion of sin. Though temptations, trials, and afflictions are present, believers continually mortify their sinful habits and are transformed by renewing their minds.[123]

For à Brakel, true believers must have a habitual tendency toward goodness and God. He stated, "First, a person who desires to be justified in his conscience ought to endeavor to have a view of his sinful heart—and of the sinful manifestation of this heart in thoughts, words, deeds, and activities, along with the manner of this manifestation."[124] Elsewhere he wrote,

> The genus or very nature of faith is that it is a *propensity*. Propensities complement the functioning of the intellect and the will. Such propensities are either acquired by much exercise or *implanted* in the soul of man by God. The latter is true for faith, hope, love, etc. All of man's activity to obtain faith is not in the least degree sufficient to enable him to acquire faith. God initially gives it, God preserves and increases it, and God finishes it.[125]

Such a faith is a matter and disposition of the heart. One must have a habit of faith, and perfection and holiness spring from this habit and disposition of faith. À Brakel emphasized that "There is a *personal* righteousness resulting from the perfection and holiness of one's disposition and deeds."[126] However, this disposition or habit is not acquired through human action;

121. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:635; 3:6.
122. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:331–32.
123. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:5–6.
124. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:406.
125. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:266.
126. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:370.

rather, it is given at the moment of regeneration. He explained this concept by noting, "When God calls someone internally, he will acquire a disposition which is entirely and essentially different from that which could be produced by nature or preparatory circumstances."[127] When one sincerely exercises trust in God, God grants him a habitual disposition to follow God. In this manner, Christians have a habitual inclination toward God to keep His law.[128]

Conclusion

Though many Reformed theologians upheld *habitus fidei* instead of *actus fidei* because *actus fidei* might imply the acceptance of Arminianism, it is noteworthy to look at the continuity and discontinuity among the *Nadere Reformatie* theologians and post-Reformation Reformed theologians on their view of faith. As Kuyper and Bavinck noted, it was safer to emphasize *habitus fidei*, but what à Brakel said was not incorrect.[129] It is important for us to consider the historical context of the seventeenth-century Netherlands and what impacted à Brakel and other theologians to accentuate *actus fidei*.

The distinction between *actus* and *habitus* is based on how people receive salvation. *Habitus fidei* is considered a person's capacity and disposition to attain salvation, and *actus fidei* is a person's sincere and voluntary trust in God. Although à Brakel did not repudiate the concept of *habitus* in his view of faith, he heavily accentuated *actus*. For à Brakel, the concept of *habitus* was a more fitting habituation formed by repeated action rather than a seed and disposition to believe. Like other theologians of his time, he accentuated *actus fidei* as the active response of man to God's grace. Though à Brakel emphasized *actus*, he did not intend to take a Neonomian view, nor did he intend to conflate *actus fidei* with sanctification. À Brakel did not repudiate the concept of *habitus* in his view of sanctification. In fact, à Brakel emphasized *actus fidei* because he was concerned about pastoral ministry.

Furthermore, his view of faith must be understood in light of the historical background of the seventeenth-century Netherlands, and his argument for *actus fidei* does not signify that à Brakel is not a Reformed theologian. In opposition to the churchgoers in the Netherlands, à Brakel claimed that one must actively assent to and voluntarily trust in Christ. While he recognized *habitus fidei* as the disposition to believe, he stressed

---

127. À Brakel, *CRS*, 2:210–11.

128. À Brakel, *CRS*, 3:81.

129. Bavinck, *RD*, 4:114; Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 396.

that *habitus fidei* itself is not enough for saving faith. Consequently, the act of faith presupposes the habit and disposition of faith, while the habit is reinforced by repeated action.

Even when à Brakel accentuated *actus fidei*, he concurrently attributed faith as the receiving instrument and the means by which people receive salvation. Instead of the voluntary will and trust that receives salvation, the righteousness of Christ is partaken of by faith. Moreover, à Brakel explained how infused habit and disposition facilitate the Christian life. Believers must have voluntary trust in God at the first moment of regeneration, and the habituation of faith must be enacted throughout the Christian life. Thus, Christianity is not a one-time commitment to faith; rather, it is a life-long commitment to living fittingly for God.

The Marrow Doctrine and the Extent of the Atonement: Focal Points Within the Context of Some Theological Positions Within Scottish Marrow Theology

LEEN J. VAN VALEN
ljvanvalen@solcon.nl
Independent Scholar

The first English edition of *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* was published at the time of the Westminster Assembly (1643–1648), the assembly of divines commissioned by the English Parliament to restructure the confession and church order of the Church of England. According to the title page of the first edition, the author of the book is "E.F., Esq." It is generally accepted that this refers to Edward Fisher (1627–1655). The addition of Esq. ("Esquire") indicates that he was neither a pastor nor a college graduate. He was a barber–surgeon in London. Research has shown that this Fisher is indeed the author of the book.

The book is written in the form of a dialogue between "Evangelista," "a preacher of the gospel"; "Nomista," "a legalist"; "Antinomista," "an Antinomian"; and "Neophytus," "a young Christian."[1] The title page of the first edition gives the contents in a nutshell:

> Touching both the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace: with their use and end, both in the time of the Old Testament, and in the time of the New. Wherein every one may clearly see how far forth he bringeth the LAW into the case of Justification, and so deserves the name of LEGALIST; And how far forth he rejecteth LAW in the case of Sanctification, and so deserveth the name of ANTINOMIST. With

---

1. Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, first ed., London, G. Calvert, 1645. William VanDoodewaard concludes that the "barber surgeon" Edward Fisher is the writer. See William VanDoodewaard, "A Journey into the Past: The Story of *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*," in Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (Fearn, Scotland: Christian Focus Publications, 2009), 22–25. See also for authorship David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: University Press, 2004), 1–3.

the middle path betwixt them both, which by JESUS CHRIST leads to eternal life.[2]

What gave rise to the publication of *The Marrow* was a controversy among the English Puritans about the relationship between law and gospel. The Antinomian movement that began to stir in England, especially in the 1630s, criticized what was deemed to be a legalistic approach to the gospel among most Puritans. It placed all emphasis on faith in Christ and rejected the need for repentance before, and after, the justification of the sinner. Richard Baxter (1615–1691) so vigorously opposed their errors that he gravitated toward another extreme: he made the gospel a new law by so emphasizing the need for penitence that believing in Christ was restricted by legal terms. He became an exponent of what later would be designated as Neonomianism.[3]

Prompted by this conflict, the Puritan Joseph Caryl, in a word of recommendation, stated the intent of *The Marrow* to be that "to reconcile and heale those unhappy differences which have recently broken out afresh among us, about the Points therein handled, and cleared." Caryl here refers to the controversy regarding the antinomian and legalistic tendencies in the theology of some Puritans.[4]

A year after the publication of the first edition of *The Marrow*, a pamphlet by I.A. was published identifying a number of "errours" in the book. It is directed not against expressions that underscore the universal offer of grace as such, but rather against the statement that repentance is the fruit of faith and does not precede justification. The booklet posits that only penitent sinners are eligible to receive the gift of faith and justification.

The writer also criticizes the fact that *The Marrow* elaborates on faith and justification without in any way referencing the new birth. The critic misses a description of how the Holy Spirit works in regeneration. Furthermore, he maintains that sanctification is not addressed. Everything revolves around the act of faith which the reader is called upon to exercise, without pointing out that it is impossible from the sinner's side to believe.[5]

---

2. Fisher, *The Marrow of modern divinity*, first ed., title page.

3. For the Antinomian conflict and Baxter see especially Ernest F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law: A Study of Puritan Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976), 22–34.

4. Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, ed. 1645, word of recommendation by Joseph Caryl, May 10, 1645.

5. IA, A MANIFEST AND BREIFE DISCOVERY Of some of the Errours contained in a Dialogue called the *Marrow of Moderne Divinity*. (London: J. Kirton, 1646).

The second edition of *The Marrow*, which was published in 1646, was probably a reaction to the pamphlet by I.A. According to the title page, it is more elaborate than the first edition. For example, included in this edition are the "Places" by the Scottish reformer Patrick Hamilton (ca. 1504–1528), who explained the distinction between law and gospel.[6] Fisher's preface to the first edition was enhanced in this edition. For example, he personally mentions some Puritans by name who do not appear in the first edition, namely, John Dod and Thomas Hooker. The author confesses that "by means of conferring with Master Thomas Hooker in private, the Lord was pleased to convince me that I was yet but a proud Pharisee, and to shew me the way of faith, and salvation by Christ alone."[7] In this edition, Fisher places greater emphasis on the errors of the Antinomians. Apparently, he intended to be more balanced—also in the dialogue itself—by paying more attention to sanctification.[8] Then, in addition to Caryl's preface, he includes some endorsements by J. Burroughs, W. Strong, I. Sprigge, and S. Prettie. These endorsements are followed by an alphabetical list of names of theologians whom the author quotes.[9]

A separate second volume of *The Marrow* was published in 1649. Like the first volume, it consists of a dialogue. Here the author explicitly deals with the Decalogue. All commandments are commented on by "Evangelista;" "Nomologista," a proponent of the law; and "Neophitus," a weak believer. The book is dedicated to John Warner, Lord Mayor of London. In addition to Caryl, Ralph Venning, Samuel Moore, and John Cradocot wrote words of recommendation. As he did in the first edition, Fisher uses the initials E. F. He still does not wish to reveal his name. In his preface, dated September 21, 1648, he gives an account of this exposition of the Ten Commandments. He wishes to clarify the place and function of the law. His intention is probably to refute allegations of antinomianism. In the

---

6. Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity…Before the which there is prefixed the commendatory Epistles of various Divines of great esteem in the Citie of London…*, "The second Edition, corrected, amended, and much enlarged. By the Author, E. Fisher." (London: G. Calvert, 1646).

7. Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, second edition, "To all such humble hearted Readers, as see any need to learn, eyther to know themselves or GOD in CHRIST", n.p.

8. Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, ed. 1646, "To all such humble hearted readers, as see any need to learn, either to know themselves, or God in Christ."

9. Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (ed. 1646), 'A Catalogue of those writers names out of whom I have collected much of the matter contained in this ensuing Dialogue', "To the Reader", n.p.

second edition, he indicates that the law has not been set aside for believers, as the Antinomians teach.[10]

David Como has discovered that Fisher initially interacted with antinomian groups. Although he had distanced himself from them after the release of *The Marrow*, he had well-known Antinomians Prettie and Sprigge write a word of recommendation for the second edition of the first volume.[11]

Scottish Editions of *The Marrow*

The Marrow was discovered in 1700—55 years after the publication of the first edition—by the Scottish theologian and minister Thomas Boston (1676–1732), in the home of a church member in Simprin, his first congregation. Given its explanation of the relationship between law and gospel, he deemed it helpful to have it republished. This was prompted by his own lack of insight and the "legalistic" tendencies of his own spiritual life and theological position. The latter was due to the conditional nature of neonomian preaching that was gaining ground in the Scottish church.[12]

In 1718, through the instrumentality of Boston's friend and colleague James Hog (c. 1658–1734), minister at Carnock, the first Scottish edition of *The Marrow* rolled off the press in Edinburgh. This ninth corrected edition of the first volume includes a preface by Hog, the compiler of this volume. It is not clear which English edition Hog used; it was, at least, not the first edition of 1645. It was probably the third edition of 1646.[13] James Hog's name also appears in a critical and anonymous pamphlet, *The Snake in the Grass*, written in response to the Scottish edition of *The Marrow*. In his preface, dated December 3, 1717, Hog indicates that this book is relevant because of the distortion of the relationship between law and gospel that prevailed in the land.[14] In two pamphlets, in which he does not mention his

---

10. Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Moderne Divinity*, *The second part* (London: J. Wright, 1649).

11. Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 60–61, 455.

12. Thomas Boston (George H. Morrison, ed.), *Memoirs of the Life, Time, and Writings of the Reverend and Learned Thomas Boston, A.M.* (Edinburgh, London: Oliphant, Andersen & Ferrier, 1899), 169. On the "discovery" of Boston, and the completion of the new edition, see David C. Lachman, *The Marrow Controversy 1718–1723: An Historical and Theological Analysis* (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 1988), 201–202.

13. Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity: touching both the Covenant of Works, and of Grace…*, The ninth edition, corrected (Edinburgh: J. Mosman, W. Brown, 1718); Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, third edition (London: Giles Calvert, 1646).

14. Anon., *The Snake in the Grass: or, Remarks Upon a Book, entituled, The Marrow of Modern Divinity: Touching both the Covenant of Works and of Grace* (Edinburgh, 1719).

name, Hog addresses the criticism of *The Snake*, as well as comments made by a fellow pastor.[15]

The book immediately caused a stir. The primary opponent was James Hadow (ca. 1670–1747), professor of theology at the University of St. Andrews. In April, he spoke against *The Marrow* in a sermon before the Synod of Fife. One point of criticism concerned a passage where grace is offered promiscuously, in the sense of "Christ is dead for him." He comments on this: "Now, how can Ministers of the Gospel tell every Man, as the Truth of God, that Christ is dead for him, without the Supposition of a universal Redemption?"[16]

The Marrow Conflict

This Scottish republication of 1718 sparked a controversy within the Church of Scotland that made its way to the General Assembly. This conflict, having gone down in history as the "Marrow Controversy," lasted from 1718 to 1723. Twelve ministers, who historically have become known as the Marrow Men, defended the orthodoxy of the controversial book to a majority of the synod. These twelve included Thomas Boston and James Hog. The Assembly condemned the contents of the book based on five identified errors. These alleged errors pertain to the assurance of salvation, the relationship between law and gospel, and the scope, or extent, of the atonement. The committee responsible for reporting to the Assembly concluded that the atonement of Christ and the divine pardon were presented as being universal in nature. The book's defenders rejected this accusation.[17]

This question was also raised during the debates at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, where the book was ultimately condemned. This drawn-out procedure lasted four years. After the Assembly ruled in 1720 that *The Marrow* contained passages contrary to Scripture and the Westminster Confession, the twelve Marrow Men filed a "Representation

---

15. James Hog, *A Letter to a Gentleman, Containing A Detection of Errors in a Print, intituled, The Snake in the Grass* (Edinburgh: R. Brown, 1719); James Hog, *An Explication of Passages Excepted against in the Marrow of Modern Divinity…In a Letter to a Minister of the Gospel* (Edinburgh: R. Brown, 1719). The initials J. H. point to the authorship of Hog.

16. This sermon was printed the same year. James Hadow, *The Record of God, and Duty of Faith Therein required* (Edinburgh: J. Mosman, 1719), 27.

17. Main literature on the Marrow Controversy includes: Lachman, *The Marrow Controversy 1718–1723*; Henry F. Henderson, *The Religious Controversies of Scotland* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905), 20–43; Thomas M'Crie, "Account of the Controversy respecting *the Marrow of Modern Divinity*," in *The Edinburgh Christian Instructor* 3, August, October, December 1831, and "New Series," 1, February 1832.

and Petition" requesting that the Assembly's decision be revoked. In addition to Boston and Hog, the brothers Ralph (1685–1752) and Ebenezer Erskine (1680–1754) also belonged to the Marrow Men.[18] They expressed their surprise at the arguments underlying this decision.[19] At the next Assembly in 1721, their gravamen was countered by presenting them with twelve questions to be answered. The answers, prepared mainly by Ebenezer Erskine, were submitted to the Assembly Commission in March 1722.[20] The ecclesiastical trial that followed resulted in another condemnation of *The Marrow*. The Assembly of 1722 confirmed the acts of the 1720 Assembly in condemning *The Marrow* and went so far as to forbid pastors to quote passages of the book in the pulpit.[21]

The Marrow Republished in two Separate Volumes

During the Marrow controversy, the second volume of *The Marrow* was republished in Scotland. Hog was probably the editorial compiler of this work also. However, his name is not mentioned—not even in two pamphlets that were published shortly after this and of which he must also have been the author. This probably has to do with the regrettable progression of the controversy in the Assembly for Hog and others. Fisher's two prefaces and the endorsements, as they appear in the 1649 edition, are followed by "The Preface to this Edition" along with "The Appendix" at the end of the book. It appears that James Hog is the author of both additions, especially considering that he discusses the publication of the first volume. The preface elaborates on the character of evangelical sanctification and the difference between legal and evangelical preaching. The appendix emphasizes the biblical relationship between law and gospel.[22] Two pamphlets that were published shortly thereafter deal explicitly with the contents of this edition.[23]

Despite the Assembly's condemnation of the Marrow doctrine, a republication of the first volume of *The Marrow* was made in Scotland in 1726.

---

18. Lachman, *The Marrow Controversy*, 294.

19. Lachman, 296.

20. Lachman, 316.

21. Lachman, 409–18.

22. The English edition is Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity. The second part* (London: J. Wright, 1649). The Scottish edition: Edward Fisher, *The Second Part of The Marrow of Modern divinity…* (Edinburgh: 1722).

23. Anon, *An essay Upon Gospel, and Legal Preaching* (Edinburgh: J. Davidson, 1723); James Hog, *Review of An Essay Upon Gospel, and Legal Preaching* (Edinburgh: James Mc Ewen, 1723).

This contains explanatory notes ("Notes") by Thomas Boston. Though his name is not mentioned, there is a pseudonym, "Philalethes Irenaeus" ("the truth does not break down"). Boston used one of the Scottish editions of the first volume, the twelfth edition "corrected." He probably—like Hog—was not familiar with the first English edition of 1645.[24] Later Scottish editions consisted of a merger of the first volume with the Boston marginal notes and the second volume, which has no marginal notes.[25]

Two Main Quotes of *The Marrow* Under Criticism of the Assembly

First Quote:

> I beseech you consider, that God the Father, as He is in His Son Jesus Christ, moved with nothing but with His free love to mankind lost, has made *a deed of gift and grant* [emphasis mine] unto them all, that whosoever of them all shall believe in this His Son, shall not perish, but have eternal life. And hence it was, that Jesus Christ Himself said to His disciples, Mark 16:15, "Go and tell every man without exception, that here is good news for him; Christ is *dead for him* [emphasis mine]; and if he will take Him, and accept of His righteousness, he shall have Him.[26]

This quote did stir pens and tongues in Scotland. This mainly concerns the accusation of Amyraldism, or the view of the French School of Saumur on the expanse of reconciliation, the so-called hypothetical universalism. The short definition of this doctrine is: Christ has atoned for the whole world, but the atonement will be effected through the application of the redemption of Christ to the hearts of the elect. The question is whether the above translation quote indeed contains traces of Amyraldism. As noted above, the Marrow Men, in their commentary on the Scottish Assembly's criticism, have refuted this accusation.[27]

---

24. Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Diivinity…*, with notes by Philalethes Ireanaeus, "twelve edition, corrected" (Edinburgh: 1726).

25. This second volume was not published in one volume with the Scottish editions of *The Marrow* until 1789 with the first volume. Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, "in two parts" (Falkirk, Scotland: P. Mair, 1789).

26. Edward Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, n.d.), 126–27.

27. For the different views on the scope of the atonement, as with Saumur, see Joel R. Beeke, *Living for God's Glory: An Introduction to Calvinism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008), 74–88, "The extent of the atonement."

After the National Synod of Dort (1618–19), this French Huguenot school tried to bridge the conflicting views of the Arminians and Calvinists by formulating a compromise theology. In this construct, the decree of election follows the decree that God's Son would make satisfaction for all fallen mankind. Saumur's exponents were the Scottish professor John Cameron (1579–1625) and his disciple, Moise Amyraut (1596–1664). Both taught at the University of Saumur. They rejected the teachings of Arminius but approximated the view of Arminians concerning the extent of the atonement to the whole world.[28]

Universal Atonement, or a Universal Gospel Offer?
For our question, "Query X" from the assembly is important:

> Query X. Whether the revelation of the divine will in the Word, affording a warrant to offer Christ unto all, and a warrant to all to receive Him can be said to be the Father's making a deed of gift and grant of Christ unto all mankind? Is this grant to *all mankind* [emphasis mine] by sovereign grace? And whether it is absolute, or conditional?[29]

In their response, the representatives of the Marrow Men dismissed the charge of a universal or general atonement. The passage being challenged, that is, "The Father has made a deed of gift and grant unto all mankind, that whosoever of them shall believe in his Son, shall not perish," does not refer to a universal or general atonement but rather to the universal offer of Christ to all people.[30] They clarify this as follows:

> (…) That by the "deed of gift, or grant unto all mankind," we understand no more than the revelation of the divine will in the Word, affording warrant to all to receive Him; for although we believe the purchase, and application of redemption to be peculiar to the elect, who were given by the Father to Christ in the Counsel of peace, yet the warrant to all to receive Him is common to all. Ministers, by virtue of the commission they have received from their great Lord and Master, are authorized, and instructed to preach the gospel to every creature, that is, to make a full, free, and unhampered offer of Him,

---

28. For the view of Saumur, and the controversy of hypothetical universalism in France, see Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).

29. E. Fisher, *The Marrow* (ed. 2009), 371.

30. Fisher, *The Marrow* (ed. 2009), 371.

His grace, righteousness, and salvation to every rational soul to whom they may in providence have access to speak.[31]

Second Quote:
The context of the cited quote from "act of gift, or bestowal":

> God the Father, as He is in his Son Jesus Christ, moved with nothing but with his free love to mankind lost, has made a *deed of gift* [emphasis mine] and grant unto them all, that whosoever of them all shall believe in this his Son, shall not perish, but have eternal life.[32]

Another offending passage condemned by the Assembly is:

> And hence it was, that Jesus Christ Himself said unto his disciples, "Go and preach the gospel to every creature under heaven" (Mark 16:15), that is, Go and tell every man without exception, that here is good news for him; *Christ is dead for him* [emphasis mine]; and if he will take him, and accept of his righteousness, he shall have Him.[33]

Boston's "Annotations"
Thomas Boston's "Notes" ("Annotations") sheds a brighter light on the author's intentions in these excerpts. Boston wishes to indicate that Fisher does not espouse a universalist view of the atonement. If the book had included these explanatory notes regarding these excerpts when it was reprinted in 1718, confusion and misunderstanding might have been avoided. The twelfth edition of *The Marrow* (1726), published subsequent to the controversy, did contain these comments.[34]

Boston's commentary regarding the controversial passages sheds some light on the allegedly offending statements. As to the expression in the first segment, "a deed of gift and grant," Boston indicates that this is a quote from a book by the English Puritan Ezekiel Culverwell (ca. 1554–1631). In his "Annotations," Boston considers the two offending phrases to be paraphrases of the universal offer rather than evidence of a universal atonement. As to the phrase "act of bestowal and gift," Boston notes, among other

---

31. Fisher, *The Marrow* (ed. 2009), 371.
32. Fisher, *The Marrow* (ed. 2009), 144.
33. Fisher, *The Marrow* (ed. 2009), 144.
34. Leen J. van Valen, "*The Marrow of Modern Divinity* in historische context," in Fisher, *Het merg van het Evangelie*, ed. Brevier (2015), 28; E. Fisher, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, Twelfth edition (Edinburgh: 1726). The author and editor, Thomas Boston, is not named. Fisher has the initials E. F. and Boston is with the pseudonym "Philalethes Irenaeus."

things: "That is, from this deed of gift and grant it was that the ministerial offer was appointed to be made in the most extensive terms" (note 2). "Namely, the deed of gift and grant, or the offer of Christ in the word, (…)" (note 4).[35] And some pages thereafter follows a reference to John 3:16, to which Boston adds an excerpt from the Canons of Dort that describes the universal call of the gospel.[36]

The expression in the second segment—"Christ is dead for him"—is, according to Boston, extracted from a book by the English Puritan John Preston (1587–1628). Boston elaborates on this in detail. First, he quotes the entire paragraph from Preston's book that contains the phrase. Boston argues that the context reveals that Preston does not teach anything other than that a dead Savior is offered to all people. "A Savior is provided for him; there is a crucified Christ for him, the ordinance of heaven for salvation for a lost man, in the use-making of which he may be saved."[37]

Boston's explanatory notes regarding the Culverwell and Preston passages seek to clarify that they do not imply universal atonement. However, is this indeed the case when we examine these quotations within the scriptural context in which they appear?

David Lachman, who points out in his *The Marrow Controversy* that the Assembly misinterpreted these passages, believes that Boston's notes accurately reflect Culverwell's and Preston's views. This apparently was not the view of their contemporary, Richard Baxter, who lists their names as belonging to those to whom it applies that "this middle way of universal redemption has been by writing and disputing, and preaching maintained." He agreed with the Amyraldian view of the extent of atonement. Baxter also includes in this list British delegates to the Synod of Dort, such as John Davenant (1572–1641), who had defended the broad view of the extent of the atonement in the drafting of the Canons of Dort. Lachman challenges this conclusion as going too far, especially since Baxter, in his view, does not substantiate his claims from the sources. Baxter himself also supported the broad view of the atonement.[38]

---

35. Fisher, *The Marrow*, (ed. 2009), 1442 ,4.
36. Fisher, *The Marrow*, (ed. 2009), 152, Canons of Dort, chap. 2, art. 5.
37. Fisher, *The Marrow*, 152, quote153n.
38. Lachman, *The Marrow Controversy*, 24–26, Lachman quotes Baxter from Richard Baxter, *Certain disputations of right to Sacraments, and the true nature of fisherible Christianity* (London: 1658).

We will examine the writings of these two authors as to their intent; that is, whether they espoused a broad view of the extent of the atonement, or whether they should be interpreted according to Boston's "Annotations."

Context of Culverwell's Book The Treatise of Faith (1623)
We will first consider the context of the quote by Ezekiel Culverwell.[39] Culverwell was an English Puritan minister in Little Leighs, Essex, East Anglia. The most famous of his writings is *The Treatise of Faith* (1623; 8th edition 1648), which contains the controversial passage.[40]

The quote from *The Marrow* is extracted from the following passage in Culverwell's book:

> Now, the matter to be beleeved is here said to be the Gospel. That is, the glad tydings of Reconciliation made by Christ Jesus between God and man, which though it be diversly, and in sundry speeches set out unto us in holy Scriptures, yet all is most sufficiently contained in this one sentence delivered by Christ Himself, Joh. 3.16 "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; wherein this is evident, that the matter to be beleeved unto salvation is this: That God the Father moved by nothing but his free love to mankinde lost, hath made a part of *gift and grant* [emphasis mine] of His Sonne Christ Jesus unto mankind, that whosoever of all mankinde, shall receive this gift by a true, and lively faith, he shall not perish, but have everlasting life.[41]

At first sight, it seems from the context of the sentence that this is not a reference to universal atonement but rather a universal offer to a lost human race. Like the opponents of the Marrow Men, there were contemporaries of Culverwell who had difficulty with his broad conception of the gospel. The Scottish minister and physician Alexander Leighton (ca. 1570–1649), who had fled to the Netherlands because of his strict Presbyterian views,

---

39. E. Culverwell, *Treatise of Faith. Wherein is declared, how a man may live by Faith, and find releefe in all his necessities. Applyed especially unto the use of the weakest Christians* (London: W. Sheffard, 1623).

40. Brett Ussher, "Culverwell, Ezekiel" in *Puritans, and Puritanism in Europe, and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, ed. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:69–70.

41. Culverwell, *Treatise of Faith* (ed., 1623), 13, 14.

appears to have published a forty-one page document in Amsterdam in 1624 in which he criticized the booklet of Culverwell on faith.[42]

Among other things, Leighton objects to Culverwell's view that Christ and all His benefits are offered to all people. He considers this an Arminian error and believes that Christ is only offered to the elect. All people are not chosen, and therefore the offer cannot be extended to all people. As proof texts, he cites Ephesians 1:9 and Titus 2:11. Just because there are "reprobates" under the gospel ministry, it does not mean that the gospel is being offered to them.[43]

Culverwell responded with a pamphlet in which he points out that he believes himself to be in complete agreement with the Canons of Dort.[44] He quotes the first articles of this confession, emphasizing that all hearers of the gospel are earnestly called. When he uses the word "offering," he means the "external call of the gospel." He argues that his opponent confuses the word "offer" with the "promise" to receive Christ, for only the elect will do the latter.[45]

Context of Preston's Book The Breast-plate of Faith and Love (1630)
We will now consider the context of the second passage. John Preston was an English Puritan clergyman at Cambridge.[46] The offending passage appears in his well-known work *The Breastplate of Faith and Love (1630)*.[47]

The above quote from *The Marrow* occurs in the following context of this book:

---

42. Alexander Leighton, *A Friendly Tryall of some Passages contained in the Treatise of Faith, written by Mr. Ezekiel Culverwell* (Amsterdam [?], 1624). See also Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands 1600–1640* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 197.

43. Leighton, *A Friendly Tryall*. "Christ is only offered to those that are elected in Christ; but all are not elected in Christ, and saved by Christ. Therefore the offer is not made to all," 9, 10, 12.

44. Ezekiel. Culverwell, *A Briefe Answere to certaine Objections against the Treatise of Faith, made by Ezekiel Culverwell. Clearing him from the errors of Arminius, unjustly laid to his charge* (London: W. Sheffard, 1626), A5.

45. Culverwell, *A Briefe Answere*. "By offer I meane only the outward calling by the gospel", n.p.

46. Jonathan D. Moore, "Preston, John," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, eds. Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster (Santa Barbara, 2006), 1:204–205.

47. John Preston, *The Breast-Plate of Faith and Love, A Treatise, Wherein the Ground and Exercise of Faith and Love, as They Are Set Upon Christ Their Object, and as They Are Expressed in Good Workes, Is Explained* (London, 1630).

But, when you hear this righteousness is given, the next question is, to whom is it given? If it be only given to some, what comfort is it to me? But (which is the ground of all comfort) it is given to every man, there is not a man excepted; for which we have the sure word of God, which will not fail. When you have the Charter of a King well confirmed, you reckon it a matter of great moment: What is it then, when you have the Charter of God Himself? which you shall evidently see in these two places, Mark 16:15, "Go, and preach the gospel to every creature under Heaven: What is that? Go, and tell every man without exception, that there is good news for him, Christ is *dead for him* [emphasis mine], and if he will take him, and accept of his righteousness, he shall have it, restrain it not, but go, and tell every man under heaven."[48]

Then follows the quotation of Revelation 22:17, "And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." To this, Preston adds, "Many other places are in the Scriptures to prove that the offer is universal."[49]

At first glance, the context seems to indicate that there is no universal atonement here, but rather that Preston is speaking of the universal offer of salvation in the gospel. In what follows, he indicates that although Christ is offered and given freely to all men, God's purpose is to bestow this salvation by effectually calling only the elect (i.e., to be applied by faith).[50]

English Puritan Universalism

Jonathan Moore wants to prove in his study *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* that there is no linguistic difference between "Christ is dead for him" and "Christ died for him."[51] It is striking, he says, that Preston nowhere explicitly states in his writings that Christ died for the elect alone. In this regard, he does not adhere firmly to the doctrine of limited atonement, as did William Perkins (1558–1602), following Theodore Beza (1519–1605).[52]

---

48. Preston, *The Breast-Plate of Faith, and Love* (ed. 1634, reprint, 1979), 8.

49. Preston, *The Breast-Plate*, 8, "Many other places of Scripture there be, to prove the generality of the offer."

50. Preston, *The Breast-Plate* (repr. 1979), 9. "Though Christ be offered, and freely given to all, yet God intends him only to the elect."

51. Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

52. Pieter Rouwendal has shown that Beza deviated from Calvin's vision. Pieter L.

Moore points out that the universal "gospel call" is a compelling reason for Preston to offer grace to everyone. However, what is the basis for this offer? Is it the fact that Christ has made satisfaction for all men? He admits that Preston was inclined to base the universal gospel call on the assumption of a universal atonement. Moore posits that this is reflected in a sermon Preston delivered at Lincoln Inn in 1625.[53] This sermon includes the controversial phrase which Preston directly links to "a conditional Covenant of grace which is common to all." From this covenant relationship, "the righteousness and salvation" of Christ is for everyone.[54]

Boston views the offending phrase as a paraphrase of the universal offer and not as evidence of a universal atonement. Lachman follows the same reasoning in his book *The Marrow Controversy*. The evidence that he and Boston cite from Preston's works to show that the gospel offer is not grounded in a universal extent of the work of Christ is not, according to Moore, applicable to said phrase.[55]

While this cannot be inferred from the offending quote, Moore nevertheless argues that the extent of the atonement is wider in Preston than in those who rigorously defend limited atonement. He believes that his conclusions are substantiated by the so-called "York House Conference" held in 1626. Both Calvinists and Arminians were represented at this conference.[56] The Calvinist Preston, who was initially silent at this conference, was, according to a report, compelled to answer the opposing party's question whether Christ died for all. He pointed out in cautious terms that "Christ was indeed a ransom for all (1 Tim. 2: 6), but that, on the other hand, he actually bestows salvation only to the elect" which is the extent of the atonement. In fact, this is limited atonement, but the position at the conference was not clearly defined.[57]

Rouwendal, *Predestination and Preaching in Genevan Theology from Calvin to Pictet* (Kampen: Brevier, 2017), 30. "Christ had died sufficiently for all…but efficiently for the elect," 82. Beza criticized the phrase "sufficiently for the world."

53. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 98–100.

54. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 117, 118.

55. Lachman, *The Marrow Controversy*, 27; Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 118–20.

56. For the York conference, see Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 141–69.

57. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 162.

The Broad View Espoused at the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly

The cited quotes from Culverwell and Preston are not isolated. The Episcopalian Calvinist James Ussher (1581–1656) apparently defended the broad view of the atonement and corresponded with Culverwell on this.[58] They did not explicitly define that the extent of atonement is not directed to the elect, but to the whole world. According to the broad view, it was based on the general love of Christ to the whole of mankind. In March 1618, Ussher communicated his thoughts to Culverwell in a draft not published until 1656.[59] According to Baxter, Ussher had influenced the Episcopalian John Davenant.[60] Davenant was one of the foremost defenders of this broad view of the Synod of Dort. The differences between the broad and narrow view allegedly implied that the Canons of Dort do not explicitly indicate for whom Christ died. In fact, there was a consensus.[61]

At the Westminster Assembly, there was a small minority that espoused the view of Davenant and others, the Puritan Edmund Calamy (1600–1666) being the principal spokesman. To the Scottish theologian Samuel Rutherford (1600–1661), he posited that the "world" of John 3:16 includes not only the elect but all men.[62]

The supporters of the Ussher and Davenant view certainly did not want to be counted among the Arminians. Nor did they teach the same thing as the "hypothetical universalism" of the so-called French "School of Saumur." Saumur plainly taught that Christ has *made satisfaction* for all the world, and that goes beyond *dying* for the world. The difference is that the English broad view the atonement is extended to the world in the *preaching*

---

58. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 175; Richard Snoddy, *The Soteriology of James Ussher: The Act and Object of Saving Faith* (Oxford: University Press, 2014), 52–56.

59. This publication was made after Ussher's death in 1657. James Ussher, *The Judgement of the late Archbishop of Armagh…Of the Extent of Christ's Death, and Satisfaction* (London: J. Crook, 1658). See Snoddy, *The soteriology of James Ussher*, 53.

60. Jonathan D. Moore, "James Ussher's Influence on the Synod of Dort," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dort*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Aza Goudriaan (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 163–77; Snoddy, *The Soteriology of James Ussher*, 76.

61. For the different positions at the Synod of Dort, see G. Michael. Thomas, *The Extent of the Atonement: A Dilemma for Reformed Theology from Calvin to the Consensus (1536–1675)* (Carlisle: Paternoster Publishing, 1997), 128–61, 150, Davenant's position.

62. David L. Allen, *The Extent of the Atonement: A Historical and Critical Review* (Nashville: B&H Academy, 2016), 242. For the discussion at Westminster Assembly see Alex F. Mitchell and John P. Struthers, eds., *Minutes of the sessions of the Westminster Assembly of divines*, (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood, 1874), 152. For a critical assessment see Robert T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism* (Oxford: University press, 1979), 184–96.

of the gospel (2 Cor. 5:18–21) but the satisfaction of Christ is only applied to the elect. The minority point of view did not influence the formulation of the confession and the larger and shorter catechisms. The Westminster Confession clearly states that Christ satisfied and died only for the elect and not for the whole mankind.[63]

Although there are similarities between Ussher and Amyraut with regard to the broad vision, according to Moore these two views are different. In Usher and others, the extent of the atonement is directly associated with the offer of grace while Amyraut, Baxter, and others emphasize the satisfaction of Christ for the benefit of all mankind.[64] In England, the school of Saumur was mainly espoused by the Puritan Richard Baxter, though he did not derive his view of the atonement from Saumur. He made his own point of view, but he later stated that he agreed with Saumur on this point.[65]

According to the Dutch theologian Gisbertus Voetius, Saumur's theology fits within the parameters of Calvinist theology.[66] According to Brian Armstrong, it is a reaction to the "extreme position" of Dutch theologians such as Gomarus and Maccovius who opposed the view of Davenant and others. Even the French theologian Pierre du Moulin, who was diametrically opposed to Saumur in the French controversy, labels the position of Dutch orthodoxy as *extreme*.[67]

The Marrow Doctrine in the Scottish Theological Context

How does the Marrow doctrine relate to Scottish theological thinking in the seventeenth century? The Marrow Men, in their defense of the controversial

---

63. Lee Gatiss, "Shades of opinion within a generic Calvinism, The particular redemption debate at the Westminster Assembly," in *Reformed Theological Review*, 69 (2010), August, No. 2, 101–18. Gatiss indicates the School of Saumur had no influence on the final text of the Westminster Confession.

64. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 217–20.

65. Han Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy* (Zoetermeer, Holland: Boekencentrum, 1993), 197–200.

66. Willem J. van Asselt, E. Dekker, eds., *De scholastieke Voetius (The Scholastic Voetius)* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1995), 88–89. Voetius states, "This view [that of Saumur, LJV] [is] not a middle ground between ours and that of the Remonstrants"; 111, "Reformed theology of the seventeenth century has a remarkable variation." See also the conclusion of Richard Muller that Amyraut cannot be called un-reformed. Richard A. Muller, "Beyond Hypothetical Universalism: Moïse Amyraut (1596–1664) on faith, reason, and ethics," in *The Theology of the French Reformed Churches: From Henry IV to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, ed. M. I. Klauber (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014), 208.

67. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 133.

book, had emphasized that their view does not deviate from the Westminster Confession and representatives of the Second Reformation, such as Samuel Rutherford, Hugh Binning, and James Durham. In his study *Calvin and Scottish Theology*, M. Charles Bell claims that the Marrow doctrine is an extension of seventeenth-century theology. Hadow and others lean towards neonomianism and hyper-Calvinism; they mix law and gospel.[68]

The Scottish lay theologian John Howie (1735–1793) believed that several passages in *The Marrow* deviate from the confession and theology of the Second Reformation. He mentions the formulation of the assurance of salvation and the aforementioned quotations from Culverwell and Preston. When it comes to formulations, Howie's analysis is correct. The only question is whether the Marrow Men drew different conclusions from the same confession. As to the assurance of salvation, they indeed attempted to arrive at a consensus between the Reformers and the Second Reformation. Discerning between faith and assurance can easily result in an unwanted dichotomy. They emphasized in their defense before the Assembly that they had no intention of deviating from the confession. This also applies to their view regarding the extent of the atonement.[69]

In our opinion, there is no substantial difference between the representatives of the Second Reformation and the Marrow Men. There are differences in emphasis. Rutherford and others focus primarily on the Antinomians. They speak of faith and conversion as mandatory conditions on the part of man. Boston, who especially wished to combat the neonomian movement, did not speak of prerequisite conditions for faith in Christ.[70]

According to Moore, the universalist expressions in *The Marrow* influenced the theology of those who wanted to be loyal to the Marrow Men tradition. In the Scottish churches—which originated in the Secession of 1733, when Ebenezer Erskine and others separated from the Church of Scotland—a movement emerged that defended hypothetical universalism. The cause was a one-sided emphasis on the offer of grace, tending toward

---

68. M. Charles Bell, *Calvin and Scottish Theology: The Doctrine of Assurance* (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1985). See also John Macleod. *Scottish Theology in Relation to Church History Since the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1974), 143–45.

69. John Howie, "Some remarks on the Marrow of modern divinity," updated November 30, 2021, https://www.truecovenanter.com/gospel/howie_footnote_on_marrow.html.

70. For criticism of, or agreement with, *The Marrow's* definition of faith, see Stephen G. Myers, *Scottish Federalism and Covenantalism in Transition: The Theology of Ebenezer Erskine* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2015), 109–10. W. Cunningham rejects it and James Buchanan defends it.

Arminianism and "hypothetical universalism." Proponents were well aware, however, that the Marrow Men wanted to adhere to limited atonement. Those were not influenced by universalism.[71] Donald Macleod asserts that in mainstream Scottish theology there is a continuing stress on a broad and free offer of the gospel combined with a limited extent of the atonement that pertains only to the elect.[72]

Conclusion

In summary, I conclude the following:

First, the two controversial passages of *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, derived from the abovementioned books of Culverwell and Preston, tended to the broad view that Christ's atonement extended to the whole world in the preaching of the gospel, but that the satisfaction is only applied to the elect.

Second, Thomas Boston's marginal notes in the Scottish edition explain the intended excerpts from the perspective of a limited atonement (Christ died only for the elect). For Boston, this could only be the universal offer of the atonement. He explains that the controversial quotes of Culverwell and Preston mean this view. But in the context of the controversy between Preston and the Arminians, Preston did not explicitly state that Christ died only for the elect, as Boston did.

Finally, the sources from which the controversial passages in *The Marrow* are extracted are writings of the English Puritans Ezekiel Culverwell and John Preston, who, based on research by Jonathan Moore, had an affinity with adherents of the broad view as espoused by James Ussher and John Davenant. This does imply that in the *preaching* of the gospel Christ died for the whole world. Boston in his "Annotations" did not declare that Christ died for the whole world, but that Christ is only preached to the world to the *offer* of His atonement. He died only for the elect.

---

71. Jonathan D. Moore, "English Hypothetical Universalism and Influence on Scottish Marrow Theology," unpublished lecture of the James Begg Society, May 30, 2008. See also Macleod, "Theology in the Early Days of the Secession," *Scottish Theology*, 166–88.

72. Cf. Donald Macleod, "Dr. T. F. Torrance, and Scottish Theology: A Review Article," in *Evangelical Quarterly* 72, no. 1 (2000): 57–72.

Book Reviews

Andrew S. Ballitch, *The Gloss and the Text: William Perkins on Interpreting Scripture with Scripture* (Bellingham, Wash.: Lexham Press, 2020).

Despite being one of the most influential English Protestants of his day, William Perkins (1558–1602) has received relatively minimal dedicated attention from scholars until roughly the last decade. From 2014 through 2020, Perkins's works were republished in modern English in their entirety for the first time and three major monographs covered Perkins. One of these is Andrew Ballitch's *The Gloss and the Text*. Ballitch's work is a lightly edited version of his 2017 PhD thesis entitled, "'Scripture is Both the Glosse and the Text': Biblical Interpretation and Its Implementation in the Works of William Perkins."

Ballitch's thesis is that "William Perkins interpreted Scripture with Scripture by using three tools: context, collation, and the analogy of faith" (3). For Ballitch, context "is a close reading of the text in terms of the argument and literary features," collation is "a comparison with other passages," and the analogy of faith is "the boundaries of the Reformed tradition" (3). Ballitch contends that this three-part exegetical method is the hermeneutical principle Perkins himself teaches in *The Arte of Prophecying*. Ballitch asserts that Perkins used this method to expound Scripture throughout his corpus regardless of the genre of writing Perkins undertook. Ballitch seeks to prove his thesis by examining Perkins's works genre-by-genre and showing how these three tools constituted Perkins's method of interpretation.

In his opening chapter, Ballitch provides an overview of his thesis and a brief summary of the existing research on Perkins and Perkins's exegesis. Ballitch contends that exegesis constituted a major matter for Perkins and scholars have largely missed this topic. Ballitch also highlights the fact that many of Perkins's works originated as sermons. In chapter two, Ballitch

provides a biographical sketch on Perkins. Next, drawing especially on the work of Richard Muller, Ballitch offers a historical survey of patristic, medieval, and early Reformation exegesis. Chapters 3 through 6 form the core of the book as the author systematically works through Perkins's writings in order to prove the thesis that Perkins's exegetical method consists of employing context, collation, and the analogy of faith. Ballitch divides Perkins's works into four categories: sermons and commentaries (chapter 3), practical works (chapter 4), theological works (chapter 5), and polemical works (chapter 6). In the final chapter, Ballitch summarizes his thesis and briefly shows how his work corrects as well as adds to Donald McKim's study on Perkins. In opposition to some strains in Perkins's scholarship, Ballitch sees Perkins as a Puritan, though Ballitch largely avoids the thorny question of defining what he means by "Puritan."

Since Ballitch discusses Perkins's works individually and in substantial detail, *The Gloss and the Text* serves as a helpful primer for many of Perkins's treatises. Before discussing a particular text of Perkins, Ballitch often provides a pithy summary of Perkins's treatise as well as brief historical context about the work and the social climate that might have shaped Perkins's thought. While Perkins was hardly unique in the way Scripture dominated his writing, Ballitch winsomely brings out this important part of Perkins's theological method.

Perhaps the most significant strength of *The Gloss and the Text* is its assiduous engagement with primary sources. The author uses both the original printing of Perkins's treatises and the collected 1631 edition of his works. In total, Ballitch makes hundreds of references to Perkins's writings across nearly all of Perkins's corpus. Ballitch also provides periodic comparisons to the writings of Perkins's contemporaries. Ballitch shows deep knowledge of Perkins's corpus—a fact that is not surprising given that Ballitch co-edited one of the volumes of the recent republications of Perkins's works and has written articles on Perkins. However, Perkins's *Problem of Forged Catholicism*, which focuses extensively on citing the fathers yet still contains some engagement with Scripture, is absent from the extensive works of Perkins to which Ballitch gives substantial attention. Nonetheless, Ballitch proves his thesis through his examination of Perkins's works and drawing out, on hundreds of occasions, how Perkins used the three-part exegetical method to understand Scripture.

While Ballitch engages with academic literature on a few occasions to show that scholars have not discussed Perkins's exegesis adequately (5–17), to provide background to early modern England, and to explain how *The*

Gloss and the Text contributes to broader scholarly conversations (222–27), the majority of the book proffers minimal engagement with the wider academic discussion. Similarly, Ballitch largely misses interaction with some previous discussions of Perkins's exegesis such as the engagement of the topic in David Barbee's 2013 PhD dissertation. Nonetheless, for scholars interested in Perkins or Elizabethan exegesis, Ballitch's work will be a helpful guide to the writings and exegesis of Elizabethan England's most famous Protestant.

—Eric Beech, *Wolfson College, University of Oxford*

Coffey, John, ed. *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions,* Vol. 1, *The Post-Reformation Era, 1559–1689* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).

With this first of the five volumes comprising *The Oxford History of the Protestant Dissenting Traditions*, the authors have acceded to the unenviable task of summarizing, delineating, and reconstructing the nature of nonconformity from the Elizabethan Settlement to the Toleration Act of 1689. Emphasizing both the "contingency" of Dissent and the "fluidity" of denominational identities in the post-Reformation Anglophone world, this volume channels Patrick Collinson to shift the story of Dissent out of the clutches of denominational history and into the mainstream (15). To that end, its narrative structure, "diffusion and migration," serves to trace the Dissenting traditions in their many and varied shades from sixteenth-century England to Wales, Ireland, Scotland, the Netherlands, and the British Atlantic (34). The story told here ultimately turns global, tilling the soil for the collection's subsequent volumes, which attend to Dissent's spread up through the twenty-first century.

Divided into four parts, the volume's twenty-one chapters treat Dissent's development geographically—both within and outside of England—and then thematically, exploring its socio-political, cultural, and theological contexts. These chapters incisively capture the contingency of the historical moment and shine a light on the way in which Dissent hung as a Damoclean sword of sorts over the national church after the Reformation. From Elliot Vernon's "Presbyterians in the English Revolution," to W. J. Sheils's "Dissent in the Parishes," the contributors make plain the precarious position of the ecclesiastical establishment throughout the post-Reformation

period. Dissent is a relative term that could be, and indeed was, turned on its head under the right political circumstances.

Though the contributors successfully underscore the diversity of non-conformity, the volume would have been well served by offering a more pointed engagement with the dissimilarities, tensions, contradictions, and fissiparous tendencies within Dissent. Necessarily, this series treats the various Dissenting groups as of a piece in terms of their relationship with the national church and the post-Reformation political scene. Even still, especially with regard to soteriological orientation, many of the Dissenting groups were more likely to find common cause with the established church than with each other. John Coffey's chapter, "The Bible and Theology," offers an excellent start in this direction, noting the "centrifugal effect" of disagreements over biblical interpretation, and their ability to cast off Dissenters into "rival factions" (377). However practicable it may be, it must be acknowledged that strange bedfellows are created when Baptists and Quakers, or Ranters and post-1662 Presbyterians, are considered together. Nevertheless, the contributions in this volume ably sketch how similarly situated these groups were in the period and, though distinct, how porous were the borders of their respective communities of believers.

Finally, it has to be noted that this volume is punctuated with a number of typographical errors. Although this is understandable to a point, given the magnitude of the contributions and the breadth of the subject matter, it does make for distracting reading at times and is incommensurate with the volume's substantive heft. This concern notwithstanding, the editor and the contributors have put together a wonderful collection of essays that are a credit to the field and will serve casual students and committed scholars alike for a long time to come.

—Jonathan Baddley, *Vanderbilt University*

Davies, Michael and W. R. Owens, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of John Bunyan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).

In August 2015, the British newspaper *The Guardian* released its list of 100 best novels written in English. At the top of the list lay a book from about 350 years ago entitled *Pilgrim's Progress* by John Bunyan. This book etched Bunyan's place in English literary history. However, his life and works extended far beyond the one title for which he is often remembered.

John Bunyan's life spanned an enormously consequential period of English history including a civil war, the execution of the king, an interregnum, and a restoration of the monarchy. Bunyan was born just after the ascension of King Charles and he died right before the glorious revolution of William and Mary. His life included tragic personal loss, a decade of imprisonment, and a reputation for preaching so renowned that it reached into the upper echelons of society. In addition to preaching, Bunyan authored around sixty different titles that cemented his legacy.

Given Bunyan's unique life and his consequential literary legacy, one may be surprised to find that Bunyan is not the subject of any recent and thorough handbook, companion, or other similar edited volume. *The Oxford Handbook on John Bunyan* fills this lacuna. With contributions from roughly forty different scholars, spanning almost 700 pages and covering topics as diverse as Bunyan's theology and his reception in the eighteenth-century British empire, the handbook is a monumental achievement that will serve as a touchstone for years to come.

The handbook is divided into four sections, each with about ten different articles. The first section, entitled *Contexts*, lays out details about Bunyan's life, his world, and contemporaneous events happening in England. Readers of this review may be particularly interested in Anne Dunan-Page's fascinating history of Bunyan's Bedford congregation and its ecclesiastical practices. Dunan-Page examines the church book of the Bedford congregation to look at how individuals joined the church and how the church functioned. Dunan-Page concludes her essay by pointing out that much work remains to be done on this topic as "a full history of the Bedford congregation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is still to be written" (68). Dewey D. Wallace Jr's essay on Bunyan's theology situates Bunyan as a Baptist and Independent who is nonetheless in the broader Protestant Reformation tradition. In a few of the essays in the first section, the authors repeatedly focus on Bunyan's position as a religious dissenter on the wrong side of the political-religious establishment.

The second section, entitled *Works*, contains a number of chapters dedicated to major works of Bunyan, including *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*, *Pilgrim's Progress*, *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman*, and *The Holy War*. In addition, different authors tackle works from a particular period or a topic such as writings on the church or posthumously published works. Ken Simpson's essay entitled "'The Desired Countrey': Bunyan's Writings on the Church in the 1670s" may be of particular interest due to its juxtaposition of themes on doctrine, piety, and practice. Simpson elucidates Bunyan's

doctrine of the visible and invisible church and the controversies Bunyan participated in surrounding the practice of so-called open communion (222–23). Further, Simpson traces Bunyan's important distinction between essentials of faith and "externals" or "things indifferent" (225).

The third section, entitled *Directions in Criticism*, contains the works of authors who apply different critical lenses to the corpus of Bunyan. For example, Stuart Sim discusses the relationship between Bunyan, post-structuralism, and postmodernism. Similarly, Lori Branch writes an essay on Bunyan and a case for post-secular criticism. Branch offers a post-modernist lens as an important view on students of Bunyan and the politics of his era.

The fourth and final section, entitled *Journeys*, tracks the reception of John Bunyan and his work. For example, Cynthia Wall outlines the influence Bunyan had on the early novel. Isabel Rivers traces debates about the transformation of the reception of *Pilgrim's Progress* during the evangelical revivals of the eighteenth century. Sylvia Brown discusses the role of the British empire in the dissemination and reception of John Bunyan's works.

While there is much to commend and appreciate about *The Oxford Handbook of John Bunyan*, two items deserve particular attention. First, the essays strike an admirable yet difficult to achieve balance between primary sources and secondary scholarship. Essays contain extensive engagement with primary sources, yet they also engage with pertinent secondary scholarship without flooding the text with quotations from academics. Second, the handbook boasts an impressive breadth of contributors and topics. Authors include literary specialists, historians, and theologians from a diverse background. Nonetheless, while the handbook covers a broad range of topics, a disproportionate amount of space is devoted to literary aspects of Bunyan or critical appropriations of his works instead of exploring his theological and pastoral concerns.

The essays in *The Oxford Handbook of John Bunyan* are widely accessible and do not require much preexisting knowledge. The handbook is a must-have for any serious scholar of Bunyan and contains essays that will be useful conversation partners for a variety of scholars, pastors, and interested laypeople.

—Eric Beech, *Wolfson College, University of Oxford*

Whitney G. Gamble, *Christ and the Law: Antinomianism at the Westminster Assembly* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2018).

The publication of the *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1643–1653* (*MPWA*), edited by Chad Van Dixhoorn (2012), marked a watershed moment in the study of early modern religion in the transatlantic world, providing scholars with a wealth of new manuscript material. Until its appearance, the main preoccupation of Westminster studies was undoubtedly the heated debates on ecclesiology, and for good reason. Not only were these debates better documented, but these studies generally emerged from a Presbyterian confessional tradition—for whom these issues provided ongoing practical concern, and not just academic interest. However, the documents edited by Van Dixhoorn have opened the door to a more nuanced assessment of the divines' work, offering a richer contextualization of their labors and a growing understanding of less-studied polemical battles that arguably mattered more to those men than the ideological heirs who retold the narrative of the Assembly in subsequent centuries.

In this fine study, Whitney Gamble offers the first thorough assessment of one of the most important of these battles—the battle over antinomianism—which she judges to have been "the primary concern of the Assembly from its first meeting" (6). Drawing extensively from the *MPWA* and the newly discovered journal of Assembly divine John Lightfoot, she shows that the perceived threat from this quarter was so significant that the divines' response to antinomian teaching framed not only their early debates, but the very shape of the Westminster Confession's classical formulations on justification, saving faith, and good works.

Dr. Gamble begins with the little-known background to these debates, ably charting the rise of seventeenth-century English antinomianism. A useful survey of the work of John Eaton—and prominent disciples such as Tobias Crisp, John Saltmarsh, John Simpson, and the Baptists Robert Towne, Henry Denne, and Hanserd Knollys (39–64)—reveals a theological pendulum swing away from both Laudian Arminianism and the perceived "legalism" of the Reformed, but a swing much too far for the majority of English clergy. English antinomianism was hardly monolithic, and Gamble patiently leads the reader through the notorious complexities and diversities of the multifaceted antinomian dogma, condensing their tenets helpfully into several distinct theological commonalities. These include their sharp dichotomy between the Old and New Testaments (a rigid binary corresponding to the covenant of works and grace respectively); their rejection of

the "third use of the law" for anyone clothed in the imputed active obedience of Christ; their articulation of eternal justification, with its concomitant downplaying of the covenant conditionality of saving faith and repentance in conversion; and their conflation of justification and sanctification, which resulted in a species of perfectionism. These were hardly peripheral matters of Christian doctrine; as such, the Antinomians questioned the very fabric of Reformed theology and threatened to rewrite established norms of Puritan experiential spirituality. The lifting of Laudian censorship on the eve of the Assembly in 1641 brought a flood of antinomian publications and preaching in London, creating a panic among Reformed divines, and setting the stage for the heart of Gamble's study, namely how the Westminster Assembly used its parliamentary commission to reform the Church of England's Thirty-nine Articles to stem this tide.

The author's sure-footed treatment of these debates offers compelling new windows into how the divines delimited the boundaries of their official remit, and how they sparred with the parliament and with one another. For instance, with parliament pushing hard for a swift judgment for antinomian preachers, many divines balked at being called to function as a church court with authority to penalize those they had largely concluded were guilty of serious error, not heresy. Their efforts to persuade erring theologians by conference before moving to censure reveals their pastor's hearts, but neither do they emerge from Gamble's study as soft on false doctrine. The publication of error in print and pulpit was considered a case of *fama clamosa*, rather than a personal injury to be treated with the first steps of Matthew 18 (71–72). Ultimately, the divines' final *Humble Advise…for Preventing the Mischiefs…of Antinomianisme & Anabaptisme* is a hard-fought seven-point document sent to Parliament distilling antinomianism's "dangerous opinions," that would land recalcitrant Antinomians in prison. However, as Gamble intriguingly points out, it also would open a new theological can of worms: three of the seven censured "dangerous opinions" were ecclesiastical proclivities shared by Westminster's handful of Independents like Thomas Goodwin (80–82), who in many debates had ironically helped carry the day against key antinomian errors. Thus, while there was a general consensus over the soteriological issues addressed by the *Advise*, a famous cadre of five "no" voters emerged: the eponymous "Dissenting Brethren," whose *Apologeticall Narration* (1643) set a collision course with the new agenda-setting *Solemn League and Covenant* that same year. Gamble thus asserts a crucial but overlooked connection in Westminster studies: that the Assembly's under-studied antinomian debate actually played a significant role in

kindling its more famous ecclesiastical debate, which has spilled considerably more scholarly ink.

Perhaps the strongest scholarly contribution of Gamble's study lies in its groundbreaking exploration of how antinomianism dramatically impacted confessional formulation at Westminster (chapters 4–6). By wading through the often-dense weeds of internecine debate in the Jerusalem Chamber now available in the *MPWA*, she reveals how many of the Westminster Standards' classical statements on the cardinal Reformed doctrines of justification, saving faith, repentance unto life, and good works were painstakingly crafted as polemical broadsides against the theological hydra of antinomianism. The controversy touched on so many theological loci that this volume helpfully addresses a whole host of current topics of scholarly discussion, such as the development of the bicovenantal structure of redemption, the republication of the covenant of works at Sinai, the twofold obedience of Christ, Puritan preparationism, and the relation of law and gospel.

Christ and the Law will also be of value to address contemporary issues facing confessional churches in the Westminster tradition. For example, it offers a compelling counterpoint to ministers and ministry candidates who might be tempted to stretch their subordinate standards to accommodate questionable "exceptions" and seek vindication from the fractious debates of the divines who composed them. For example, Gamble carefully explains Thomas Gataker's heated arguments against the active imputed obedience of Christ as an over-correction to the contemporary antinomian abuse of that doctrine (94–108). The diversity of opinion at Westminster this exemplifies—along with the alleged consensus language of the imputation of Christ's *whole* obedience" rather than "active and passive obedience"— has sometimes been over-stated as an argument for a similar latitude toward definitions of justification within confessional churches today. In this case, Gamble demonstrates that Gataker's dissent was an outlier shared by only three others in the Assembly, and the term "whole obedience" was unanimously understood by the divines as shorthand for the imputation of both active and passive obedience (128–31, 141–42). Thus, she reminds us that while new manuscript discoveries have revealed a much broader array of opinions at Westminster than hitherto assumed, and that the Confession it spawned was thus very much a consensus document, neither should the *MPWA* become a kind of "Ur-text" to the plain words of the Confession for those seeking to evade subscription on cardinal points. *Christ and the Law* exposes the irony that a Confession of Faith so painstakingly crafted

as an exclusionary document to seventeenth-century Antinomians should be increasingly interpreted as an inclusionary consensus document that might accommodate proponents of comparable antinomian tenets in the twenty-first.

All in all, a most welcome contribution to Westminster studies that mines the manuscripts and brings out treasure that will be of great value to both the church and the academy.

—David G. Whitla, *Reformed Presbyterian
Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA*

Richard A. Muller, *Grace and Freedom: William Perkins and the Early Modern Reformed Understanding of Free Choice and Divine Grace* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020).

Grace and Freedom, like many academic books, represents the continuation of an important and ongoing dialogue among scholars. During the past decade, Richard Muller, Paul Helm, Antonie Vos, and others have discussed the relationship between grace and freedom in early modern thought in books such as *Reformed Thought on Freedom* (2010), *Divine Will and Human Choice* (2017), and *Reforming Free Will* (2020), as well as in journals such as the *Journal of Reformed Theology*. Muller, Helm, and others have debated not only the relationship between grace and freedom but also the applicability—and indeed at times even the definition—of terms such as compatibilism, libertarianism, determinism, synchronic contingency, and diachronic contingency to describe the views of early modern Reformed thought. *Grace and Freedom* provides another contribution to this important discussion by focusing on debates over grace (or divine sovereignty) and freedom (or human free will) involving the English theologian and pastor William Perkins (1558–1602), other Protestants, and Roman Catholics.

Throughout *Grace and Freedom*, Muller makes a few key arguments—five of which deserve brief summation. First, Muller argues that the use of terms such as compatibilism, determinism, and libertarianism to analyze early modern theology (including the views of William Perkins) is anachronistic and inaccurate (4–6, 187–93). Muller's contention that these terms do not describe the general views of Reformed Orthodoxy is a point Muller also emphasizes in his previous work, *Divine Will and Human Choice* (Baker Academic, 2017). Second, Muller proffers that Perkins's understanding

of the will tended toward a voluntarist view over and against some of his Reformed contemporaries both in England and on the Continent (8, 19, 54, 61, 64, 75, 91–92, 133, 184, 191–94). Muller sets Perkins's views in the context of their medieval background, particularly the thought of Aquinas, as well as the influence of earlier Reformers like Ursinus and Zanchi.

Third, Muller argues that Perkins operated with a two-part understanding of the freedom of the will: "the libertie of contradiction" and "the libertie of contrarietie" (68; cf., 19, 64–68, 77, 82, 91–94, etc.). While Muller offers other nuances for defining and understanding free will in early modern thought, including the place of spontaneity (8, 107), he largely sticks to this two-part understanding of free will. Fourth, Muller contends that the distinction between primary and secondary causality is critical to understanding Perkins's view of free will as well as Perkins's harmonization of divine will and human freedom (69, 72, 127, 155–56, 187–88, 190). Fifth, Muller asserts that Perkins followed the Augustinian four-state understanding of human nature and that Perkins agreed with Roman Catholic theology on human nature in three of those four states, differing only on the second (97–98, 132, 185–86, 194–95). Further, Muller sees differences in human nature throughout these four states as a pivotal part of understanding Perkins's views (190, 194).

Grace and Freedom contains many of the hallmarks of Richard Muller's previous works. For example, it proffers extensive primary source engagement not only from Perkins but also from the broader early modern period. In addition, Muller places Perkins against the background of medieval theology, providing substantial discussion of Aquinas, Scotus, and others. Similarly, Muller uses Perkins, and the broader issue of the relation of free will to divine grace, to reiterate points he made in previous works about the relationship between Calvinists like Perkins and John Calvin. Further, *Grace and Freedom* rightly sees and structures Perkins's thought through an Augustinian lens—a lens Perkins himself had, as anyone familiar with his works can discern from the copious citations or references to Augustine found in his corpus.

However, *Grace and Freedom* is written primarily for academics. Muller assumes a substantial amount of background context, and the content is very dense at times. Similarly, while Muller recognizes the potential benefits of an appendix to define some of the many key terms that reappear in the book, he suggests that readers consult his *Dictionary of Greek and Latin Theological Terms* (x–xi). A ten-to-fifteen page appendix in *Grace and Freedom* with

key terms, definitions, and brief historical context specific to this work on Perkins would be a valuable addition beyond merely consulting a dictionary.

In summary, *Grace and Freedom*, like so many of Richard Muller's previous works, is a thoroughly researched and broadly situated treatment of aspects of Reformed thought.

—Eric Beech, *Wolfson College, University of Oxford*

Sweeney, Douglas A., and Jan Stievermann, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Jonathan Edwards*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

It is no small feat to publish a handbook on one whose hand penned many a book. *The Oxford Handbook of Jonathan Edwards*, edited by Douglas A. Sweeney and Jan Stievermann, takes on the daunting challenge of addressing Jonathan Edwards's life, intellectual output, and international impact in one text. The editors rightly recognize the enormity of that task and promise to do nothing less than gather a volume that "…surveys the full breadth of the present spectrum of scholarship on Edwards across different disciplines and regions of the world" (*xv*). With an introduction and thirty-seven chapters authored by some of the most prominent scholars of religion—including George Marsden, Kathryn Reklis, and Harry Stout—*The Oxford Handbook of Jonathan Edwards* illustrates the sheer range of scholarship that one person can inspire.

The Handbook is divided logically into four sections, each unified by a relatively broad subfield of Edwards studies. As the title suggests, "Part I. Edwards's Backgrounds, Sources, and Contexts" initiates readers to Jonathan Edwards's world, grounding *The Handbook*'s study of Edwards in the particular historical moment that he embodied. From these five chapters, two simultaneous portraits of Edwards emerge; the first is of a man in his immediate surroundings. Ava Chamberlain, for instance, presents a detailed study of Edwards's family life, showing how the theologian's management of his household and relationship with his wife Sarah epitomized the rapidly changing "dynamics of family life in colonial New England" (15).

David Kling's chapter "Edwards in the Context of International Revivals and Missions" removes Edwards from his familiar perch in the towns of Northampton and Stockbridge, Massachusetts, placing him in the midst of a movement that Kling calls "transatlantic evangelicalism" (52). That image of a worldly, if not cosmopolitan, Edwards squares well with Peter

Thuesen's analysis of the expansive sources that Edwards drew on in his writings. Among those most influential sources were those circulated in the "republic of letters," an international network of knowledge-seekers that exchanged ideas through correspondences in the early modern world (84).

Perhaps not surprisingly given Edwards's chosen profession, the second section, "Part II. Edwards's Intellectual Labors," makes up the bulk of *The Handbook*. Here, chapters span a vast chasm of topics from meticulously researched inquiries into the finer points of Edwardsean theology (see, for instance, chapter 10 on pneumatology by Robert W. Caldwell III) to studied considerations of Edwards's place in eighteenth-century natural philosophical debates (see chapter 21, "The Natural Sciences of Philosophy of Nature" by Avihu Zaki). Enabled in large part by the finishing of the *Works of Jonathan Edwards* in 2008 and the continual digitization efforts of Edwards's unpublished works by the Jonathan Edwards Center at Yale, these chapters impress upon readers Edwards's staggering intellectual output. Granted, their tendency towards the granular might attract the specialist in historical theology more than a generalist.

"Part III. Edwards's Religious and Social Practices" is a refreshing turn away from Edwards's intellectual life to his lived experiences of religion—if such a distinction between the philosophic and the worldly exists. John Salliant's chapter "Ministry to the Bound and Enslaved" stands out as exceedingly relevant to current dialogues on the centrality of race and slavery in American history. Here, Salliant advances the persuasively argued thesis that, in the American context, "Edwards himself never became an abolitionist, but he assembled some of the theological instruments that men and women used to create abolitionism soon after his death" (432). That is not an easy picture of the man for many to accept, for it allows honest, historically accurate discussion of what is now seen as Edwards's moral shortcoming—his failure to reject an exceedingly cruel institution. Equally as helpful as Salliant's discussion of Edwards's interactions with enslaved people—both Indian and African—are the considerable number of works that he cites. Hopefully, these resources allow greater enquiry into Edwards and slavery.

The editors, though, saved the most thought-provoking chapters for last. "Part IV. Edwards's Global Reception" emphasizes just how far-reaching Edwards's works were. As a helpful counterpoint to John Salliant's work, Adriaan Neele gives an account of how nineteenth-century missionaries—American and European—used *The Life of David Brainerd* and *A History of the Work of Redemption* in their proselytizing across the

African continent. Missing, though, is any attempt to uncover how people in Africa reacted to Edwards. As such, placing this chapter under the auspices of "Global Reception" seems misleading (551). Alternatively, Dongsoo Han does a better job at bringing to life the much-understudied use of Edwards in Asian theological works. In particular, Han brings our attention to the robust and growing twentieth-century Korean tradition that employs Edwards in Christian revivals. It is worth noting that other Asian countries have not relied as heavily on Edwards, which Han suggests is a result of lack of access to translated works (522).

The Oxford Handbook of Jonathan Edwards has a chapter for all audiences. That is, I think, the genius of the book. Editors Sweeney and Stievermann do not purport to give the final word on one of America's most prolific theologians and influential minds. Instead, they present a broad and fair evaluation of Edwards in his day and ours. For that reason, I suspect *The Handbook* will become the introductory text for anyone wishing to study Jonathan Edwards.

—Andrew Juchno, *Yale Divinity School*