

Studies in Puritanism and Piety Journal

Volume 7 • Spring 2026

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| From the Editors | 1 |
| “William Fulke on Traditions and History in the Identity of the English Church” — <i>Richard A. Muller</i> | 3 |
| “The Harder Reading: The Hungarian Reception of Allestree’s <i>The Whole Duty of Man</i> (1658) During the Long Eighteenth Century” — <i>Zsombor Tóth</i> | 31 |
| “‘Live a Holy Life in Order to Die Well’: On the Influence of William Perkins’s <i>Salve for a Sicke Man</i> on Gisbertus Voetius’s View of Dying Well” — <i>Gerard M. Bosker</i> | 53 |
| “Salvation and Methodist Societies: How Soteriology Shaped Spiritual Formation” — <i>Joshua Tingle</i> | 70 |

BOOK REVIEWS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Larsen, Christina N. <i>The Glory of the Blessed Son: An Approach to the Christology of Jonathan Edwards</i> . T&T Clark, 2025 <i>David Reid</i> | 107 |
| Meeuse, Cornelius Jan. <i>De bestrijding van het cartesianisme door Jacobus Koelman</i> . Labarum Academic, 2024 <i>Jan Van de Kamp</i> | 109 |
| Schweitzer, Cameron. <i>Towards a Clearer Understanding of Jonathan Edwards’s Biblical Typology: A Case Study in the “Blank Bible.”</i> JESociety Press, 2024 — <i>David Reid</i> | 112 |
| Slavinski, Sergiej S. <i>Francis Cheynell: Polemic and Piety in The Divine Trinunity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit</i> (1650). Leiden: Brill, 2024 — <i>James Morrison</i> | 115 |

Van Brugge, David. *That Which They Can't See: A Retrieval of Jonathan Edwards' Homiletical Use of Imagination*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2025 — Allen M. Stanton 118

Van Wyk, John R. *To Understand Things as Well as Words: An Examination of Jonathan Edwards and His Pedagogical Methodology*. Pickwick, 2025 — Chris Stevens..... 121

FROM THE EDITORS

The seventh edition of *Studies in Puritanism and Piety Journal* features a collection of compelling articles and insightful book reviews. At the forefront is Richard Muller's introduction to William Fulke (1538–1589), a largely underrecognized Puritan who, in his own time, was a formidable polemicist. Following in Jewel's footsteps, Fulke vigorously challenged Roman Catholic arguments against the Bible and tradition. Muller highlights, "While Jewel was the preeminent English scholar asserting the use of the church fathers to defend the catholicity not just of the Reformation but of the English church, Fulke emerges as one of his most significant followers," as evidenced by his extensive list of major apologetic treatises. Fulke directly countered the critiques of the Roman Catholic Thomas Stapleton (1535–1598) against Scripture and extra-biblical tradition by uniquely appealing to Bede's *History of the Church of Englande*, establishing the Scriptures as the sole authoritative guide and emphasizing the role of the early church fathers. He also passionately defended Protestant translations of Scripture against arguments supporting the Rheims New Testament, reinforcing the primacy of biblical authority.

Zsombor Tóth offers a compelling analysis of an obscure translation of the conformist Richard Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man*, translated into Hungarian by the Reformed scholar György Aranka Zágoni (1705–1767). Tóth provides insightful biographies of both Aranka and Allestree and delves into meticulous text-critical examination, uncovering intriguing new insights into how Allestree's work was received and became influential in Hungary.

G. M. Bosker, after offering insightful introductory comments on the *ars moriendi*, compellingly compares the works of Gilbertus Voetius (1589–1676) and William Perkins (1558–1602) on dying well, highlighting several intriguing points of convergence. Bosker convincingly highlights the contrast between the steadfast Reformed orthodoxy of the Dutch and that of the English Reformers.

The final article, authored by Joshua Tingler, explores the crucial differences between the Methodist societies in Wales and Wesleyan Methodism. While Bebbington acknowledges that both adhered to the four core points of evangelicalism—biblical authority, Christological focus, salvation by faith alone, and active saving faith—closer examination reveals that their distinct approaches to soteriology ultimately led to the formation of separate societies and specialized structures. This distinction highlights the profound theological implications that shaped their divergent paths.

This edition features six exemplary scholarly reviews that underscore the journal's commitment to high-quality analysis. David Reid evaluates Christina Larsen's acclaimed work, *The Glory of the Blessed Son: An Approach to the Christology of Jonathan Edwards*. Jan Van de Kamp offers a noteworthy translation and review of Cornelius Jan Meeuse's *De bestrijding van het cartesianisme door Jacobus Koelman*, accessible to an English audience. Cameron Schweitzer's insightful study, *Towards a Clearer Understanding of Jonathan Edwards's Biblical Typology: A Case Study in the "Blank Bible,"* garners a thorough review by David Reid, while James Morrison examines Sergiej Slavinski's work, *Francis Cheynell: Polemic and Piety in The Divine Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (1650)*. David Van Bruggé's innovative exploration of Jonathan Edwards's use of imagination, *That Which They Can't See: A Retrieval of Jonathan Edwards' Homiletical Use of Imagination*, is reviewed by Allen Stanton, and John R. Van Wyk's detailed examination, *To Understand Things as Well as Words: An Examination of Jonathan Edwards and His Pedagogical Methodology*, is expertly reviewed by Chris Stevens. This collection exemplifies the journal's dedication to advancing scholarly discourse, making this edition an informative read for those committed to Puritan studies and scholarship.

William Fulke on Traditions and History in the Identity of the English Church

RICHARD A. MULLER

mullri.emeritus@gmail.com

*P. J. Zondervan Professor of Historical Theology, Emeritus,
Calvin Theological Seminary*

William Fulke (ca. 1538–1589) has received little attention in modern scholarship — despite his prominence in his own time as a theologian and apologist of the Elizabethan Settlement.¹ He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, graduating with the B.A. in 1558. Fulke subsequently studied law at Clifford's Inn. While at Clifford's Inn, he wrote his first major treatise, a work directed against astrology.² He returned to Cambridge, completed his master's degree in 1564, and was elected fellow of St. John's. His association with Thomas Cartwright and involvement in the vestarian controversy revealed his Puritan sympathies and led to a brief expulsion from the college. On his return in 1567, he lectured on Hebrew — and was again briefly censured in connection with a dispute over illegal marital unions. In 1569, he became chaplain to Robert Dudley, the earl of Leicester, and accompanied Dudley on diplomatic journeys to France. In 1572, he

1. On Fulke, see Richard Bauckham, "The Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke (1537–1589)" (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 1972); see also Bauckham, "Science and Religion in the Writings of Dr. William Fulke," *British Journal for the History of Science* 8, no. 1 (1975): 17–31. Also note the "Biographical Account" in William Fulke, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, Against the Cavils of Gregory Martin* (Cambridge University Press, 1843), i–xi; Edmund Venables, "Fulke William," s.v., in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 20:315–18; and Richard Bauckham, "Fulke, William," s.v. in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 21:129–31.

2. William Fulke, *Antiprognoticon contra inutiles astrologorum praedictiones Nostradami, Cuninghami, Loui, Hilli, Vaghami, & reliquorum omnium* (London, 1560); and *Antiprognoticon that is to saye, an Inuectiue Agaynst the Vayne and Vnprofitable Predictions of the Astrologians as Nostrodame, etc.... Whervnto is added by the author a shorte treatise in Englishshe, as well for the vtter subuersion of that fained arte, as also for the better vnderstandynge of the common people, vnto whom the fyrst labour seemeth not sufficient* (London, 1560).

was awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity and 1578 he was made master of Pembroke College, a position that he retained until his death in 1589.

The beginning of Fulke's interest in identifying traditionary sources for the defense of the Reformation began in the 1560s during the controversy over John Jewel's "Challenge Sermon" and saw early fruit in an unpublished work that gathered quotations from the church fathers by subject. As Richard Bauckham has pointed out, Fulke's apologetic or polemical works divide roughly into two groups: an early series of works published between 1568 and 1571, and a later series, corresponding with his tenure at Pembroke College, published between 1579 and 1589. Fulke's *Answer of a True Christian*, a work written in 1568 but only published in 1577, stands as the partial exception to this chronology.³ The concentration of major polemical writings in the last decade of Fulke's life parallels his increasing involvement in the official apologetics of the English church. In 1580, he was selected by Richard Cox, bishop of Ely, to argue the Protestant cause against Thomas Watson (ex-bishop of Lincoln) and John Feckenham (ex-abbot of Westminster). The same year saw the publication of Fulke's response to Thomas Stapleton's translation of Bede's history and to its interpretation in Stapleton's *Fortresse of the Faith*.⁴ In 1581, Fulke was one of the scholars chosen to dispute the Jesuit, Edmund Campion.⁵ The expertise that he demonstrated in these debates led to his appointment in 1582 by the Privy Council to defend the church against Roman polemics, notably, the frontal attack on English Protestant translations of Scripture by Gregory Martin written in tandem with the Romanist translation of Scripture, the Rheims New

3. Bauckham, "Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke," 140–41.

4. Bede, *The History of the Church of Englande. Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman*, trans. Thomas Stapleton (Antwerp, 1565); and Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortresse of the Faith First Planted Amonge vs Englishmen, and Continued Hitherto in the Vniuersall Church of Christ. The Faith of Which Time Protestants Call, Papistry* (Antwerp, 1565), published with the translation of Bede.

5. See Alexander Nowell and William Day, *A True Report of the Disputation or Rather Priuate Conference Had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Iesuite, the last of August. 1581. Set downe by the reuerend learned men them selues that dealt therein. VVhereunto is ioyned also a true report of the other three dayes conferences had there with the same Iesuite. Which nowe are thought meete to be published in print by authoritie* (London, 1583). Fulke was involved principally on the second and third days of the four-day disputation. On Campion and the disputation, see Peter Lake and Michael Questier, "Puritans, Papists, and the 'Public Sphere' in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context," *Journal of Modern History* 72, no. 3 (2000): 587–627. Note also William Whitaker, *Ad rationes decem Edmundi Campiani Iesuitae quibus fretus certamen Anglicanae exxlesiae ministris obtulit in causa fidei, responsio Gulielmi Whitakeri* (London, 1581).

Testament—printed in France and smuggled into England. Fulke's response was published in 1583. Fulke's final polemical work, *De Successione ecclesiastica*,⁶ responded to the last book in Stapleton's massive treatise on the doctrinal principles of the "true church."⁷

The following essay examines Fulke's contribution to the debate over tradition in the latter half of the sixteenth century, noting both his backgrounds in the earlier, detailed works of Thomas Cranmer and John Jewel on tradition and the use of the church fathers, but focusing on two ways in which Fulke elaborated and nuanced the issue in the context of a polemic that had advanced in detail and content beyond the stage identified by Cranmer's and Jewel's efforts. First, against Stapleton, Fulke developed a unique argument for an indigenous English tradition based on his reading of Bede's *History of the Church of Englande* and the *Anglo-Saxon Homilies*, turning Stapleton's argument against him based on historical argumentation. Second, Fulke elaborated on the basic Protestant polemic against human traditions but nuanced it in response to issues of New Testament interpretation raised by polemics against Protestant translations of Scripture, most notably in Gregory Martin's arguments in favor of the Rheims New Testament.

The English Church and Tradition: Cranmer and Jewel

Recourse to patristic argumentation in order to demonstrate the absence of a solid traditional rootage for Roman Catholicism, in particular for the Mass and transubstantiation, was characteristic of theological and apologetic stance of the early modern English church of the Elizabethan Settlement.⁸ This is not to claim, in line with an older Anglican scholarship, that a fundamental difference of confessionality obtained between English

6. William Fulke, *De Successione ecclesiastica et latente ab antichristi tyrannide ecclesia liber contra Thomae Stapletoni Principiorum fidei doctrinalium librum decimum tertium* (London, 1584).

7. Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica. Per controuersias septem in libris duodecim tradita in quibus ad omnes de religione controuersias diiudicandas sola & certissima norma, & ad easdem semel finiendas sola & suprema in terris autoritas, via, & ratio demonstrantur* (Paris, 1582).

8. See Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford University Press, 2009); and Quantin, "Perceptions of Christian Antiquity," in Anthony Milton, ed., *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, vol. 1: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520–1662* (Oxford University Press, 2017), 280–97; and K. J. Walsh, "Appeals to Antiquity in the Making of the Elizabethan Settlement" (PhD diss., Australian National University, 1971).

and continental Reformed theology—rather it is to note the clear parallel and mutual interdependence of the English with the continentals.⁹ The assumption of Reformed Protestants, whether English or continental, was that their teachings were representative of the catholic tradition and that it was the papacy that had deviated from the catholic faith by the addition of “human traditions,” some directly contrary to Scripture, others either arbitrary or temporally conditioned, and commanded their observance as necessary to faith and salvation. In the case of transubstantiation, the Protestant polemic was not only shared across virtually the entire spectrum of Protestant churches, but it was also rooted in a long historical background of alternative explanations of the Lord’s Supper prior to the declarations of IV Lateran in 1215 and a significantly more recent background of arguments against the doctrine in the late Middle Ages. The Protestant polemic, then, was not against tradition in general but against the oppressive and abusive use of specific human traditions.¹⁰ As John Foxe argued, the “oppression of the bishops of Rome” and ultimately the schism with the Eastern Church demonstrated that Rome had “lost the benefit of universal consent, so also she lost the name of ‘Catholic.’”¹¹

Foxe’s views belong to a Protestant narrative of decline that identified the later Middle Ages as an era of increasing distortion of and departure from the truths of the gospel and that supported the fundamental conservatism of the Reformation as a return to biblical truth.¹² This return, however, did not entail an attempt to leap over all of the intervening centuries as if all

9. See Mary Morrissey, “The ‘Challenge Controversy’ and the Question of Authority in the Early Elizabethan Church,” in Helen L. Parish, Elaine Fulton, and Peter Webster, eds., *The Search for Authority in Reformation Europe* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2016), 147–69, here 147–48; and Quantin, 1–21, 31; setting aside the view of Anglican distinctiveness present in his earlier essay, “The Fathers in Seventeenth Century Anglican Theology,” in Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, 2:987–1008; and also found studies such as H. R. McAdoo, “The Influence of the Seventeenth Century on Contemporary Anglican Understanding of the Purpose and Functioning of Authority in the Church,” in G. R. Evans, ed., *Christian Authority: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Oxford University Press, 1988), 251–77.

10. The point can be argued from the statements of various Reformers, notably, John Calvin: see above, chapter 4, “*Traditio* and *Paradosis* vs. *Humanas Traditiones*: Calvin on the Problem of Tradition.”

11. John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, a New and Complete Edition: With a Preliminary Dissertation*, by the Rev. George Townsend, 8 vols. (London, 1837), 2:418–19.

12. Jordan J. Ballor, “Deformation and Reformation: Thomas Aquinas and the Rise of Protestant Scholasticism,” in Manfred Svensson and David VanDrunen, eds., *Aquinas Among the Protestants* (Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 29–33; cf. Muller, *Post-Reformation*

teachings beyond the biblical canon were to be rejected. The Reformers and their successors cited with relative approval both the church fathers of the first five centuries, various early medieval theologians, and a series of “sounder scholastics” or *saniores scholastici* in whose works much solid exposition of Christian doctrine could be found, distinguished from dogmatic and customary accretions, and employed as a resource in theological formulation. In the late sixteenth century Protestant theologians happily posed Aquinas against the post-Tridentine views on the relative authority of Scripture and tradition.¹³ More importantly, Protestants appealed to their agreement with the broad outlines of Christian doctrine found in the writings of church fathers and in the four ecumenical councils (Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon) as evidence of the catholicity and orthodoxy of the Reformation, while at the same time recognizing presence of error in all such human productions and rejecting the assumption that Scripture ought to be read under the light of an extra-biblical traditionary norm.¹⁴

The early Reformation debate over tradition, as inaugurated in the writings of early Reformers like Tyndale and developed in the work of Thomas Cranmer,¹⁵ was typically focused on various traditions in doctrine and ceremony, whether or not they were grounded in Scripture or found among the fathers of the first five or six centuries,¹⁶ and whether in view of their foundation and origin they could be considered as permanent and normative. Most of the comments that Cranmer made with reference to tradition,

Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 1:194–197

13. David S. Sytsma, “Thomas Aquinas and Reformed Biblical Interpretation: The Contribution of William Whitaker,” in Manfred Svensson and David VanDrunen, eds., *Aquinas Among the Protestants* (Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 49–74.

14. Cf. Heinrich Bullinger, *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*, trans. H. I., ed. Thomas Harding, 4 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1849–1852), 1:12–14. Bullinger limits the councils to four, excluding the Councils or Synods of Constantinople of AD 553 and 680 as adding nothing to the orthodoxy of the first four. Also note *Thirty-Nine Articles*, xxi, in Philip Schaff, ed., *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes*, 3 vols., 6th ed. (Harper & Brothers, 1919), 3:500, on the authority of “Generall Councils.”

15. On Cranmer’s life and career, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (Yale University Press, 1996); also Paul Ayris, “The Public Career of Thomas Cranmer,” in *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 4 (2000): 75–125; and note Elliott Maurice, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Bible: ‘Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum,’” in *Churchman* 109, no. 1 (1995): 66–76.

16. Understandings of the duration of “primitive” Christianity varied during the era: see John C. English, “The Duration of the Primitive Church: An Issue for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Anglicans,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 73, no. 1 (2004): 35–52.

much in accord with the thought of other Reformers, are in the plural to “traditions” or to a particular tradition, that, like rites and ceremonies, can exist in the church albeit not in a final or normative manner.¹⁷ Rather than appeal to “tradition” in the singular as having a normative value, Cranmer appealed, as indicated in the title of his *Defensio*, to “the consent of the most ancient doctors of the Church.”¹⁸ Yet even in this appeal there remained a qualification. As Quantin points out, this consent “was not the *consensus Patrum* of Tridentine theology.”¹⁹ For Cranmer, the consent, even if it were available with an identifiable uniformity in all points of doctrine, would not have an authority distinct and separate from Scripture, and would require validation on the basis of its grounding in Scripture. Cranmer also recognized that the consent of the fathers was itself hardly uniform, not without error, and, like the Vincentian canon itself, more functional in the negative, ruling out doctrines that were limited in assent, time, and place, than in the positive, attempting to identify an absolutely universal belief. Or, to make the point in another way, a positive relation to patristic doctrine could serve as an argument for catholicity over against doctrinal innovation and as an indicator of the historical connection between the Reformation and Scripture via the early church, but it could not serve as an argument for the truth of one’s doctrine apart from Scriptural attestation.²⁰ In Cranmer’s case, as

17. Thomas Cranmer, *A Confutation of Unwritten Verities*, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556* (Cambridge University Press, 1846), 7, 22, 27, 52n, 55–60, 63; also idem, *An Answer unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation Devised by Stephen Gardiner*, in *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, relative to the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper* (Cambridge University Press, 1844), 19, 209; and cf. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, “Tradition and Traditions in Thomas Cranmer,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 59, no. 4 (1990): 467–78. There are quotations from the fathers that reference the “tradition” of the church in the singular: e.g., Cranmer, *Confutation of Unwritten Verities*, 57, 58.

18. Thomas Cranmer, *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Christ, with a confutation of sundry errors concerning the same, grounded and established upon God’s holy word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the church*, in *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed., Henry Jenkins, 4 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1833), 2:275–468; cf. K. J. Walsh, “Cranmer and the Fathers, Especially in the Defence,” *Journal of Religious History* 11, no. 2 (1980), 227–47, here page 236.

19. Quantin, *Church of England*, 55.

20. Cf. William Newton Todd, “The Function of the Patristic Writings in the Thought of John Calvin” (ThD diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1964), 144–53; with John K. Luoma, “The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century: The Anglican-Puritan Debate over Church Polity as Represented by Richard Hooker and Thomas Cartwright” (PhD diss., Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1974),

the title of his *Defence* indicates, a doctrine would need to be “grounded upon God’s word” and received in the church historically by way of the “consent” of its ancient teachers.²¹

Cranmer’s defenses of the teaching of the English Reformation, notably his arguments concerning the Lord’s Supper evidence a balance of Scripture and patristic reference, with Scripture as the prior authority the truth of which had been handed down and expounded faithfully in the church.²² Against “the papists” Cranmer not only affirmed the biblical basis for his understanding of the sacrament, he also insisted that he was not a lonely or individualistic interpreter: “lest the papists should say that we suck this [doctrine] out of our fingers, the same shall be proved, by the testimony of the old authors, to be the true and old faith of the catholic Church.”²³ The Roman practice of reserving the host and praying to it provided Cranmer with but one example of a Roman or papal innovation that could not be found in the writings of the fathers, not even, Cranmer averred, in the first thousand years of the church, but only in the thirteenth century.²⁴ Cranmer was also well aware of late medieval objections to transubstantiation and that both Duns Scotus and Gabriel Biel had recognized the doctrine rested neither on Scripture or reason, but on the determination of the Roman magisterium.²⁵ Accordingly, it was not merely the Pope that Cranmer saw as opposed to the truth of Scripture, but the “very papacy and the see of

71–77 (on Thomas Cartwright). Louma contrasted Cartwright with Hooker on the basis of Hooker’s use of traditions not contrary to Scripture in matters of church governance. Arguably Cartwright and Hooker were closer to agreement concerning matters of doctrine related to salvation. Luoma’s argument is summarized in his “Who Owns the Fathers? Hooker and Cartwright on the Authority of the Primitive Church,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 8, no. 3 (1977): 45–59.

21. Also note, Cranmer, *Defence*, 296–97, 320–28; cf. Walsh, “Cranmer and the Fathers,” 236; also see William P. Haaugaard, “Renaissance Patristic Scholarship and Theology in Sixteenth-Century England,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 10, no. 3 (1979): 37–60, here, pp. 41–42, 42n10, 52n52.

22. See Maurice Elliott, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Bible: ‘Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum,’” *Churchman* 109, no. 1 (1995): 66–76; idem, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Papacy: ‘And as for the Pope, I Refuse Him as Christ’s Enemy,’” *Churchman* 109, no. 2 (1995): 132–42; Ashley Null, “Thomas Cranmer and the Anglican Way of Reading Scripture,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 75, no. 4 (2006): 488–526; and Derek Scales, “Thomas Cranmer’s ‘True and Catholick Doctrine of the Sacrament,’” *Churchman* 104, no. 1 (1990): 102–31.

23. Cranmer, *Answer unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation*, 103.

24. Cranmer, *Answer to the Fifteen Articles*, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters*, 172.

25. Cranmer, *Defence*, 333–34.

Rome” that had created traditions in which the Word of God was opposed and suppressed.²⁶

John Jewel (1522–1571), bishop of Salisbury from 1560 until his death, has typically been identified as the preeminent apologist of the Elizabethan church.²⁷ At the heart of Jewel’s apologetic was the assumption that the English church had not forsaken the catholic faith—indeed, it held to the true catholic faith “of the apostles and of the holy fathers,” which it believed to be “Noe’s ark” apart from which there is no salvation.²⁸ Separation from the Church of Rome was not without great reluctance, since once, in another time, the gospel had been preached there. But Rome had departed from the truth and had subjected God’s commandments to the rule of one man. Accordingly, the English did not depart from the church: they departed from error.²⁹

Jewel was able to identify several medieval critics of the papacy and a variety of doctrinal views that countered later medieval and contemporary Roman doctrine and practice. There were cautions against papal power and claims of universal sovereignty not only in the works of Gregory the Great but also in the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux.³⁰ To support his argument, Jewel referred to a letter of Gregory the Great directed against John, the bishop of Constantinople, who had claimed to be “the universal bishop of Christ’s whole church”:

26. Cranmer to Lord Lisle, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters*, 322; cf. Elliott, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Papacy,” 135.

27. John Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, 4 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1845–1850). On Jewel’s life and thought, see Gary W. Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer* (Ashgate, 2006); also Angela Ranson, “‘Because Thy God Loves England’: Bishop John Jewel and the Catholicity of the Church of England, 1535–1599” (PhD diss., University of York, 2013); idem, “The Challenge of Catholicity: John Jewel at Paul’s Cross,” in W. Torrance Kirby and Paul Stanwood, eds., *Paul’s Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England* (Brill, 2014), 203–21; also Wyndham Mason Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (Harvard University Press, 1962); and Edward B. Jones, “An Examination of the Anglican Definition of the Church as Expounded by Bishop John Jewel” (PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 1963).

28. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology of the Church of England*, in *Works*, vols. 3–4, here, 4:709.

29. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, 4:718, 720.

30. E.g., John Jewel, *Bishop Jewel’s Answer to the Second Letter [of Dr. Cole]*, in *Works*, 1:32; *Bishop Jewel’s Reply to the Letter Above Written*, in *Works*, 1:46; *A Reply to M. Harding’s Answer*, in *Works*, 1:94, 164; *Defense of the Apology*, 4:1009.

“If the church,” saith [Gregory], “shall depend upon one man, it will soon fall to the ground.” Who is he that seeth not how this is come to passe long sithence? For long agoe hath the bishop of Rome willed to have the whole church depend upon himself alone. Whereof it is no marvel, though it be clean fallen down long agoe.³¹

The catholic unity of the church, however, does not depend on the fallen church of Rome or on the pope, but on Christ and is signified by the presence of the scriptures as the foundation built on the prophets and apostles. The Roman church subverts the scriptures and, like the ancient heretics, sets up as an authority and a source of unity human “conclusions and imaginations” rather than Christ.³²

Jewel’s approach to tradition and to the use of the church fathers is neatly summarized in the sermon he preached at Paul’s Cross in 1560,³³ famously known as the “Challenge Sermon.” The sermon rests on the words of institution of the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:23–29). After a brief introduction to Paul’s preaching, the sermon is largely a discourse on the meaning of the text in the early church. Jewel attacks the secretive aspects of the Mass, arguing that the words of institution were spoken in ancient times “to the people, and that in such sort as they might well understand them, and prepare themselves to the holy communion.”³⁴ Not only were the words of institution meant to be heard and understood by all, but celebration of the sacrament was also open to all communicants: there were no private masses, only one holy communion “which now God of his great mercy hath restored to us.”³⁵

Once he had documented these foundational arguments with multiple patristic references, Jewel provided his general rule for use of the church fathers in controversy:

31. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, 4:730.

32. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, 4:748–51, 759–60.

33. John Jewel, *The Copy of a Sermon Preached by the Bishop of Sarisbury at Paul’s Cross, the Second Sunday before Easter, in the Year of Our Lord, 1560*, in *Works*, 1:1–25. Note Mary Morrissey, “The ‘Challenge Controversy’ and the Question of Authority in the Early Elizabethan Church,” in Helen L. Parish, Elaine Fulton, and Peter Webster, eds., *The Search for Authority in Reformation Europe* (Ashgate, 2016), 147–69; and W. J. Torrance Kirby, “Signs and Things Signified: Sacramental Hermeneutics in John Jewel’s ‘Challenge Sermon’ and the ‘Culture of Persuasion at Paul’s Cross,’” *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 11, no. 1 (2009): 57–89.

34. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:19.

35. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:20.

If any learned man of all out adversaries, or if all of the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor, or father, or out of any general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church, whereby it be clearly and plainly proved that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ...or that the bishop of Rome was then called an universal bishop, or the head of the universal church; Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christs body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament...or that the lay people was forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue— if any man alive were able to prove any of these articles by any clear or plain clause or sentence, either out of the scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old council, or by any example of the primitive church; I promised that then I would give over and subscribe unto him.³⁶

Jewel could argue that the heretics of old, like the Roman Church, abused the fathers for their own purposes, but close study has revealed their errors. Scripture remains the final and sole rule of Christian teaching, but the fathers serve as a guide to its reading.³⁷

On the specific doctrinal issue of the Lord's Supper, Jewel, like Ridley, could point to the views of John Scotus Eriugena, Ratramnus in the ninth century, an obscure bishop in eastern Europe Theophylact in the eleventh, and Berengarius in the twelfth, all of whom were in accord in preaching a patristic doctrine of Christ's presence, with only Berengarius coming under papal censure. Berengarius, moreover, had been condemned for echoing Augustine.³⁸ The denial of corporeal presence on the part of English Reformers, accordingly, could be argued as standing in continuity with the teachings of the fathers as mediated by several medieval teachers. When Jewel's opponent, Thomas Harding, echoing the language of Trent, demanded a traditionary connection between Berengarius and the English

36. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:20–21.

37. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:22, 24–25.

38. Jewel, *Reply to M. Harding's Answer*, in *Works*, 1:458, 503, 546; Cf. Nicholas Ridley, *A Conference between Nicholas Ridley [...] and Secretary Bourn*, in *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of London, Martyr, 1555* (Cambridge University Press, 1843), 159; and idem, *Disputation at Oxford Between Dr. Smith, with His Colleagues and Other Doctors, and Bishop Ridley*, in *Works*, 202, 206.

church—“Shew us your succession. Where are your bishops?”³⁹—Jewel continued to argue his point against the antiquity of transubstantiation, denying that it was part of any legitimate succession in doctrine, but he did not answer the question concerning the connection between Ratramnus, Berengar, and the English church of the sixteenth century.⁴⁰

Against Stapleton: Fulke on Bede and the Traditionary Foundations of the English Church

The argumentation concerning the nature and authority of the ongoing traditions of the church found in William Fulke’s later works, particularly in his *Overthrow* of Thomas Stapleton’s *Fortresse of the Faith*, moved quite a distance from the argumentation of Tyndale and More but also a significant step beyond the major apologetic work of Cranmer and Jewel.⁴¹ Tyndale’s early stand on the sole authority of Scripture, accompanied by polemic against “human traditions”⁴² was not abandoned by Fulke, but was greatly modified and refined to include comment on the later history of the church and the continuities and discontinuities of its doctrines. Cranmer set a standard for the citation of church fathers as “authors” recognized as doctrinal authorities against arbitrary human traditions. Jewel drew on this standard and expanded polemically on the subject of the church fathers and traditionary catholicity. When Fulke came to his refutation of Stapleton, he prefaced it with a substantial “catalogue” of “popish books” and English replies, in which Jewel’s works are set at the beginning of the list.⁴³ If Jewel was the preeminent English scholar to affirm the use of the church fathers

39. Thomas Harding, *A Confutation of a Booke Intituled An Apologie of the Church of England* (Antwerp, 1565), Vi (fol. 219v); cf. *Canones et decreta sacrosancti Concilii tridentini sub Paulo III., Iulio III. et Pio IV* (Leipzig, 1866), 15.

40. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, V, 4:784–85; cf. *ibid.*, II (2:339–40, 344, 348) contrasting succession of person or place with succession of true doctrine.

41. On Stapleton, see Marvin R. O’Connor, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (Yale University Press, 1964); also, Michael Richards, “Thomas Stapleton,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 18, no. 2 (1967): 187–99.

42. See E. Flessemann-Van Leer, “The Controversy About Scripture and Tradition Between Thomas More and William Tyndale,” in *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis*, NS 43 (1960): 143–64.; cf. Richard A. Mullet, “Not of Private Interpretation: Scripture and Tradition in Reformation and Early Modern Protestantism,” *Christian Scholar* 31 (2019): 29–43, here, pp. 31–34.

43. William Fulke, *T. Stapleton and Martiall (Two Popish Heretickes) Confuted, and of Their Particular Heresies Detected* (London, 1580), sig. ¶2 r–v; updating Fulke’s previous “catalogue” of “popish bookes” and replies published in William Fulke, *D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and M. Rastel, accounted (among their faction) three pillars and archpatriarches of the popish*

in a cohesive defense of the catholicity not simply of the Reformation but of the English church, Fulke can be seen, evidenced by Fulke's own list of major apologetic treatises, as one of his more significant followers. Indeed, as Bauckham points out, Fulke's treatment of the issue of authority developed past that of Jewel, if only because Fulke continued the controversy, both building on Jewel's work and dealing at length with the substance of later Romanist polemic.

Perhaps the most important contextual difference between Jewel's work and Fulke's is signaled by the event of three publications, Thomas Stapleton's translation of Bede's ecclesiastical history (1565), Stapleton's *Fortresse of the Faith* (1565) which rested much of its case against the English church on Bede,⁴⁴ and the publication in 1566, with translation into early modern English, of the *Anglo-Saxon Homilies* by Aelfric, the early eleventh-century Abbot of Eynsham.⁴⁵ Jewel, who lived until 1571, did not take on the task of refuting Stapleton. That effort fell to Fulke.

Jewel had argued on several fronts, all of use to Fulke, but none that addressed the historical argument posed by Stapleton on the basis of Bede. Jewel had indicated, first, the positive value of the writings of the earliest fathers, shown them to be worthy of respect and of use to the church of his own day, particularly as correctives to Roman doctrine. Second, he used the fathers as evidence of the fall of the papacy from the united body of the church. And third, he had shown that the fathers could be used to telling effect in debate over both doctrine and polity. In a purely polemical sense, all of these readings of the fathers could form an effective argument for repudiation of Roman church governance as well as Roman doctrines that

synagogue (vtter enemies to the truth of Christes Gospell, and all that syncerely professe the same) ouerthrowne, and detected of their seuerall blasphemous heresies (London, 1579), sig. C.ii r–v.

44. On Stapleton, see Marvin O'Connell, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (Yale University Press, 1964). O'Connell, p. 55, refers to the *Fortresse* as an "appendix" to Bede.

45. Aelfric, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie Shewing the Auncient Fayth in the Church of England Touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord Here Publikely Preached, and Also Receaued in the Saxons Tyme, Aboue 600. Yeares Agoe* (London, ca. 1566). N.B., the Latin original of Aelfric's work on the sacrament was largely Ratramnus of Corbie's treatise on the Lord's Supper. On Aelfric, see Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, eds. *A Companion to Aelfric* (Brill, 2009); on the medieval and early modern reception of Aelfric, see Hugh Magennis, "Not Angles but Anglicans? Reformation and Post-Reformation Perspectives on the Anglo-Saxon Church, Part I: Bede, Ælfric and the Anglo-Saxon Church in Early Modern England," *English Studies* 96, no. 3 (2015): 243–63; and idem, "Not Angles but Anglicans? Reformation and Post-Reformation Perspectives on the Anglo-Saxon Church, Part II: Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *English Studies* 96, no. 4 (2015): 363–78.

could be shown to be later accretions—and to point to an understanding of catholicity not dependent on Rome.⁴⁶

This pattern of argumentation did not, however, address the positive issue of the English church as a true church that had remained in continuity with the church of the first six centuries and that need not be implicated in the problems of the papacy. This issue arose most pointedly in connection with the historical responses of “Romish” polemicists like Thomas Stapleton, who argued that the English church was dependent for its very existence on the mission of Augustine, sent by Gregory the Great to convert the Angles and Saxons to Christianity. According to Stapleton, it followed from this datum of the origins of English Christianity that the so-called Reformation was an apostasy from the ancient faith that had been maintained for some nine hundred years after Augustine’s mission before sinking into heretical innovations in the sixteenth century.⁴⁷

Fulke finally published his response to Stapleton in 1580 together with his rebuttal of a treatise by John Martiiall.⁴⁸ The issue that Fulke confronted was to affirm the accord of the English church with the ancient tradition of Christian doctrine while at the same time disconnecting the English church from the historical path of the Roman see—in short to undermine the claim announced in Stapleton’s full title, *Fortresse of the Faith First Planted Amonge vs Englishmen, and Continued Hitherto in the Vniuersall Church of Christ* by showing that the late sixth-century mission to England of the monk Augustine was not the “faith first planted” and that the papal church was not universal. Fulke addressed the problem through an appeal to ancient English historical sources, notably the *Ecclesiastical History* of Bede and the newly published *Anglo-Saxon Homilies* of Aefric. In the case of both documents, Fulke was responding to publications that had appeared after the publication of Jewel’s *Apology*. Jewel had referenced Bede’s Latin text largely for issues of doctrine and practice,⁴⁹ but Fulke was confronted by

46. Cf. Jones, “Examination of the Anglican Definition,” 234–37; Angela Ranson, “Redefining Unity in the Jacobean Church: The Legacy of John Jewel,” in Angela Ranson, André A. Gazal, and Sarah Bastow, eds. *Defending the Faith: John Jewel and the Elizabethan Church* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018), 210.

47. Stapleton, *Fortresse of the Faith*, I, fol. 7r–11v.

48. The internal title of Fulke’s response to Stapleton is *An Overthrow to the Feeble Fortresse of Popish Faith Reveived from Rome, and Lately Advanced by Thomas Stapleton*, hereinafter cited as *Overthrow*. Martiiall’s work is *A replie to M. Calphills blasphemous answer made against the Treatise of the crosse* (Leuven, 1566).

49. Cf. e.g., Jewel, *Works*, vol. 1, pp. 301–7.

Stapleton's English translation of Bede's *History* that had appeared from the recusant press in Antwerp in 1565. Stapleton had gone so far as to affix to the translation a list of differences between the faith of the early English church and the doctrines of Protestantism.

Fulke's approach to Bede resonated with some of Jewel's observations,⁵⁰ but also had parallels with the apologetic historiography already evident in such works as John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* and Simon Devoyon's *Discours sur le denombrement des docteurs de l'Eglise de Dieu*.⁵¹ Foxe and Devoyon identified a series of medievals including Ratramnus, Berengar, Wycliffe, and Hus, who would be identified by later writers as "forerunners" or precursors of the Reformation. Fulke's response to Stapleton looked in two directions—he worked through Bede's references of historical figures and events to develop a view of the character and teaching of the ancient English church, sometimes critiquing what he found in the narrative, but equally so drawing positively on Bede's narrative to counteract Stapleton's reading.⁵² Notably, Fulke was able to show, contrary to Stapleton, that Bede stood against claims concerning the unbroken continuity of papal rule and religion in England: "it is false that the religion nowe called Papistry hath been professed these 900 years," Fulke wrote, "which I have proved by more then 40 differences, gathered out of the historie of Bede, and other monuments of antiquitie,"⁵³ the latter including prominently Aelfric's *Anglo-Saxon Homilies*. This reading of Bede, established by Fulke, remained a feature of

50. Cf. Jewel, *Works*, 1:206, 300.

51. Simon Devoyon, *Discours sur le denombrement des docteurs de l'Eglise de Dieu: assauoir, tant de ceux qui ont esté dès le commencement du monde (contenus aux Saintes Escriitures) que de plusieurs qui ont puis apres succedé par ordre iusques aujour'd'uy* (Orleans, 1565); in translation, *A testimonie of the true Church of God confirmed as well by the doctrine as liues of sundry holy men, both patriarkes, and prophetes, and also by the Apostles and their true succours. Wherein is manifestly shewed how that God hath in all ages rayseed vp some, yea euen in most horrible darkenesse, which haue beene faithfull stewards, and true dispensers of his will, with a catalogue of their names*, trans. William Phiston (London, 1585).

52. Magennis, "Not Angles but Anglicans?" part 1:255–56, identifies Fulke as the inaugurator of the use of Bede to establish the ancient identity of the English church. The English recusant, Lawrence (or James) Anderton, alias John Brereley, argues against Fulke in his *The Apologie of the Romane Church deuided into three seuerall tractes whereof 1. The first, concerneth the antiquitie and continuance of the Catholike Romane religion ever since the Apostles time. 2. The second that the Protestant religion was not so much as in being, at or before Luthers first appearing. 3. The thirde that Catholickes are no lesse loyall and dutifull to their soveraigne, then Protestant. All which are vndertaken and proued by testimonies of the learned Protestant themselves* (S.l.: s.n. [English secret press], 1604), i.1–2 (pp. 2–8).

53. Fulke, *Overthrow*, I. xv (p. 58).

British anti-papal polemic, as evidenced in James Ussher's *Discourse* on the ancient religion of the Irish and the British.⁵⁴

Stapleton had pointed to the absence of miracles substantiating Protestant claims to truth, while Bede's account had indicated many miracles accompanying Augustine's mission to Britain. Fulke countered with two arguments. First, there was a qualitative difference between the revelation in Christ and the church's later testimony to that revelation. Echoing Tyn-dale, Fulke argued that, after Christ, confirmation by miracle was no longer needed in the church.⁵⁵ As to the reported miracles of Augustine, Fulke impugned both the account and the character of Augustine: "if," Fulke commented, "by subtill practice miracles have bene feigned to have bene done by him, and reported by a credulous man Bede, it hurteth not our cause: seeing as other writers report [Augustine] to have bene both a proud and a cruell man."⁵⁶ In response to Stapleton's argument that Augustine's mission had sought to bring unity to Christ's church, in contrast to the Protestant sowing "infamous dissention," Fulke offered a double response, probably drawing on Geoffrey of Monmouth's history England, where, as distinct from Bede's account, Augustine is identified as missionary to the pagan Saxon invaders, and whose authority was rejected by the Christian Britons and their bishops.⁵⁷ Augustine, Fulke noted, had "no desire of Christian unitie" but had only worked to subject British Christians, including those who had held the faith prior to Augustine's mission, "to himselfe and to the Church of Rome" — a truly "Antichristian ambition and tyrannie." Further, "The dissention of the Protestants is not in articles of faith: nor such, but that they are all brethren, that unfeignedly professe the doc-

54. James Ussher, *A Discourse of the Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and the British* (London, 1631), x (pp. 105–117). Ussher does not cite Fulke.

55. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 1).

56. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 1–2).

57. Given the date of the printed edition, Fulke would have needed to consult a manuscript version of which there were several at Cambridge: Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Pontici Virunnii viri doctissimi Britannicæ historiæ libri sex magna et fide et diligentia conscripti: ad Britannici codicis fidem correcti, & ab infinitis mendis liberati: quibus præfixus est catalogus regum Britannicæ: per Dauidem Pouelum, S. Theolog. professorem* (London: Edmund Bollifant, 1585); in translation, *The History of the Kings of Britain. An edition and translation of the De gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britannicæ)*, ed. Michael D. Reeves, trans. Neil Wright (Boydell Press, 2007), pp. 258–61. Geoffrey's account is the one source available to Fulke that offered a negative reading of Augustine: in addition to Bede, William of Malmesbury is quite positive: see his *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum, the History of the English Bishops*, 2 vols., ed. and trans., M. Winterbottom (Clarendon Press, 2007), 5–6.

trine of salvation: although they dissent in the matter of the sacrament, in orders, rites and ceremonies."⁵⁸

Bede's opinion of Augustine was capable of dismissal—but much of what could be learned from Bede's account concerning the early church, Christianity in England, and the power of Rome could stand against Stapleton's use of the history. Where Stapleton claimed that Protestant churches have no proper consecration and therefore no legitimate bishops, Fulke could counter from Bede that

Laurence, the second Archbishop of Canterburie, acknowledgedeth the Ministers of the Scots and Britaines for Bishops, although they were not subject to the Church and See of Rome.... Aidanus, Finanus, Colmanus are judged of Beda for true Bishops, although they were devided from the Church of Rome, and so are such Bishops as were ordeined by them, for they converted the greatest part of the Saxons unto Christian faith; As Northumbrians, Mertians, and East Saxons.⁵⁹

Where Stapleton had acknowledged the presence of these bishops and of valid consecration in Anglo-Saxon England, Fulke was able to argue further—on the basis of what Stapleton had acknowledged—that the English church had ties to the apostolic witness that did not depend on Rome and which had, in fact, existed prior to the mission of Augustine.⁶⁰

Not only does Bede offer evidence of the independence of the English church from Rome, he also indicates the subordination of popes to emperors and the installation of bishops by kings. Even after the mission of Augustine, Fulke argues, the English remained independent of Rome in matters of ecclesiastical preferment: "At Augustines comming and long after, they refused to yeld obedience to the See of Rome, yea among the Saxons themselves, Wilfrid deposed by the king, and absolved by the Pope, could not be restored, but by a Synod of his own countrie."⁶¹ Fulke also notes numerous instances, recorded by Bede, of English kings deposing bishops, of forbidding idolatry, of governing synods, of commanding archbishops to consecrate bishops, and of conferring privileges on monasteries—all

58. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 2).

59. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 13), citing Bede, *History*, II.iv.

60. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 13–14); II. vii (pp. 113–14).

61. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 14), citing Bede, *History*, V. xx. Note here also Eddius Stephanus, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, text, translation, and notes by Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge University Press, 1927), xiv–xv (pp. 30–33).

of which actions demonstrate an absence of Roman church rule.⁶² By way of conclusion to these arguments, Fulke noted that the patristic roots of the English church went deeper than the Roman mission sponsored by Gregory the Great and argued that the Reformation was a return to this older tradition: “The Protestantes are returned to the auncient faith which was in this land before Augustine came from Rome, which did not so much good in planting faith where it was not, as in corrupting the sinceritie of the faith where it was before he came.”⁶³

Fulke and the Anglo-Saxon Homilies

In pursuing this claim, Fulke was perhaps the first apologist for the English church to place stress on the *Anglo-Saxon Homilies* as evidence of an indigenous English theological tradition—using Aelfric’s text together with materials from Bede to create what one modern scholar has called “the myth of Aelfric the protoprotestant [and] the myth of an independent Anglo-Saxon church.”⁶⁴ Although Jewel had known of the writings of Aelfric, as evidenced by a letter of early 1568 to Archbishop Parker noting a work that he had discovered in his library, his encounter with the volume had come after the publication of his *Apologie* (1562) and his *Defense of the Apologie* (1567). Jewel refers to the newly found volume as a “hidden treasure... whether it be by Alfricus or no,” and indicates that he had sent it to Parker for inspection.⁶⁵ Jewel’s letter raises issues concerning the identity of the book that he mentions and the dating the translation and publication of Aelfric’s sermon on the sacrament: that publication is undated but typically thought to have been printed in 1566 or 1567. To add to the curiosity, the publication is subscribed by Matthew Parker as archbishop of Canterbury

62. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 19–21), citing Bede, *History*, I.xxxiii; III.vii, viii; IV.xii, xiii, xxiii; V.xx, etc.

63. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 14).

64. Hugh Magennis, “Aelfric Scholarship,” in Magennis and Swan, eds, *Companion to Aelfric*, 11. Although Fulke’s account of a non-papal, pre-Augustine English church and its tradition is an apologetic construction, it does rightly reflect the presence of Christianity in England from Roman times onward and its distinction in many respects from the forms of Christianity brought by Augustine at the close of the sixth century: see Caitlin Corning, *The Celtic and Roman Traditions Conflict and Consensus in the Early Medieval Church* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

65. Bishop Jewel to Archbishop Parker, 31 January 1568, in Jewel, *Works*, 4:1274.

and Thomas Young as archbishop of York, plus thirteen other English bishops — missing, however, from the list is John Jewel.⁶⁶

In the early modern context — the modern complaint of mythologization aside — Fulke was able to demonstrate the highly fissiparous character of the medieval theological tradition, the absence of a uniform Roman hegemony such as presumed by his Roman adversaries, and the presence of doctrinal formulations alternative to the claims of post-Tridentine Romanism. On the key issue of transubstantiation, Fulke declared that the older, pre-Roman tradition had persisted. From Aelfric's *Homilies*, Fulke could state, "The Church of English Saxons, for 300 yeares after Augustine, did beleve bread and wine to remain in the sacrament after consecration, which the Papists denie, proved by a Sermon extant in the Saxon tongue, translated out of Latine by Aelfrike... and appointed to be read unto the people at Easter before they received the Communion, also by two Epistles of the same Aelfricke."⁶⁷ And further, "The Church of English Saxons beleved the sacrament to be the body and bloud of Christ, not carnally but spirituallly; expressly denying as wel the carnal presence as transubstantiation, which the Papists hold. Aelf. Sermon. Pasc. & Ep."⁶⁸

In Aelfric, Fulke not only found a medieval sacramental theology, but also historical evidence, in accord with Bede's *History*, that the English church had preserved its own theological heritage in a path not dependent on the guidance of Rome, and had done so as long as two centuries after the mission of Augustine to Britain.⁶⁹ Aelfric, then, represented an indigenous tradition, at some variance with the thought and practice of continental and particularly Roman Christianity, a tradition that flourished in the ninth and tenth centuries. Had Fulke recognized that Aelfric's translation was from the Latin of Ratramnus, it would not have disturbed his argument, given

66. Aelfric, *Testimony of Antiquitie*, fol. K.iiii recto-verso. On the recovery of Aelfric by Parker and others, see Magennis, "Aelfric Scholarship," 9–10.

67. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 17); note that Fulke, like various of his contemporaries identified Aelfric of Eynsham with an Archbishop of Canterbury of the same name — a confusion only cleared in the nineteenth century: see Joyce Hill, "Aelfric: His Life and Works," in Magennis and Swan, eds, *Companion to Aelfric*, 35.

68. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 17).

69. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 22); the argument is reflected in Perkins's appeal to Aelfric: see William Perkins, *Probleme of the Forged Catholicisme, or Universalitie of the Romish Religion*, in *The Works of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ, in the Universitie of Cambridge, M. William Perkins*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1612–1613), 2:562, col. 1, 564, col. 1.

that Ratramnus' teachings had already been identified by Ridley and Jewel as a representative of doctrinal truth against the early medieval papacy.⁷⁰

Given the *Homilies* of Aelfric, particularly on the question of denials of the Mass and of transubstantiation, the English Reformation could be seen as expressing not only agreement with the continental Reformers but also a continuity with its own past: "it is false," Fulke wrote,

that the Popish faith hath had so long continuance. For the Papistes are departed as from many other points of doctrine, so even from the Lords supper, which Augustine planted among the Saxons, unto carnall presence and transubstantiation the contrarie of which were taught by Augustine, as appeareth from the publike Saxon Homely, lately translated into English, and imprinted.⁷¹

Aelfric also taught, "We receive ghostly, Christ bodye, and drinke his bloude, when we receave with true beliefe that holye housell" — in Fulke's reading, Aelfric stood in agreement with the Protestants, that the wicked and the faithless do not receive Christ in the sacrament, since the true presence of Christ is apprehended and received spiritually, by faith.⁷²

According to Fulke, Aelfric also attested to communion in both kinds by the laity as well as the clergy, to an absence of private masses, and to the celebration of Easter in conformity with Irish and Greek custom, rather than after the manner of Rome.⁷³ In these and in a score of other examples, Fulke identified a continuous theological foundation for the English Reformation: he was able to affirm the value of the first five, even six, centuries of Christian thought, to maintain the Protestant assumption of a fall of the Roman Church, and at the same time to argue that the English church stood in continuity, in its own tradition, with the faith of the earliest fathers.

70. Cf. Nicholas Ridley, *A Conference Between Nicholas ridley, Sometime Bishop of Lincoln, and Secretary Bourne, with Others, at the Lieutenant's Table in the Tower*, in *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D. Sometime ord bishop of Lincoln. Martye, 1555* (Cambridge University Press, 1843), 158–59; idem, *Disputation at Oxford Between Dr. Smith, with His Colleagues and Other Doctors, and Bishop Ridley*, in *ibid.*, 202, 206; with John Jewel, *A Replie Vnto M. Hardinges Answer: By perusing whereof, the discreet and diligent Reader may easily see the weake, and vnstable grounds of the Roman religion, which of late hath been accounted Catholique*, in *Works*, 1:503, 546.

71. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 3).

72. Aelfric, *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, 27 recto; Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 18).

73. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 17), citing Aelfric, *Serm. Pasc.*, and Bede, *History*, I.xxvii; II.v; V.xxii.

Thus, in addition to holding a doctrine of the Lord's Supper more ancient than transubstantiation, the "English Saxons" allowed the people to read Scripture in the vernacular and "to search the lawe of God"; so also did they insist on the preaching of the Gospel in English on holy days, and that "al people be instructed in the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the commandments in the English tong" — all of which the papists deny. So also,

The worshipping of images, and the second Council of Nice that decreed the same, was accursed in the Church of God in England and France, & written against by Alcuinus, in the name of the Church of England and Fraunce.... The Papists defend both that idolatrous Council, and their wicked decree.⁷⁴

Rome, therefore, was the innovator and the universal faith identified by the Vincentian Canon — what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all — could not be ascribed to Rome.⁷⁵

Fulke finalized his rebuttal of Stapleton's argument that the English church "must shew a succession from the Apostles; as the Scripture witnesseth the Church to have, and the ancient Fathers exacted of heretics" by noting two fundamental points. First, that

the Scripture requireth no succession of names, persons or places, but of faith and doctrine, and that wee proove, when we approve our faith and doctrine by the doctrine of the Apostles. Neither had the fathers any other meaning in calling upon new upstart heresies for their succession, but of a succession of doctrine as well as of persons. Which is manifest by Tertullian, *De praescript*... succession of Bishoppes even to the Apostles, helpeth not, excepte there be a continuance in the doctrine of the Apostles, which when the Papistes can shewe, we will gladly yield unto them.⁷⁶

74. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 18–19).

75. Fulke's argument has strong affinity with John Calvin, *Ioannes Calvinus Iacobo Sadoleto Cardinali, Salutem*, in CO 5, col. 392–93; in translation, *Calvin's Reply to Sadoleto*, in *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, ed. Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet, 7 vols. (Baker, 1983), 1:35–37.

76. Fulke, *Overthrow*, II.i (p. 73); citing Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, xxxii, in ANF, 3:258; also Fulke, *De successione ecclesiastica*, i, vi (pp. 22, 162); cf. similarly, Calvin, *Institutio*, I.vi.2; vii.3; Theodore Beza, *De veris et visibilibus Ecclesiae Catholicae notis, tractatio* (Geneva, 1579), 16, 22 marg.; Thomas Sampson, *A Briefe Collection of the Church, and of Certayne Ceremonies Thereof* (London, 1581), 22; Bertrand de Loque, *Traité de l'Eglise, contenant un vray discours pour cognoistre la vraye Eglise, et la discerner d'avec l'Eglise Romaine*

And second, that the papal claim of antiquity is false, inasmuch as “the auncient and learned Fathers, never allowed any continuance of the Catholicke Church and faith, but such as has their beginning at Christ & his Apostles, and not such as beganne five or six hundred yeares after Christ, as all the testimonies which [Stapleton] cryeth, do plainely prove.”⁷⁷ Since the papacy itself only began some five or six hundred years after Christ, it cannot claim to represent the most ancient church, namely that of Christ and the apostles — not indeed, can it claim to universal, given the Eastern Church and the older English tradition.⁷⁸ “Whatsoever therefore Augustine writeth against the Donatistes, for shutting up the Church of Christ onely in Africa, may be rightly applyed to the Papistes, for restraining it onely to a part of Europe.”⁷⁹

Against Gregory Martin: Fulke on the Problem of Tradition and Traditions

Before his response to Gregory Martin’s attack on the English translations of Scripture, Fulke’s approach to the problem of tradition, evident in his replies to Rastell and Martiall and other earlier works, added little to standard Protestant outcry against “human traditions” that had already been argued by Tyndale, Cranmer, and Jewell. By way of example, in his early polemics, Fulke had responded to the use of Basil and Augustine to support unwritten traditions.⁸⁰ To the basic argument of Augustine that universal teachings of the church, if known to have been observed at all times, ought to be understood as belonging to the “tradition of the Apostles,” Fulke responded, “if you bee able to prove, that al these things whereof you speake, the universall Church of Christ, doth, and hath alwaies observed, I will yelde to you, that thei are the Traditions of the Apostles.”⁸¹ If, however, these teachings cannot be shown to have been always held, there is no reason to accept them as apostolic traditions on grounds of the “reason, and authoritie” of contemporary papists. There remains, however, Fulke allowed, a limited place for

et toutes autres fausses assemblées (Genève, 1577), v (pp. 16–21); Robert Some, *A Godlie Treatise of the Church* (London, 1582), sig. E4r, E5r.

77. Fulke, *Overthrow*, I.xviii (p. 60).

78. Fulke, *Overthrow*, Liii, iv (pp. 28, 29).

79. Fulke, *Overthrow*, Liv, v (pp. 29, 31).

80. William Fulke, *A Confutation of a Popishe, and Sclaunderous Libelle in Forme of an Apologie: Geuen out into the Courte, and Spread Abrode in Diuerse Other Places of the Realme* (London, 1571), fol. 41r–42v.

81. Fulke, *Confutation of a Popishe, and Sclaunderous Libelle*, fol. 57r.

extra-scriptural traditions. Scripture itself has “determined of all necessarie articles of faith, and against all superstitious opinions,” but, as Augustine indicated, the church may legitimately institute “variable Ceremonies” and promulgate “particuler decrees” that are not “prejudiciall” to the truths of Scripture.⁸² As to human traditions that are contrary to Scripture, these can hardly be identified as apostolic: the apostles “did not deliver one thynge in wrytyng, and a contrary thynge in Tradition.”⁸³

Gregory Martin’s publication of his *Discouerie of the Manifol Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures* in 1582, paired with the publication of the Rheims New Testament,⁸⁴ marked a significant juncture in the Counter-Reformation polemic against English Protestantism, as it called into question the validity of Protestant Bibles, specifically of Beza’s Latin New Testament and *Annotationes* (1556), the Geneva Bible (1562), and the Bishops’ Bible, printed between 1577 and 1579. These, Martin contended, were “Heretical translations” that bred the doctrinal heresies of Protestantism.⁸⁵ The Geneva Bible has been described as a revision of the Tyndale-Coverdale tradition as lodged in the Great Bible (1539) and of Whittingham’s New Testament (1557), carefully compared the Hebrew and Greek texts and with Beza’s Latin *Annotationes*. The Bishops’ Bible (1568) was largely a revision of the Great Bible, made with attention to the Hebrew and Greek originals.⁸⁶ Martin’s attack on the Protestant Bibles received two extended responses, the first by William Fulke and the second by Fulke’s contemporary Thomas Cartwright, with Fulke’s work appearing, in very short order,

82. Fulke, *Confutation of a Popishe, and Schlaunderous Libelle*, fol. 57v–58r.

83. Fulke, *Confutation of a Popishe, and Schlaunderous Libelle*, fol. 59v; similarly, William Whitaker, *An Answer to a Certaine Booke. Written by M. William Rainolds Student of Divinitie in the English Colledge at Rhemes, and Entitled, A Refutation of Sundrie Reprehensions, Cavils, &c.* (London, 1585), 17.

84. Gregory Martin, *A Discouerie of the Manifol Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretikes of Our Daies Specially the English Sectaries, and of their foule dealing herein, by partial & false translations to the aduantage of their heresies, in their English Bibles used and authorised since the time of schisme* (Rheims, 1582); and *The Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated faithfully into English, out of the authentical Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred vvith the Greeke and other editions in diuers languages; vvith arguments of bookes and chapters, annotations, and other necessarie helps, for the better understanding of the text, and specially for the discouerie of the corruptions of diuers late translations, and for clearing the controversies in religion, of these daies: in the English College of Rhemes* (Rheims, 1582).

85. Martin, *Discouerie of the Manifol Corruptions*, sig. b verso.

86. H. W. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible: A Historical Sketch of the Successive Versions from 1382–1885*, 2nd ed. (E. P. Dutton, 1902), 187–97, 217–23; cf. David Norton, *The History of the English Bible as Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), 36–41.

in 1583, followed by subsequent printings in 1617 and 1633.⁸⁷ Fulke also followed his treatise against Martin with a full-scale demolition of the Rheims New Testament.⁸⁸ Publication of Cartwright's *Confutation* was delayed: Cartwright's answer to Martin's preface appeared in 1602,⁸⁹ and the complete *Confutation* only appeared in print in 1618,⁹⁰ leaving Fulke's work as the main defense of the Elizabethan Church against Martin's polemic and its companion, the Rheims New Testament.⁹¹

What concerns us here is Fulke's understanding of tradition, both substantively in relation to the theological debates of the era and linguistically in terms of the meaning of the text and the task of translation. Martin had accused the Protestant translations of denying traditions among the

87. William Fulke, *A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holie Scriptures into the English tong, against the manifolde cavils, frivolous quarels, and impudent slaunders of Gregorie Martin, one of the readers of Popish divinitie in the trayterous Seminarie of Rheims [...] Wherevnto is added a briefe confutation of all such quarrels & cauils, as haue bene of late vttered by diuerse papistes in their English pamphlets, against the writings of the saide William Fvlke* (London, 1583); August Matthews, 1633); also note, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, Against the Cavils of Gregory Martin* (Cambridge University Press, 1843). Citations are taken from the 1583 text.

88. William Fulke, *The Text of the Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated out of the vulgar Latine by the papists of the traiterous seminarie at Rhemes. With arguments of bookes, chapters, and annotations, pretending to discover the corruptions of diuers translations, and to cleare the controuersies of these dayes. VVhereunto is added the translation out of the original Greeke, commonly vsed in the Church of England, with a confutation of all such arguments, glosses, and annotations, as conteine manifest impietie, of heresie, treason and slander, against the catholike Church of God, and the true teachers thereof, or the translations vsed in the Church of England* (London, 1589).

89. Thomas Cartwright, *Sun Qevw en Cristw. The Answer to the Preface of the Rhemish Testament* (Edinburgh, 1602). On the politics of the delay, see Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright*, 202–4.

90. Thomas Cartwright, *A Confutation of the Rhemists Translation, Glosses and Annotations on the Nevv Testament so farre as they containe manifest impieties, heresies, idolatries, superstitions, prophanesse, treasons, slanders, absurdities, falsehoods and other evils. By occasion whereof the true sence, scope, and doctrine of the Scriptures, and humane authors, by them abused, is now given. VVritten long since by order from the chiefe instruments of the late Queene and state* (Leiden, 1618). See James David Rich, "Thomas Cartwright and His Confutation: From English Presbyterian Gadfly to International Calvinist Propagandist" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2015); on Cartwright's life and work, see A. F. Scott Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535–1603* (Cambridge University Press, 1925).

91. The controversy with Martin is analyzed by Bauckham, "Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke," 325–405; and surveyed in Norton, *History of the English Bible*, 40–44, 49–52.

apostles—a “matter” that he identified as of great “importance.” He argued specifically that, where the New Testament spoke of Jewish traditions as contrary to the Word of God, the Protestant translations consistently rendered the Greek as “traditions,” but when the text spoke of apostolic traditions, the Protestant translations rendered the Greek as “ordinaunces” or “instructions,” obviously, in Martin’s view, to suppress the positive use of the word and argue that no traditions were “allowable.”⁹² Along similar lines, Martin complained that the Bishops’ Bible had wrongly rendered *dogmatizesthe* in Colossians 2:20 as “burdened with traditions,” when elsewhere the word *dogmata* had been suitably rendered as “ordinances” or “decrees.” Once again, the English Bibles and Beza were guilty of a heretical suppression of the text’s meaning, identifying tradition solely as a problem or an error.⁹³

In response, Fulke began by outlining the problem traditions in general, written and unwritten. Fulke readily acknowledged the “importance” of the issue, given that if Martin and his Rhemist colleagues had their way they would take advantage of the positive references to tradition in Scripture in order that all manner of “unwritten traditions” might be “thrust upon” the church and “the written word of God shall serve no purpose at all,” being insufficient “to teach all truth necessary to salvation.”⁹⁴ Like the Valentinian heretics, Fulke opined, Martin held Scripture to be uncertain of meaning apart from his extra-scriptural traditions, many of which are actually contrary to Scripture. Further, the Roman Church picked and chose which traditions it would observe, including many that, as John Jewel observed, were unknown to the church in its first six centuries. The earliest church did, certainly, insist on keeping the traditions of the apostles, as is evident from the epistles of Ignatius—but as Eusebius commented of Ignatius, “he exhorted them straitly to kepe the tradition of the Apostles, which testifying that it was now for assurance committed to writing, he thought necessary to be plainly taught.”⁹⁵ Protestants strive to follow this tradition of the apostles, as preserved in the “undoubted writings” of the apostles in the canon of Scripture.

92. In Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (pp. 73–74). N.B., for convenience, all citations of the debate are taken from Fulke’s *Defense*, which reproduces nearly the whole of Martin’s text in numbered paragraphs followed by Fulke’s refutations.

93. Martin, *The Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated faithfully into English*, col. 2:20, in loc. (p. 541).

94. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (p. 74).

95. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (p. 75), citing Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, III.xxxv.

As to the pattern of Protestant translation against which Martin complained, Fulke argued that it is linguistically justified in addition to its salutary purpose. Martin, by way of example, commended the Roman practice of translating *paradosis* as “tradition” in Matthew 15:2; 2 Thessalonians 2:15 and 3:6 — whereas the Bishops’ Bible had understood the *paradosis* of the Pharisees in Matthew 15:2 as “tradition,” but the *paradosis* of the disciples in 2 Thessalonians as “instruction.” How, Martin complained, could these varied translations of one word be explained other than by the heretical intention of the translators to attach the church’s tradition. He demanded that the Protestants attempt to justify themselves, “either out of Scriptures, fathers, or Lexicon.”⁹⁶

From a linguistic perspective, Fulke pointedly criticized Martin’s approach to the translation of *paradosis* uniformly as “tradition” as failing to recognize the lexically identified range of meaning of a word and the need to determine a translation by the context of a usage. The Greek word *paradosis* can mean “tradition,” as something delivered or handed down, but it can also mean the specific “doctrine delivered” or an “ordinance,” an “instruction,” or an “institution” — the latter term commonly used in the early modern era as a synonym for a formal instruction.⁹⁷ Scripture clearly has both positive and negative references to *paradosis*, sometimes referring to doctrine that is grounded in Scripture, other times identifying false teaching as *paradosis*.⁹⁸ The context, then, of the positive or negative use of the term would require variation in the translation, “because the English word as it is used by [Martin] is not so indifferent, to signifie the doctrine of God delivered out of the Scriptures: as to signifie doctrines of men devised beside the Scriptures.” Fulke cites examples of qualification of the terms “paradosis” and “tradition” from the fathers, noting in particular Jerome’s varied renderings of *paradosis* as “tradition” and as “precept.”⁹⁹

From the theological perspective, Fulke noted a specific problem with the uniform translation of a term, later echoed in Cartwright’s *Confutation*,¹⁰⁰ given that “traditions” as used by Rome referred to secret transmissions by word of mouth, unrelated to the teachings of Scripture and the identifiable *paradosis* of the apostles and the earliest church, therefore lacking biblical

96. Martin, *Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions*, ii.2–5 (pp. 26–29).

97. Note the definition of *traditio* as “a delivering or giving, a teaching,” s.v., in John Veron, *A Dictionarie in Latine and English* (London, 1584).

98. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1, 2 (pp. 75–76, 77–78).

99. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.5 (p. 82).

100. Cartwright, *Confutation*, 531.

authority. Translating the Greek indiscriminately as “traditions,” would lead “the simple” into the error of viewing even unbiblical traditions positively and concluding that the Holy Spirit would command the church to believe or observe things that the Spirit himself had not “committed to writing.” The Protestant translations, therefore, render positive usages of the Greek *paradosis* in such texts as 2 Thessalonians 2:15 and 3:6 alternatively, but quite correctly, as “ordinances,” “instructions,” “institutions,” or “the doctrine delivered.” “Tradition” or “traditions” is the “Papist” choice to identify teachings “delivered beside the word of God written” — which, then, on the papists’ own terms, leads to a proper translation of Pharisaic *paradosis* as “tradition.” Accordingly, the Protestant translations distinguish the false traditions from the true, the latter being *paradoseis* conformed to the Word of God and suitable for use as “ordinances” or for “instruction,” and to be understood as valid “doctrine delivered” to the church. Otherwise, Scripture might be taken to be imperfect and as not conveying all truth necessary to salvation.¹⁰¹

Even so, in Colossians 2:20, there is not so great a difference in meaning between “ordinances” and “traditions” to justify complaint about the linguistic accuracy of the translation of *dogmatizesthe* as “burdened with traditions.” But negative implication of the biblical text itself requires translation as “burdened with traditions” inasmuch as “those *dogmata* against which the Apostle writeth, were according to the precepts, & doctrines of men” such as “the Scripture calleth traditions, Matth 15.”¹⁰² The translation itself, then, is justifiable both linguistically and theologically: it identifies the problem of *dogmata* that are actually false human traditions. And then there is the case of 1 Corinthians 11:2, where even the Vulgate had rendered *paradosis* as *praecepta* — perhaps, Fulke adds, to teach Protestants alternative terms for use in translation. And, directly to Martin, “do you not perceive that while you raile upon us, you revile your owne vulgar Latin translation”?¹⁰³

Fulke notes further that it ought to disturb the consciences of Romanist theologians who have to know that many things that they identify as traditions have no foundation in Scripture.¹⁰⁴ In 2 Thessalonians 2:15, the apostle Paul references traditions delivered in part by preaching and in part by his epistle. The text does not intend, therefore, a tradition delivered

101. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (pp. 75–76).

102. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.5 (p. 81); cf. Cartwright, *Confutation*, p. 513.

103. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.2, 6 (pp. 77, 83).

104. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.2 (pp. 76–77).

only by word of mouth—nor can it be proven that the traditions delivered by word of mouth by the Apostle were not elsewhere stated expressly in Scripture.¹⁰⁵ To Martin's insistence that the apostles did convey traditions by word of mouth, Fulke responds that, certainly, the apostles taught by word of mouth, both "preaching and teaching,"

but that they preached, taught or delivered any doctrine, as necessarie to salvation, which they proved not out of the holy Scriptures, and which is not contained in the new Testament or the old, this is not yet proved, neither ever can it be proved. Such matters of ceremonies, order, & discipline, which are mutable, no man denies, but they might & did deliver, but yet in them nothing but agreeable to the generall rules set down in the Scripture.¹⁰⁶

As Bauckham rather nicely pointed out, the rift between the Reformation understanding of Scripture and tradition represented by Fulke and the understanding found in his Romanist opponents "was not the result of the controversy pushing the contestants into extremist positions." Rather it was the result of "a fundamental difference over the nature of revelation," with the Protestants finding the living Word of God in Scripture alone but also listening to it as conveyed in the preaching and sacraments of the church, and the Romanists finding the living word of God ultimately in the *magisterium*, "with no necessary reference to Scripture."¹⁰⁷

Conclusion

William Fulke came to the defense of the orthodoxy and catholicity of the English church at a time when the use of patristic sources was well established—one might even say, catalogued—by such predecessors as Thomas Cranmer and John Jewel. He also was the recipient of a view of tradition or, more correctly, traditions, reaching back to Reformers like Tyndale and Calvin and incorporated into the confessional foundation of the English church—a view of traditions that had distinguished between lawful traditions concerning ecclesiastical practice that conformed to the Scriptures, and human traditions, whether written or unwritten, either lacking biblical warrant or standing in contradiction to Scripture, traditions created and mandated on human authority alone. Like many of his Protestant predecessors, Fulke could also argue historically against the Roman claims of

105. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.2 (p. 77).

106. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.3 (p. 78).

107. Bauckham, "Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke," 188.

ecclesial universality, of an unbroken line of papal and episcopal succession, and, indeed, of the origins of the papal claims to supremacy during the first five hundred years of the church. Fulke also insisted on the distinction, common among Protestant works of the era, between the church's theological tradition understood as the "succession of doctrine" and a "succession of persons" in the church: against Roman apologists, Fulke insisted that the legitimacy of the latter depended on their adherence to the former—and that the former, "succession of doctrine" was lacking in the case of Rome's unwritten traditions.

Beyond this, Fulke's work moved the terms of this debate significantly beyond the earlier formulations of writers like Cranmer and Jewel on two fronts, both reflective of the different adversaries with whom he engaged. In his polemic against Martin, Fulke's defense of the English translations of Scripture both clarified the distinction latent in the biblical text between the negative use of *paradosis*, characteristic of Jesus's complaint against the Pharisees, and the positive use of *paradosis* found in the Pauline epistles and drew on a theory of translation that rooted the meaning of a word or term in its literary context and thereby justified rendering one word with a variety of terms. That theory had been implicit in the exegesis of those texts and in the translations, but Fulke made it explicit.

Second, Fulke identified what would loosely be called the tradition of the English church, namely the historical trajectory of doctrine and practice, identified as the "succession of faith and doctrine," similar to the concept of a body of historical precedent identified as tradition in the Roman sources of the era, but disconnected from the Tridentine appeal of a normative written and unwritten tradition supporting the claims of the Roman Church. Contrary to Trent and its defenders, Fulke argued the connection of English Protestantism to a medieval succession of faith and practice without declaring the succession to be normative alongside of Scripture. Where Stapleton had used Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* to claim that the church of the English Reformation had departed from the doctrine and practice of the ancient catholic church, Fulke was able to argue from Bede, supported by evidence from Aelfric's *Anglo Saxon Homilies*, an alternative line of teaching and practice in the English church that was ancient, indigenous, and not subservient to the doctrines and ceremonies more recently dictated by Rome. In short, what Rome claimed as an unbroken tradition simply did not exist for transubstantiation, the practice of communion in one kind, the installation of bishops, and various other doctrines—certainly not on English soil.

The Harder Reading: The Hungarian Reception of Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man* (1658) During the Long Eighteenth Century

ZSOMBOR TÓTH

toth.zsombor@abtk.hu

Scientific Advisor

*Institute of Literary Studies, Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences*

The concept of the “long Reformation” (1500–1800) and its application is still in its infancy in the field of Hungarian intellectual history research.¹ This concept offers a new chronology (1500–1800) which seems better suited to revealing the so-called *glocal* features of the Hungarian Reformation. Furthermore, it allows macro- and micro-level analyses that frequently lead to a re-evaluation of the characteristics of the Reformation in early modern Hungary and Transylvania. This approach, at least in my research practice, is unified by the historical reality of religious persecution, and the theological and historical assessments of this phenomenon, which were occasionally conceptualized and propagated by early modern Hungarian theologians in eschatological terms. Indeed, an early modern Reformed historical-theological awareness and politics of memory has emerged, which appears to validate the conviction of the Hungarian Reformed elite that the history of the Reformation must have been a representation of religious persecution endured by the chosen ones. Unavoidably, the Hungarian case has followed the same trajectory as that of the rest of Western Europe, thus reiterating the same narrative of ecclesiastical history. The Reformation can be defined as an attempt to return to the principles of the primitive church

1. For the concept of long Reformation (1500–1800) and its application to research on Royal Hungary and Transylvania from a methodological point of view see Zsombor Tóth, “Understanding Long Reformation in Eastern Europe: The Case of Hungarian Puritanism Revisited,” *Journal of Early Modern Christianity* 7, no. 2 (2020): 319–41; Zsombor Tóth, *A hosszú reformáció jegyében. Vallási perzekúció és tanúságtétel a református irodalmi hagyományban a gyászévtizedtől 1800-ig* [“Under the Banner of Long Reformation: Religious Persecution and the Hungarian Reformed Tradition from the Decade of Sorrow to 1800”], *Humanizmus és reformáció* 41 (BTK Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2023), 59–79.

and to share her destiny of enduring persecution and bearing witness to the truth.

My research focuses on the complexity of Reformed Orthodoxy within the context of the long Hungarian Reformation, paying particular attention to the long eighteenth century (1680–1800). This further periodization and distinct emphasis on the timespan of 1680–1800 is justified, as it highlights the previously overlooked reception of Huguenot devotion. It seems that a significant number of influential Huguenot authors who expressed a Reformed orthodox standpoint, such as Pierre Du Moulin, Sr. and Pierre Du Moulin, Jr., Charles Drelincourt, Pierre Jurieu, Jacques Lenfant, and Daniel de Superville, had been translated into Hungarian, but rarely published during the aforementioned period.² Nevertheless, the reception, as confirmed by an impressive corpus of manuscripts and a few prints, is undeniable, and the timeframe of 1680–1800 proves to be pertinent.

The aim of this paper is to introduce new facts and considerations regarding the European reception of Richard Allestree's bestseller, *The Whole Duty of Man* (1658). The hitherto unknown Hungarian reception is surely exceptional, as Allestree's book, in fact, its French version, was translated three times during the long eighteenth century. Of the three Hungarian translators, only one has been identified thus far: the Reformed theologian György Aranka Zágoni (1705–1767), as confirmed by the surviving manuscript of his translation. Therefore, the focus of my investigations will be his person, life course, and the Hungarian translation he produced. The identity of the other translators remains unknown, despite the fact that the third translation was published in 1769 without naming the Hungarian translator(s). Given that all of them relied on the same French version of Allestree's book, it is unsurprising that the English author's text was regarded and read by the Hungarian readership as a piece of francophone devotional literature.

Therefore, I am proposing a case study that examines the Hungarian corpus with György Aranka's contribution in focus, in order to reveal the intricacies of the reception as a process of entangled transfers from Anglican devotion to Hungarian Reformed Orthodoxy via francophone piety. Textual criticism and a close reading of György Aranka's translation will allow

2. For a survey of the Huguenot authors read and translated by Hungarians see Zsombor Tóth, "Looking Beyond the Paradigm: The Hungarian Reception of Huguenot Authors in the Context of the Long Reformation in Central and Eastern Europe," in *Looking Beyond the Paradigm*, ed. Angela Ilić and Zsombor Tóth and Ulrich A. Wien, *Studies of Early Modern Christianity in Central Eastern Europe* 2 (De Gruyter, 2026), 13–31.

a reconstruction and assessment of this cultural and confessional encounter, revealing how and why Allestree's text could have been so popular. My conclusion will establish that the development of the long Hungarian Reformation, in particular the evolution of Reformed Orthodox spirituality, benefited extensively from the impact of English pietistic religiosity and Huguenot devotional literature.

The First Hungarian Translator of *The Whole Duty of the Christian Man*: György Aranka Zágoni (1705–1767)

György Aranka Zágoni's (ca. 1705–1767) life course embodied the pattern that granted success and social promotion to a select group of privileged Hungarian Reformed theologians. In addition to his talent, linguistic skills, and religious commitment, György Aranka rose to the top of the Transylvanian Reformed Church hierarchy due to his willingness to make sacrifices and overcome challenges. After completing his studies at home and abroad, he served as a pastor in two parishes: first in Marosvásárhely/Tirgu Mures (1731 and 1747) and then in Szék/Sic (1732 and 1755). He subsequently became dean in 1755 and superintendent in 1765. Few of his published works have survived, most of them being funeral sermons, but among them stands out the Hungarian translation of the Huguenot Charles Drelincourt's (1595–1669) manual of consolation³ titled, *Les Consolations de L'Ame Fidele contre Les Frayeurs De La Mort*.⁴ Although it had been translated by the aging György Aranka, it would be edited and published only by his son, Aranka Jr., in 1768. It was determinant in György Aranka's life and carrier that he found the means and financial support to

3. Charles Drelincourt, *Les Consolations de L'Ame Fidele contre Les Frayeurs De La Mort* (Paris, 1651). This book has been published countless times, as Drelincourt himself continuously revised and expanded it throughout his life, so it is not surprising that by the end of the seventeenth century, forty-two editions had been registered, followed by another fifteen editions during the eighteenth century. For the seventeenth century Huguenot devotional literature and the publication history of the text, see Marianne Carbonnier–Burkard, "Les pasteurs français auteurs d'une littérature d'édification, au XVII^e siècle," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 156, no. 1 (2011): 37–48. For an assessment of the Huguenot characteristics of the consolatory-devotional literature cultivated by Drelincourt, see Marianne Carbonnier–Burkard, "Un manuel de consolation au XVII^e siècle: les Visites charitables du pasteur Charles," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 157, no. 3 (2011): 331–56.

4. György Aranka Zágoni, *A keresztyén léleknek halál' félelmei ellen való orvosságai*. S. l. 1768 *A keresztyén léleknek halál' félelmei ellen való orvosságai* ["Remedies for the Christian Soul Against the Fears of Death"] (S. l.: S. n. 1768). A 1775 edition of this translation is also known to exist in Pozsony/Bratislava.

continue his studies abroad. The language skills and education he acquired, especially his theological training, proved to be a defining experience, as reported in his diary.⁵

After an eventful journey that began in 1728, the twenty-three-year-old György Aranka first arrived in Bern. On September 1, 1728, he enrolled at the local university and remained there until April 30, 1729. His next destination was Geneva, but before arriving there, he stopped in Lausanne, where he spent four days visiting a “clergyman renowned for his piety and learning.”⁶ This seems to be an important fact in his life course in terms of his acquaintance with French-speaking Huguenot culture and the so-called *littérature d’édification*, or edifying literature. It was precisely in this year that a theological seminary was established in Lausanne to provide clergy for the Huguenots in France. György Aranka enrolled at the University of Geneva on May 31, 1729, and stayed there throughout 1730. The benefits of his sojourn in this distinctive cultural and confessional milieu are best exemplified by a rather fictitious episode, in which his command of French was said to be so proficient that he was permitted on three occasions to deliver a sermon in French to a local congregation.⁷ While it is reasonable to reserve some doubt regarding the veracity of this episode, it remains an indisputable fact that, while in Geneva, György Aranka had the opportunity to meet exiled or established Huguenots, attend their religious services, and read their books.

Once the linguistic barrier had been overcome, the young Hungarian Reformed theologian may well have felt at home in the company of the Huguenots. The twenty-six-year-old György Aranka set off for home in the spring of 1731 via Basel, where he enrolled at the university on May 4, 1731, but did not sign the university register. However, György Aranka’s stay was significantly shorter than his periods in Geneva and Bern, as he returned to Transylvania at the beginning of October 1731. Much to his satisfaction, the books he had purchased—probably including the French

5. Elemér Jancsó introduced and edited György Aranka’s Latin travelogue that recorded his travels and exploits between 1728 and 1731. See Elemér Jancsó, “Kétszáz éves külföldi útleírás. Zágoni Aranka György erdélyi ref. püspök külföldi utazása 1728–1731-ben” [“The Foreign Travels of György Aranka Zágoni, Transylvanian Reformed Superintendent, 1728–1731”] *Páosztortűz* 26, no. 1 (1940): 46–52.

6. Jancsó, “Kétszáz éves külföldi,” 51.

7. Jancsó, “Kétszáz éves külföldi,” 46

translation of Allestree's bestseller — survived the long journey without any notable loss, as he recalled it in his diary.⁸

The significance of this impressive stay abroad is indisputable. György Aranka's mental world, intellectual profile, and piety were undoubtedly influenced by everything he saw, heard, read, and learned. Let us not forget that Bern, Geneva, and Basel were not only centres of Reformed Orthodoxy and Enlightenment, but also welcoming spiritual havens for the French Huguenot elite forced into exile.⁹ The Huguenot refugees, who arrived in large numbers and in several waves, received significant support, although their presence in the settlements of neighbouring countries was not without problems; yet they were able to practice their Reformed faith, publish books, and organize their communities, thus establishing schools, congregations, and trade corporations, many of which still existed in the nineteenth century. The presence of the Huguenots in Switzerland brought such intellectual and devotional excitement to eighteenth-century Swiss life that even Hungarian pilgrims studying there could benefit, as illustrated by György Aranka.

A Hungarian Manuscript and an Extraordinary Copy of It

Two manuscript variants of György Aranka's French translation have survived: one that appears to be an autograph¹⁰ written around 1752, preserved at the Library of the Romanian Academy in Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca, and another¹¹ held at the Documentary Library in Nagyenyed/Aiud, Romania.

8. Jancsó, "Kétszáz éves külföldi," 52.

9. Marie-Jeanne Ducommun, Dominique Quadroni, *Le Refuge protestant dans le Pays de Vaud (late 16th–early 18th centuries). Aspects of emigration* (Droz 1991); Yves Krumeacker, "La circulation des huguenots sur les routes du Refuge," *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 98, no. 2 (2012): 311–27; Michelle Magdelaine, "Le refuge huguenot, exil et accueil," *Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest* 121, no. 3 (2014): 131–43; Daniela Solfaroli Camillocci, "Refuge et migrations à Genève au miroir de polémistes, missionnaires et voyageurs (XVIe–XVIIe siècles)," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 232, no. 1 (2015): 53–81.

10. Aranka György: *Jo keresztyén: A Keresztyén embernek minden tisztit XVII. szakaszokba foglaló idvességés trakta* ["The Good Christian, That Is, an Edifying Treatise Introducing All the Duties of a Christian in Seventeen Sections"] 9+382 pages, manuscript, reference number: MS R. 1252, Special Collections of the Library of the Romanian Academy, Cluj. Hereinafter: Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*.

11. Aranka György: *Jo keresztyén: A Keresztyén embernek minden tisztit XVII. szakaszokba foglaló idvességés trakta* ["The Good Christian, That Is, an Edifying Treatise Introducing all the Duties of a Christian in Seventeen Sections"] 4+475 pages, manuscript copy, reference number: MS 29, Special Collection of the Documentary Library of Nagyenyed. Hereinafter: Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1755*.

The latter appears to be a copy from 1755 of the former, executed by the learned Reformed pastor of Nagyenyed/Aiud, József Hermányi Dienes (1699–1763). In this version held at Nagyenyed, the ageing Dienes Hermányi after completing the manuscript with an introduction of his own,¹² he himself stated that, despite his poor condition, he started copying the manuscript in December 1754 and finished it on January 19, 1755.¹³ This appears to be a piece of valuable information, as it helps dating both manuscripts. While the copy produced by Dienes Hermányi was finished in 1755, György Aranka's autograph appears to have come into being before 1754.

At a closer look, this manuscript looks like a rather artificial construction bearing the intervention of several hands, as several manuscript pages of different sizes and in different handwritings were retrospectively bound together with the truncated autograph. The main text¹⁴ is undoubtedly the work of György Aranka, although it is not signed by him. The front page, the superintendent's letter of recommendation¹⁵ dated 16 March 1762, and the table of contents¹⁶ were presumably added later to the original. As this manuscript was never published, despite the recommendation offered by Reformed superintendent György Verestói (1698–1765) in 1762, it seems plausible that it was widely read and disseminated among Reformed theologians and perhaps even laypeople. This would explain the manuscript's precarious condition and the necessity to supplement the damaged original with the aforementioned parts.

Indeed, György Aranka's autograph, perhaps completed sometime before 1754, appears to have undergone many alterations due to intensive use, as evidenced by the final modification: the superintendent Verestói's recommendation added in 1762. Fortunately, the dating of this autograph can be further clarified by examining the preface added by Hermányi Dienes to his own copy from 1755. Hermányi Dienes reports that he obtained the autograph manuscript from György Aranka after borrowing it to copy it, and he provides some details about the making of the original.

12. Dienes Hermányi decided to complete the manuscript with a short introduction providing a biographical context of György Aranka's life and carrier, while also emphasizing the significance of the book. According to Dienes Hermányi, the book would never be published due to discriminatory policies against Protestant denominations. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1755*, I–II.

13. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1755*, II.

14. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, 6–382.

15. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, I.

16. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, III–XVIII.

As the salary began to decline there, [György Aranka] thought that he would translate this book [French translation of Allestree's book] and have it printed at the expense of some generous individuals, following the example of Reverend István Tatai, who translated and published Stehelinus's Catechism with the financial support of the Transylvanian nobility.¹⁷

Hermányi Dienes's reference to István Tatai's translation of Stehelin, published in 1752,¹⁸ is of paramount significance, as it enables us to date the creation of the autograph text variant to between 1752 and 1754. However, as we shall see in the following section, the Hungarian translation was most likely based on the fourth French edition of Allestree's book, which was published in 1737. This suggests that György Aranka might have commenced the translation after 1737 and concluded the autograph manuscript between 1752 and 1754. Dienes Hermányi, as we have already seen it, obtained the manuscript from György Aranka in 1754. At this time, some of the later handwritten and foreign hand completions had not yet been added to it. Based on my research findings, to maintain clear differentiation between the two surviving manuscripts, I will date György Aranka's autograph manuscript to 1752 and Dienes Hermányi's copy to 1755. My references to these variants will reflect this dating, as mentioned in my previous footnotes, which provide full descriptions of both manuscripts.¹⁹

The English Original and Its French Translations

Following the disentangling of the complex relationships between György Aranka's autograph from 1752 and the copy produced by Dienes Hermányi in 1755, this section will analyse the French text that served as the source for the Hungarian translation. To solve this task, it is necessary to examine the English original and its various French translations, published several times during the first half of the eighteenth century. Accordingly, the title page of György Aranka's autograph manuscript contains some references that shed light on the sources of his translation: "First written in England by a certain pious man; but because it was so useful, it was translated into French and

17. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén* 1755, IVr.

18. Dienes Hermányi's recollection is partially inaccurate, as the author is not István, but Ferenc Csirke Tatai.

[Tatai Csirke Ferenc], *Catechismusi Házi-Kints, avagy A' keresztyéni hit' fő-ágazatának kérdések és feleletek általvaló magyarázatja* ["Catechism Domestic Fortune, or the Summary of Christian Religion Exposed in Question-and-Answer Format"] (Kolozsvárott, 1752).

19. See footnotes number 10 and 11.

has already been published four times, and now it has been translated into Hungarian for the benefit of Hungarian Christians.”²⁰

These findings demonstrate that the French translation from English underwent several editions and that György Aranka may have worked from a fourth edition of a French variant. The English text that served as the source for the French translation was published anonymously,²¹ because its authorship is disputed, and only the current professional consensus suggests that it may have been the work of Richard Allestree (1619–1681).²² His life coincided with the Puritan Revolution or English Civil War, marked by the rise of Oliver Cromwell, in which Allestree participated as a royalist in the armed conflicts of 1642–43. He was highly educated and well-trained, teaching at Oxford from 1663 and becoming chaplain to Charles II. He later served as dean of Eton College (1665). His famous library of approximately three thousand volumes, which he bequeathed to the university in 1681, is preserved at Oxford.²³ Allestree’s biography was written shortly after his death in 1685 by Bishop John Fell (1625–1686).²⁴ We also know of one of Allestree’s Hungarian connections, as he added a handwritten entry in the *album amicorum* of János Mezözlaki, who spent some time in England between 1667 and 1669.²⁵ Allestree authored numerous devotional works;²⁶ his sermons were also published, and in 1684, three years

20. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén* 1752, XVII.

21. [Richard Allestree], *The Practice of Christian Graces, or, The whole duty of man laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, but especially the meanest reader: divided into XVII chapters, one whereof being read every Lords Day, the whole may be read over thrice in the year: with Private devotions for several occasions* (London, 1658).

22. Paul Elmen, “Richard Allestree and The Whole Duty of Man,” *Library* 5, no. 1 (1951): 19–27.

23. Christina Neagu, “Time Capsule Under Restoration. The Allestree Library,” *Christ Church Library Newsletter* 7, no. 2 (2011): 15–17.

24. I found only a rather late edition of this biography: John Fell, *The Life of Richard Allestree D. D., Sometime Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and Provost of Eton* (London, 1848).

25. For János Mezözlaki and his stay in England, see István Gál, “Tótfalusi Kis Miklós angliai összeköttetéseinek nyomában. Mezözlaki János angol ismeretésegei” [“In the Footsteps of Miklós Kis Tótfalusi’s Connections in England. János Mezözlaki’s English Acquaintances”] *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 75, no. 3 (1971): 339–41; Berta Trócsányi, “Református teológusok Angliában a XVI és XVII. Században” [“Hungarian Reformed Theologians in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries”] *Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok*, nos. 5–6 (1944): 115–46.

26. To give just a few examples of the most important ones: *Gentleman’s Calling* (1660); *Causes of the Decay of Christian Piety* (1667); *Ladies Calling* (1673); *Government of the Tongue* (1674); *Art of Contentment* (1675); *Lively Oracles* (1678).

after his death, a collection of his works came out.²⁷ His most popular work, *The Whole Duty of Man*, first published in 1658, appeared anonymously, yet it became an international bestseller. In addition to the French translation mentioned above, Latin,²⁸ German,²⁹ and Dutch³⁰ translations are also known to exist. Not to mention that Dutch translations and adaptations resulted in numerous further editions. This process clearly suggests that the original confessional characteristics of the English text were overwritten in the process of transmission and reception to such an extent that the devotional work of the Anglican-royalist author became one of the popular devotional works of Dutch Calvinist orthodoxy.³¹ It appears that following the first Dutch edition in 1684, the work became a favourite piece of devotional culture and literature in the *Nadere Reformatie*, mainly due to the newer editions from the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The French reception also deserves special attention, as something similar occurred: the book, conceived in a royalist political and Anglican theological environment, was integrated into the literary tradition and corpus of Francophone Reformed piety (*piété réformée francophone*).³² Two French translations appeared, which went through numerous editions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is worth bearing in mind

27. [John Fell?], *The Works of the Learned and Pious Author of the Whole Duty of Man* (London, 1684).

28. The earliest edition that has been identified is from 1680. [Richard Allestree], *Officium hominis, cum stylo, tum methodo luculentissimaâ expositum; opus cujusvis, at præcipuè in doctissimi lectoris captui accommodatum* (London, 1680).

29. Friedrich Eberhard Rambach (1708–1775) translated it into German, and it seems to have been a popular read in that language as well, as it was published several times: in 1761, 1774, and 1776. [Richard Allestree], *Abbildung der ganzen Pflicht des Menschen: wegen ihres lehrreichen und erbaulichen Inhalts aus der engländische Sprache übersetzt [...] von Friedrich Eberhard Rambach* (Copenhagen, 1761). The German translation also reached the Hungarian-speaking world, with copies of various German editions preserved in collections in Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca and Budapest.

30. [Richard Allestree], *De Gantsche Pligt van een Christen* (Utrecht, 1684).

31. For a detailed assessment of the Dutch-reception see Jacques B. H. Alblas, "Richard Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man* (1658) in Holland: The Denominational and Generic Transformation of an Anglican Classic," *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 71, no. 1 (1991): 92–104.

32. In many respects, Allestree's text enjoyed almost the same reception as Bayly's *The Practice of Piety* (1612), which was extremely popular in French translations and went through twenty-four editions between 1622 and 1671. Carbonnier-Burkard, "Les pasteurs français," 42. It appears that almost the same phenomenon is repeated here, as a text written by an Anglican author serves Huguenot piety, thereby reinforcing the similarities between Puritan and Huguenot devotion.

that the English text, which was published anonymously in 1658, was conceived and written in a specific historical and personal context. This context not only determined the book's content but also implicitly influenced how it was received. As a royalist, Allestree was at the mercy of the radical Puritan group after the king's execution in 1649. He was reportedly forced to endure a brief period of imprisonment, among other hardships, yet this ordeal did not waver his loyalty. With the Restoration, Allestree's fortunes improved, and he enjoyed an impressive career as a reward for his unaltered loyalty and, of course, his genuine talent. However, it was not possible to predict in 1658 that Allestree, influenced by his experiences of persecution, would develop a discourse of piety that evoked the martyrologic tradition of the early modern period. As Allestree's text explicitly states, the act of martyrdom is to be embraced, particularly in the context of facing violence and the dominance of one's persecutors. The model of conduct to be followed is one of accepting God's will with humility and steadfastness. Furthermore, it presents the possibility of martyrdom, as this is the sole means of bearing witness in the face of religious persecution.³³

The anti-Huguenot sentiment and religious persecution that commenced in France during the 1660s and 1670s and culminated in the revocation of the *Edict of Nantes* (1685) provided an almost identical, or at least a suitable, analogy to the historical context of Allestree's text. Huguenot translators and readers certainly felt the relevance of the English text and may even have drawn strength and enthusiasm from it for their persecution-related testimony, which undoubtedly influenced the production of the eighteenth-century French translations and editions. This topicality and applicability were reinforced by the fact that Allestree's English text also recommended a collection of prayers in the appendix to the original text, which could be said primarily in times of various afflictions (illness, exile, persecution, etc.).

The initial French translation of the English text was published in 1669,³⁴ shortly followed by the second edition in 1671. It is evident that these French editions received a positive reception, as the Huguenot philosopher Pierre Bayle also praised³⁵ the abilities of their female translator,

33. Allestree, *The Practice of Christian Graces*, 398–99.

34. [Richard Allestree], *La Pratique des vertus chrétiennes, ou Tous les devoirs de l'homme [...] Traduit de l'anglais (par Mlle Durel)* (Rouen, 1669).

35. In his letter of 1678, Bayle states that Mademoiselle Durel's translation enjoyed greater popularity than the French version of Lewis Bayly's bestseller *The Practice of Piety*: "C'est elle qui nous a traduit de l'anglois, La Pratique des vertus chretiennes, livre

Mademoiselle Durel.³⁶ Nonetheless, the third edition, published in 1723,³⁷ was already based on a new translation. Although the translator is unknown, this translation promised a greatly altered, more accurate French version than the previous ones. It appears that, commencing with the third French edition, a more complete and superior version of the text was in fact created. This French variant was replicated in subsequent editions, including the fourth edition,³⁸ which appears to be the source of György Aranka's Hungarian translation as well. This claim is confirmed by discrepancies at the macro and micro levels observed in a comparison of the various French editions. In the third (1723) and subsequent editions, the section between pages 447 and 452 in *Part 17* is separated by the anonymous French translator under the title 'Conclusion', whereas in the first (1669) and second (1671) editions, this five-page section is incorporated into *Part 17* with no distinctive markings or reference to a distinct structural unit bearing the explicit title 'Conclusion'. György Aranka's Hungarian translation, however, seems to follow the structure of the third (1723) or the consecutive editions more closely, reproducing the separate 'Conclusion' under the subheading 'Bé-rekesztés',³⁹ which is the Hungarian equivalent for the French 'Conclusion.' Furthermore, the distinction between the French variants of the first two editions and the subsequent ones (1723, 1737, etc.) is corroborated by a discrepancy at the micro level. For, the third (1723) and subsequent French editions discuss the homiletics of prayer in section 5⁴⁰ devoted to prayer, and are thus faithful to the English original. Furthermore, strictly following the English model, they distinguish between public and private prayer and occasions for prayer (*prières public et particuliere*). The discussion of *prières particuliere* is omitted from the two French versions preceding

beaucoup plus estimé que La Pratique de pieté." Pierre Bayle's (1647–1706) correspondence is available online at: <http://bayle-correspondance.univ-st-etienne.fr/?Lettre-161-Pierre-Bayle-a-Jacob&lang=fr#nb19>.

36. Mademoiselle Durel, née Marie de Baux, was the wife of Jean Durel or John Durel (1625–1683); they married in 1664. Marie de Baux's father was the famous Huguenot priest Jean-Maximilien de Baux, sieur de Langle (1590–1674).

37. [Richard Allestree], *La pratique des vertus chretiennes, ou, Tous les devoirs des hommes: avec les devotions particulieres, pour diverses occasions ordinaires & extraordinaires. Traduit de l'Anglois* (Delft, 1723).

38. [Richard Allestree], *La pratique des vertus chretiennes, ou, Tous les devoirs des hommes: avec les devotions particulieres, pour diverses occasions ordinaires & extraordinaires. Traduit de l'Anglois* (Lausanne, 1737).

39. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén* 1752, 376–82.

40. Section V. De l'adoration ou du service que nous devons à Dieu.

the third (1723) edition, but it appears in György Aranka's translation, who defines private/solitary prayer as follows: "Private prayer is that which must be performed alone, or isolated from any human company, in which one can better disclose one's own particular needs than in common prayers. Attending regularly divine service cannot be a reason for neglecting this special prayer; God commands both, and thus the performance of one cannot replace the other."⁴¹

This passage shows that György Aranka worked from a French variant, which was published only in the third (1723) edition and subsequent ones. It is worth recalling György Aranka's remark about the source of his translation at this point, as he stated that the French text had already been published four times.⁴² It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that György Aranka relied on the fourth edition of the French text, published in 1737, for his Hungarian translation.

Allestree in Print and in Manuscript (Again?): Further Aspects of the Hungarian Reception

In 1769, a remarkable book⁴³ was published by István Margitai's printing shop. Margitai, a Reformed printer of some renown based in Debrecen, achieved prominence through his promotion of Reformed publications, thereby securing a dominant position in the Hungarian book market during the eighteenth century. It is plausible that this publication is part of a substantial series of devotional works that were initially published by Margitai's printing establishment. The primary objective of this series was to cater to the spiritual needs of a Reformed readership that embraced Reformed Orthodoxy and pietistic devotion. The title of the book fully concurs this initiative: *A Christian man's entire duty clearly and comprehensibly outlined for everyone, but especially for the benefit of simpler readers, divided into 17 parts [...] First written in English, it has now been translated into Hungarian*. The content of the printed text confirms what is fairly apparent at a first glance, this is, indeed, a Hungarian translation of Richard Allestree's bestseller *The Whole Duty of Man* (1658).

41. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén* 1752, 156–57.

42. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén* 1752, XVII.

43. [Richard Allestree], *A keresztyén embernek egész tiszte világosan és érthetőképen lera-jzoltatva mindeneknek, de kivált az együgyűbb olvasóknak kedvéért és XVII. részekre fel-osztva* ["A Christian Man's Entire Duty Clearly and Comprehensibly Outlined for Everyone, but Especially for the Benefit of Simpler Readers, Divided into 17 Parts"] (Debrecen, 1769).

However, it is important to note that the Debrecen print did not publish György Aranka's translation; this publication is a *new* Hungarian translation of Allestree's work. The printed edition does not name the Hungarian translator(s) and suggests that it was translated from English. However, the extant scholarship does not provide a definitive consensus regarding the authorship of this translation. It has been posited that two individuals, the Reformed superintendent Ferenc Tatai Csirke (1707–1764)⁴⁴ and the senator of the city of Debrecen, Sámuel Szeremley (1695–1771),⁴⁵ may have been responsible for rendering Allestree's English text into Hungarian. It is noteworthy that this Hungarian variant is purportedly the result of a translation from the English original. However, this assertion is fairly bold, as there is no evidence to corroborate the proficiency in English of Tatai Csirke and Szeremley. Moreover, recent scholarship asserts⁴⁶ that the translation may have been completed from French, probably from a similar edition that constituted the source of György Aranka's version as well. The debate surrounding authorship has been further complicated by the claim that the 1769 publication is in fact the second edition of Tatai Csirke's translation, which first appeared in 1749.⁴⁷ It is, regrettably, impossible to verify this claim, as no copies of the presumed 1749 *editio princeps* have survived. Notwithstanding the unresolved issues surrounding authorship and the number of print editions, it is an established fact that a *second Hungarian translation* of Allestree's book from the French was published in 1769.

Finally, the unexpectedly vivid reception in Debrecen is further augmented by a mysterious manuscript variant⁴⁸ which recently surfaced among the holdings of the National Széchényi Library in Budapest. I was fortunate to discover and identify this manuscript as the *third translation* of Allestree's book. However, this variant remains shrouded in secrecy, as it is impossible to disclose the identity of its author, or even its copyist, at

44. See János M. Hermán, "Tatai (Csirke) Ferenc, V. D. M., vir est optimus," *Református Szemle* 107, no. 2 (2014): 194–236, 203.

45. Csaba Fekete, *Első konfirmációs ágendánk (1751)* ["Our First Confirmation Agenda" (1751)] (Debrecen, 2007), 22.

46. Tóth, *A hosszú reformáció*, 390–95.

47. Hermán, "Tatai Csirke Ferenc," 203.

48. [S. n.], *A keresztényi virtusoknak gyakorlása vagy Az embernek Istenhez magához és felebarátához való kötelességei és Tisztei. Francziából fordítottatott 1752. Esztendőben* ["The Practice of the Christian Virtues or, The Duties and Obligations of the Man Towards God and His Brethren, Translated from French in 1752"], 24+681+7 pages, manuscript, reference number: Quart. Hung. 316, Special Collections of the National Széchényi Library, Budapest.

this stage of the research. It appears to be a single-handed copy, completed on 9 October 1752.⁴⁹ Fortunately, the manuscript had two relatively well-known Reformed superintendent owners, whose lives sheds some light on its destiny. The second owner, Ferenc Tóth (1768–1844), added a short Latin entry⁵⁰ to the blank page before the first page of the manuscript. This states that he bought the manuscript at the auction of Ferenc Hunyadi Szabó's (1743–1795) library, held in Debrecen on 5 October 1795. This information enables us to establish a chronology: after its completion in 1752, the manuscript came into the possession of Ferenc Hunyadi Szabó, and following his death on 7 July 1795, it was purchased by Ferenc Tóth on 5 October of the same year. After his death in 1844, it seems plausible that the manuscript was donated to the National Széchényi Library.

With regard to the content of the present manuscript, it is worth noting that it differs both from György Aranka's manuscript translation and the print variant published at Debrecen in 1769. A thorough examination of the manuscript and a confrontation with the French editions, has clearly demonstrated that, in a manner analogous to the previously mentioned Hungarian translations, it is consistent with either the third edition (1723) or a subsequent edition of the French versions. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Hungarian translation completed in 1752 and connected to the Protestant Rome of the era, the city of Debrecen constitutes a third Hungarian version of Allestree's book. Furthermore, it seems to suggest the presence of a *third Hungarian translator* who was not privy to György Aranka's endeavors or, at the very least, his intention to produce a Hungarian version of Allestree's exceptionally popular devotional work.

György Aranka's Translation Under Scrutiny: What Made Richard Allestree's Text so Popular?

The preceding sections appear to corroborate the assertion that a substantial corpus of both print and manuscript material, involving at least three different translators, attests to the formidable Hungarian reception of Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man*. Yet, it is important to acknowledge that the eighteenth-century Hungarian readership was not aware of Allestree's authorship, as they received a Hungarian text from a French translation. However, it is evident that all three Hungarian variants resonated with the

49. [S. n.], *A' keresztényi virtusoknak*, 687.

50. "Fr(anciscus). TÓTH ex auctione Cl(arissimi). D(omini). Fr(anciscus). Hunyadi d(ie). 5. Oct(o)bris. 1795. Debrecini."

devotional needs of the Hungarian Reformed readers. The inevitable question is how Allstree's text attracted such distinguished attention, and how this remarkable interest in it can be explained. The question of whether the imposition of stringent censorship, resulting in the substantial curtailment of the dissemination of devotional works, constituted a sufficient justification for the engagement with and translation of these texts, is a matter that merits further reflection. For it is evident that censorship could not have exerted its influence on the dissemination potential of the manuscript publicity; consequently, it can be deduced that the transmission of these texts in translated manuscript copies could have easily reached a Reformed readership. Therefore, the most significant component of the unusually vivid Hungarian reception remains unanswered: namely, what question of decisive importance to the eighteenth-century Hungarian Reformed readers could this text answer?

Hermányi Dienes described György Aranka's translation as an "invaluable book on morality,"⁵¹ which indeed falls within the framework of early modern moral theology. The Hungarian precursors of this theology were undoubtedly influenced by English Puritanism. The spiritual impact of Puritanism and Pietism was so intense in the seventeenth century that even the Anglican Allestree could not escape its influence. This kind of "experimental Calvinism,"⁵² evident in seventeenth-century English Reformed piety, appears to have had a significant impact on Allestree's text as well. This explains the misunderstanding of the Hungarian Reformed readership, who probably judged the text to be a piece of Puritan devotional literature—most likely a conduct book originally written in English, then translated into French, and finally transposed into Hungarian. Remarkably, during the translation process, the Royalist and Anglican Allestree's text, along with his authorial intention, was incorporated into the Puritan theological and devotional context. As the Hungarian readership had already assimilated some Puritan classics, this proved decisive in the absorption and integration of this text into Hungarian Reformed pietistic devotion.

Furthermore, the influence of Huguenot piety on the reception of Allestree's text is also worth noting, given that the Hungarian translators would have encountered the text primarily within a French historical and

51. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1755*, I.

52. See Andrew Cambers, "Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, circa 1580–1720," *Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 4 (2007): 796–825; Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580–1720* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).

denominational-linguistic context. As previously mentioned, there were two variants of the French translation of Allestree's text. The third edition offered a new translation, the historical context of which was influenced by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, the Camisard resistance organized in the Cévennes region of southern France from 1702 to 1704, and the establishment of the Church of the Desert (*l'Église du Désert*). Significant texts of martyrological literature reflecting on the religious persecution of the Huguenots were written by Pierre Jurieu⁵³ and Élie Benoist⁵⁴ and reached a wide readership at the end of the seventeenth century. Apart from informing international Protestant communities and gaining their support, it was important to persuade those who had been forced to convert to Catholicism (*nouveaux convertis*) to resist, bear witness, and take on the roles of martyrs and confessors.⁵⁵ Hungarian interest in Allestree's French text could not ignore these particular Huguenot-related historical, literary and theological contexts.

It seems probable that the central element connecting these layers of tradition, namely Anglican/Puritan, Huguenot, and Hungarian Reformed piety, through translation as a linguistic and cultural transfer, is *religious persecution* and the contemporary moral-theological, in fact *martyrologic* response given to it. The flight and exile from Cromwell's followers, but

53. Pierre Jurieu (1637–1713) was a committed intellectual champion of the Huguenot cause. Of his oeuvre I would like to mention his extremely popular publication, which most fully expresses his experience of persecution and his martyrological response to it: Pierre Jurieu, *Lettres pastorales adressées aux fidèles de France qui gémissent sous la captivité de Babylon* (S.l., 1686). For a scholarly appraisal see Élisabeth Labrousse, "Note sur Pierre Jurieu," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 58, no. 3 (1978): 277–97; David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic 1680–1700* (Routledge, 2015), 179–94; Martin I. Klauber, "Pierre Jurieu (1637–1713): The French Reformed Theology of Refuge," *Studies in Puritanism & Piety* 6, no. 1 (2025): 3–15.

54. Élie Benoist (1640–1728) wrote the most comprehensive historical work from a Huguenot perspective, which dealt with the history of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, also applying legal considerations, while reflecting on the entire history of the Reformation in France as a context in his ambitious work: Elie Benoist: *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes* (Delft, 1693–1695). For relevant literature see: Charles Johnston, "Elie Benoist, Historian of the Edict of Nantes," *Church History* 55, no. 4 (1986): 468–88; Van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile*, 194–207.

55. For a general assessment of Huguenot theology of this tormented period, see Martin I. Klauber, ed., *The Theology of the French Reformed Churches: From Henry IV to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* (Reformation Heritage Books, 2014); Martin I. Klauber, ed., *The Theology of the Huguenot Refuge: From the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Edict of Toleration* (Reformation Heritage Books, 2020).

above all the perception of the execution of Charles I of England as martyrdom by the royalist camp,⁵⁶ resulted in Allestree's text being useful not only as a conduct book, but rather a consistent reinforcement of the martyrologic tradition of the period. For Reformed discourses on martyrdom reiterated the conviction that in the face of persecution (*persecutio*) and the accompanying afflictions (*afflictiones*) a Christian must bear witness to the truth, that is embrace suffering or even death with patience (*patientia*) and steadfastness (*constantia*). The testimony of the early modern confessor is the humble and patient endurance of all afflictions, such as imprisonment, exile, illness, or even death, without complaint, as embodied by the figure of Job and especially his behaviour in the Bible.

Nevertheless, a distinct development within the European tradition of early modern Protestant martyrologies saw the confessor become more prominent, with their role in the face of religious persecution was centred more on witnessing than on dying. While the significance of dying a martyr's death remained unchallenged, witnessing without dying also gained immense respect. Confessors who returned from distant exile or survived long, exhausting imprisonments provided an accessible form of witnessing for ordinary people. Early modern confessors undoubtedly became extremely popular, as they provided a valid role for the average person suffering religious persecution. This was also the case in Hungarian tradition, where patiently enduring affliction without dying as a martyr was one of the most widespread forms of witnessing.

The theology of martyrdom, which was based on the *afflictiones-patientia-constantia* pattern inherited from the Church Fathers, was incorporated into early modern Hungarian Reformed martyrologic discourses, producing a significant impact. The first major persecution (1671–1681) of the Hungarian Protestant denominations, which culminated in the ordeal of Protestant ministers being sent to the galleys, brought about the emergence of a genuine Hungarian Protestant martyrological tradition. The author of the first Hungarian martyrology,⁵⁷ István Nagy Szőnyi (1632–1709), developed a concept of martyrdom that provided a theological paradigm for persecuted Calvinist and Lutheran priests and lay people who resisted

56. For the martyrdom of Charles I of England (1600–1649), see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Boydell Press, 2003).

57. István Nagy Szőnyi, *Mártírok Coronája* ["The Crown of Martyrs"] (Kolozsvár, 1675).

religious persecution organized with Habsburg military assistance.⁵⁸ According to Nagy Szőnyi's definition of martyrdom, which contained ten distinct categories, he stated that: "Fourth-order martyrs are those who peacefully endure the cross."⁵⁹

Furthermore, Nagy Szőnyi considers anyone who endured persecution or any kind of affliction (exile, imprisonment, etc.) for religion to be a martyr. This view remained prevalent in the Hungarian Reformed tradition throughout the eighteenth century, during the long Reformation as well. Nagy Szőnyi's work was reissued in 1752 and disseminated in manuscript copies. The fear of religious persecution and the idea of persecution had become so ingrained in Hungarian Protestant denominations that it would become the defining feature of their identity. Moreover, it is reasonable to suggest that the overarching narrative of the Hungarian long Reformation (1500–1800) was derived from the widely accepted notion that the history of the Reformation has always been an account of the religious persecution endured by the chosen few.

In light of these findings, I am convinced that the Allestree text, which arrived via French Huguenot mediation, became part of the long Reformation in Hungary because it addressed the specific interests generated by experiences of, and fears surrounding, persecution in the eighteenth century, and sought to propose solutions for enduring them. Apparently, Allestree's book provided instruction and a model of behaviour, and thus possible guidance and consolation for the Hungarian Reformed readership dealing with everyday persecutory experiences. Allestree's teaching and instructions were useful to contemporary readers not primarily because of their novelty, but rather because of their validity and their reaffirmation of existing and accepted moral and theological statements. It can be posited that reading Allestree may have facilitated the acceptance of afflictions or even martyrdom.

In this specific context of reception history, György Aranka's interpretation indicates a profound preoccupation with martyrdom, asserting that humility and obedience are indispensable prerequisites for a Christian to submit to the divine will and embrace patience. According to György Aranka, the concept of humility is introduced as an awareness of human

58. Zsombor Tóth, "Calvinian Anthropology and the Early Modern Hungarian Devotion: The Case of István Nagy Szőnyi, the First Hungarian Martyrologist," in *Anthropological Reformations: Anthropology in the Era of Reformation*, ed. Anne Eusterschulte and Hannah Wälzholz, REFO500 Academic Studies 28 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 415–28.

59. Nagy Szőnyi, *Mártírok Coronája*, 5.

frailty in contrast to divine excellence.⁶⁰ This, the Hungarian translator contends, should inspire obedience to the heavenly Father. In a subsequent step, the concept of patience is introduced:

The second type of submission to God's will is patience, which consists in suffering with joy and complete obedience all the punishments that God has deemed good to send upon us. This is made easy for us by humility, of which we have already spoken. For if our hearts are filled with the fear and great reverence we owe to God, it is impossible for us to rebel against him, whatever he does to us.⁶¹

Patience requires a stoic attitude, grounded steadfastness, and the humble acceptance of suffering. As György Aranka asserts,⁶² the character of Job in the Bible serves as a valid exemplar, for Job's narrative instructs us to persevere in the face of adversity and to refrain from expressing discontent towards God. The employment of both the biblical paradigm and the moral-theological argument, founded upon the principles of patience and steadfastness, evokes resonances with a theological legacy that reaches back to the tenets of the Church Fathers, particularly Tertullian.⁶³ This facilitates György Aranka's exposition of the notion of bearing witness to the truth, and by extension, martyrdom.

But perhaps someone will say that there is a part of piety that exposes us to persecution and suffering in this world, which are not pleasant to the flesh and blood, but are very difficult and sad. To this I reply that even in these circumstances, the good Spirit finds sufficient cause for joy. This was the experience of the apostles, who rejoiced that they were deemed worthy to suffer for the name of Christ (Acts 5:41). St. Peter also says that if anyone suffers as a Christian, he should glorify God for it (1 Peter 4). The testimony of a good conscience has such great power that it can transform even the most cruel sufferings into victorious joy, which we can never feel more strongly than when we

60. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, 50. All English translations are mine, unless otherwise noted.

61. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, 52.

62. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, 55.

63. For the impact of Tertullian upon the early modern Hungarian martyrology see Zsombor Tóth, "Ad Martyras. Persecution, Exile and Martyrdom: Early Modern Martyrological Discourses as Invented Traditions," in *A qui appartient la tradition? Who owns the tradition?*, ed. Vilmos Keszeg (Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület, 2014), 22–41.

suffer for righteousness' sake. This proves that the Christian religion is worthy of love, even in what seems to be sorrowful.⁶⁴

The joy of suffering for Christ, György Aranka teaches us, is complete in that it also makes it possible to win the crown of (eternal) life.⁶⁵ The crown of life (Rev. 2:10) is evidently a reference to the crown of the martyrs who have won eternal life. It is worth pausing on that Nagy Szőnyi, profoundly influenced by Tertullian's tenets on martyrdom, selected the very same biblical passage for inclusion on the front page of his martyrology, published in 1675 with the poignant title of *The Crown of Martyrs*. It is reasonable to suggest that this Hungarian literary and theological antecedent had influenced György Aranka when he formulated his encouragement to follow Christ and embrace martyrdom:

Let us follow Jesus in the greatest afflictions, and, if He so desires, even through a sea of blood, for He went there first. For even if our faithfulness to him leads us to death, we are certain that we will lose nothing there, since he has promised the crown of life to all who suffer for his name's sake, and this crown is such that even among the instruments of torture, the expectation of it can give a Christian greater joy than a worldly man could taste in his greatest fortune.⁶⁶

It can be concluded that György Aranka's discourse on martyrdom, based on Allestree's text, becomes even more significant when considered in the relevant historical context. After all, the general condition of Hungarian Protestant denominations gradually deteriorated during the long eighteenth century, despite 150 years of free religious practice. The Edict of Toleration (1781), offered by Emperor Joseph II, only allowed limited freedom of worship for non-Roman Catholics, and it would take another decade for this to be reinforced by the Diet of 1791, which secured religious freedom. Therefore, from the 1750s onwards, the Reformed Hungarian readership of Allestree's text had every reason to seek comfort and hope in the face of the religious persecution they must have experienced daily. The Hungarian reception history of Allestree's text seems to confirm this, too. After the first Hungarian translation surfaced in Transylvania in the 1750s and entered manuscript circulation, a different region—the so-called Partium, centred on the city of Debrecen—took over and sustained

64. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, 50.

65. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, 378–79.

66. Aranka, *Jó Keresztyén 1752*, 379.

the dissemination of the text in print and manuscript form for two decades or so. Finally, the 1769 edition enabled the text to be disseminated on a significantly larger scale, reaching well beyond the geographical confines of Transylvania and its Reformed readers.

Similarly, it is notable that this chronology bears some resemblance to the literary history of the Hungarian Reformed martyrology, which began with the work of the Reformed minister István Nagy Szőnyi, *The Crown of Martyrs* (1675). Despite Jesuit censorship and the dangers associated with reading or using the book, the extremely popular work was reissued and published in Sopron with a false imprint in 1752.⁶⁷ Despite the ensuing scandal and repression following the publication of the second edition, *The Crown of Martyrs* remained a favourite of the era, as evidenced by surviving manuscript copies, some of which date from the 1780s. A second Hungarian martyrology, written by a Reformed theologian and published in 1789 with the suggestive title *The Column of Martyrs*,⁶⁸ further highlighted the focus on the experience of religious persecution and the reality of martyrdom. Although Allestree's book is undoubtedly more than just a treatise on martyrology, it seems that the Hungarian Reformed readership of the long eighteenth century, including translators, may have held a different view.

Conclusion

The aim of my study was to construe the complex devotional heritage of eighteenth-century Reformed Orthodoxy, using the example of the intricate Hungarian reception of Richard Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man*. My focus was on the Reformed theologian György Aranka, the only known Hungarian translator of the three and the most successful, who produced a translation of Allestree's bestseller from a French version. György Aranka's peregrination experience reflects Swiss and Geneva-centered Calvinism, fertilized by Huguenot influences, and simultaneously embodies the spirit of the Enlightenment—referred to in literature as “reasonable Calvinism.”⁶⁹ An intriguing question is what György Aranka did (or could

67. István Nagy Szőnyi, *Mártýrok Coronája* [“The Crown of Martyrs”] (Nürnberg, 1727).

68. György Szikszai, *Mártírok oszlopa* [“The Column of the Martyrs”] (Pozsony, 1789).

69. For a discussion of the concept see Jennifer Powell McNutt, *Calvin Meets Voltaire. The Clergy of Geneva in the Age of Enlightenment, 1685–1798* (Routledge, 2013); “Reformed Preaching in the Age of the Enlightenment: A Comparison of Johnathan Erskine's Enlightened Evangelicalism with Geneva's Reasonable Calvinism,” *Intellectual History Review* 26 (2016): 371–89.

have done) with this, given that, by the end of his life, he had reached the institutional peak of Transylvanian Reformed Orthodoxy and had to adopt a rather conservative position. In contrast, his surviving translations reveal linguistic, cultural, and even denominational hybridity, evoking an interdenominational or supra-denominational stance rather than rigid orthodoxy. György Aranka seems to have maintained a reassuring balance between the institutionally accepted orthodox position and openness to denominational crossovers, linguistic borrowings, and cultural influences. I do not see this solely as a manifestation of the influence of the Enlightenment, but rather as evidence of the intellectual diversity and complexity of European Reformed Orthodoxy, which is probably best reflected in the concept of “religious Enlightenment” and its potential applications to Central and Eastern Europe.⁷⁰

The case of superintendent György Aranka reminds us that officially adopting a Reformed Orthodox position does not eliminate the coexistence or influence of hybrid traditions that have been assimilated at an individual level. Furthermore, the complex reception of Allestree’s text by early modern readers from various cultural and denominational backgrounds sometimes contradicts the working hypotheses of experts in the field. While the Hungarian reception places great importance on the roles of translators, copyists, and publishers as they unfold in both manuscript and print publicity, it also reveals something unexpected. Although the French translation of the royalist Allestree initially activates a theological tradition and reading experiences associated with English Puritanism, it ultimately contributes to the reception of Huguenot devotional culture. Indeed, György Aranka’s translations rightly raise the possibility of a Huguenot reception that has yet to be examined in detail. This is especially pertinent when we consider that numerous other French Huguenot authors’ works were only ever published in manuscript form, yet still had an impact.

70. For the concept and use of “religious Enlightenment,” see David Sorkin, *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna* (Princeton University Press, 2008), 5-11. A significant application of the concept to Scandinavian Reformation(s): Johannes Ljungberg, Erik Sidenvall, “Reason and Orthodoxy in the Nordic Countries: An Introduction,” in *Religious Enlightenment in the Eighteenth-Century Nordic Countries: Reason and Orthodoxy*, ed. Johannes Ljungberg and Erik Sidenvall (Lund University Press, 2023), 1-29.

“Live a Holy Life in Order to Die Well”: On the Influence of William Perkins’s *Salve for a Sicke Man* on Gisbertus Voetius’s View of Dying Well

G. M. BOSKER
gmbosker@tua.nl
Researcher Church History
Theological University of Apeldoorn

Dying is an intriguing theme because no one knows in advance what it is like to die, and every human being tries to imagine what it will be like to die. Throughout the centuries, people have reflected on dying and death. In the 1970s, several historians conducted research into how dying has been dealt with throughout the centuries. The most famous researcher in this field is the French historian Philippe Ariès (1914–1984). Ariès researched attitudes toward life and death from classical antiquity up to the time he published his research in the 1970s.¹ Remarkably, in his research on the history of mentality, Ariès pays little attention to how death was handled in seventeenth-century European Pietism, including German Pietism and English Puritanism.²

By contrast, church historians have devoted considerable attention to the views on dying held by important representatives of European pietistic movements in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These views have been compared and research has been conducted into developments and mutual influences. However, such research has, so far, been largely limited to identifying mutual influences within a single country.³ In order to

1. Philippe Ariès, *Western Attitudes Toward Death from the Middle Ages to the Present* (Baltimore, 1975); Ph. Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death: The Classic History of Western Attitudes Toward Death Over the Last One Thousand Years*, trans. Helen Weaver (Alfred A. Knopf, 1981).

2. Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, 234.

3. In the Dutch-speaking area, the earliest research into sixteenth and seventeenth-century writings about dying was conducted by K. Exalto in 1975. K. Exalto, *De dood ontmaskerd, de voorbereiding op de dood in de late middeleeuwen, in de reformatie en in de gereformeerde theologie van de 17e en 18e eeuw* (Ton Bolland 1979). Ten to fifteen years ago,

determine the extent to which international influences play a role in views on death, this article examines the extent to which the views of Dutch pastor and professor Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676) on death were influenced by the views of English Puritan pastor William Perkins (1558–1602). Voetius was evidently influenced by Perkins, as he was familiar with Perkins's writings on death and quoted from them in his own work.

Both ministers paid attention to the theme of death and dying in their writings. Voetius spent a chapter on it in a compendium he wrote on asceticism. And for his part Perkins dedicated a separate treatise on dealing with death and preparing for dying. Prior to a brief summary and comparison of both writings, a brief outline is given of the historical context in which both ministers wrote about dying and preparing for death.

Developments in Dealing with Death and Dying

Dealing with Death from Ancient Times to the Modern Era

Changes in attitudes towards dying and dealing with death occur very slowly, Ariès observes. He divides attitudes towards death into four periods. This is a very broad classification, making it impossible to draw clear boundaries. The first period runs from classical antiquity to the twelfth century. Ariès refers to this period as the period of “the tamed death.”⁴ The second period, from the twelfth to the beginning of the eighteenth century, is referred to by Ariès as the period of “the death of the self.” The third period, described by Ariès as the period of “the death of the other,” runs

this research was taken up again by A. Baars, J. Hoek, H.J. Selderhuis, and others. A. Baars, “Pastoraat aan stervenden, lessen voor levenden. De visie van de vroege Nadere Reformatie op sterven en stervensbegeleiding,” in *DNR* 36 (2012); J. Hoek, “‘Euthanasia’ in the Seventeenth Century: *Ars moriendi* in Dutch Reformed Perspective,” in *Strangers and Pilgrims on Earth: Essays in Honour of Abraham van de Beek*, Studies in Reformed Theology 22, ed. E. van der Borght and P. van de Geest (Brill, 2011); H. J. Selderhuis, “*Ars moriendi* in Early Modern Calvinism,” in T. Rasmussen and J. Øygarden Flåtten, *Preparing for Death, Remembering the Dead* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 109–22. In 2024, I obtained my PhD with a thesis on the views of several Reformed ministers from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries on dying. G. M. Bosker, *Memento mori. Een onderzoek naar de visie van enkele Nederlandse gereformeerde predikanten in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw op het sterven* (Barneveld, 2024). For a more extensive overview of church historical research on the theme of dying, see this dissertation. Bosker, *Memento mori*, cf. 14–16.

4. Cf. Ariès, *Western Attitudes*, 2–14; Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, 28–32; 45.

from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century.⁵ In the twentieth century, the fourth period, death has become taboo, according to Ariès.⁶

During the second period, death became increasingly individualized as a result of growing urbanization. The individualization of dying is evident from the fact that there is increasing talk of an individual judgement immediately after death, which is increasingly linked to one’s own biography. The final decision about the eternal destination of the dying person is made at the moment he breathes his last breath. The familiarity with death from the first period gives way to fear and uncertainty. In the late Middle Ages, the deathbed increasingly became a place where angels and demons fight for the soul of the dying person. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the individualization of death continued, and death remained problematic; preparation for death shifted from the deathbed to the whole of life.⁷

The Origins of the Ars Moriendi

It was mainly in this period, when dying was problematic and death evoked fear, that a special genre of writings emerged to prepare people for death. This genre is called the *ars moriendi*. During this period, from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, Europe was ravaged by devastating plagues. During these centuries, the plague took many lives. While the mortality rate in the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands was around 3.5 percent in years without plague outbreaks, it could reach 15 percent in years with severe outbreaks.⁸ These devastating epidemics meant that death was always close by during this period. People were constantly confronted with death in the streets, when they saw houses standing empty because the residents had succumbed to the plague, and when they saw the many funeral processions passing through the town. In addition, mass graves could be seen in the cemeteries where those who had died of the plague were buried.

5. Cf. Ariès, *Western Attitudes*, 59–73; Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, 440–42; 484; 490–96; 510–12.

6. Cf. Ariès, *Western Attitudes*, 85–90; Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, 600–612; 617–30.

7. Ariès, *Western Attitudes*, 30–39; 45–46; Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, 318–37; 345–51; 436–37.

8. Van der Woude, “Demografische ontwikkelingen van de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 1500–1800,” in D. P. Blok et al., *Nieuwe Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden V* (Fibula/van Dishoeck, 1977–1983), 139–45.

Many people at that time had lost a loved one, a family member, or a friend to the plague.⁹

Because many people died as a result of the plague and other infectious diseases during these centuries, there were not always enough clergy to accompany the dying. Therefore, the help of monks and lay people was sometimes needed. However, these monks and lay people often had little or no experience with end-of-life care. The first writings on dying from the late Middle Ages were therefore intended to provide clergy and laypeople with some guidance on how to accompany the dying. Good end-of-life care was considered absolutely essential because the end-of-life counselor had to accompany the dying person at the most decisive moment, the transition from temporary life to eternal destiny. The first writings on dying contained a brief explanation of the art of dying, questions for the dying person, prayers, exhortations, some practical advice for those accompanying the dying and, in some cases, a few examples of a blessed death. These writings reveal an intense pastoral concern for people in the last hours of their lives and a deep conviction that the decisive moment of death comes once for every human being.

The most well-known basic forms of the *ars moriendi* are the *Admonitio Anselmi*, attributed to Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109), the third part of the *Opus Tripartitum de praeceptis decalogi, de confessione et de arte moriendi* by Jean Gerson (1366–1429), the treatise *Speculum artis bene moriendi* by Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl (ca. 1360–1433), and a deathbed locution that is not a written text, but eleven woodcuts. The author of this pictorial *ars moriendi* is unknown. Each of the eleven woodcuts depicts a dying person on their deathbed. Five of the eleven images show the dying person being attacked by devils who want to incite them to doubt, despair, impatience, overconfidence, and greed. Five other images show angels supporting and helping the dying person with five corresponding consolations. Faced with the temptations of the devils, the dying person is encouraged by the angels to have faith, hope, patience, humility, and to offer a renunciation of the world. The eleventh and final image shows the good death of the dying person, who has overcome all temptations. The soul of the dying person, depicted as a small human figure, is led to heaven by the angels to enjoy eternal beatitude. These images of dying are intended to encourage

9. L. Noordegraaf and G. Valk, *De gave Gods. De pest in Holland vanaf de late Middeleeuwen* (Bert Bakker 1996), 132.

the dying in the final struggles that may precede death and to call upon them to trust in the saving power of God’s grace.¹⁰

Sixteenth-Century Reactions to the Late Medieval Ars Moriendi

The fundamental principle of the late medieval *ars moriendi* is that a person’s eternal destiny is only decided at the moment of death. Until then, all he can do is constantly reflect on his life, examine his conscience, confess his sins, pray, receive the sacraments, imitate Jesus’s suffering, and hope that God will be merciful to him. However, it remains a matter of hope. Receiving complete certainty about a favorable outcome of the struggle with death is impossible. It was precisely this desire for certainty that prompted Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (ca. 1469–1536) and Martin Luther (1483–1549) to approach preparation for death from a different perspective.

Erasmus applied Plato’s view that philosophy is a continuous reflection on death to Christian preparation for dying. He characterized life on earth as continuous preparation for the afterlife. During this lifelong preparation for death and the constant reflection on death and the afterlife, Christians learn to let go of earthly things more and more. According to Erasmus, personal faith that comes from constant reflection on Jesus’s death and a pious way of life, through which Christians overcome death, is crucial for dying well. The dying person who overcomes this struggle through Jesus’s power has the prospect of eternal happiness.¹¹ In Erasmus’ view, personal faith and a pious way of life are therefore the most important sources of comfort in death. The sacraments play hardly any significant role in this view. With this view of dying, Erasmus aligns with the humanistic spirituality of, among others, the well-known Dutch representative of the *Devotio Moderna*, Thomas à Kempis. According to à Kempis, we must live with death in mind and prepare ourselves for dying by despising the world and leading a righteous life.¹²

In his search for certainty in dying, it was the Wittenberg reformer Martin Luther who completely broke with the late medieval *ars moriendi*.

10. R. Rudolf, *Ars moriendi, von der Kunst des heilsamen Lebens und Sterbens* (Graz, 1957), 69–78.

11. L. Schottroff, *Die Bereitung zum Sterben, Studien zu den frühen reformatorischen Sterbebücher* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2012), 83–88.

12. T. H. à Kempis, “De imitatione Christi,” in T. H. à Kempis, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, ed. J. Pohl (Herder, 1902), I.23.1–3; Cf. Breure, *Doodsbeleving en levenshouding, Een historisch-psychologische studie betreffende de Moderne Devotie in het IJsselgebied van de 14e en 15e eeuw* (Verloren, 1987), 42–43, 57.

Luther emphasized the fulfilled work of Jesus Christ *extra nos* and *pro nobis*. Death is terrible in itself. Human life is a constant struggle against death, which presents itself together with sin and hell. However, this struggle is not in vain, because victory is anchored in Jesus Christ. Jesus's victory gives man, especially on his deathbed, certainty and joy. When people face death in Christ, death is defeated. Luther was therefore able to turn the medieval adage "in the midst of life is death" on its head and say, "in the midst of death is Life."¹³ The strong emphasis on the *extra nos* of salvation in Jesus Christ was emphasized by the Geneva Reformer John Calvin (1509–1564). In addition, Calvin emphasized in his theology of the *unio mystica cum Christo* the work of God *in nobis*. According to Calvin, death encompasses all the misery that results from the Fall. When a person is united with Christ through the Holy Spirit, he or she participates in the new creation, God's image is restored in him or her, and he or she receives eternal life. Christians, who live in communion with Christ, look forward to perfect life with Him and therefore have no reason to fear death.¹⁴

The writings belonging to the genre of *ars moriendi* and the responses to them described above laid an important foundation for various writings on dying that were written in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, including those by William Perkins and Gisbertus Voetius. There will now follow a brief summary of the chapter that Voetius wrote on the art of dying well. This is succeeded by an explanation of Perkins's thoughts on dying and preparing for death. Their views on dying are then compared against the background of the context described above.

Voetius and the Theme of Dying

Theology Is Always Focused on Church Practice

Gisbertus Voetius studied theology at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands, where he not only received a solid scholastic education but also became acquainted with medieval devotional literature and Puritan writings from England. After finishing his studies, Voetius became a minister of the Reformed Church in Vlijmen in 1611. It was mainly during his time as a minister in Vlijmen that Voetius immersed himself in the writings

13. M. Luther, *Eyn Sermon von der Bereytung zum Sterben. Doctoris Martini Lutheri* (Nürnberg, 1519); Cf. Exalto, *De dood ontmaskerd*, 45–49; Schottrof, *Bereitung zum Sterben*, 44–46.

14. As a sinner, a person fears death. But as one justified in Christ, he has nothing to fear and receives death with joy. H. J. Selderhuis expresses this as follows: *simul terror et consolatio*. Selderhuis, "Preparing for Death, Remembering the Dead," 121–22.

of William Perkins. In 1617, Voetius became a minister in Heusden, the town where he was born in 1589. Voetius served the Reformed Church of Heusden until he was appointed professor at the newly founded, illustrious school of Utrecht in 1634. In 1636, the school of Utrecht was promoted to university status. Voetius remained a professor until his death in 1676. In addition to his position as professor, Voetius also served as minister of the city church of Utrecht from 1637 to 1672.¹⁵

The fact that Voetius was active not only in the academy but also in church life clearly influenced his academic work. Voetius believed that theology should always serve the church practically. That is why he placed strong emphasis on what he called *theologia practica*. He divided this practice-oriented theology into three areas: ethics or decalogistics, which mainly concerned the interpretation and application of the Ten Commandments to daily life; *politica ecclesiastica*, which mainly concerned matters of ecclesiastical law; and asceticism. The latter area concerns the practice of piety, to which Voetius, along with other ministers considered part of the Dutch movement of the Further Reformation, attached great importance.¹⁶

Voetius and Asceticism

In the field of asceticism, Voetius published his well-known work *Ta askētika, sive Exercitia pietatis in usum iuventutis academicae nunc edita* in 1664.¹⁷ In this publication, Voetius discusses various topics related to the practice of piety, such as holy living, prayer, meditation, faith, conversion, the sacraments, dealing with temptations, Sabbath observance, self-examination, and the like. Dying well also has a place in this publication because, according to Voetius, there can be no dying well without living well.

Voetius published his *Exercitia Pietatis* in Latin. The purpose of this publication was to convey the Puritan ideal of sanctification to ministers and theology students. In terms of subject matter, the *Exercitia Pietatis* is not original, but it is original in its scholastic treatment of ascetic topics.

15. A. C. Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius I* (Groen, 1989), 7, 13, 75–86, 105, 137–55, 186–215; W. van ‘t Spijker, “Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676),” in *De Nadere Reformatie: een beschrijving van haar voornaamste vertegenwoordigers*, ed. T. Brienens (Boekencentrum, 1986), 49–51.

16. C. A. de Niet, “Inleiding. Aspecten van Voetius’ praktische vroomheidsleer,” in G. Voetius, *De praktijk der godzaligheid. Ingeleid, vertaald en toegelicht door dr. C. A. de Niet* (De Banier, 1996), xxiv–xxxii.

17. G. Voetius, *Ta askētika, sive Exercitia pietatis in usum iuventutis academicae nunc edita. Addita est Oratio de Pietate cum scientia coniugenda* (Gorinchem, 1664).

Voetius draws on various sources for this scholastic treatment of piety. Firstly, he used sources from classical antiquity, including the works of Aristotle, Seneca, and Epictetus, as examples. Secondly, he used writings by the Church Fathers, such as Augustine, Ambrose, Cyprian, Jerome, Tertullian, and Chrysostom. Thirdly, he used writings by the Reformers. Fourthly, Voetius draws on medieval Roman Catholic sources. These include writings by Thomas Aquinas, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas à Kempis, Jean Gerson, and others. Fifthly, he consults writings by contemporaries such as Perkins, Amesius, Bayly, Goodwin, and many others. It is remarkable that Voetius drew abundantly from pre-Reformation Roman Catholic sources and little from the writings of well-known Reformers such as Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon.¹⁸

At the beginning of his *Exercitia Pietatis*, Voetius himself provides an overview of the main structure. This shows that Voetius uses a dichotomous structure. The first chapter focuses on topics of piety that are strongly internal and individual. In later chapters, the emphasis shifts more strongly to communal and external subjects.¹⁹ Voetius classifies his treatment of the good death among the general individual exercises. This fits in with the trend towards increasing individualization that various historians, including Philippe Ariès, observe from the eleventh century onwards. Since the purpose of the *Exercitia Pietatis* is to convey the Puritan ideal of sanctification to ministers and theologians, Voetius will have included this chapter in his *Exercitia Pietatis* to equip ministers and theologians to properly guide the dying and to impress upon parishioners that sanctification of life is indispensable for a good death.

Dying Well and Living Well

Voetius begins his chapter on dying well by citing various writings on dying published over the centuries. These writings can be divided into three categories. First, there are writings on the art of dying from his own time. These include writings by William Perkins, Johannes Hoornbeek, and Charles Drelincourt. Second, there are writings on dying by pre-Reformation Roman Catholic authors, such as Erasmus of Rotterdam,

18. While Voetius refers forty times to the work of Thomas Aquinas, thirty times to the work of Bernard of Clairvaux and Bonaventure, and twenty-one times to the writings of Erasmus, he refers only eight times to the work of Luther and Calvin. C. A. de Niet, *Inleiding*, lvix–lxiii.

19. Voetius, *Ta askêtika*, 18–19; Cf. De Niet, *Inleiding*, 29–30.

Tauler, and Bellarminus. Third, there are writings on dying by early Christian authors such as Ambrose and Cyprian.²⁰

After a brief introduction based on the words of Ecclesiastes 9:2, Voetius addresses twelve questions about dying that are necessary for a proper understanding of the subject. A number of central ideas emerge from his discussion of these questions. First, dying is not part of human nature, but is an inescapable punishment for sin. Second, the state of man after death is irrevocable. This makes it necessary for every person to prepare for death. Third, Voetius explicitly connects a holy life to a holy death. It is not the words and actions during a person’s last hours before death that decide his eternal destiny, but his Christian confession and pious way of life.²¹

The actual treatment of dying can be divided into two parts, namely preparation for dying and dealing with dying itself. Preparation for dying can, in turn, be divided into two parts, namely general preparation throughout life and special personal preparation prior to the dying phase.

General Preparation for Death

Preparation for death can be divided into two parts: general preparation throughout life and special personal preparation prior to the dying phase. The most important element of general preparation throughout life is the *meditatio mortis*. In general preparation throughout life, it is important that the believer regularly reflects on death, the causes of death, the necessity of dying, the possible ways of dying, the uncertainty of the moment of death, the certainty that we will all die, the means to overcome the fear of death, and descriptions of deathbeds (*exempla*).²² Voetius does not provide an exegetical foundation for *meditatio mortis*. In addition to contemplating death, Voetius believes it is necessary to take concrete measures regarding earthly matters. The reason that such earthly matters must be settled in advance is that, after the death of the dying person, these things should not be a cause

20. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 561–63.

21. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 563–69.

22. That Voetius also considers *meditatio mortis* to be a motive for conversion is evident from the chapter on the practice of conversion. There, he states that the hope of a long life and the idea that death is far off are obstacles to conversion. In this context, Voetius notes that our life, whether long or short, is uncertain and that the time of our death is unknown. The conditioned nature of our lives, and the reflection on this, should be a powerful motive for conversion. Occasions that are especially useful for *meditatio mortis* are the beginning and end of each day. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 176–77; 365; 400.

of discord among the bereaved. These practical measures include drawing up a will and arranging care for the bereaved, especially the children.²³

Specific Personal Preparations for Death

The special personal preparation for death involves three relationships: with God, with oneself, and with one's neighbor. Of these three relationships, the special preparation regarding oneself is emphasized, which fits in with the general-individual framework in which Voetius places the art of living well.

In relation to God, Voetius believes that believers should strive to revitalize their relationship with God. Illness, pain, and other foreshadowings of death offer a good opportunity for this. Voetius mentions self-examination (syllogism), reflection on God's promises, encouragement to persevere, and asking others for advice and help as means of achieving a closer and stronger relationship with God.²⁴

In relation to themselves, the believer should use situations of adversity, pain, and illness to stir themselves up to sorrow over sin and to seek help from Christ. In addition, a believer should face physical death with confidence. He should ensure that he has already died to the world, to sin, and to his own flesh before he dies physically. This makes it easier for him to willingly accept and face death. Voetius then offers some consolations against the fear of death. First, the dying person should not view death in isolation. Viewed in isolation, death is the bitter fruit of sin and the seal of damnation. Through the death of Christ, death means gain for the believer, because on the day of death, his soul enters into eternal salvation. For the faithful Christian, death also means deliverance from sin, temptations, and the hatred of the world. Second, the believer must remember that dying is God's will. God has determined the end of life for all believers with a view to their well-being and the enjoyment of salvation. Third, the believer can derive comfort from the faith, steadfastness, patience, and cheerfulness of the godly who have already died. Fourth, believers must constantly strive to be closely united with Christ and to live in communion with Him. Fifth, the believer must constantly reflect on God's loving promises. In the case of illness, God strengthens the heart, gives comfort, relief, and respite. He does not test the believer beyond what he or she can bear.²⁵

23. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 570–72.

24. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 567–77.

25. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 577–81.

In relation to his neighbor, the believer should, in his special preparation for death, make amends for any harm he has caused his neighbor, pay any outstanding debts, and give timely instructions to all his household members and subordinates about a pious way of life and the things they should do. He should reconcile with his neighbor if there has been a quarrel. Finally, he must take measures regarding his earthly possessions.²⁶

Dying Itself

The second part of Voetius’s chapter on dying well deals with dying itself. Voetius characterizes dying as a struggle or battle, in which the dying believer must keep his eyes focused on Christ. If the believer does so, this struggle will have a happy ending. It is important that the dying person willingly entrust himself to Christ, look forward to meeting Him, and continually support his faith with prayers. Dying believers who have strayed in religion or have lived an improper life must confess this.

In dying, there are five struggles a dying person may face. The first struggle is the fear of death. The dying person may fear death because it may come at an inconvenient time or because it is frightening. The weapons to overcome this fear of death are forsaking the world, encouraging certainty of faith through syllogism, regularly reflecting on death, and praying for a good death. The second struggle is the struggle with the torments that precede death. The dying person can resist this struggle by submitting to God’s will. God shows in these torments that His strength is made perfect in our weakness. The third struggle is against the temptations of the devil. There are two kinds of temptations from the devil. On the one hand, there are the temptations of carelessness, pride, and reliance on one’s own good works. On the other hand, there are the temptations of unbelief and despair. The dying person can arm themselves against these by trusting in God’s mercy and the merits of Christ. The fourth struggle is with the temptations of the world. This concerns the dying person’s struggle with the fact that, upon dying, he must leave behind his family, possessions, and position. In this struggle, it is necessary for the dying person to regard death as a gain, to trust that he will be reunited with his family later, and that God will care for them until then. Furthermore, in this struggle, the dying person must consider that his earthly possessions have no heavenly value. The fifth struggle concerns the temptations of the flesh. The dying person can defend himself against temptation by considering that God sometimes

26. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 572–75, 582–83.

chastises His own to test their patience and perseverance. It may also be that He wants to show His power in supporting the sick person. In addition, the dying person who is faced with this struggle must remember that the torments he is experiencing, however intense and prolonged, cannot be compared to the torments of hell and the sufferings that Christ endured.²⁷

Victory

Ultimately, believers are more than conquerors in these struggles. While the body is buried in the earth, the soul goes to God. At death, the soul is brought before God's private judgment, where it is acquitted. The soul is then admitted into God's inner sanctuary to enjoy eternal salvation. This eternal salvation consists in contemplating God (*visio Dei*) and enjoying everlasting joy. The soul of the godly will be in eternal communion with Christ, the angels, and the other saints and the righteous.²⁸

William Perkins's Salve for a Sicke Man

The Day of Death Is Better Than the Day of Birth

One of the writings on death to which Voetius explicitly refers is *Salve For A Sicke Man* by the Puritan theologian William Perkins (1558–1602), published in 1595. In the introduction to his work, Perkins argues, based on Ecclesiastes 7:1, that the day of death is better than the day of birth. Perkins describes death as the deprivation of life. As such, death is a punishment determined by God and imposed on every human being. God is also the One who carries out this punishment. According to Perkins, there are two kinds of death. First, there is physical death. This physical death is nothing more than the severing of the connection between the human soul and the human body. In addition to physical death, there is spiritual death. Spiritual death is the separation of man and God. This separation between God and man brings unspeakable misery and sorrow. Every human being is spiritually dead by nature, even if he is physically alive. It is important that every human being be connected to Christ through the Holy Spirit during his physical life. According to Perkins, in order to die well, it is essential that the godly person be assured in his conscience that he has a relationship with Christ. Those who bear the fruits of righteousness and repentance, which demonstrate their union with Christ, have no reason to fear death. For those who live godly lives, the day of death brings deliverance from all

27. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 583–606.

28. Voetius, *Ta askētika*, 606–10.

pain, sorrow, and sin. In addition, death brings the godly into eternal life with God, Christ, the angels, and all the saints in heaven. However, those who are outside the covenant of grace and outside Christ go to hell and therefore have reason to fear death.²⁹

According to Perkins, proper preparation is necessary for a good death. Perkins sees preparation for death as a necessary duty to which humans are bound by God’s commandment. Various biblical texts call on believers to be ready every day for Christ’s return to judge the world. According to Perkins, these same passages also oblige people to be prepared for death. After death, no change or conversion is possible. If a person dies unconverted, he will also be judged by God as unconverted. Preparation for death is therefore indispensable. Perkins divides preparation for death into general and special preparation for death.³⁰

General Preparation for Death

General preparation for death is the process that enables people to face death throughout their lives. This general preparation for death is comprised of five duties, some of which overlap.

The first duty of general preparation for death is the continual meditation on death during our temporary life. In this meditation on death, a number of things must be considered, such as the cause of death, namely our sin, the remedy for death, namely the accursed death of Christ, and the threat of death. The latter means that we must live every day as if it were our last. This contemplation of death serves to make us humble before God, to encourage further conversion, and to make us content in all circumstances. Perkins bases the contemplation of death on two passages: Psalm 39:5 and Psalm 90:12. In addition, he argues that pagan philosophers had many excellent reflections on death, although they lacked the correct view of eternal life. As humans, we tend to think that we will live for a while longer. In this way, we put off the thought of death. Perkins sees it as our duty to banish this godless and incorrect imagination from our hearts.³¹

The second duty is the daily weakening of death. The strength and power of death lie in sins. In order to deprive death of its power and disarm it, a person must examine his sins daily, humble himself before God,

29. Perkins, *A Salve for a Sicke Man: or A Treatise Containing the Nature, Differences, and Kinds of Death; as Also the Right Maner of Dying Well* (Cambridge, 1595), 1–7.

30. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 30.

31. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 35–39.

confess the sins he has committed before God, and resolve to live according to God's Word. Sins are like the sting of death that must be torn out of the heart, root and all. Those who want to die as a righteous person must live as a righteous person. Those who, on the other hand, want to live the life of a wicked person can count on dying the death of a wicked person. This means that a constant humbling of self before God and a pious life are essential.³²

The third duty is to enter into eternal life during this life. Those who wish to live in eternal bliss must begin in this world by rising from the grave of their own sins, in which they are naturally buried. To enter eternal life during this life, three things are necessary, namely, the saving knowledge by which we conclude that God is our God, peace of conscience, and the rule or life of the Holy Spirit, by which a person begins to live according to God's Word.³³

The fourth duty is to die to this life before we die. According to Perkins, this means dying to sin by making proper use of the many trials that befall us. Perkins advises us to start by dying to and banishing minor sins. Those who are able to die to minor sins will find it easier to overcome their mortal sins. According to Perkins, the same applies to bearing crosses and even to death. If we have learned to bear crosses such as illness and hardship patiently, we will also be able to endure death. Perkins characterizes hardships and disasters in this life as precursors to death. We can only bear the sorrows of death if we have been shaped by many trials in this life.³⁴

The fifth and final duty is to do good to the church, the community, or individuals through one's own legacy. According to Perkins, those who do so will end their lives with comfort and a clear conscience.³⁵

Special Personal Preparation for Dying

Special preparation for death should take place as the hour of death approaches. This special preparation for death takes place in relation to God, oneself, and one's neighbor. In relation to God, the dying person should revitalize his faith and conversion on his deathbed through self-examination, confessing his sins before God, and praying for forgiveness and reconciliation with God through Christ. The more serious the

32. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 39–43.

33. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 43–46.

34. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 46–48.

35. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 48.

situation of the dying person, the more seriously this duty must be fulfilled. If a dying person is no longer able to do this himself, support from the Christian community is needed. The sick person must call upon the elders of the congregation or the pastor to teach him on his deathbed and pray for him. Perkins emphatically states that pastoral assistance is needed first, and only then medical help. According to Perkins, medical help is of no value if the root of all illness, namely sin, is not healed. While the elders or the pastors have the task of teaching the dying person and praying for him, the dying person must confess his sins.³⁶

In relation to himself, the dying person must do two things. First, he must arm himself against excessive fear of death by meditating on eternal life, God’s special providence, God’s promises, and the special status of all who are in Christ. The dying person must view death through the lens of the gospel and not through the lens of the law. In the law, death is a curse and a descent into the pool of destruction, but in the gospel, death is an entrance into heaven. For believers, death has been changed by the death of Christ. Second, the dying person should take care of his body until God takes it away. In this context, Perkins devotes considerable attention to the use of medical care and the duties of doctors. According to Perkins, pastoral care is the most important thing. Medical care is not intended to prevent death, but to allow life to continue and be prolonged to its natural end.³⁷

In relation to his neighbor, the dying person must do two things. First, he must reconcile with his neighbor, if necessary. Second, he must leave those over whom he had authority during his life in good order. Thus, heads of families must settle their family affairs properly and draw up a will.³⁸

Experiencing Death

When the hour of death approaches, the dying person must trust wholeheartedly in the love and mercy of God in Christ. This faith must be expressed through actions, such as calling upon God in prayer. In addition, he must be prepared to leave the world when God calls him and must commend his soul into God’s hands. Only those who have practiced these three duties during their lifetime can do so on their deathbed. That is why

36. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 54–61.

37. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 61–80.

38. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 80–84.

Perkins concludes his deathbed writings with the exhortation to prepare for death during one's lifetime.³⁹

Comparison and Conclusion

When Voetius's chapter on dying well is compared with Perkins's *Salve for a Sick Man*, four clear similarities and one striking difference become apparent.

Similarities

First, there is agreement on the main structure. Both Voetius and Perkins divide their treatment of the *ars moriendi* into two parts — namely, preparing for death and dealing with dying itself. In addition, both authors divide preparation for death into general preparation, which takes place throughout life, and special preparation, which must occur when the hour of death approaches. The way in which Perkins and Voetius interpret the two parts of preparation for death also shows similarities.

Second, both Voetius and Perkins assign a crucial place to the continual contemplation of death in general preparation for death. Perkins bases this *meditatio mortis* on two texts from the Psalms, while Voetius provides no exegetical foundation whatsoever for this part of death preparation, which he considers indispensable. Since the *meditatio mortis* cannot be traced directly to the Bible, it must have another origin. Recent research has shown that *meditatio mortis* may be traced back to Stoic philosophy, both directly and indirectly through the monastic tradition.⁴⁰ This is supported by the fact that Voetius and other seventeenth-century writers on dying well refer directly to Thomas à Kempis, Seneca, and Epictetus, among others, on this point.

Third, both Voetius and Perkins speak of special preparation for death with reference to God, oneself, and one's neighbor. Regarding God, both ministers emphasize the need to revitalize one's faith and to seek an ever-closer relationship with God. Self-examination plays an important role in this. Regarding themselves, according to both ministers, the dying must arm themselves against the fear of death. In this context, both Voetius and Perkins emphasize that believers should not view death in isolation, but through the lens of the gospel. Through the death of Christ, dying means gain for the believer. Regarding their neighbors, both ministers point

39. Perkins, *Salve for a Sicke Man*, 87–109.

40. Bosker, *Memento mori*, 170.

out that matters for the bereaved, especially the family, must be properly arranged in order to prevent discord, and that the dying person must reconcile with their neighbors if there is a quarrel.

Fourth, both Voetius and Perkins make a clear connection between life and death. Those who wish to die in a state of grace must live piously and tear the sins, which are the thorns of death, from their hearts and lives. Those who die during their lifetime to sin, the world, and their own ego can face death with peace of mind. When Voetius and Perkins emphatically stipulate a devout life as a condition for a blessed death, they follow in the footsteps of the humanistic spirituality of Thomas à Kempis and Desiderius Erasmus. Both Voetius and Perkins also emphasize personal faith and reject Roman Catholic rituals at the deathbed.

Fifth, both Voetius and Perkins show relatively little connection with the *ars moriendi* of the Reformation. In both Voetius’s and Perkins’s *ars moriendi*, however, the necessity of union with Christ, derived from Calvin’s theology, plays an important role. The *ars moriendi* of Voetius and Perkins is furthest removed from Luther’s view on a good death. While Luther’s redefinition of the medieval adage “in the midst of life is death” to “in the midst of death is life” places full emphasis on the certainty of Christ’s victory over death, the comfort of Christ’s merit *extra nos et pro nobis*, the certainty of salvation, the comfort of God’s promises and the sacraments, Voetius and Perkins focus primarily on the believer who must overcome death himself by practicing piety.

Differences

A significant difference becomes apparent when both ministers write about dealing with death itself. While Perkins briefly describes three duties that the dying person must observe in the context of dealing with death, Voetius describes five struggles that the dying person may face in the struggle with death and the corresponding consolations. The five struggles described by Voetius are reminiscent of the well-known medieval *ars moriendi* in eleven woodcuts. The five struggles and their resistance correspond in part to the medieval engravings depicting the five temptations and their accompanying consolations. Voetius’s brief explanation of the believer’s victory is similar to the eleventh image of the medieval pictorial *ars moriendi*. The similarities outlined above make it very likely that Perkins’s *Salve for a Sicke Man* influenced Voetius’s exposition on the good death in his *Exercitia Pietatis*.

Salvation and Methodist Societies: How Soteriology Shaped Spiritual Formation

JOSHUA TINGLER
joshuartingler@gmail.com
PhD Candidate
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

From the beginning of the Evangelical Revival, different subgroups emerged, including Welsh Calvinistic Methodism and Wesleyan Methodism. As John Wesley put it, people “lump together under this general name [Methodist] many who have no manner of connexion with each other.” Meanwhile, Howell Harris joined George Whitefield in objecting to Wesley “monopolising the name Methodist to himself only.”¹ The ability of Methodists to jump from one type of society to another indicates the existence of common Methodist ground, enough to warrant the shared Methodist title.² Yet the two movements clearly saw themselves as distinct, forming separate connections. In fact, besides Howell Harris, all the Welsh leaders kept their distance from Wesley. The welcome they gave George Whitefield demonstrates their willingness to overcome cultural and language barriers, so their reluctance to coordinate with Wesley seems to have stemmed from doctrinal and organizational concerns.³ The Welsh

1. John Wesley, “A Short History of the People Called Methodists,” in *Methodist Societies: History, Nature, and Design*, ed. Rupert E. Davies in *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1989), 9:367; Tom Beynon, ed., *Howell Harris’s Visits to London* (Cambrian News, 1960), 229. After each initial citation, further references to the critical editions of Wesley’s works will be to “Wesley, *Works*,” followed by the volume and page numbers.

2. For example, see National Library of Wales, Calvinistic Methodist Archive (CMA), Trevecca College MS 3050. The CMA records will be cited throughout this article. A brief description of the archive can be found in Eryn M. White, *The Welsh Methodist Society: The Early Societies in South-West Wales 1737–1750* (University of Wales Press, 2020), 7–8.

3. Problems in Neath and Pembrokeshire after Wesley’s involvement seemed to confirm these concerns. See CMA Trevecca College MSS 2978, 3023:36–38; Beynon, *Harris’s Visits to London*, 20, 25; W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *Journal and Diaries II (1738–1743)*, vol. 19, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1990), 231–32;

Methodists, like Whitefield, were Calvinistic in their soteriology, whereas Wesley affirmed an Arminian scheme. In February 1741, the Welsh Revival's leaders gathered at Llandoverly, and Harris shared two letters, one he had written to Charles Wesley and the other written to John Wesley by George Whitefield. Taken together, they detailed disagreements with the Wesleys' views on Arminianism and Christian perfection. Those present gave their assent to the letters, thus making clear the "Calvinistic foundations" of Welsh Methodism.⁴

This article will examine the Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist movements, their similarities and differences, starting with their overlapping but distinct soteriologies and proceeding to their respective societies. These surveys culminate in an evaluation of the extent to which their differing soteriologies led to distinct approaches to spiritual formation in their societies. The focus on Welsh and Wesleyan Methodism is warranted for two primary reasons. First, though other Methodist movements existed, these two possessed sufficient internal stability not only to persist as recognizable movements, but even to grow into thriving denominations. Second, these two movements differed in soteriology, and their relative independence allows the extent and effects of their differences to be examined.

As will be demonstrated, some practical differences between Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist societies can indeed be traced back to their distinctive soteriological perspectives. Specifically, three meaningful differences will emerge from the evidence. First, John Wesley's doctrines of prevenient grace and repentance led him to open society membership to all desiring salvation, while the Welsh Methodists restricted it to those converted to faith in Christ, believing that heart-change by faith must precede progress in holiness. Furthermore, Wesley's view of the way of salvation, culminating in Christian perfection, shaped his societies into a hierarchical

W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *Journal and Diaries III (1743–1754)*, vol. 20, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1991), 130, 211–12; W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *Journal and Diaries IV (1755–1765)*, vol. 21, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1992), 425–26.

4. For this reason, the present study will refer to Welsh Calvinistic Methodism simply as "Welsh Methodism." In the eighteenth century, there was little need to differentiate further. The Wesleys established a few scattered societies in Wales, which often struggled to survive, but these were part of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion, not the Welsh Methodist Connexion. See Geraint Tudur, *Howell Harris from Conversion to Separation: 1735–1750* (University of Wales Press, 2000), 78; Wesley, *Works*, 20:265, 472; Wesley, *Works*, 21:425; W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *Journal and Diaries V (1765–1775)*, vol. 22, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1993), 461.

structure. The Welsh Methodists, on the other hand, lacked the theological impetus to divide societies based on levels of spiritual maturity. Finally, Welsh Methodism assessed spiritual growth by inward markers, whereas Wesleyan Methodism looked primarily to outward, behavioral indicators.

Two Methodist Soteriologies

Both Methodisms drew upon a Puritan heritage and expressed their beliefs in the new evangelical milieu, especially as Puritan heart religion was recast into a theology of instantaneous new birth. David Ceri Jones correctly notes Welsh Methodism's use of the Puritans and calls their engagement "highly selective."⁵ Yet it must be remembered that Puritanism itself was not a theological monolith, and Puritan emphases such as election, assurance, and heart-religion permeated Welsh Methodism. Harris, for instance, claimed the theology of "ye Good old orthodox Reformers & Puritans." Even the lesser-known Welsh Puritan tradition had an effect.⁶ As for Wesley, his family tree included high church branches and deep Puritan roots. Both his parents came from Puritan homes but rejected Puritan ecclesiology and Calvinism for establishment Anglicanism, inculcating in John a high view of the early church and the sacraments, along with an abhorrence of predestination.⁷ Nonetheless, the Puritans exerted their influence through Epworth's moral and devotional discipline, an emphasis furthered as the young scholar John explored the "holy living" writings of Jeremy Taylor, Thomas à Kempis, William Law, and others. Despite these other influences, Bruce Hindmarsh suggests Wesley "probably owed his largest debt" to Puritan spiritual writers, indicated by their prominence in Wesley's editing and publishing program.⁸

5. David Ceri Jones, "'We Are of Calvinistic principles': How Calvinist Was Early Calvinistic Methodism?" *Welsh Journal of Religious History* 4 (2009): 53.

6. Gomer M. Roberts, ed., *Selected Trevecka Letters (1742–1747)* (Calvinistic Methodist Bookroom, 1956), 166; R. Tudur Jones, "The Healing Herb and the Rose of Love: The Piety of Two Welsh Puritans," in R. Buick Knox, ed., *Reformation Conformity and Dissent: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Nuttall* (Epworth, 1977), 178–79.

7. For Wesley's mother Susanna, see her letter to John dated August 18, 1725. Frank Baker, ed., *Letters 1: 1721–1739*, vol. 25, *The Works of John Wesley* (Oxford University Press, 1980), 178–80. For his father, Samuel, see the discussion in Herbert Boyd McGonigle, *Sufficient Saving Grace: John Wesley's Evangelical Arminianism*, Studies in Evangelical History and Thought (Paternoster, 2001), 74–78.

8. D. Bruce Hindmarsh, *The Spirit of Early Evangelicalism: True Religion in the Modern World* (Oxford University Press, 2018), 97; See also W. Reginald Ward and Richard P.

In addition to this shared Puritan heritage, the well-established idea of a religious society provided clay from which all Methodists molded their own society meetings. The concluding decades of the seventeenth century brought a general turn toward piety, with a “societary impulse,” resulting in the rapid expansion of religious societies.⁹ Many similarities existed between Methodist societies and these predecessors, but they carried significant differences as well, Methodist societies being less formal in a variety of ways. The result was an “untidy” relationship between Methodist societies and the older societies, the latter sometimes supporting or embracing Methodism and sometimes maintaining their distance.¹⁰ Yet by the mid-eighteenth century, Methodist societies of all types were clearly distinguished from societies of the older sort.

Furthermore, David Bebbington’s four markers of evangelicalism provide a helpful summary of the beliefs and values Welsh and Wesleyan Methodism held in common. Both sought to follow the Bible; both looked to Jesus’s death to provide salvation; both practiced their faith in active, public ways; and both expected conversions to change lives.¹¹ The emphasis on conversion particularly distinguished them, as both Calvinist and Arminian Methodists delighted in recounting their dramatic, instantaneous conversions.¹² These shared emphases encouraged opponents like Theophilus Evans to lump all the revivalists together as targets of his criticism.¹³

Heitzenrater, eds., *Journals and Diaries I (1735–1738)*, vol. 18, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1988), 213.

9. Henry D. Rack, “Religious Societies and the Origins of Methodism,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 38 (1987): 587. See also D. E. Jenkins, “Introduction,” in *Religious Societies (Dr. Woodward’s “Account”)* (Hugh Evans & Sons, 1935), 6–11.

10. Methodist societies were mostly led by laypeople and favored extempore prayer with confession and examination over set prayers and devotional readings. See Josiah Woodward, *An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in the City of London, &c. and of their Endeavours for Reformation of Manners*, 6th ed. (London, 1744), vii, 53, 120, 129; John Walsh, “Religious Societies: Methodist and Evangelical, 1738–1800,” in W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood, eds., *Voluntary Religion*, *Studies in Church History* 23 (Basil Blackwell, 1986), 284, 288; Rupert E. Davies, “Introduction,” in *Wesley, Works*, 9:6.

11. See David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (Baker, 1992), 5–17.

12. It should be noted, however, that sometimes Arminians shared narratives of their conversions from Calvinism. See D. Bruce Hindmarsh, *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Oxford University Press, 2005), 242–45.

13. Theophilus Evans, *The History of Modern Enthusiasm, from the Reformation to the*

On a surface level, Welsh and Wesleyan Methodism also shared doctrinal convictions regarding original sin, justification by faith, and assurance. These doctrines received affirmation and attention from both movements. Yet a close examination exposes significant variations in their perspectives even on these shared doctrines. Though Wesley declared “there is not a hair’s breadth difference between Mr. Wesley and Mr. Whitefield” regarding *original sin*, his comment was only true theoretically.¹⁴ On a practical level, Wesley’s doctrine of prevenient grace led to a distinct approach to the unawakened person, enabling him to affirm original sin without also affirming unconditional election. Though humanity is fallen in Adam—spiritually dead, corrupted, and condemned—yet, argued Wesley, “there is no man in a state of mere nature” but rather “through the obedience and death of Christ” all “recover a capacity for spiritual life” and “an actual seed or spark thereof.”¹⁵ Christ’s universal redemption universally cancels original guilt and begins the healing of original corruption. Practically, prevenient grace shows itself in the restoration of “a measure of free will” and “a general knowledge of good and evil.”¹⁶ These abilities imply, Wesley concluded, “some tendency toward life, some degree of salvation.” Hence, though all humanity is corrupted and guilty in Adam, all also receive the beginnings of God’s gracious work, enabling them to respond and take steps in the way of salvation, the first of which is repentance and the second faith.¹⁷

Present Times, 2nd ed. (London, 1757), 108-120. Welsh Methodist leader William Wilkins served for a time as Evans’s curate. It was not a good match.

14. John Wesley, “What Is an Arminian?” in *Doctrinal and Controversial Treatises II*, ed. Paul Wesley Chilcote and Kenneth J. Collins, 13:407.

15. Wesley also called this “preventing grace” because it precedes the human response. See John Wesley, “On Working Out Our Own Salvation,” in Albert C. Outler and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *John Wesley’s Sermons: An Anthology* (Abingdon, 1991), 491; Henry D. Rack, ed., *The Methodist Societies: The Minutes of Conference*, vol. 10, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 2011), 129, 153; Henry D. Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast: John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism*, 3d ed. (Epworth, 2002), 389; Randy L. Maddox, “Introduction to the Doctrine of Original Sin,” in *Doctrinal and Controversial Treatises I*, Randy L. Maddox, ed., vol. 12, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 2012), 140–142.

16. Wesley did not simply mean natural conscience, emphasizing rather the *supernatural* gracious origin of these abilities. See John Wesley, “Predestination Calmly Considered,” in *Works*, 13:287, 290; John Wesley, “Original Sin,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 328; Wesley, “Working Out Our Own Salvation,” in *ibid.*, 488.

17. For Wesley, repentance meant “conviction, or self-knowledge.” The repentant fear God, having entered the “legal state” of being “under the law.” The pattern of repentance and its works preceding faith was present quite early in Wesley’s writings. See John Wesley, “The Way to the Kingdom,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 128; John Wesley, “The

Regarding *justification by faith*, there was enough shared ground for Wesley to defend Calvinist writers against Sandemanian critique.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Wesley introduced three qualifiers that distanced his teaching from that of the Welsh Methodists. First, he defined faith so as not to exclude works. In 1738, he insisted that true faith is “necessarily productive of all good works and all holiness,” and if he would have continued to describe works simply as the products of faith, he may have avoided objection.¹⁹ Yet Wesley increasingly spoke of works as necessary for salvation in a more direct sense, describing them in the mid-1740s as “necessary to the continuance of faith” and justification, and culminating in the 1770 *Minutes* which said “every believer... works *for* as well as *from* life.”²⁰ Second, largely through fear of antinomianism, he declined to affirm the imputation of Christ’s active righteousness.²¹ Finally, he distinguished between present and final justification. The former was granted through faith and maintained by works, while for the latter works were a condition.²² These differences struck at the heart of what the Welsh Methodists meant by “justification

Scripture Way of Salvation,” in *ibid.*, 376; Wesley, *Works*, 10:126, 393; John Wesley, “The Principles of a Methodist,” in *Works*, 9:62; John Wesley, “Answer to Mr. Church’s Remarks,” in *ibid.*, 95–96.

18. John Wesley, “A Sufficient Answer to *Letters to the Author of ‘Theron and Aspasio’*; in a Letter to the Author,” in *Works*, 13:347–51.

19. John Wesley, “Salvation by Faith,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 44. See also John Wesley, “Hymns and Sacred Poems (1739),” in *Works*, 13:37.

20. For the trajectory, minutes, and controversy, see Wesley, *Works*, 10:128, 392–93, 403; McGonigle, *Sufficient Saving Grace*, 267–70; John Wesley, “The Principles of a Methodist Farther Explained,” in *Works*, 9:176; Wesley, “Scripture Way of Salvation,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 377.

21. Wesley seems to have become uncomfortable with such teaching by at least the mid-1740s, a discomfort made very public by later controversy. See John Wesley, “Justification by Faith,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 115, 119; John Wesley, “The Lord Our Righteousness,” in *ibid.*, 382–90; Wesley, *Works*, 10:129; John Wesley, “The Doctrine of Salvation, Faith, and Good Works: Extracted from the *Homilies* of the Church of England,” in *Works*, 12:33–35; John Wesley, “Letter to James Hervey,” in *ibid.*, 323–38; Ted Campbell, ed., *Letters III: 1756–1765*, vol. 27, *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 2015), 102.

22. Wesley encountered this distinction in Baxter’s *Aphorisms of Justification*, which he abridged with appreciation in 1745. It remains debatable how far Wesley’s marriage of faith and works departed from traditional Protestant teaching. In fact, Wesley himself seems to have considered this question, concluding a 1767 meditation on justification with, “But if so, what becomes of *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae?*” In 1779, he admitted that salvation must be “(in a scriptural sense) by works.” This was the end of a long trajectory. See John Wesley, “An Extract of Mr Richard Baxter’s *Aphorisms of Justification*,” in *Works*, 12:84–85; Wesley, “Letter to Hervey,” in *Works*, 13:326; John Wesley, “A Letter to a Gentleman at

by faith." They insisted that the imputation of Christ's righteousness, active as well as passive, received through a living faith of the heart, was the only hope of sinful humanity before a righteous God.²³

As for *assurance*, Wesley discussed the similarities and differences in a letter. He agreed with the Calvinists "(1), that an assurance of salvation is not of the essence of faith; (2), that a true believer may wait long before he hath it; and (3), that after he hath it, it may be weakened and intermitted." But then, Wesley wrote, he "saw clearly that by this one phrase, 'assurance of salvation,' we meant entirely different things."²⁴ Both types of Methodists regarded assurance as a wonderful privilege available to believers, but Wesley meant assurance of present acceptance, while the Calvinists meant assurance of final salvation. For the Welsh Methodists, justification and assurance both had their roots in election.

Therefore, even regarding these three soteriological topics in which Wesley and the Welsh Methodists partially agreed, significant variation existed. Regarding predestination, perseverance, and perfection, they differed sharply. Whereas the Welsh leaders subscribed to particular redemption and *predestination*, Wesley affirmed *universal redemption*. Welsh Methodists considered personal election a "fundamental truth," and being "more amazed at... God's distinguishing love" a sign of growth.²⁵ In

Bristol," in *ibid.*, 359; John Wesley, "Thoughts on Salvation by Faith," in *ibid.*, 554; Wesley, *Works*, 10:128, 22:114.

23. For an account from Harris of disagreeing with Wesley about final justification and imputation, see Beynon, *Harris's Visits to London*, 148. See also S. J. Turner, "Theological Themes in the English Works of Williams Pantycelyn" (MTh diss., Aberystwyth University, 1982), 219–24.

24. Wesley, *Works*, 25:562–63. See also *ibid.*, 622. Assurance was simultaneously central and controversial to both parties. As Wesley's views developed, he began to distinguish between degrees of assurance. In Wales, Harris and Rowland differed publicly in early 1742 on whether assurance was of the essence of faith, with Harris defending the affirmative position. Welsh Methodist policy followed Rowland, and eventually Harris moderated his own stance. See John Wesley, "The Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption," in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley's Sermons*, 143; John Wesley, "A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Rutherford," in *Works*, 9:375–76; Eryn White, "Revival and Renewal Amongst the Eighteenth-Century Welsh Methodists," in Dyfed Wyn Roberts, ed., *Revival, Renewal, and the Holy Spirit*, Studies in Evangelical History and Thought 5 (Wipf & Stock, 2009), 5; Tudur, *Howell Harris*, 45–46, 155–57.

25. William Williams's hymns resound with God's salvific sovereignty. Even society reports testify to the importance of this doctrine to Welsh Methodism's leaders. For example, an exhorter once eulogized a recently deceased Methodist as "a hearty resister of ye deniers of free Grace." John Morgan Jones and William Morgan, *The Calvinistic Methodist Fathers of Wales*, 2 vols., trans. John Aaron (Banner of Truth, 2010), 1:272–73; William

contrast, Wesley considered unconditional predestination to be a violation of God's attributes. In his controversial "Free Grace" sermon, he called it "the horrible decree" and "a doctrine full of blasphemy," representing God "as worse than the devil."²⁶ Thus, Wesley attacked Calvinism vehemently on this point.

Furthermore, the two movements held opposing views on *perseverance* and *falling away*. Harris, for instance, took refuge in God's declaration, "I change not" (Mal. 3:6) as a promise of preservation.²⁷ But Wesley approached the same text very differently, teaching that God's "unchangeableness itself requires that if [believers] grow high-minded, God should cut them off; that there should be a proportionable change in all the divine dispensations toward them." Hence, he deemed perseverance a "fatal doctrine."²⁸

Finally, the two movements differed over the possibility of *Christian perfection* in this life. Though Wesley's views on perfection shifted somewhat over time, largely in response to experiences, perfection remained a major focus of his ministry. In fact, Wesley saw this as the crown of Methodism, while the Calvinists thought it presumptuous and antinomian.²⁹

Williams, *Gloria in Excelsis: or, Hymns of Praise to God and the Lamb* (Carmarthen, 1772), 49; Gomer M. Roberts, ed., "Early Society Reports," *Journal of the Historical Society of the Presbyterian Church in Wales (JHSPCW)* 52 (1967): 58.

26. As McGonigle demonstrates, "anti-Calvinism" remained "a theological constant throughout [Wesley's] life," a conclusion confirmed by the Free Grace, Imputation, and Minutes Controversies, which spanned from 1739 into the 1770s. Though Wesley sometimes downplayed the differences for reasons of cooperation, his convictions on the subject did not change. McGonigle, *Sufficient Saving Grace*, 139–160, 307; John Wesley, "Free Grace," in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley's Sermons*, 56–57; John Wesley, "Dialogue Between a Predestinarian and His Friend," in *Works*, 13:232; John Wesley, "An Extract from the *Shorter Catechism* of the Westminster Assembly," in *ibid.*, 94–109; Wesley, *Works*, 19:332–33; Frank Baker, ed., *Letters II: 1745–1755*, vol. 26, *The Works of John Wesley* (Oxford University Press, 1982), 498–99.

27. Rowland and Williams also cherished the doctrine, the latter portraying it in the life of his literary model Methodist, Theomemphus. Eifion Evans, *Pursued by God: A Selective Translation with Notes of the Welsh Religious Classic Theomemphus by William Williams of Pantycelyn* (Evangelical Press of Wales, 1996), 124–25; Eifion Evans, *Daniel Rowland and the Great Evangelical Awakening in Wales* (Banner of Truth, 1985), 243; Roberts, *Trevecka Letters* (1742–1747), 6; Howell Harris, *A Brief Account of the Life of Howell Harris, Esq.: Extracted from Papers Written by Himself* (Trevecka, 1791), 16–17.

28. Wesley, *Works*, 25:563; John Wesley, "Serious Thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints," in *Works*, 13:248.

29. Wesley gave the experience many other names, including "full salvation," "entire sanctification," "perfect love," or simply "holiness." Under whatever name, he considered it Methodism's "grand depositum," while Wesley scholars refer to it as his "favourite doctrine"

In Williams's fictional account of Theomemphus, it is "Presumption" who encourages the archetypal Welsh Methodist to believe he can drive corruption from his heart.³⁰ This reflects the value the Welsh Methodists placed on humbly recognizing the remnants of sin. Wesley's distinction between "sins properly so called" and "infirmities" or "mistakes" looked to them like a dismissal of the seriousness of sin. For Wesley, however, the distinction was necessary to ensure the goal of perfection remained attainable. And as for those who might be deceived into thinking themselves perfect, Wesley saw no great danger there, declaring it "a mistake which generally argues great grace, an high degree both of holiness and happiness."³¹ That Wesley called "great grace" what the Welsh Methodists deemed "great presumption" indicates the substantial gulf that separated the movements on this point of doctrine.

In sum, though the Welsh and Wesleyan Methodists concurred regarding salvation by faith in Christ, they veered apart as they worked out the details of this broad evangelical standpoint. The Welsh leaders taught a heart-oriented Calvinism. Everyone hearing their message encountered the reality of sin and the necessity of the new birth. Once convicted and awakened in the heart, the hearer was to receive justification by faith through Christ's righteousness alone. Those who exercised this faith did so because it was given them by the God who elected them. Such a heart-altering conversion would produce good works and, sooner or later, the joy and peace of assurance. This conversion could not be finally undone, due to the unchanging promise and character of God. On the other hand, holiness was Wesley's central theme, indicated in part by his "obsession" with antinomianism. He claimed to carry "a perfect hatred" against antinomian doctrines, abhorring

or his "most distinctive and misunderstood teaching." Complicating matters, Charles Wesley himself did not always agree with John regarding the details of Christian perfection. See John Wesley, "Christian Perfection," in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley's Sermons*, 73; Wesley, "Scripture Way of Salvation," in *ibid.*, 374; John Wesley, "Repentance of Believers," in *ibid.*, 415; Wesley, *Works*, 10:285; John Wesley, "Brief Thoughts on Christian Perfection," in *Works*, 13:199; Paul Wesley Chilcote, "Introduction to Christian Perfection," in *ibid.*, 3; McGonigle, *Sufficient Saving Grace*, 146; William J. Abraham, "Christian Perfection," in William J. Abraham and James E. Kirby, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Methodist Studies* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 595.

30. Eifion Evans, *Bread of Heaven: The Life and Work of William Williams, Pantycelyn* (Bryntirion, 2010), 204.

31. John Wesley, "Thoughts on Christian Perfection," in *Works*, 13:78.

them “as hell-fire.”³² Hence, the Wesleyan way of salvation was a way of practical holiness. Wesley expected his followers to be enlightened by prevenient grace, awakened to repentance by convincing grace, pardoned by justifying grace, and then made holy by sanctifying grace, even to the point of perfect love, the ultimate goal of holiness.³³

These distinctives culminated in what Henry Rack calls a “general ethos” of “opposing religious instincts.”³⁴ Likewise, Bruce Hindmarsh argues that the divide was not merely over abstract theological quandaries, but rather over “matters of deep feeling and spiritual seriousness,” as indicated by the intensity of the disputes.³⁵ Hindmarsh develops this by observing distinctive “spiritual aspirations” between Calvinists and Arminians. Revival Calvinists, according to Hindmarsh, reveled in the sublimity of God’s power and love. They expected Christians to be humbled and transformed by contemplating the overwhelming vastness of God’s glory. In contrast, Hindmarsh notes Wesley’s emphasis on agonizing and striving. “The Arminian beliefs of the Wesleys,” he observes, “and their teaching about Christian perfection combined to form a spirituality that sought not so much the rest of contemplation as the victory that follows travail.”³⁶ Wesleyan Methodist Hannah Ball’s record of a temptation experience exemplifies this approach to spirituality: “I was much tempted,” she wrote, “but was enabled by divine assistance to resist, and the tempter fled. Our joys are joys of conquest, not of rest.”³⁷ This emphasis on striving can also be seen in Wesley’s ongoing opposition to anything approaching quietism or stillness: the Lord provides “strength to labour, not to sit still.”³⁸

32. McGonigle, *Sufficient Saving Grace*, 270; John Wesley, “A Short History of Methodism,” in *Works*, 9:371. See also John Wesley, “Cautions and Directions Given to the Greatest Professors in Methodist Societies,” in *Works*, 13:86–87; Wesley, *Works*, 26:30, 27:102; Roberts, *Selected Trevecka Letters (1742–1747)*, 45.

33. Different ways of phrasing these steps appear throughout Wesley’s writings. His summary of Grace Paddy’s rapid experience gives the way in miniature: “A person convinced of sin, converted to God, and renewed in love, within twelve hours!” See Wesley, “Short History of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:487; John Wesley, “Hymns and Sacred Poems (1740),” in *Works*, 13:46–48; Wesley, “Scripture Way of Salvation,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 372–80.

34. Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 289, 451.

35. Hindmarsh, *Spirit of Early Evangelicalism*, 236, 246, 252–60.

36. Significantly, Hindmarsh notes the contribution of Aldersgate and affirms that Wesley’s striving was “an agony of grace.” See Hindmarsh, *Spirit of Early Evangelicalism*, 260, 265.

37. Thomas M. Morrow, *Early Methodist Women* (Epworth, 1967), 31.

38. Wesley, *Works*, 27:84.

For his comments on Calvinism, Hindmarsh draws mainly from Jonathan Edwards and English Calvinists, but similar themes arose in Welsh Methodism. Rowland preached, for instance, “The Almighty loves to display his sovereignty, and to act freely without controul.” Therefore, humans dare not “lay Righteousness itself, to our crooked line, and find fault, if it doth not agree with our scanty admeasurement.” Rather, “Down...in the dust let us bow before him, and acknowledge our acquiescence in his sovereign will.”³⁹ Likewise, Williams’s writings present “a vision of the majesty of God,” an idea one scholar refers to as “a metaphysical intuition of the sheer Godness of God.”⁴⁰ Furthermore, society reports reference overwhelming experiences of God’s sublime presence and love. “[T]he windows of heaven open,” remarks one such report, “and the dew of God’s love was show’r’d down upon us until we were almost drowned in the ocean.” As a result, explained the exhorter, “I could feel wisdom, humility...flowing into my heart.”⁴¹

Hindmarsh’s observation about varying “spiritual aspirations” provides a helpful summary of how these different perspectives led to distinct approaches to spirituality. As will be seen, these distinctives carried practical implications for spiritual formation in the societies.

Welsh Methodist Societies

One historian of Wales has rightly called the *seiadau*, or societies, “the very life-blood of the movement.”⁴² In the societies, Methodists practiced their beliefs and examined their experiences in the company of likeminded people. When Howell Harris experienced conversion in the spring of 1735, he almost immediately started exhorting his acquaintances around his Trevecka home.⁴³ The spring of 1737 brought multiple milestones for Harris:

39. Daniel Rowland, *Eight Sermons upon Practical Subjects, Preached at the New Church in Llangeitho, South Wales*, 2nd ed. (London: 1774), 55–56.

40. H. A. Hodges, *Flame in the Mountains: Williams Pantycelyn, Ann Griffiths and the Welsh Hymn*, ed. E. Wyn James (Y Lolfa, 2017), 51–52.

41. CMA Trevecca College MS 3003. See also *ibid.*, MSS 3001:10, 3079.

42. Geraint H. Jenkins, *The Foundations of Modern Wales 1642–1780* (Oxford University Press, 1987), 354. For a thorough overview of Welsh Methodist society life in one critical region of Wales, see White, *Welsh Methodist Society*.

43. Harris’s conversion took place in three stages: March 30, May 25, and June 18. For these and more details of Harris’s life and early ministry, see especially Tudur, *Howell Harris*, 17–19, 32–33, 64–80; Harris, *Brief Account*, 10–15; William George Hughes-Edwards, “The Development and Organization of the Methodist Society in Wales—1735–1750,” (MA diss., University of Wales, 1966), 72–75, 91, 249–54, 284–85.

he founded at Wernos what he would come to consider the first permanent society, he received his first invitation to exhort outside his home county, and he began exhorting without a book. Daniel Rowland experienced conversion about the same time as Harris, and while the latter grew his ministry from his base at Trevecka, Rowland preached and gathered converts around Llangeitho, farther west. Harris and Rowland met in the middle at Defynnog in August 1737, and from that point the two revivalists joined efforts.⁴⁴

Harris became ill in the spring of 1738, and he utilized his less-demanding schedule to write society rules. In August he received a request for an English version, so rules must have been in circulation by the summer.⁴⁵ In 1739, Harris had a personal and pivotal introduction to George Whitefield, whose works would soon be translated into Welsh and whose presence in Wales would continually be desired.⁴⁶ 1740 brought more discussion about society rules, and the earliest extant set of Harris's rules can be dated to this period. Then, in February 1741, the leaders of the Welsh Revival convened at Llandovery and produced rules of society similar to Harris's earlier efforts.⁴⁷ A partial copy of these Llandovery rules was discovered at Llangeitho, implying their use in Rowland's societies as well. Many other meetings followed, and the end result for the societies was the June publication of *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r Societies*, a guide which influenced the societies second only to the Bible until supplanted by William Williams's *Experience Meeting* in 1777.⁴⁸

44. Unfortunately, the absence of Rowland's personal papers limits investigation into the details of his ministry. See Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 50–55, 93–94; David Ceri Jones, Boyd Stanley Schlenker, and Eryn Mant White, *The Elect Methodists: Calvinistic Methodism in England and Wales 1735–1811* (University of Wales Press, 2012), 13.

45. The exact content of these rules is not known, but a manuscript does carry two sample questions for members from about the same time. See Jones, *Trevecka Letters*, 226–28.

46. Harris then joined Whitefield in London, becoming acquainted with other revival branches and beginning a pattern that would repeat yearly through the 1740s and, over time, diminish Harris's leadership role in Wales. See George Whitefield, *Journals* (Banner of Truth, 1960), 228–30.

47. These rules seem to regulate the two-month society of leaders, but that meeting in this regard functioned as a large-scale model of a typical Welsh Methodist society. The text in English is provided in Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 120–24. Subsequent references will cite this translation.

48. *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r Societies neu'r cyfarfodydd neullduol a ddechreuassant ymgynnull yn ddiweddar yn Nghymru* (Bristol, 1742); David Ceri Jones, "A Glorious Work in the World": *Welsh Methodism and the International Evangelical Revival, 1735–1750*, *Studies in*

The meetings in February 1741 provide a microcosm of the practical side of early Welsh Methodism, which utilized “a more collegiate style of leadership” than Wesleyan Methodism.⁴⁹ Harris held prominence throughout Wales, but other leaders joined in guiding the movement, including Rowland, William Williams, and Howell Davies. Rowland proved especially influential and probably presided over the 1741 Llandoverly meetings. Rowland’s leadership later expanded when Harris’s idiosyncrasies isolated him from the movement for more than a decade.⁵⁰ As a result, no single leader can adequately account for Welsh Methodist doctrine and policy in the same way that Wesleyan Methodism depended on John Wesley. Thus, this survey will consider contributions from a variety of leading Welsh Methodists. The 1741 Llandoverly/Llangeitho rules and *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau’r* give the clearest insight into the leaders’ original vision for the Welsh Methodist societies. Other major sources for understanding Welsh society life included Whitefield’s society writings, which the Welsh leaders endorsed by translating, as well as the array of society reports sent by superintendents to various Associations throughout the 1740s. In addition, Williams’s 1777 treatment of *The Experience Meeting* shows society life and ideals from the other side of the Harris disruption and a re-awakening which took place in 1762.

Purposes

Howell Harris wrote to Daniel Rowland in 1743 to inform his co-leader of accusations against the societies. Harris recommended openness regarding “what we do in our private assemblies.” According to Harris, they met “together to confer abt [about] ye [the] state of our souls to unburthen [unburden] our minds to consult together abt [about] our growth in Grace—to Pray & sing & open our Hearts together.”⁵¹ Harris’s summary hits the high points. Though variation was allowed from society to society,

Welsh History 22 (University of Wales Press, 2004), 210–11. For the full text in English, see John Aaron’s translation in Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:266–73. Subsequent references will cite this translation.

49. Jones, Schlenther, and White, *Elect Methodists*, 53. For the Wesleyan Connexion, see Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 246–49.

50. On this division and its effects, see Eryn White, “‘A Breach in God’s House’: The Division in Welsh Calvinistic Methodism 1750–1763,” in Nigel Yates, ed., *Bishop Burgess and His World: Culture, Religion and Society in Britain, Europe and North America in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (University of Wales Press, 2007), 85–102.

51. Roberts, *Selected Trevecka Letters (1742–1747)*, 86. See also *ibid.*, 112, 166.

singing and praying were constants.⁵² The 1741 rules included hymns, and *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r* considered praise and prayer the starting point of the society. As the movement matured, William Williams and others wrote many hymns to reflect and shape Methodist doctrine and experience, complementing a formal plan of catechesis. Some society reports even mention singing and praying, verifying their importance in Methodist life.⁵³

"After singing praises and praying," the rules explain, "we open our hearts to one another," telling the good and the bad, followed by mutual examination of motives, purposes, and principles.⁵⁴ A willingness to give and receive rebukes was required of every Methodist because "opening the heart" and examining were essential Methodist experiences.⁵⁵ *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r* lists eight purposes for the society, including provoking to love and good works, understanding the devil and one's own heart, bearing one another's burdens, and glorifying God through testifying to "what he has done for our souls."⁵⁶ *The Experience Meeting* repeats most of these purposes, though it adds, with the advantage of decades' experience, that the society should help maintain "this same warmth and liveliness that was ours at the beginning."⁵⁷ Williams recommended using examination only

52. For the emphasis on flexibility, see William Williams, *The Experience Meeting: An Introduction to the Welsh Societies of the Evangelical Awakening*, trans. Bethan Lloyd-Jones (Regent College, 2003), 21, 30–31, 34, 41. For the importance of singing and praying, see Mark A. Noll, "The Significance of Hymnody in the First Evangelical Revivals," in Roberts, *Revival, Renewal, and the Holy Spirit*, 53; Hughes-Edwards, "Development and Organization," 184–93.

53. CMA Trevecca College MSS 3023:1–2, 3079. For the place of catechesis in the societies, see Roberts, *Selected Trevecca Letters (1742–1747)*, 74; CMA Trevecca College MSS 2963, 3023:41–42.

54. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:269–70; Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 123.

55. George Whitefield, *A Letter to the Religious Societies of England Written in His Voyage to Philadelphia 1739, and Now Particularly Recommended to Those Who Have Lately Formed Themselves into Religious Societies in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1742), 17. This is a summary of Whitefield's earlier sermon on the subject, which can be found in Lee Gatiss, ed., *The Sermons of George Whitefield* (Crossway, 2009), 152–67.

56. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:266–69. Whitefield emphasized the latter sentiment when defending the societies to the Bishop of Bangor: "In Wales they have little fellowship meetings, where some well-meaning people meet together, simply to tell what God has done for their souls." See George Whitefield, *The Letters of George Whitefield: For the Period 1734–1742* (Banner of Truth, 1976), 493.

57. Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 13–16. A society report by Thomas Williams portrays what seems to have been the society ideal: "[S]o far as I understand they all know the Lord Jesus Christ & believe in him, they are light, strong, Lively souls, who adorns their

if members will not share proactively, yet the society's reports indicate a dependence on regular examination to correct misinformed self-assessments.⁵⁸ Outsiders objected to these Methodist practices, and the leaders were aware of dangers such as inappropriate sharing and spiritual pride.⁵⁹ But nevertheless they saw great benefit in close spiritual evaluation. In fact, William Williams remarked boldly, "Of all the means of grace, I know of none more profitable than the special fellowship meetings, called private societies, to correct, to direct, to edify and to encourage weak members who are ever ready to stray aside... or to be carried about... to false and erroneous doctrines."⁶⁰

Admission

Membership in a Welsh Methodist society carried a combination of doctrinal, ethical, and experiential expectations. Regarding the first, Whitefield warned against "Bigotry or Party-zeal" and encouraged a catholic outlook.⁶¹ Likewise, Williams cautioned about the danger of "Zeal for obscure issues."⁶² *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r* goes so far as to claim, "[W]e do not hinder anyone of whatever opinions from becoming a member of the Society, as long as they can find it in their hearts to agree with the aforementioned Rules, and to answer the following questions." Yet the "following questions" themselves display the limits of this catholicity. "Do you believe and assent to the fundamental truths," the document asks: "firstly, concerning the Trinity; secondly, election; thirdly, original sin; fourthly, justification by faith; fifthly, perseverance in the state of grace."⁶³ The Welsh

profession, and are orthodox in their Judgment, & have ye power of Godliness...." See Roberts, "Early Society Reports," *JHSPCW*, 52:57–58.

58. Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 36, 39; CMA Trevecca College MS 3023:1–2; Roberts, *Selected Trevecca Letters (1742–1747)*, 22; Gomer M. Roberts, ed., "Early Society Reports," *JHSPCW*, 53 (1968): 20.

59. The Dissenters objected especially to "opening the heart," and Jenkins, a modern historian, calls this preoccupation with the state of souls the "dark side of Methodism." William Williams, for his part, gave specific guidance regarding what to share and what to avoid. See Roberts, *Selected Trevecca Letters (1742–1747)*, 32; Jenkins, *Foundations of Modern Wales*, 369; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 39, 51–57.

60. Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 12. This parallels a Williams society report from 1745, in which he said he keeps "a private society to know their Doctrine & State." CMA Trevecca College MS 2945:140–41.

61. Whitefield, *Letter to the Religious Societies*, 14–15.

62. In youth, Williams had witnessed doctrinal controversy split his family's chapel. See Evans, *Bread of Heaven*, 2; Evans, *Pursued by God*, 81.

63. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:271–72. The prior Llandoverly/

Methodists intended to include Calvinistic Dissenters in their membership, but not Arminians.

As for behavior, Harris's early rules ask the member to "watch over his own conduct," keep society secrets, be consistent in private and public life, attend Lord's Day worship and assemblies of the brethren, and not foster suspicion.⁶⁴ *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r* speaks more generally of a "change in...life" regarding "character and behaviour."⁶⁵ Williams's *Experience Meeting* reiterates these early themes, exhorting members to make other believers their closest companions, to attend services, to refrain from "empty talk" and gossip, and to be willing to give and take rebukes. It also highlights the need for generosity.⁶⁶ Society expulsions provide further clues to behavioral standards. Some accounts speak in generalities about bringing "some reproach upon religion" or walking "contrary to the Gospel," but others refer to specific violations such as marrying unbelievers or being dishonest in work.⁶⁷ Though discipline seems to have been a regular occurrence, most of the leaders were not eager to "turn out" a member. "It is better to err on the side of mercy," Williams counseled, and they looked for concrete and unrepentant sin before removing the wayward.⁶⁸

As important as doctrine and lifestyle were, experience was the critical criterion. Harris lamented that the Dissenters stopped at examining "the Orthodoxy of their Principles, and...the Morality of their Lives."⁶⁹ The Welsh Methodists, Harris claimed, would receive "none but such as have

Llangeitho rules make a similar statement, while *The Experience Meeting* includes an affirmation of justification by faith and the imputation of Christ's righteousness among entrance questions. Election is implied but not explicit. It should be noted also that, apparently, the societies gave room for a member to grow in doctrinal understanding and commitment. Thomas James reported on one who "Has been in much doubt about the divinity of Xst [Christ], but now believes not only yt [that] he is God but that he is his God." See Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 124; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 34–36; Gomer M. Roberts, ed., "Early Society Accounts," *JHSPCW*, 51 (1966): 68.

64. Jones, *Trevecka Letters*, 247.

65. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:272.

66. Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 34–38.

67. White, *Welsh Methodist Society*, 241–56; CMA Trevecca College MSS 3016, 3052, 3062.

68. Howell Harris was the exception, but it is noteworthy that the other leaders opposed Harris's expulsions when he based them on his "spiritual eye," concluding that his criteria were too subjective. See Tom Beynon, ed., *Howell Harris's Visits to Pembrokeshire* (Cambrian News, 1966), 139; Beynon, *Harris's Visits to London*, 181; Tudur, *Howell Harris*, 166, 181; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 44, 46.

69. Similarly, a Welsh Methodist exhorter described the Dissenters as having "great

experience as spiritual travelers, and spiritual soldiers.”⁷⁰ Williams made a similar contrast in *Theomemphus* when he employed allegory to highlight the inadequacy of “Orthodoxus” and “Christ in the head.” His hymns provide the Methodist alternative in their repeated use of “enjoy,” “feel,” “taste,” and “prove.”⁷¹ This emphasis came through clearly enough for Griffith Jones to warn the Methodists about “looking too much to the inward work and too little...to the outward word.”⁷² Yet for the Welsh Methodists, the inward work was the heart of the matter, and they sought in members a genuine experience of conversion. The rules reflect this, the Llandovery/Llangeitho version opens membership to “whoever is able to give us satisfaction that he savingly knows Christ, and is a genuine believer.” *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r* calls it “vain” to unite in society “unless our souls are united to God in Christ, and to one another in the Holy Spirit.” Prospective members, it requires, are to be convinced of their lostness and awakened to the necessity of the Spirit’s work. This included counting the cost, being ready to part with everything, and desiring assurance if not already possessing it.⁷³

Despite these high standards, the Welsh Methodists acknowledged a difference between “weak and strong faith.”⁷⁴ Those with the beginnings of grace were not to be refused. Hence the society reports overflow with remarks like this one from Williams: “[S]ome strong believers, others pretty legal.”⁷⁵ In *The Experience Meeting*, he advised that “the light of faith and assurance” will vary between new members and those more mature, so none seeking eternal life “should be shut out, however faint may be the revelations and visitations of God to him.”⁷⁶ Shortly before his death, Wil-

heads and little experiences.” See CMA Trevecca College MS 3023:8–9; Roberts, *Selected Trevecca Letters (1742–1747)*, 12–13.

70. D. E. Jenkins, *Calvinistic Methodist Holy Orders* (Calvinistic Methodist Bookroom, 1911), 71.

71. Evans, *Pursued by God*, 79, 132; Turner, “Theological Themes,” 280–82.

72. Beynon, *Harris’s Visits to Pembrokeshire*, 89.

73. Jones, *Trevecca Letters*, 246; Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 124; Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:267, 271–72. See also Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 34–36.

74. Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 123–24. See also Jones, *Trevecca Letters*, 247; Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:272.

75. Similarly, Morgan John Lewis reported about two who “could not say that they have found the Lord, but I believe they have and so did the Rest of the Brethren believe the Same...their Hearts Seem’d to be broken.” See CMA Trevecca College MSS 3001:3; 2945:140–41.

76. Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 34, 37.

liams observed “that true religion consists of three parts”: first, “true light respecting the plan of salvation”; second, “being in intimate fellowship with God”; and third, “life and conduct.”⁷⁷ It was this true religion—involving belief, experience, and behavior—that the Welsh Methodists desired in their members.

Structure

The Welsh Methodists distinguished members from hearers, mirroring this distinction by holding both private and public meetings. For instance, in George Whitefield’s letter to the Welsh leaders, he advised that public exhorters are “called to awaken” and private exhorters “to establish and build up.”⁷⁸ Hearers attended the “publick” exhorting and could, in time, give their names and “offer themselves to the Society.”⁷⁹ *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau’r* only requires giving one’s name “in the previous meeting,” but it also asks the length of time since coming under conviction and receiving “this change in... life.”⁸⁰ The society reports display a pattern of potential members being “on trial,” and Morgan John Lewis’s reasoning seems to have been the common thought: “I don’t see it right to receive any Immediately except their Experience be very clear.”⁸¹ When the society as a group gave consent, the new member was received.

At the formation of the *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau’r* rules, the leaders allowed for a subdivision within the members between a “general” and “private” society, giving a set of questions for assessing when a member is ready

77. Evans, *Bread of Heaven*, 322.

78. Whitefield, *Letters*, 511. When evaluating the call of George Gambold, a July 1745 Association noted that “his gifts are rather for edifying the s[ain]ts than of conviction,” probably implying the same distinction between the private and public work. Eryn White employs the term “society meeting” for the private and “preaching meeting” for the public, as the private work constituted the society proper. See CMA Trevecca College MS 2945:147; White, *Welsh Methodist Society*, 191.

79. CMA Trevecca College MSS 3001:6, 3023:34–35. See also Roberts, “Early Society Reports,” *JHSPCW*, 52:9.

80. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:272.

81. Sometimes it took a while for experiences to become clear, and Thomas Williams recorded the reception of four “who had been long on trial.” These and the following references come from Pembrokeshire, Carmarthenshire, Monmouthshire, and Glamorganshire, indicating a common practice throughout Welsh Methodism. Roberts, “Early Society Reports,” *JHSPCW*, 52:10; Roberts, “Early Society Reports,” *JHSPCW*, 53:86–87; CMA Trevecca College MSS 2945:123–25, 2945:140–41, 2992, 3002, 3004, 3023:9–10, 3027:47, 3033, 3065, 3073; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 36–37.

to move from the former to the latter.⁸² The first and final questions ask about assurance, while the middle six look for growth in various graces. Some have taken this subdivided society structure as definitive for Welsh Methodism, but there is good reason to doubt whether an unassured-in-general/assured-in-private distinction ever became the norm.⁸³ Those who take it as typical seem to assume the implementation of the structure described in *Sail, Dibenion a Rheolau'r*, yet even in that document, a separate private society is not mandated but merely permitted. Eifion Evans provides only one further reference, an account by Harris of his ministry in Bala in 1749.⁸⁴ In it, Harris recommended “to some select Brethren” that they have “a Separate Band where alone Secrets are to be handld [handled]” because “some are Fathers in ye [the] house and some are Babes.” Harris’s reason for the suggestion, he made clear, was to keep Dissenters in a “general” meeting and protect Methodist secrets. Hence, even in Bala, such a society subdivision did not yet exist, and it was specifically recommended because of problems with Dissenters. Furthermore, in this account, Harris used “private Society” and “publick Work” in the typical ways, differentiating the gathering of Methodist members from the preaching to all who would hear. Thus, this does not constitute evidence for a subdivided society.

On the contrary, a single-society structure finds abundant support in the reports. Superintendents utilized the distinction between those who had grown to assurance and those who had not, but both the assured and the unassured were included together in the private society. Morgan John Lewis reported that some “have not yet received great manifestations of the Love of God,” yet concluded, “They meet in private so often as possible.”⁸⁵

82. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:272–73. The Welsh Methodists were not systematic about terms. They also referred at times to the Association of leaders as a “general society.” See, for instance, CMA Trevecca College MS 2953.

83. For examples, see Eifion Evans, *Howel Harris Evangelist: 1714–1773* (University of Wales Press, 1974), 24; Eifion Evans, “Adding to the Church—In the Teaching of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists,” in *Fire in the Thatch: The True Nature of Religious Revival* (Evangelical Press of Wales, 1996), 112–15; F. F. E. Aubel, “The Revivalist Movement in South Wales from Griffith Jones to the Schism of 1750” (MTh diss., University of Lampeter, 1987), 68. White (*Welsh Methodist Society*, 226–28) notes that Williams presented an undifferentiated society by the time of writing *The Experience Meeting*. This is certainly true, yet the evidence put forth in this study indicates the subdivided structure was never the normal practice.

84. JHSPCW Manuscript Supplement 1 (1941): 472. Aubel also cites two Association reports, but both refer to bands (which will be discussed below) and not to a general/private society subdivision. See CMA Trevecca College MSS 2945:102–3, 2992.

85. CMA Trevecca College MS 3001:12. The following reports are found in CMA

Likewise, Thomas Williams explained, “[H]ere are about 7 or 8 of weak ones who are diligent in hearing ye [the] word, & meet in Private.” Richard Tibbot told of “6 members in the private society,” two of whom “believe weakly,” with the other four “pretty dark, concerning their justification.” William John associated members “in bondage,” a favorite Welsh Methodist term meaning lacking assurance, with the private society. The various reports overflow with positive (“in great liberty,” “in full assurance of faith,” “Witness that they are justified”) and negative (“under the law,” “under Doubts and fears,” “Groaning for delivery”) assessments, but all seem to be full members of the private society.⁸⁶ Some reports refer to members’ spiritual fluctuations, a reality that contributed to the intermingling of different spiritual states within a society. Three decades later, William Williams’s *Experience Meeting* provides examination questions to assess whether someone “is under the law or under grace,” but without a hint of a society subdivided along those lines.⁸⁷ Rather, the expectation seems to be that both the unassured and the assured, the weak and the strong, would come together in a single undifferentiated “experience meeting.”

The one subdivision for which some evidence exists is “Bands,” society subgroups based not on spiritual condition but on sex and, sometimes, marital status. Though the concept never gained widespread support in Wales, it was implemented in some societies, even to the time of Williams’s *Experience Meeting* in 1777.⁸⁸ Whitefield recommended a band structure in his letter to the societies, and Harris initiated it in various places.⁸⁹ The Welsh-English Watford Association officially “Agreed that men and women...meet in separate Bands as the Spirit of the Lord shd [should] lead them.”⁹⁰ Yet only a minority of the society reports mention bands, and some scholars conclude that the Welsh societies were simply too small for

Trevecca College MSS 2945:135–37, 3008, 3023:3–4; Roberts, “Early Society Reports,” *JHSPCW*, 53:46, 49.

86. CMA Trevecca College MSS 3001:4, 3001:9, 3002, 3005, 3007, 3011; Roberts, “Early Society Accounts,” *JHSPCW*, 51:65; Roberts, “Early Society Reports,” *JHSPCW*, 52:54, 85; Roberts, “Early Society Reports,” *JHSPCW*, 53:46, 86.

87. Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 55.

88. Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 130.

89. See Whitefield, *Letter to the Religious Societies*, 16; Beynon, *Harris’s Visits to Pembrokeshire*, 43, 70, 161; Gomer M. Roberts, “Calvinistic Methodism in Glamorgan, 1737–73,” in Glanmor Williams, ed., *Glamorgan County History* (Glamorgan County History Trust, 1974), 4:505, 518.

90. CMA Trevecca College MS 2955.

widespread implementation.⁹¹ However, many Welsh societies were indeed large enough, fifteen to twenty-five being the average society membership, with many recording memberships above forty.⁹² Inadequate size may have prohibited some from subdividing into bands, but a more basic reason seems to have been a lack of interest. In the very month of the Watford meeting, Harris observed that “some of ye Dear Lambs are to some wise ends permitted to scruple about ye Classical Divisions of ye Brethren and Sisters.”⁹³ Harris’s visits to London acquainted him with what he termed the “Classical Divisions,” but to others in Wales bands may have seemed like an unnecessary English or Moravian innovation.

In March 1749, Harris tried again, this time recommending bands based on spiritual condition.⁹⁴ But the directive does not seem to have been carried out. Hughes-Edwards attributes this failure to the smallness of Welsh societies, but a more probable reason is that the directive was not representative. The association in question was merely a monthly association of exhorters from the region of Howell Harris’s home, led by Harris himself. Given his increasingly estranged status, it is not surprising the other leaders ignored this recommendation.

Where they existed, then, bands were practical rather than spiritual subdivisions. They fostered openness and propriety. But the main division within Welsh Methodist meetings was between the “publick” meeting for preaching at which hearers were welcome and the private meeting for the society proper. Abraham Williams told of a place where “they do flock to hear the word but there is no private society.”⁹⁵ Morgan John Lewis described those who “come together to hear the Word in the Publick Society,” of which “14 have given their names” and “just begin to meet in private.”⁹⁶ Examples could be multiplied, as society reports speak often of

91. See, for instance, CMA Trevecca College MSS 3001:1, 3016, 3023:22–23. For small size being a factor, see CMA Trevecca College MSS 3008, 3019; Gomer M. Roberts, ed., *Selected Trevecca Letters (1747–1794)* (Calvinistic Methodist Bookroom, 1962), 33; Glanmor Williams et al., *The Welsh Church from Reformation to Disestablishment, 1603–1920* (University of Wales Press, 2007), 173; White, *Welsh Methodist Society*, 210, 230.

92. Aubel, “Revivalist Movement,” 67; Hughes-Edwards, “Development and Organization,” 181; CMA Trevecca College MSS 2945:123–25, 3005, 3014.

93. Roberts, *Selected Trevecca Letters (1742–1747)*, 77.

94. This may well have been an example of Harris’s Wesleyan-mindedness. See Hughes-Edwards, “Development and Organization,” 179, 430; Beynon, *Harris’s Visits to London*, 211.

95. CMA Trevecca College MS 3085.

96. CMA Trevecca College MS 3001:6. For more examples, see CMA Trevecca

these two types of meetings utilized by the Welsh Methodist societies to pursue their spiritual purposes.

Other Methods and Meetings

Besides these regular elements, the Welsh Methodists shepherded their converts through special meetings and various writings. They regularly emphasized the need for the Lord's Supper and dotted the calendar with days of prayer and fasting. Harris brought Moravian meetings, such as letter days, love-feasts, and watchnights, to Wales, and among these, it seems, love-feasts took root.⁹⁷ As for writings, the leaders guided the Welsh Methodists by letters, magazines, hymns, and translations.⁹⁸ Letters and periodicals like Whitefield's *Weekly History* connected Welsh converts with like-minded believers in other parts of the transatlantic world. The accounts also provided models for understanding spiritual experiences. The Welsh Methodists themselves translated or re-emphasized English books for the benefit of the societies, including Bunyan's *Holy War*, Cole's *Practical Discourse of God's Sovereignty*, and multiple works by Ebenezer and Ralph Erskine. Later, William Williams would compose his own collections of writings, blending doctrine and practice together to interpret and guide Welsh Methodism.

Summary

The Welsh Methodists were Calvinistic Methodists. Their Calvinism was reflected in their requirement that members affirm election and perseverance. More than that, their admission standards highlighted their conviction that only those who had hearts renewed by the new birth could progress in true holiness. Society membership would not benefit the unregenerate. But the mutual support of the society enabled those who had experienced evangelical conversion to grow together in sanctification.

College MSS 2945:25–26, 3003, 3008, 3023:1–2, 9–10; Roberts, "Early Society Reports," *JHSPCW*, 52:16; Roberts, "Early Society Reports," *JHSPCW*, 53:19, 87; Beynon, *Harris's Visits to Pembrokeshire*, 76, 124, 140.

97. See Hughes-Edwards, "Development and Organization," 208–14; Whitefield, *Letters*, 511; CMA Trevecca College MSS 2945:145, 2989, 3023:13; Beynon, *Harris's Visits to Pembrokeshire*, 76.

98. CMA Trevecca College MS 3023:13; Jones, "A Glorious Work", 18, 109, 262–63; Susan Durden, "A Study of the First Evangelical Magazines, 1740–1748," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976): 260–62; D. Densil Morgan, *Theologia Cambrensis: Protestant Religion and Theology in Wales* (University of Wales Press, 2018, 2021), 1:383–85; 2:14.

Wesleyan Methodist Societies

In the summer of 1748, Howell Harris recorded in his diary: “Praying for Bro. Wesley seeing his temptation, so many bowing to him, wholly submitting to him, preachers, people great and small. O Lord keep my brother!”⁹⁹ The sympathetic Harris recognized that John Wesley alone held ultimate authority in Wesleyan Methodism and that the Conference served merely as his advisor.¹⁰⁰ The movement did at times depart from Wesley’s ideal; nonetheless, a study of Wesleyan Methodist doctrine and discipleship centers on John Wesley.

Early Development and Structure

Wesleyan Methodism’s mature structure reflected the progressive holiness of Wesley’s way of salvation. Yet Wesley reached this end through a series of experiences, additions, and modifications. As he put it, “everything arose just as the occasion offered.”¹⁰¹ He has been called a pragmatist and a borrower, but his genius showed in his ability to incorporate disparate ideas into a thoroughly Wesleyan whole.¹⁰² Wesley grew up around a religious society of the old style at Epworth, and he read about those societies at an early stage. From that foundation, Wesley developed his own type of society, influenced at first by the Moravians. He visited their base in Germany, writing *Rules of the Band Societies* upon his return.¹⁰³ Though Wesley would officially part ways with Moravianism in July of 1740, he adapted Moravian structures for his United Societies, the first of which he formed at Bristol in 1739, followed by the Foundery in London. Looking back, Wesley attributed the formation of these societies to requests from converts that he advise them. However, the circumstances surrounding the origins of

99. Beynon, *Harris’s Visits to London*, 189.

100. Davies remarks, “He was Methodism, in person and in power.” Davies, “Introduction,” in *Wesley, Works*, 9:20.

101. John Wesley, “A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:254.

102. Kevin Watson notes that the class meeting was the only meeting original to Wesleyan Methodism, yet even that idea did not originate with Wesley. Kevin M. Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness: The Band Meeting in Wesley’s Thought and Popular Methodist Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2014), 56. See also Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, xx, 237–38, 584; Walsh, “Religious Societies,” in Sheils and Wood, *Voluntary Religion*, 281, 291; Davies, “Introduction,” in *Wesley, Works*, 9:8–9.

103. Richard P. Heitzenrater, *Mirror and Memory: Reflections on Early Methodism* (Kingswood, 1989), 124–26. For overviews of the development process, see Wesley, “Short History of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:428–30; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 16–17, 29–34; Heitzenrater, *People Called Methodists*, 37–67.

various societies differed, with Wesley serving as “co-ordinator or cannibaliser of a wide range of renewal groups under local leaders.”¹⁰⁴

Methodist society meetings were open to visitors and included preaching, prayer, and singing.¹⁰⁵ From almost the start, the society’s serious members were divided by sex and marital status into small bands for confession and accountability.¹⁰⁶ In early 1742, a suggestion to raise contributions to pay a society’s debt laid the foundation for Wesley’s class meeting, a division of all society members into groups of about twelve determined by geography.¹⁰⁷ In time, class membership defined membership in Wesleyan Methodism. Other society subgroups filled out the Wesleyan plan, reflecting Wesley’s “tendency towards the proliferation of small groups.”¹⁰⁸ The various groups flowed from Wesley’s conviction that Christianity teaches a “social” and not a “solitary” religion. Therefore, preaching without establishing societies “is only begetting children for the murderer,” for the awakened will fall asleep again without the support of others.¹⁰⁹ Hence, Wesley referred to the classes and bands as “the very sinews of our Society,” and from this basic structure, the movement expanded.¹¹⁰

104. Rack, “Religious Societies,” 584–86. For various perspectives, see Wesley, “Plain Account of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:256; Wesley, “Short History of the Methodists,” in *ibid.*, 421; Jones, Schlenker and White, *Elect Methodists*, 31–34.

105. Frances Pawson, for instance, attended Methodist society meetings for seven years before joining. See Morrow, *Early Methodist Women*, 49; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 51–52.

106. Wesley, “Principles Farther Explained,” in *Works*, 9:169; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 2–3.

107. Wesley seems to have delighted in retelling this account. See Wesley, “Plain Account of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:260–62; Wesley, “Short History of the Methodists,” in *ibid.*, 434; Wesley, “Thoughts upon Methodism,” in *Works*, 9:528–29; Wesley, *Works*, 19:251, 258; David Lowes Watson, *The Early Methodist Class Meeting: Its Origins and Significance* (Wipf & Stock, 1985), 93.

108. See the Select Society and Penitent Bands described below. Walsh refers to this as a “quasi-military organisation.” See J. D. Walsh, “Origins of the Evangelical Revival,” in G. V. Bennett and J. D. Walsh, eds., *Essays in Modern English Church History: In Memory of Norman Sykes* (Oxford University Press, 1966), 161; Davies, “Introduction,” in Wesley, *Works*, 9:13.

109. Wesley, “Hymns and Sacred Poems (1739),” in *Works*, 13:39. See also John Wesley, “Upon our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount (IV),” in Outler and Heitzenrater, eds., *Wesley’s Sermons*, 195; Wesley, *Works*, 19:318, 21:424; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 39–43.

110. John Wesley, “Farther Thoughts upon Christian Perfection,” in *Works*, 13:120.

The Class Meeting

Class membership distinguished a Methodist from an observer in the society, and the only prerequisite for membership was “a desire to flee from the wrath to come.”¹¹¹ No strict doctrinal or experiential standards were required of those seeking membership, beyond a basic admission of one’s personal need for salvation from sin. There were, however, behavioral expectations for maintaining membership. Wesley argued that desiring salvation will be evident, “*First*, by doing no harm, by avoiding evil in every kind.... *Secondly*, By doing good.... *Thirdly*, By attending upon all the ordinances of God,” such as public worship and preaching, the Lord’s Supper, family and private prayer, and fasting.¹¹² These three “general rules” echo through Wesley’s works as a necessary spiritual step, even as he points out their inadequacy as a spiritual stopping place.

One of the class’s purposes was to help Methodists move along in the way of salvation. Each member described their soul’s condition, and the class leader sought to respond appropriately. Classes also served financial ends by providing the setting in which Wesleyan Methodists gave their contributions for the poor. Furthermore, discipline was kept through mandatory attendance and the renewal or otherwise of quarterly tickets.¹¹³ The combined emphasis on accountability and spiritual growth can be seen in Wesley’s description of Methodists uniting “to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their salvation.”¹¹⁴ Since any repentant, awakened person could seek class membership, the class was a place where those with the beginnings of grace sought justification and those who were justified sought further sanctification.¹¹⁵

111. This admission requirement predated the class as such, but persisted in Wesleyan Methodism. See John Wesley, “The Character of a Methodist,” in *Works*, 9:34; John Wesley, “The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies,” in *Works*, 9:70; John Wesley, “Thoughts upon a Late Phenomenon,” in *Works*, 9:536–37; Wesley, *Works*, 10:277; Wesley, *Works*, 21:384; Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, 106–8.

112. Wesley, “Nature, Design, and General Rules,” in *Works*, 9:70–73. See also Wesley, “Character of a Methodist,” in *Works*, 9:35; John Wesley, “A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:254–55; Hindmarsh, *Spirit of Early Evangelicalism*, 84–86.

113. John Wesley, “Thoughts upon Methodism,” in *Works*, 9:528–29; Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, 104–7, 115, 218; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 3, 68–69.

114. Wesley, “Nature, Design, and General Rules,” in *Works*, 9:69–70.

115. David Watson presents disciplined accountability as the main purpose of the class meeting, treating the emphasis on seeking salvation and spiritual growth as secondary. More balanced, Thompson argues that the class meeting had “a decidedly soteriological intent” while recognizing the importance of discipline in Wesley’s structure. See Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, 95–104; Andrew C. Thompson, “‘To Stir Them Up to

The Band Meeting

Those who experienced justification were invited, though not required, to take a further step by joining a band.¹¹⁶ Bands were about half the size of classes and were divided by sex and marital status. Besides the experiential requirement of justification, band membership also demanded some degree of assurance and a desire for sanctification. The 1738 “Rules” present attitude requirements as well, asking prospective members if they are willing to confess their sins and hear their faults “plain and home,” as well as the thoughts of others concerning them. As for behavioral requirements, when Wesley published new “Directions” for the bands in 1744, he reminded them that since they had the faith of justification, it was not “grievous” for them to keep the “general rules” given to all Methodists: do no evil, do good, and use the ordinances.¹¹⁷

In the band meeting, prayer preceded and followed mutual confession and examination.¹¹⁸ To help band members evaluate their hearts and experiences, Wesley provided five guiding questions: “1. What known sins have you committed since our last meeting? 2. What temptations have you met with? 3. How was you delivered? 4. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not? 5. Have you nothing you desire to keep secret?”¹¹⁹ Theoretically, these questions facilitated the “closer union” and further sanctification of band members, indicating that band meetings aimed at the soteriological goals of growth in holiness and the pursuit of perfection. For instance, Wesley counseled Jane Catherine March to share her experience of perfection with her band in order to “help

Believe, Love, Obey’—Soteriological Dimensions of the Class Meeting in Early Methodism,” *Methodist History* 48 (2010): 167–76.

116. Despite Kevin Watson’s contention that, before the addition of the class meeting as the basic Methodist small group, bands tended to be open to those “earnestly seeking forgiveness,” the early *Rules* included justification as an admission requirement. See Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 3, 63–64, 70–71, 102–3, 199. See also John Wesley, “Rules of the Band Societies,” in *Works*, 9:77; John Wesley, “Directions Given to the Band Societies,” in *Works*, 9:79; Wesley, “Thoughts upon Methodism,” in *Works*, 9:529; Wesley, *Works*, 10:285–86.

117. Davies notes that some “were downgraded from band membership to society membership” under the 1744 “Directions.” See Davies, “Introduction,” in Wesley, *Works*, 9:13.

118. The Scriptures were not expounded in band meetings. See Wesley, “Rules of Band Societies,” in *Works*, 9:77; Wesley, “Principles Farther Explained,” in *Works*, 9:192.

119. Late in Wesley’s life, the fifth question was removed. See Wesley, “Rules of Band Societies,” in *Works*, 9:78n.

their souls” through her honesty and example.¹²⁰ Kevin Watson, in examining the practical evidence, notes several ways in which “popular Methodist practice” differed from Wesley’s plan.¹²¹ Nevertheless, bands served through Wesley’s lifetime as a step in the way of salvation, intended to move Methodists from justification toward perfection.

The Select Society

In 1786, Wesley reviewed his movement and remarked that “innumerable blessings” stemmed from band meetings, especially for those seeking perfection. “When any seemed to have attained this,” he explained, “they were allowed to meet with a select number” who had likewise received perfection.¹²² In 1770, he referred to a noteworthy select society consisting of sixty-five members, all of whom possessed Christian perfection.¹²³ It seems, however, that some select societies broadened membership to include those seriously pursuing perfection, even if they had not yet attained it. Rules were less extensive than in the other groups, merely requiring confidentiality, submission, and generosity.¹²⁴ These select societies formed the apex of Wesley’s society structure and were intended to serve as examples to the rest of Wesleyan Methodism.

The Penitent Band

Some, however, regressed rather than making progress toward salvation. For these, Wesley offered the “penitent band.” Penitents were to pray, hear preaching, and sing hymns, seeking restoration to holiness. Sometimes penitent bands proved so successful in restoring the fallen that their

120. Wesley, “Plain Account of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:266–67; Wesley, *Works*, 27:396.

121. Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 13, 108, 120, 182, 184. See also W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *Journal and Diaries VII (1787–1791)* in *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 2003), 24:106.

122. It seems that Wesley’s original goals for the select society also included having “a select company to whom I might unbosom myself on all occasions, without reserve.” See Wesley, “Thoughts upon Methodism,” in *Works*, 9:529; Wesley, “Plain Account of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:269–70.

123. Wesley, “Short History of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:491.

124. Davies, “Introduction,” in Wesley, *Works*, 9:13–14; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 157–59; Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, 120. On the challenges of the select society, see also David Stark, “Beyond Perfection: A Redemptive Reading of Retracted Holiness Testimony in John Walsh’s Letter to Charles Wesley, 15 August 1762,” *Wesley and Methodist Studies* 5 (2013).

members passed straight into perfection.¹²⁵ As Heitzenrater notes, penitent bands were “the organizational manifestation” of Wesley’s theology of tentative justification.¹²⁶

Other Meetings and Methods

By addition and adaptation, Wesleyan Methodism accumulated a busy calendar. The band meeting typically served as a gateway to three further meetings: public bands, prayer meetings, and love-feasts. In addition to these meetings, Wesley’s societies also carried on works of charity, watch-nights, public fasts, and “covenant renewal services.”¹²⁷ Furthermore, Wesley expected and exhorted his people to participate in the Lord’s Supper, the other means of grace, and parish worship, from each of which Wesley claimed to derive spiritual benefit.¹²⁸ Beyond these meetings and ordinances, Wesley shepherded his Methodists with many publications, the most significant of which were probably Charles’s hymns and John’s *Arminian Magazine*. Hymn-singing permeated the societies, and as the structure and preface of the 1780 hymnal show, Wesleyan hymns served as a catechism of “experimental and practical divinity.”¹²⁹ The *Arminian Magazine*, founded by Wesley in 1778 to counter Calvinist periodicals, gave Wesley a tool with which to bolster his Methodists against rival theologies on the

125. Davies observes that though select societies and penitent bands “gradually ceased,” the “elaborate organization that Wesley had favoured in the early years lingered on...until the 1780s in many areas.” See Davies, “Introduction,” in *Wesley Works*, 9:13; Wesley, “Plain Account of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:269; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 67–68; Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, 121.

126. Heitzenrater, *People Called Methodists*, 136.

127. Public bands, also called “body bands,” were all the bands meeting together. The love-feast was a simple meal of bread and water at which attendees testified to God’s work in their lives. It was eventually opened to all members. Wesley, “Plain Account of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:264; Wesley, *Works*, 19:257; Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, 117–20; Walsh, “Religious Societies,” in Sheils and Wood, *Voluntary Religion*, 288–89; Watson, *Pursuing Social Holiness*, 52–54; Randy L. Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology* (Kingswood, 1994), 210–11.

128. Since Wesley believed the Lord’s Supper should be used by the awakened, calling it a “converting ordinance,” every Methodist was therefore fit to partake. See John Wesley, “Means of Grace,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 165, 168–69; Wesley, “Answer to Mr. Church’s Remarks,” in *Works*, 9:112; Wesley, *Works*, 19:158.

129. Franz Hildebrandt and Oliver A. Beckerlegge eds., with the assistance of James Dale, eds., *A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists*, in *The Works of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1983), 7:73–75; Noll, “Significance of Hymnody,” in Roberts, *Revival, Renewal, and the Holy Spirit*, 47, 49.

one hand and spiritual lethargy on the other.¹³⁰ “God begins his work at the heart,” Wesley believed, “then the inspiration of the Highest giveth understanding.”¹³¹ Wesley’s writing and editing tasks were one way he pursued this educational end.

Summary

Similar to his theological mixture of the “holy living” and heart-oriented Reformed traditions, Wesley attempted a practical union of elements from Anglican and Moravian religious societies. The Wesleyan result provided a place for those seeking justification as well as for those seeking or enjoying perfection. Starting in 1749, Wesley’s assistants kept lists of society members and their respective spiritual states. Different signs indicated whether each was awakened, doubtful, justified, or perfect.¹³² Given Wesley’s soteriology, the category of “doubtful” or “seeker” (as Heitzenrater terms it) probably applied to those having some faith but no assurance of their justification. According to Wesley, these may or may not have been justified, making it fitting for this category to come between “awakened” and “justified.” Such categorization not only confirms awakening as Wesley’s basic requirement for society membership, but also supports an understanding of Wesley’s societies as places to pursue holiness by taking the next step of salvation.¹³³ Wesley believed that everyone was enlightened by prevenient grace, a conviction which undergirded his open-air ministry and invitation for all to attend society *preaching*.¹³⁴ Those awakened to repentance Wesley placed in *classes*, and when they experienced justification, he encouraged them also to join *bands*. In the bands, they would pursue Christian perfection with the goal of entering a *select society*. Finally, *penitent bands* existed

130. *The Arminian Magazine: Consisting of Extracts and Original Treatises on Universal Redemption* 1 (1778): iii–viii; Durden, “First Evangelical Magazines,” 275.

131. Wesley, “Short History of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:452; Hindmarsh, *Spirit of Early Evangelicalism*, 97.

132. For examples and discussion, see Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, 109, 212–14; Heitzenrater, *People Called Methodists*, 194.

133. Without detailed elaboration, Rack observes a “theological dimension underlying the differences between the various types of society.” Lindström likewise notes the connection between Wesley’s soteriology and society structure, though he neglects the fact that Wesley’s Methodists never spiritually outgrew the classes. These involved members from all spiritual states together. See Rack, “Religious Societies,” 594–95; Harold Lindström, *Wesley & Sanctification* (Francis Asbury, 1996), 122.

134. Wesley, “Short History of the Methodists,” in *Works*, 9:463; Wesley, “Means of Grace,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 168.

to help the fallen get back on the way to salvation. Hence, Wesley's mature society structure directly reflected the steps in his soteriology.

Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist Societies: Commonalities and Distinctives

Commonalities

The shared elements of Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist societies form a backdrop against which their differences stand out. The most basic area of similarity is that both types of society pursued the same general purposes: sanctification, disciplined accountability, and fellowship. These three purposes conjoined, with togetherness critical to accountability and growth in holiness. Also, both movements employed similar activities. They preached publicly to reach the unconcerned and the masses. Those who met in society began with singing and prayer. And for both movements, the heart of the society meeting was some combination of testimony, examination, and exhortation.¹³⁵ Notably, both produced rules appealing to James 5:16, indicating the centrality of confession.¹³⁶

The two movements also shared certain logistical strategies. For instance, Wesley commissioned Class Leaders to watch over attendance and collect funds to pass on to the society's Steward. Welsh Methodism did not have classes, but the Steward functioned in a similar role, noting absences and collecting contributions.¹³⁷ Furthermore, both groups employed lay preachers/exhorters to carry on the work. This similarity set apart Methodists of every type from the common ecclesiastical patterns of the day. As for other meetings, Wesley's Connexion scheduled more of them, yet the Welsh Methodists' acceptance of love-feasts and watchnights implies a general openness.¹³⁸ It seems possible that geography accounts for the different scale of such events. Wesleyan Methodism's more urban settings would more easily facilitate extra meetings than would rural Wales.

135. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:268–73; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 31–43; Wesley, "Rules of the Band Societies," in *Works*, 9:77; Wesley, "Nature, Design, and General Rules," in *Works*, 9:69.

136. Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 123; Wesley, "Rules of the Band Societies," in *Works*, 9:77.

137. Wesley, "Nature, Design, and General Rules," in *Works*, 9:70; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 22–24.

138. Charles Wesley recorded an interesting account of a watchnight in 1756 at which both he and George Whitefield preached. See Frank Baker, Richard P. Heitzenrater, and Randy L. Maddox, eds., *The Journal Letters and Related Biographical Items of the Reverend Charles Wesley, M.A.* (Kingswood, 2018), 372.

When Mark Noll calls Charles Wesley and William Williams “the great early masters” of evangelical hymn-writing, he touches on another element shared by Welsh and Wesleyan Methodists.¹³⁹ Both movements produced hymns in abundance and sang them with fervor. They also published other works, especially on doctrinal and devotional subjects. Susan O’Brien sums up the literary output as including past Reformed and Puritan works, new “sermons and discursive writings,” and “revival news.”¹⁴⁰ Especially in the early years, the Calvinists excelled at the latter category, reflecting the international dimension of the Calvinist wing of the revival. Meanwhile, Wesley produced practical treatises in greater abundance.¹⁴¹ Indeed, Wesley pursued publication on a generally larger scale than did the Welsh Methodists, but this may have been simply a matter of resources and readership. Both sought to shepherd converts through literature.

These similarities reveal a remarkable degree of common ground, relating to both purpose and methods. Regarding society life, therefore, the overlap was immense. This helps explain why it was common and relatively easy not only for ordinary converts but even for revival leaders to move from one branch of the revival to another. This happened less often in Wales, given the natural barriers noted earlier, but Neath, Cardiff, and Pembrokeshire nonetheless provide examples. Yet, given their differing soteriologies, these common factors existed alongside significant differences.

First Distinctive: Admission Requirements

Someone wishing to become a Methodist would encounter the first Welsh/Wesleyan society distinctive from the very beginning of the process. The two movements employed different admission standards. While Welsh Methodism demanded a conversion experience as a prerequisite to society membership, Wesley’s Methodism only required a “desire to flee from the wrath to come.” Their differing uses of “under the law” as a descriptor help illustrate their distinctive approaches to membership. To Wesley,

139. Noll, “Significance of Hymnody,” in Roberts, *Revival, Renewal, and the Holy Spirit*, 58.

140. Susan O’Brien, “Eighteenth-Century Publishing Networks in the First Years of Transatlantic Evangelicalism,” in Mark A. Noll, David B. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk, eds., *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700–1900* (Oxford University Press, 1994), 43.

141. Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 383.

“under the law” indicated someone not yet brought to justifying faith.¹⁴² The Welsh Methodists, however, employed the same description mainly to indicate someone not yet enjoying assurance.¹⁴³ Both groups welcomed people “under the law” into society membership, looking for spiritual seriousness. But they viewed this seriousness from differing soteriological perspectives. To the Welsh, it would imply the beginnings of God’s efficacious, gracious work, granting faith to the applicant’s heart. To Wesleyans, it would indicate the applicant’s responsiveness to prevenient grace and openness to faith.

Therefore, despite similar terminology, there were practical, and not merely theoretical, differences between the two movements on this point. For instance, a Welsh society report gives the following membership update: “[N]one added but there is three that seems to be under something of concern for theyr souls but we cant receive them as members yet till we see farther what our Lord is pleas’d to do for them and with them.”¹⁴⁴ Here, the applicants are said to be in Wesley’s required condition, but they are not accepted. The Welsh Methodists leaned on preaching to bring people to conversion, opening the society to those who already possessed some measure of faith in Christ. Wesley, meanwhile, expected the society itself, in addition to preaching, to be a means of justifying grace.

Second Distinctive: Structure

Perhaps the most obvious distinctive between Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist societies is Wesley’s “proliferation of small groups.”¹⁴⁵ Wesley developed layers of groups within his movement, culminating in the select society for the pursuit and continuance of Christian perfection. Thus Wesleyan Methodism incorporated a hierarchical structure that mirrored Wesley’s view of the way of salvation. Each step from repentance to perfection, including the step backward, had its own place. Welsh Methodism, on the other hand, had all levels of maturity together in an undifferentiated society, similar only to Wesley’s class meeting. Though the Welsh occasionally utilized bands, these were not divided by spiritual status but simply by

142. Wesley, “Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption,” in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley’s Sermons*, 137–40.

143. See, for example, CMA Trevecca College MS 2945:152–54.

144. CMA Trevecca College MS 3033. Jones, Schlenther, and White (*Elect Methodists*, 49) speak of the Welsh Methodists’ “rigorous” standards and “probing interrogation” into prospective members’ spiritual states.

145. Davies, “Introduction,” in Wesley, *Works*, 9:13.

sex and sometimes marital status. Even when the Welsh societies settled into bands, therefore, the bands did not constitute a further step of spiritual growth. The Calvinists had no opposition to confession and examination in a more private setting, yet their bands would be different than Wesley's by virtue of their differing soteriologies. The Welsh Methodists did not affirm the possibility of perfection in the present life, and therefore would not have designed a group intended to foster perfection or, as with the select society, maintain it. Nor would they have employed Wesley's idea of the penitent band, because they did not believe a convert could fall from true grace. Rather, they would confront the wayward and seek repentance, expelling from membership if no evidence of heart-change followed. In short, wherever Welsh Methodists found themselves in their spiritual pilgrimage, their general ongoing pursuit of holiness and repentance would be carried on in the same private society.

Rack's description of the contemporaneous Evangelical Anglican societies provides an illuminating parallel to the situation in Wales. Evangelical Anglicans, like the Welsh Methodists, tended toward a moderate Calvinism, and they were "extremely suspicious of perfectionist doctrine."¹⁴⁶ Therefore, Rack observes, it was "natural for [Evangelical Anglicans] to use undifferentiated religious societies." Wesley's view of perfection, it seems, energized his system of societies, and those who rejected perfection teaching saw no need to develop different societies for different levels of spiritual development. A simplified illustration will accent the distinct approaches. The Welsh Methodists envisioned a spiritual pilgrimage with ups and downs all along the way forward.¹⁴⁷ Converts with different levels of strength would walk together on the same pilgrim path. Wesley, on the other hand, presented his Methodists with a stairway of societies, leading toward a summit of perfection which itself continued to slope upward. On this Wesleyan journey, there were two ever-present realities. There was always a higher step to take, and the risk of falling backward. Wesley did not intend to provide a place to settle.

146. He further notes the Anglicans' concerns over schism and "lay power," and these concerns applied far less in Welsh Methodism. See Rack, "Religious Societies," 594–95.

147. This analogy is not arbitrary. Pilgrimage served as one of William Williams's favorite images for the Christian life. See Glyn Tegai Hughes, *Williams Pantycelyn* (University of Wales Press, 1983), 93–98.

Third Distinctive: Approaches to Spiritual Growth

A third aspect distinguished Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist societies, less concrete than the other two, but nonetheless fundamental. In short, they differed in their respective approaches to spiritual growth. The general atmosphere of spiritual life in the societies varied because the two movements employed different criteria for marking sanctification. Two parallel criticisms highlight the difference. In 1741, John Wesley complained to Charles that the Moravians “make inward religion swallow up outward in general.”¹⁴⁸ Two years later, Howell Harris recorded a very similar criticism from Griffith Jones, directed toward the Welsh Methodists: “[L]ooking too much to the inward work and too little regard to the outward word.”¹⁴⁹ What Wesley lamented in the Moravians, Jones feared in the Welsh Methodists. This indicates the differing focal points of the two movements. While Wesley emphasized outward religion, the Welsh Methodists prioritized inward religion.

This distinction shows clearly in their various rules for the societies. The Welsh leaders provided lengthy lists of questions to discern one’s spiritual state.¹⁵⁰ Wesley, on the other hand, gave a long list of required behaviors, summed up in his three famous categories: do no evil, do good, and use the ordinances.¹⁵¹ The Welsh Methodists pictured the mature as those becoming more compassionate, more aware of their sinfulness, more sensitive to sin, more amazed at God’s love, and more at peace in Christ. Wesley expected his Methodists to exhibit their maturity by avoiding evils like sabbath-breaking, quarreling, and dishonesty, while doing good to others in body and soul and using ordinances such as public worship, the Lord’s Supper, family prayer, and fasting. Thus, their respective societies emphasized inward and outward spirituality, respectively.

Though this was a significant difference, it remained a difference of degree and not fully of type. The Welsh Methodists did indeed care about their converts’ behavior, even though their primary attention remained elsewhere.¹⁵² For instance, they removed from membership those whose

148. Wesley, *Works*, 26:56–57.

149. Beynon, *Harris’s Visits to Pembrokeshire*, 89.

150. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:270–73; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 31–43.

151. Wesley, “Nature, Design, and General Rules,” in *Works*, 9:70–73; Wesley, “Directions Given to the Band Societies,” in *ibid.*, 79.

152. The ordinances provide an instructive example. Wesley emphasized the ordinances repeatedly and even set aside a weekly day of fasting. The Welsh too valued the

behavior proved unacceptable, and William Williams employed the Wesleyan-sounding word “striving” as a positive characteristic among society members.¹⁵³ Nevertheless, Williams specifically directed converts to speak of spiritual things rather than physical things, looking for the motivation and volition that lay behind behavior. For his part, Wesley too cared about motivations, yet he tended to direct attention to actual deeds as reflective of the heart’s condition. Even Wesley’s band rules, which give a list of questions for evaluation, focus on sins actually committed.¹⁵⁴ Hence, though both types of society examined both heart and life, their areas of emphasis differed: one prioritized inward religion, the other outward.

This inward/outward distinctive reflects the theological differences between the two movements. For instance, their disagreement on the role of works in justification proved relevant to the societies. Because the Welsh Calvinists believed in salvation only by imputed righteousness, they directed their followers to look to Christ to find assurance and security. But since Wesley taught a tentative salvation and considered human works, a condition of final justification, he trained his Methodists in the necessity of doing good works. Similar practical implications flowed from their opposing views on perfection and perseverance.

For example, the disagreement over Christian perfection manifested itself in how the two movements approached sin. Focusing inwardly, Welsh Methodists repeatedly warned about the heart’s deceitfulness and recommended confession and examination as means of ascertaining the heart’s condition. They praised Mary Evan, for instance, as “a plain experienced Christian knowing much of herself,” and growth in grace was evidenced in others who “see much of the deceitfulness of their own hearts” and “grieve at this sight of their own vileness.”¹⁵⁵ To the Welsh Methodists, a more sensitive conscience was a sign of spiritual growth.¹⁵⁶ Consequently, Wesley’s perfection teaching, hinging on a distinction between “sins properly

ordinances, esteeming the Lord’s Supper in particular, but they only recommended a monthly day of fasting and the ordinances in general receive far less attention in their writings. See Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 124; CMA Trevecca College MSS 3019, 3072; Wesley, “Nature, Design, and General Rules,” in *Works*, 9:73; Wesley, “Directions Given to the Band Societies,” in *Works*, 9:79.

153. CMA Trevecca College MS 3023:10. See also *ibid.*, MS 3062; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 47–48, 55.

154. Wesley, “Rules of the Band Societies,” in *Works*, 9:78.

155. CMA Trevecca College MSS 3002, 3016.

156. Jones and Morgan, *Calvinistic Methodist Fathers*, 1:273; Williams, *Experience Meeting*, 40.

so called” and “infirmities,” would strike them as a hindrance to spiritual maturity. Wesley, on the other hand, considered an achievable perfection as essential motivation for spiritual growth.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, they gave different directions to their members due to their alternate positions on perfection and sanctification.

Also, given their contrasting views on perseverance, the two movements approached God’s promises from varying perspectives. Wesley declared, “Perform the condition. And the promise is sure.” He even argued that many seemingly unconditional promises nonetheless carry an implied condition.¹⁵⁸ To Wesley, with his characteristic combination of faith and works, such conditionality motivated the necessary lifestyle of holiness. The Calvinists would have reversed Wesley’s remark: “The promise is sure, so perform the commandment.” As Harris put it, directly contradicting Wesley’s 1770 *Minutes* thirty years before they were written, Calvinists affirmed: “working from and not for life.”¹⁵⁹ To them, “faith in the promises... subdued Satan’s temptations.” Far from seeing unconditional promises as impediments to holiness, the Calvinists taught their followers to look to the promises for the power to obey.

These examples, some direct and others indirect, combine to indicate the differing focal points of Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist societies.¹⁶⁰ The Welsh leaders, through their teaching and social rules, guided their converts to distrust their own hearts and to look constantly to Christ’s faithfulness and righteousness. Wesley’s societies, on the other hand, provided discipline and accountability to help his Methodists put holiness of heart into living, striving practice. Comparatively with the Welsh Methodists, Wesley focused more on outward religion as the gauge of spiritual growth, while the Welsh Methodists gave greater attention to inward religion.

157. Wesley, *Works*, 27:369–70.

158. Wesley, “Serious Thoughts upon Perseverance,” in *Works*, 13:249.

159. Evans, *Daniel Rowland*, 129n.

160. Might the disagreement about strictness and “levity” between Harris on the one hand and Rowland and Williams on the other have been rooted in a similar difference of emphasis? A definitive answer may prove elusive, especially in the absence of Rowland’s papers, yet Harris was certainly the most Wesleyan of Welsh Methodism’s top leaders. It seems possible that what Harris condemned was, to the others, a practical application of the Calvinist idea of secure salvation and, therefore, another example of a soteriologically-informed approach to spiritual formation. See Harris, *Brief Account*, 57, 62; Hughes-Edwards, “Development and Organization,” 329; White, *Welsh Methodist Society*, 101.

Conclusion

This third distinctive had perhaps the most far-reaching consequences of any of the factors distinguishing Welsh and Wesleyan Methodist societies. Though the two movements had much in common, their differences were not negligible. The societies reflected their leaders' differing views on soteriological subjects such as the state of humanity before faith, the possibility of perfection, the certainty of perseverance, and the role of works in salvation.

Wesley opened membership to all the repentant, who "desire to flee from the wrath to come," and he structured his societies into a hierarchy for the pursuit of holiness, focusing on outward, practical markers of spiritual growth. Such a focus fit well with Wesley's union of faith and works in the way of salvation, and it seems to have strengthened as his ministry developed.¹⁶¹ The Welsh leaders also prodded their Methodists toward holy living, but they did so from the Reformed footing of "faith alone" and imputed righteousness. Prospective members were only accepted if they seemed to possess such faith, and members all met together in one private society. They focused on inward spirituality, the heart's faith being primary and the lifestyle of faithfulness secondary.

Their shared evangelical emphasis on experience did not diminish the importance that the various Methodists attached to doctrine. On the contrary, it seems to have made their doctrinal commitments deeply personal. Since both movements were convinced that doctrine should be "experimental," their shared emphasis on experience actually widened the practical differences between them. Therefore, though Welsh and Wesleyan Methodism each remained recognizably Methodist, their respective soteriologies shaped distinctive approaches to the common goal of spiritual formation.

161. For instance, compare Wesley's 1739 preface to *Hymns and Sacred Poems* with his 1787 sermon, "The More Excellent Way." See Wesley, "Hymns and Sacred Poems (1739)," in *Works*, 13:37; John Wesley, "The More Excellent Way," in Outler and Heitzenrater, *Wesley's Sermons*, 512–15.

Book Reviews

Christina N. Larsen. *The Glory of the Blessed Son: An Approach to the Christology of Jonathan Edwards*. T&T Clark, 2025.

This monograph by Jonathan Edwards scholar Christina Larsen is the latest in this excellent series from T&T Clark exploring Reformed theology both historically and constructively. Her analytic approach offers a thought-provoking insight into an untapped aspect of Edwards's Christology. While Edwards's dogmatics on occasion is known to have tested his traditional Calvinistic "boundaries," any perceived theological novelty in his thought is immediately acknowledged by the author and contextualized for the reader. Her theologically technical subject matter is well-informed and conveyed by careful parsing of the developmental progression in Edwards's thought.

Edwards was convinced not only of God's delight in communicating his inner blessedness to his creatures as the blessing of his Son, but that such communication of divine glory is inevitable, and expressed through the occasioning by the Son of the inner blessedness in the hypostatic union of the Trinity. This conviction gives rise to a perceivable tension with the traditional Reformed view, which maintains God's absolute freedom in his external works. Larsen suggests that Edwards's novel method represents his alternative approach to preserving the freedom of God *ad extra*, one that renders the communication of divine glory as good news for the church. The "fittingness" of this work of the Son is measured against two devices (or "registers"). The first is "covenantal" in nature in relating to the performance of Christ's mediatorial office. The second is termed "evocative" in referring to his apprehension of God's goodness. The latter is further illustrated by motifs of 'structure' anticipating the eternal wedding feast, of "diverse excellencies" concerning Christ's attributes, and of "beautification"

describing his bride. Guidance is provided in footnote references to what are familiar authorities within Edwardsean scholarship.

Chapter 1 examines Edwards's novel framework for God's glorification, as occasioned by the Son who communicates God's *ad intra* glory to his creatures. While otherwise adhering to the basic contours of Reformed thought, Edwards considers this outward flow of divine inner blessedness inevitable and is convinced of God's delight in bestowing this upon his creatures. Larsen argues that this does not imply any commensurate divine increase *ad intra*, but is forthright in acknowledging that Edwards's conclusion departs from the traditional Reformed view of God's freedom of indifference. Instead, Edwards considers this in terms of the outflow of God's *ad extra* works, which are grounded in the hypostatic relations of the Trinity and centered on the Son. His psychological analogy of the Trinity is referenced to illustrate this, in which the fullness of God is communicated by the Spirit as the mutual love existing between the Father and the Son. Larsen's measured reiteration of this novel approach to divine freedom throughout her work helps readers grasp the technical facets of Edwards's Christology.

The Son's fittingness in his work of preparation for God's glorification is examined by mapping these into Edwards's three propositional periods of *A History of the Work of Redemption*. Chapter 2 examines the first span of the Old Testament era from the fall to Christ's incarnation. The covenantal register is deployed when considering the fulfillment of the Son's obligations throughout this period. The evocative register affirms his occasioning of God's blessedness for his bride in constructing redemptive history, conveyed through Edwards's structural motif of divine chariot wheels to depict the providential progression of the work of redemption. Chapter 3 continues to examine the same Christological work during Edwards's second redemptive period, focusing on the Son's glorification throughout his earthly life and the performance of his mediatorial office. The covenant of works is fulfilled through Christ's satisfaction and merit, with the Son's obedience expressing the Father's eternal love. Both the "covenantal" register and "diverse excellencies" motif highlight Edwards's Christological view of divine freedom, wherein the Son enacts his blessed divine fellowship with the Father in the unity of the Spirit. This is deemed to be good news, as Christ ends his bride's alienation, making possible the glorious communication of divine goodness to her.

Edwards's final propositional dispensation in *A History of the Work of Redemption* comprises four historical subperiods. Chapter 4 considers the

fittingness of Christ's occasioning of the freedom of God's *ad extra* glorification during the first three of these eschatological segments, during which his bride enjoys gospel benefits, but in part only amid an evil world. The establishment of the Son's covenantal communion with her continues despite her lack of perfect fittingness, by both his enactment of the blessed fellowship flowing from the hypostatic fellowship of the Trinity, and also through their union in the Spirit under the covenant of grace. Edwards scholars will appreciate the author's demonstration of this consistency with Edwards's concept of beauty, as the bride, endowed with a new vision of Christ's moral excellence, consents to his perfect image of his fellowship with the Father and the Spirit. Chapter 5 brings Edwards's final subperiod, the culmination of the Son's work upon the day of judgment. The author details the events surrounding the Son's fitting of his bride for her final glorification and the consummation of their blessed union at the eternal wedding feast. This finalizes his work in expressing God's freedom, which Edwards considers to be evidenced by the blessing of his creatures through the outflowing of glory from the loving fellowship of the Trinity.

Larsen's monograph is highly recommended not only for students of Jonathan Edwards but also more generally for eliciting constructive theological insight from his Christology. She concludes her study by listing several ways in which his particular conviction regarding divine freedom might foster future discussion more widely within Reformed theology, as well as informing a greater articulation of God's blessedness and beauty. More importantly, this work reminds the wider church to confess and celebrate its glorification in Christ, as the recipient of God's perfect, triune blessedness.

—David Reid
PhD Candidate,
Union Theological College, Belfast

Cornelis Jan Meeuse. *De bestrijding van het cartesianisme door Jacobus Koelman*. Labarum Academic, 2024.

The current book has been defended as a doctoral dissertation at Theological University Apeldoorn (the Netherlands) by Cornelis Jan Meeuse in June 2024, at age seventy-eight. However, its origins go back to the time when the author was in his twenties and earned his primary

teaching degree. Thanks to one of his teachers, he became intrigued by the seventeenth-century Dutch Reformed minister Jacobus Koelman, known as the “Puritan of the Further Reformation” (13, 313), and his contest with the then “new philosophy” of René Descartes (or Cartesianism). Later, Meeuse studied theology and became a minister himself. During these times, he wrote some publications on Koelman’s biography and his future expectations (which is often, but not by Meeuse, called millenarianism). After he retired as a minister, he developed the subject that had raised his interest during his youth into a PhD project.

It was an excellent idea of Meeuse to devote his dissertation to the dispute with Cartesian philosophy by one of the representatives of the Dutch Further Reformation, as it has struck other scholars (e.g., Willem J. van Asselt and Paul H. A. M. Abels in *The Handbook of Dutch Church History* [2015], ed. Herman J. Selderhuis) that Cartesianism was especially impugned by representatives of the Dutch Further Reformation.

Moreover, this dissertation on a philosophical issue enriches our understanding of Koelman, who is well-known among Dutch (church) historians as the author and translator of writings on church reform and spiritual life, as well as for his Puritan-like rejection of celebrating holy days like Christmas and of the reading of liturgical forms for the sacraments. Meeuse, therefore, gets the credit for being the first scholar to give an overview of Koelman’s dispute with authors whom the latter considered Cartesian.

Although Meeuse’s dissertation is very informative about Koelman’s argument against Cartesianism, I have a couple of remarks. My first comment is that in Meeuse’s book, the contribution of the Dutch Further Reformation (and specifically of Koelman) to the dispute with Cartesianism remains unclear. On the one hand, Meeuse writes that the supporters and opponents of Cartesian philosophy “did not always coincide with certain religious associations” (315, cf. 103–4, 138), but on the other hand, he seems to suggest that “further Reformers” who criticized Cartesianism were the most fierce opponents (113, 139, 271) and that they especially complained that it dismissed the necessity of the operation of the Holy Spirit in enlightening human reason and renewing the will (139, 307, 315). Furthermore, the author does not really answer the question of why he selected among Dutch Reformed theologians or among the further reformers, Koelman, as a protagonist to investigate (13–15).

My second point of critique is that I wonder whether Meeuse doesn’t view Cartesian philosophy and its alleged adherents (of which he discusses Ludovicus Wolzogen, Balthasar Bekker, and Willem Deurhof) too much

through the eyes of Koelman and too little on their own terms. For example, he states that Cartesianism brought about “a true cultural revolution” during the seventeenth century (313, 315), even a “fundamental revolution in science” (13, 315), but to what extent does that apply to all those who took up Descartes’s ideas? This suggests that they copied his views, but it seems to be more likely that they were used in an eclectic manner, just as happened with Scholasticism, which, according to Meeuse, was not used slavishly (88, 306, 313).

Moreover, according to the title page, Koelman combatted “Cartesianism,” but the authors that Koelman disputed only were affected by Cartesian philosophy to a certain extent (e.g., Bekker only took over from Descartes the distinction between body and soul), or they were influenced by other kind of philosophies: Bekker by Thomas Hobbes, David Joris and Baruch de Spinoza (270), Deurhoff by Spinoza (304, 320). Next, Koelman considered the new Cartesian philosophy to be the poison from which all kinds of errors and heterodox ideas would spread (311, 322). This explains why he even called Spinoza a Cartesian (239–40, 311). To what extent was that justified?

In addition, there remains ambiguity in Meeuse’s evaluation of why Bekker was disputed by Koelman: was it Cartesian philosophy as being fundamental for his ideas (title page, 308, 309, 322) or Bekker’s critical Bible exegesis, his rejection of the appearance of angels and devils and the risk that these views would lead to atheism (270, 308)? If the latter is more correct, why did Meeuse choose as the title of his book: *The Contest of Cartesianism* by Jacobus Koelman?

Moreover, to what extent did Koelman do justice to the authors whom he combatted? Although I can understand Meeuse’s decision to omit this question, as it would require discussion of the interpretation of Koelman’s opponents (37), I find it unsatisfactory that Meeuse does not even ask any critical questions about Koelman’s criticism of “Cartesians.” I also find it problematic that he, in my view, dismisses it by stating that it is easier to pose this question than to answer it and that Koelman put the quotations from his opponents in the framework of his own views (310). A couple of questions related to my previous point remain unanswered: did Bekker really deny the existence of spirits and demons (308), or only the opinion that they could affect human bodies?

My third remark is that Meeuse’s book is more of an inventory of the arguments of Koelman against Cartesian philosophy (see, e.g., the many enumerations throughout the book) than an analysis of the reasons and

intentions of these arguments and of their implications for the philosophical and theological thoughts of Koelman and those whom he opposed. For example, Meeuse does not explain why Koelman was so critical on the Cartesian view that there are no second causes in everything that happens in the world, but that everything would come directly from God (225, 270, 309, 319, part 9). Furthermore, the question why Koelman did object against Bekker's view that God accommodated his speaking in Scripture towards ordinary people (269, 309), as the latter view was already advocated by Calvin? Next, the section on the relevance of Koelman's dispute with Cartesianism is very short (312) and, in my view, Koelman's objections against Cartesian philosophy need to be "translated" from the context of the seventeenth century to that of our age to be useful in our times.

To sum up, I am grateful for Meeuse's overview of the objections of one of the Dutch "further Reformers" against Cartesianism, but the objections of opponents of this philosophy, like Koelman, and their backgrounds and intentions need to be analyzed more critically and compared with the views of the alleged "Cartesians."

—Dr. Jan van de Kamp
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,
School of Religion and Theology,
Hersteld Hervormd Seminary

Cameron Schweitzer. *Towards a Clearer Understanding of Jonathan Edwards's Biblical Typology: A Case Study in the "Blank Bible."* JESociety Press, 2024.

In this monograph from JESociety Press, author Cameron Schweitzer addresses a lacuna in Edwardsean scholarship on the biblical typology of Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758). The New England minister, theologian, and philosopher is renowned for his distinctive use of the hermeneutic that interprets Old Testament types as foreshadowing New Testament antitypes of the person and work of Christ. By the early modern period, Reformed Orthodox exegetes employed typological interpretation of the Old Testament Scriptures where a literal one was unavailable. Perry Millar's previous assertion that New England colonial ministers during this period considered typological hermeneutics "imaginative and capricious" has since been refuted. Edwards considered not only the Bible but creation itself to be full of images and types portraying its divine creator and consequently, his use

of typology was more expansive than what was usual within his Reformed Orthodox tradition.

Schweitzer's introduction in chapter 1 notes that studies on Edwards's typology often focus on his allegorical imagery as recorded in *Images of Divine Things* (WJE, vol. 11 in the Yale edition).¹ With interest in Edwards's exegesis in recent years, this research now focuses on biblical types from the *Blank Bible* (WJE, vol. 24), named for its blank pages on which Edwards recorded scriptural observations over three decades. This is a primary source in relation to his exegetical thoughts and an ideal subject for investigation. Other works by Edwards such as *Notes on Scripture* (WJE, vol. 15) are cited throughout in both Schweitzer's text and comprehensive footnotes. His analysis is confined to 210 notations from *The Blank Bible* that use what he refers to as "type family" language. While this excludes other "figural-connecting" words that also convey typological meaning, the omission is mitigated by reference to both sets in tables included in appendices.

This thesis challenges two approaches to categorizing Edwards's typology. The first, advocated by Perry Miller and Mason Lowance distinguishes Edwards's "conservative" typology reflecting his Puritan heritage from his typology as found in *Images* that is considered "liberal." Schweitzer further distinguishes what he terms as "tighter" and "looser" conservative types relating to the New Testament and Christ respectively. The second view is that of scholars including Stephen Nichols and Janice Knight advocating a singular or "Christological" classification of Edwards's typology. These and other important authorities on Edwards's biblical exegesis are referenced throughout. While substantial footnotes include relevant scholarship debating Edwards's typology, a summary of the historical development of this hermeneutic that distinguishes its use by Reformed, Reformed Orthodox, and Puritan exegetes would have provided additional context for this discussion.

Chapter 2 examines Edwards's Christological types from *The Blank Bible* where the Old Testament Scriptures convey general typological connections, persons, and objects, Christological portraits, and those that speak of Christ's incarnation and divinity. Chapter 3 deals with soteriological types of the cross, revealed in antitypes involving general statements of Christ's death, substitutionary sacrifices, penal sacrifices, and the portrayal of *Christus Victor*. Chapter 4 adds further miscellaneous soteriological

1. Hereinafter, WJE.

types along with others connoting Christ's ascension and exaltation. The Old Testament types of Christ's person and work listed in these three chapters justify either or both a conservative or Christological classification.

When examining Edwards's ecclesiological typology in chapter 5, Schweitzer engages with Benjamin Wayman's article in *Jonathan Edwards Studies* (2012) entitled "Women as Types," which posits that these are consistently feminine in nature. Schweitzer demonstrates from the "*Blank Bible*" entries that Edwards's typology regarding the church is multifaceted, as well as being neither conservative nor Christological. Chapters 6 and 7 cite instances where both type and antitype arise in the Old Testament and New Testament respectively, some of which are deemed Christological. Similarly, chapter 8 deals with Edwards's Old Testament eschatological types, namely, those concerning Joseph's humiliation and exaltation and David's mighty men are types of Christ. While Edwards's nature types listed in chapter 9 are not conservative, they include the Christological example of Christ as "the sun of righteousness." Chapters 10 and 11 deal with Old Testament types relating to Christian spirituality and miscellaneous antitypes. The latter include those portraying the covenant of grace, the devil, sin, sacraments, and the Holy Spirit. None of the typological examples in these chapters are considered conservative or Christological. As his research unfolds, Schweitzer's case is reinforced by Edwards's biblical typology being viewed as unsuited to these categorizations.

This work benefits from a methodical structure and systematic format that remains consistent throughout and which guides the reader through what is a well-reasoned argument. By the concluding chapter, Schweitzer is seen to have made his case convincingly in asserting that the terms "conservative" and "Christological" are not invariably reflective of Edwards's typology in the "*Blank Bible*." His suggested alternative classification combines its historical, teleological, and eschatological characteristics is consistent with the findings of this study. A more definitive classification of Edwards's typology will require comparative finding from across his extensive theological and homiletical corpus. That aside, *Towards a Clearer Understanding of Jonathan Edwards's Biblical Typology* is to be welcomed as an accessible, informative, and well-argued contribution not only in its own right, but also as representative of ongoing progress in this area

—David Reid
PhD Candidate,
Union Theological College, Belfast

Slavinski, Sergej S. *Francis Cheynell: Polemic and Piety in The Divine Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (1650)*. Brill, 2024.

Over the last few years, Brill's *Studies in the History of Christian Traditions* series has become a home for numerous excellent monographs on important figures, movements, and themes within historical theology, including seventeenth-century Reformed orthodoxy. One such work is that by Sergej S. Slavinski on the Trinitarian piety of Francis Cheynell (1605–1665). Originating as a doctoral dissertation completed at the University of Edinburgh, the volume focuses specifically on Cheynell's *The Divine Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* (1650). The significance of this discourse stems not only from its length, but also *from* the fact that it was written at the request of the Oxford delegation at the Westminster Assembly. As such, the 480-page tome of *Divine Trinity* constitutes "an official defence of the Classical orthodox doctrine of the Trinity in the politically and religiously charged milieu of mid-seventeenth-century England" (1).

After setting the treatise in the context of Cheynell's career, the political turbulence of 1640s Oxford, and the polemics of early modern trinitarianism, Slavinski goes on to examine its content in six subsequent sections. Chapter 3 highlights the importance of divine simplicity and incomprehensibility in providing the work's metaphysical underpinning. Chapter 4 considers Cheynell's understanding of the role of Scripture and its relationship with tradition. The next two chapters examine Cheynell's metaphysics of "unity in Trinity" and "Trinity in unity," respectively. In particular, the author seeks to locate his understanding of concepts like "nature" and "person" within the contexts of medieval, late-scholastic, and Reformed Christian thought. Lastly, chapter 7 examines the ultimate focus of *Divine Trinity*, namely the inseparable relationship between Trinitarian theology and Christian piety. For Cheynell, "one must first make cognitive room for the Trinity as one true God before communing with God" (254).

Slavinski's monograph is a fine piece of scholarship that will be of interest to a variety of readers. Most obviously, the study will be essential reading for those with an interest in Cheynell himself. Despite his presence at the Westminster Assembly and his position as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford at the end of the 1640s and the beginning of the 1650s, little secondary scholarship exists on the seventeenth-century divine. He has occasionally received passing reference in works such as *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (2008) and Brill's *Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy* (2013). However, surveys of Trinitarian, Reformed, or early modern

theology often fail to mention him entirely. By providing an account of *Divine Trinitunity* in its social, historical, and intellectual context, Slavinski has made a convincing case for the significance of Cheynell's thought in these areas. This monograph represents a significant advancement in the scholarship on this underappreciated thinker.

Admittedly, there has been some recognition of Cheynell's role in early modern trinitarianism, and Slavinski's research develops this scholarship in numerous ways. It refines the findings of Chad Van Dixhoorn on the differences that existed amongst those at the Westminster Assembly on Trinitarian doctrines such as the eternal generation of the Son. It corrects Ryan McGraw's misreading of Cheynell in his work on the ways in which Reformed authors approached the topic of communion with God during the period. It also extends the nuanced and complex account given by Paul Lim in his extensive work on the "crisis" of the Trinity in early modern England. Although Lim identified the importance of *Divine Trinitunity* in mid-seventeenth-century Trinitarian controversy, he chose to focus on the work of Cheynell's colleague John Owen (1616–1683) in highlighting the close relationships between spirituality and scholastic theology in the polemical defense of orthodox trinitarianism. Slavinski's monograph extends this thesis to Cheynell's work itself.

Doctrinal debates in the early modern period were rarely, if ever, isolated to purely theological issues. Religion and politics were inextricably intertwined, and as a result, theological controversies often had societal implications and *vice versa*. Although this adds complexity to the task of historical theology, it does mean that when it is done well the findings of one study can shed light on a variety of other areas. This is the case with the present monograph. In addition to those who have an interest in early modern Reformed Trinitarian theology, the volume will also be of relevance to those working on other aspects of seventeenth-century life. For example, Giorgio Caravel has drawn attention to Cheynell's anti-Trinitarian polemics in the context of the ideas of Jacob Acontius (ca.1520–c.1566) whose writings on religious toleration were being translated and circulated within England during the 1640s. Similarly, scholars like Sarah Mortimer have located Cheynell and his *Divine Trinitunity* within their discussion of the perceived threat of Socinianism during the period. They have shown how ideas regarding nature, religion, and political non-resistance impacted upon more purely theological ones such as the Trinity. Moving in a different direction, Jean-Louis Quantin has cited Cheynell in discussions regarding the use of patristic sources in the religious controversies of the period.

By providing a closely contextualized study of *Divine Trinity*, Slavinski has been able to add to our understanding of areas such as these and their convergence in the thought of a figure like Cheynell. In particular, he has provided a detailed case study of how a prominent orthodox theologian utilized patristic and other sources to respond to the challenge of heterodoxy within the politically charged atmosphere of mid-seventeenth-century England's revolutionary years.

What may be of the greatest interest to readers of this journal is the contribution that this study makes to our understanding of Puritan piety. Whilst conscious of the difficulties inherent to terms like "Puritan" and "Puritanism", the author draws on the work of numerous scholars including Geoffrey Nuttall, Peter Lake, and John Coffey to highlight how Puritans "balanced polemic and piety in pulpit, print, and academia in their campaign for England's reformation" (15). By locating Cheynell's *Divine Trinity* within this movement, Slavinski expands our understanding of the complex relationship between dogma and praxis in Puritan spirituality during the 1640s and 1650s. By way of example, he notes how Cheynell engaged in a "charitable Trinitarian hatred" as he sought to indict unorthodox doctrine for the benefit of England's spiritual welfare (hence the illustration on the cover of the volume of Giovanni Ambrogio Figino's 1591 painting of St. Ambrose on horseback driving away Arian heretics). This reforming interest is astutely connected with the dramatic societal and ecclesiastical changes which were going on at the time, such as the collapse of state censorship, the abolition of episcopacy, and the introduction of the Westminster Assembly's *Directory for Public Worship* (1645). Seen in this context, Slavinski makes a convincing argument for the central role of both polemic and piety in *Divine Trinity*. This corrects the reading of scholars who have overlooked the defensive nature of the discourse but also finesses the interpretation of those who have seen it in purely polemical terms. Whilst the work was undoubtedly and self-consciously controversial, this controversy arose out of a concern for the spirituality of the nation.

In light of the recent anniversary of the Council of Nicaea, engagement with Cheynell's *Divine Trinity* may be especially apt for the church today. The last few decades have seen a number of helpful volumes on the importance of a classical doctrine of God for Christian theology. What has not been so common is a detailed treatment of how an orthodox Trinitarian theology relates to a vibrant Christian piety. Yet, this is what can be found in Cheynell's treatise. Whilst the seventeenth-century divine saw Trinitarian knowledge as an essential precondition of Trinitarian communion, he also

considered it to be a necessary consequence of it. In other words, an understanding of the infinite simplicity and incomprehensibility in Trinitarian multiplicity could not but produce a response in the life of the believer individually and within the church corporately, and across 146 pages Cheynell showed his audience what he believed would be the result. This consisted in a faith in, worship of, and obedience to God through Christ. By marrying a Reformed Christology with a Trinitarian divinity, Cheynell sought to “promote Reformed trinitarianism as the apex of faith and true communion with God” (227).

Slavinski’s monograph offers a model of one way to successfully engage in the study of historical theology. By taking a discourse such as Cheynell’s *Divine Trinunity* and closely reading it within the theological, historical, and social dynamics of its time, one is able to add depth to our understanding of important texts from the history of the church. Not only can this shed light on an important question regarding the religion of seventeenth-century England, but it also allows such works to speak to us with great power today. Altogether, this volume is a significant contribution to the scholarship on the religious controversies of the early modern period, and an essential one for those seeking to understand this often-overlooked pastor and theologian.

—James Morrison
PhD Candidate
Union Theological College, Belfast

David Van Brugge. *That Which They Can’t See: A Retrieval of Jonathan Edwards’ Homiletical Use of Imagination*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2025.

That Which They Can’t See is an insightful book, yet it is complex and deserves careful attention to assess its contribution to Edwardsean studies. Van Brugge divides this study into three main parts. Part 1 recalls the modern skepticism toward the imagination in homiletic textbooks. Part 2 focuses on the topic, particularly the rationale for studying Edwards’s use of the imagination. In Part 3, the book conveys “The Benefit of Strengthening a Homiletical Use of Imagination with Edwards,” along with an appendix listing all of Edwards’s relevant sermons from Stockbridge, Massachusetts.

In the introductory chapters, Van Brugge laments the disparaging treatment of imagination in modern preaching. He writes, “The primary

challenge is that the intersection of imagination and homiletic for expository preachers in the twenty-first century remains under-recognized" (24). He supports this by pointing to the relative lack of importance ascribed to imagination in modern homiletical textbooks. As a pastor of a Heritage Reformed Congregation in Ontario, Canada, he understands the intricacies of the preaching ministry and the general skepticism toward imagination. This book challenges that skepticism by outlining the problem, the method, the rationale for studying Edwards, and the goal. The goal is to recruit Jonathan Edwards as a resource for his use of imagination in twenty-first-century preaching. He suggests that we use Edwards as a test case for the use of imagination in his sermons preached in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. He also claims that we should consider him as representative of the Baroque Puritan for his imaginative preaching.

From the reviewer's perspective, part 3, encompassing chapters 3 through 6, stands out as the most significant part of this study. Edwards's use of imagination is especially compelling. Building upon previous work, he distinguishes himself by offering a truly original contribution. In chapter 3, Van Brugge examines Edwards's characterization of imagination as an active process initiated in the mind, where an individual can receive external things and elevate them into a spiritual realm. The mind is not merely passive, absorbing information; rather, it is an active faculty, with imagination constituting a core aspect of a person's heart and soul. Consequently, the will and affection are inherently interconnected, not separate faculties. Nevertheless, because the imagination holds power and influence, it also bears the potential for error, underscoring the crucial sense of responsibility that accompanies its use (90–92).

Van Brugge appeals that there is, in Edward's view of imagination, what he describes as mediating, liberating, and transforming aspect. He discusses the mediating role, arguing that it must be logical and capable of mediating (92). Edwards was convinced that imagination could be employed in evil, bearing in mind original sin, and even in the regenerate person, which could sometimes be immoral or spiritually deceptive. However, imagination can be used for spiritual good (95).

Then, Van Brugge addresses the imagination as liberating, as "unrestrained by... the sensible external and outward objects. In other words, it pictures immaterial things to the human eye, such as atoms, the characters of persons, and invisible things such as ideas and affections." This power of the mind is accessible to believers and unbelievers alike. Therefore, imagination must not be restricted because one day the mind will behold the glory

and the loveliness of Christ, which “will be ten thousand times greater than ever was impressed on the imagination of either saint or sinners” (96–97). The liberated imagination allows the mind to think about God, His activity, His care for creation, and the gospel of Christ. But it is of preeminent importance that the person remains humble (98).

Finally, the author speaks to the transformative aspect of imagination in Edwards’s use. In this way, Edwards meant that a person must have a regenerated heart to truly have a transformed imagination. While unbelievers can imagine truthfully, their imaginations are fleeting. The regenerated heart includes “all spiritual and gracious affections,” so that this person will “view nothing as it did before” (100). It must undergo regeneration by the Spirit to be transformative. In other words, “it is a transformed-heart, [and a] sanctified manner of operating” (101).

The author demonstrates quite ably that imagination was extremely important to Edwards. According to Van Brugge, in Edwards, “The imagination should not be neglected, because God knows ‘what affections may arise from imagination, and how far imagination may be mixed with spiritual illumination’” (107). He cites potential sources from his own time, including theological, biblical, and philosophical sources that may have influenced his theory of imagination. Van Brugge relies on previous Edwardeans, sometimes critiquing them at other times praising them, for example, the contributions of Conrad Cherry, Wilson Kinmach, Michael McClymond, Sang Hyun Lee, Joe Rigney, Harold Simonson, and many more, and Van Brugge makes a significant contribution to this scholarship.

In chapter 5, Van Brugge characterizes Edwards as a “baroque preacher.” He admitted that to consider him “Puritan baroque is not a common label” (141). To explain reasons why, he stands on the work of several scholars who have proposed the Baroque style in preaching. Generally, the term “baroque” is associated with music, art, architecture, poetry, and theater; it has been applied only recently to preachers and sermons. He attributes these characteristics to Puritan preachers and “Other Puritan-era Protestants have been identified as baroque. The English Poets John Donne (1572–1631) and John Milton (1608–1674) have both been referred to as baroque” (173). Given that the select Puritans were associated with the term “baroque,” Van Brugge attributes this to Jonathan Edwards.

He supports his argument by noting six characteristics of baroque imagination: imagery, light, space (interior and exterior), movement, affections, and glorification. He freely admits this could be seen as anachronistic (177):

It cannot be said that Edwards intentionally applied baroque characteristics to his preaching, because there is no record of his awareness of the term. Suggesting so would be impossible; it would be anachronism at its worst. The term baroque was only identified as applying to the stylistic characteristics a century later, long after the greatest demonstrators of baroque art were dead. However, like Rembrandt, Bach, and others, Edwards did use certain characteristics in his preaching that were later identified as baroque. It is helpful to recognize that, in order to retrieve from Edwards' homiletical use of imagination.

However, the attempt to characterize Edwards as a baroque figure is less convincing. In reality, this classification was not crucial to the core of the book, as it appears only in a few chapters. The author emphasized the importance of reconnecting with Edwards's imagination and how it could enrich preaching in the twenty-first century, without relying on the label "baroque." I would describe Edwards as a biblical, Reformed, revivalist, and expositional preacher, but I remain unconvinced that he should be labeled a baroque preacher.

Overall, this was a fascinating book full of thought-provoking, stimulating information on evoking the imagination, especially in preaching and sermons. Preaching could use a little more imagination, and that is the point of Van Bruggé's book.

—Allen M. Stanton, PhD
Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary

Van Wyk, John R. *To Understand Things as Well as Words: An Examination of Jonathan Edwards and His Pedagogical Methodology*. Pickwick, 2025.

John R. Van Wyk is a former doctoral student of noted Edwardsean scholar Douglas A. Sweeney, who brings both historical acumen and theological sensitivity to a topic that has received surprisingly little sustained attention in the vast corpus of Edwards scholarship. While there exists an almost unbroken stream of works on Edwards's metaphysics, ethics, theology, and many other topics, few have considered how he taught or conceived of teaching. Van Wyk's study attempts to fill that gap by illuminating Edwards "as an educational theorist and as an educator" (263).

Van Wyk acknowledges the difficulty of his task as: “evidence is frustratingly scant regarding the origins and development of his pedagogy” (152). Given the state of evidence, he necessarily builds his case through deduction, contextual reconstruction, and, at times, assumptions. The result is a richly detailed intellectual tour that situates Edwards’s pedagogical instincts within the broader philosophical and theological currents of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The first half of the volume is devoted to tracing Edwards’s intellectual influences, a section that is both illuminating and, at times, disproportionately long. Van Wyk examines with care the impact of Lockean epistemology, Newtonian physics and optics, and the moral philosophy of innate ideas on Edwards’s understanding of knowledge and instruction. These pages demonstrate his immense knowledge of Edwards’s intellectual world, though the connection to pedagogy sometimes feels indirect.

Despite these challenges, Van Wyk succeeds in demonstrating that Edwards’s pedagogical impulses were primarily grounded in Scripture. The Bible was not only the chief content of education but also its governing framework. Edwards’s early domestic environment, especially a well-educated mother and sisters, and being steeped in biblical literacy, prepared him to view the mind and heart as integrally united in the pursuit of divine truth. Van Wyk identifies four key secondary influences that reinforced this scriptural centrality: the theocentric idealism of Malebranche, the practical piety of Baxter (whose dialogic method Edwards admired), and the educational reformers Comenius and Francke, whose commitment to coeducation and the moral formation of students resonated deeply with Edwards’s own aims (153). Through these figures, Edwards’s pedagogy emerges as a blend of Reformed orthodoxy, Enlightenment empiricism, and pietist practicality.

When attention turns directly to Edwards as educator, Van Wyk draws from surviving records of the Stockbridge mission school and Edwards’s own family practices. From these sources, Edwards emerges as an educator who valued both intellectual rigor and spiritual vitality. Foundational to Edwards’s instruction were the Bible, psalter, and the Westminster Shorter Catechism—texts designed to cultivate literacy as a means of biblical comprehension, a central Puritan ideal. Yet Edwards was not a dry taskmaster. As Van Wyk observes, Edwards sought to remove the “dull, wearisome task” of rote memorization (210), favoring instead an engaging, dialogical mode of learning that invited active reflection rather than mechanical recitation. His pedagogical method thus combined the cognitive and the affective, aiming to transform both understanding and desire.

Two features of Edwards's approach distinguish him as a pedagogically progressive educator. First is the dialogic character of his teaching. Influenced by Baxter's conversational style and by the Puritan emphasis on catechetical discourse, Edwards viewed dialogue as a means of eliciting thoughtful participation and guiding students toward internal appropriation of truth. Second, and perhaps most striking, was Edwards's commitment to equally educating both boys and girls. In an eighteenth-century colonial context where formal education was often gendered, Edwards's practice stood out. While he certainly distinguished between levels of intellectual ability and between contexts—training frontier youth versus mentoring ministerial candidates—he remained consistent in his insistence that everyone deserved and benefited from equal opportunity to learn (211). Van Wyk persuasively situates this conviction within Edwards's theological anthropology: all humans, as image-bearers, were rational and moral beings capable of knowing and glorifying God.

The discussion of Edwards as mentor is among the book's most engaging sections. Following his notoriety as a revivalist, Edwards became a sought-after mentor for apprentices and theological students who frequently lived in his household. Van Wyk's portrayal of this domestic seminary—an antecedent to the "Log College" model later expanded by Edward's student Bellamy—reveals how Edwards's influence extended beyond the pulpit into the intellectual and moral formation of future leaders. Among his pupils, Joseph Bellamy (1719-1790) and Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803) stand out as particularly significant, shaping the theological, cultural, and institutional contours of early American evangelicalism. Through this lens, Edwards's educational legacy appears both immediate and enduring.

A noteworthy shortcoming of the book, at nearly 300 pages, often reads more like an extended course on Edwards's thought than a focused monograph on his pedagogy. Van Wyk devotes roughly forty pages to defining Puritanism—material that, while accurate, feels tangential to the stated aim. The core discussion of pedagogy does not arrive until Chapter 6, "Jonathan Edwards's Pedagogical Method," on page 196. Readers may wish that the author had condensed the contextual background to allow more sustained analysis of Edwards's educational theory and practice. Additionally, the inclusion of subject and author indexes would have enhanced the utility of references for researchers.

Nevertheless, the book's exhaustive scholarship is undeniable. Van Wyk's command of primary and secondary sources is impressive, and his synthesis of intellectual history with educational theory offers a genuinely

new vantage point for understanding Edwards. What emerges is a portrait of a man who viewed education as a holistic, transformative endeavor. True education, in Edwards's vision, informed the understanding, shaped the will, and directed the affections—all for the glory of God. Learning was thus inseparable from sanctification, and the classroom a site of spiritual as well as intellectual formation. In recovering this vision, Van Wyk provides not only a valuable historical study but also a model for contemporary Christian pedagogy (see contemporary application 275–77). Like many studies of Edwards, this book underscores his complexity: a mind of vast range, influenced by multiple traditions yet driven by a Godward view of all things. Though occasionally overextended, *To Understand Things as Well as Words* succeeds in drawing attention to a neglected dimension of Edwards's genius and invites further exploration of the Puritan divine as teacher.

—Chris S. Stevens, PhD
Reformed Theological Seminary
Jackson, Mississippi