

Studies in Puritanism and Piety

Volume 1, Number • October 2019

CONTENTS

From the Editors	1
Fresh Directions in Rutherford Studies — <i>Timothy L. Decker</i>	3
Bunyan on the Christian Mind: Good Company and the Formation of Intellectual Virtue in <i>The Pilgrim's Progress</i> — <i>Will Tarnasky</i>	28
Puritan Preaching and Pathos: Some Uses from “Puritan Rhetoric” — <i>Maarten J. Kater</i>	43
“Oft Have I Seen Thee Look with Mercy’s”: A Brief Biography of John Cotton — <i>Nathan Tarr</i>	57
Lay Leadership and the Foundations of American Congregationalism — <i>Francis J. Bremer</i>	76
Jonathan Edwards Reads John Owen — <i>Kenneth P. Minkema</i>	97
The Process of Sanctification: A Bourdieusian Approach to the Declension of Power in New England Puritan Clergy <i>W. Scott Jackson</i>	109

BOOK REVIEW

Chaoluan Kao, <i>Reformation of Prayerbooks: The Humanist Transformation of Early Modern Piety in Germany and England</i> (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018). Hardback. 232 pp. £76.77. — <i>Harrison Perkins</i>	128
Contributors	131

FROM THE EDITORS

This inaugural issue of *Studies in Puritanism and Piety* is the product of a vision to create a forum for research and reflection on the Puritans in the post-Reformation world, making Puritan scholarship accessible to readers and providing opportunities for scholars to present their research. In this volume, the focus is primarily upon New England Puritanism, Congregational thought, and the empowerment of laypeople, along with contributions that give a close-up view of Samuel Rutherford, Bunyan's thought, and Puritan preaching.

Matthew Vogan's article signals that the time of the neglect of Rutherford studies is long gone. After reviewing the literature on Rutherford studies, he offers an incisive discussion of the issues involved in situating Rutherford within Puritan studies. He then provides fresh research directions for Rutherford's historical context, theology, and political thought, followed by a thorough appendix cataloging Rutherford's unpublished (and some unresearched) works.

Will Tarnasky challenges the view that John Bunyan's works promote individualism in Christianity, offering an illuminating discussion of virtue ethics and the theme of companionship in *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Maarten J. Kater's insightful study demonstrates that the "Puritan style" of preaching is not devoid of rhetoric. After briefly reviewing basic rhetorical concepts from the history of rhetoric, Kater surveys the work of William Perkins, Richard Sibbes, and Richard Baxter to reveal a profound and balanced use of rhetoric. He concludes with practical guidelines for preaching with *pathos* today.

Nathan Tarr offers a fresh biography of John Cotton, following his early career in old England, his association with nonconformity, and his labors and trials as an early key figure in New England who coined "Congregationalism" and defended the New England Way. Francis J. Bremer

gives us an often-overlooked view of New England congregationalism from the other side of the pulpit, tracing the history of the empowerment of laypeople from its roots in England to the shores of New England, where churches were organized and run according to the "Plymouth Way."

Kenneth P. Minkema offers a rare consideration of how Jonathan Edwards had access to and read John Owen, highlighting several theological topics as avenues through which the two can be brought into conversation, and paving the way for fresh research directions on Edwards's reception of Owen. Finally, Using a Bourdieusian analysis of colonial New England's economics and civil government, W. Scott Jackson traces the decline of Puritan clergy in New England to argue that during the decades following the Great Migration, it was the power of the Puritan clergy, not the Puritan culture, that declined, thus spelling the end of the New England Way.

Fresh Directions in Rutherford Studies

MATTHEW VOGAN
Reformation Scotland Trust

Samuel Rutherford (1600–1661) is unquestionably one of the most vital figures in the intellectual life of early modern Scotland. His contribution to the Westminster Assembly and close engagement in debate with heterodox religious groups in England provide a powerful lens for these areas of Puritan studies. Scholarly engagement with Rutherford was, however, mostly limited to a handful of theses and articles on his political thought and spirituality until the turn of the twenty-first century.¹ No doubt this reflected the trends and interests of twentieth century studies.

The historian John Coffey, however, kindled a revival of interest in Rutherford's oeuvre in his seminal intellectual biography published in 1998, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford*. It established Rutherford in his historical context in a way that redressed the weakness of previous scholarship. This in turn prepared the way for a historical theological approach, most notably in Guy M. Richard's book, *The Supremacy of God in the Theology of Samuel Rutherford*.² A broader introduction to Rutherford's theological contribution (including ecclesiastical and political theology) followed, comprising essays from a number of scholars.³ *Reformed Orthodoxy in Scotland: Essays on Scottish Theology c.1560–c.1775* deepened the focus on Rutherford's scholastic approach

1. See John Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 273–75.

2. *The Supremacy of God in the Theology of Samuel Rutherford* (Milton Keynes: Pater-noster Press, 2008). See also San-deog Kim, "Time and Eternity: A Study in Samuel Rutherford's Theology with Reference to his Use of Scholastic Method" (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2002).

3. Matthew Vogan, ed., *Samuel Rutherford: An Introduction to His Theology* (Edinburgh: Scottish Reformation Society, 2012).

and established a fuller theological context.⁴ Rutherford studies are now burgeoning (especially in relation to historical theology). This was evident at a conference in May 2018 where nine different scholars from around the world delivered papers.⁵ With greater information available in relation to archival material and access to rare books, there is significant potential for producing an edition of Rutherford's collected works.⁶ This article seeks to take account of current research and indicate further directions for future engagement.

Rutherford and Puritanism: A Bad Fit?

Rutherford's inclusion within a journal dedicated to the study of Puritanism is a debatable point. Perhaps he would not quite have bristled at being called a Puritan, but he would certainly have borne it with some resignation as a term of reproach. Puritanism is a notoriously difficult term and category to define in terms of its beginning and end points and the spectrum of views included.

Until David G. Mullan introduced the idea in his book *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638*, this problem was not an issue in relation to studies of seventeenth-century Scotland.⁷ Part of Mullan's intention was to elide differences on church government and demonstrate a Calvinist piety that transcended them. The comparison is obvious: English Puritans could have different doctrinal views or positions on church government yet share a similar piety. In an essay discussing the unsolved problem of Scottish Puritanism John Coffey notes that Mullan never explains this label in order to defend it as a valid category.⁸

4. Aaron Clay Denlinger, ed., *Reformed Orthodoxy in Scotland: Essays on Scottish Theology (1560–1775)* (London: T&T Clark, 2015).

5. "Rutherford Redivivus: A Conference Engaging with Samuel Rutherford's Theology and Historical Context," St Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, Scotland, May 25, 2018. See conference report by Rene Heij in *Reformatorsch Dagblad* (5/26/2018) <https://www.rd.nl/kerk-religie/professor-coffey-onderzoek-naar-rutherford-krijgt-nieuwe-impuls-1.1489882> (accessed August 30, 2018).

6. Reformation Heritage Books has commenced an edition of Rutherford's collected works. A significant number of Rutherford's works have not been reprinted since the seventeenth century, and a number of these have never been translated out of Latin. An appendix indicates the large amount of unpublished material that can be ascribed to Rutherford's pen.

7. David G. Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

8. John Coffey, "The Problem of Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638" in Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben, eds., *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland 1550–1700*

There is some appeal in using the term to denote a shared religious culture between the two kingdoms. It functions as a convenient shorthand (with appropriate qualifications) in the context of both England and New England. "Puritan nation" also seems the most obvious term for Margo Todd to adopt in describing the moral and religious transformation of early modern Scotland.⁹

The difficulty with the term in a Scottish context, however, is that its use is anachronistic. The term Puritan was never especially used in Scotland before 1618, whereas it was used in England from 1564. Its use after 1618 in Scotland was to identify those who opposed the Episcopalian forms of worship being introduced through the Articles of Perth. Those who resisted the changes were defending the status quo rather than seeking to change it. The Puritans in England were conversely trying to change the status quo toward a greater match with the practice in Scotland. The name fell out of use after 1638 in Scotland when the bishops and their supporters fell from power. Its use in studying the Scottish context can be confusing. To speak, for instance, of "the puritan episcopacy of Scotland" seems to be something of an oxymoron even when qualified.¹⁰ It is only fair to say, however, that Margo Todd (the author who coined the phrase) has herself discussed "The Problem of Scotland's Puritans."¹¹ She distinguishes between the application of Puritan to church reform and fervent spirituality. It is not easy, however, to provide overwhelming evidence that would suggest this was a distinction that was understood at the time. The term "puritan" may sometimes be used to refer to a strictness and diligence in religious practice but it was also used to distinguish those who opposed innovations in worship. Those who held to the former yet not the latter were a diminishing minority as events continued to polarize positions in Scotland. The most frequent term used by Rutherford and others to distinguish themselves within the Scottish Church was "best affected" or "well-affected" (e.g. Rutherford's Letters 15 and 40). This cuts across both

(Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2006), 66–90, 67. See also Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions*, 18–25.

9. Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 402–12.

10. Margo Todd, "Bishops in the kirk: William Cowper of Galloway and the puritan episcopacy of Scotland" *Scottish Journal of Theology* (57:3, August 2004), 300–312.

11. Margo Todd, "The Problem of Scotland's Puritans" in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. by John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 174–88.

categories advanced by Margo Todd since it denotes the degree of inclination towards Presbyterian concerns as well as piety.

English Puritans came to embrace the nickname but Scottish Presbyterians resisted this. Samuel Rutherford only used the word in reference to it as a term of abuse applied by the enemies of the Presbyterians (see Letters 11, 59 and 262).¹² In one sermon he refers to those who are afraid of being nicknamed Puritans.¹³ George Gillespie objected to the fact that “they make godly and zealous Christians to be mocked and nicknamed Puritans, except they can swallow the camel of conformity.” He makes the point that this was also the term applied to a medieval heresy:

Our consciences bear us witness how, without all reason, we are branded with the name of those ancient heretics, from whose opinions and manners, O, how far are we! And as for ourselves, notwithstanding all this we shrink not to be reproached for the cause of Christ. We know the old Waldenses before us were also named by their adversaries, Cathars or Puritans; and that, without cause, has this name been given both to them and us. But we are most sorry that such as are walking humbly with their God seeking eagerly after the means of grace and salvation, and making good conscience of all their ways, should be made odious, and that piety, humility, repentance, zeal, conscience etc. should be mocked, and all by occasion of the ceremonies.¹⁴

It can therefore seem as though the Scottish context is being arbitrarily squeezed to fit the English categories for the sake of convenience when the term Puritan is employed. Setting aside the question of referring to Rutherford as a Puritan, we can easily affirm his central importance to Puritan studies. His letters are indeed one of the key texts in the shared religious culture between England and Scotland. Rutherford’s direct engagement with the development of English Puritanism during the civil war period provides a further useful perspective.¹⁵ He is also valuable for New England

12. *Letters of Samuel Rutherford*, ed. Andrew A. Bonar (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier, 1891) 21, 102, 485.

13. *Fourteen Communion Sermons by the Rev. Samuel Rutherford*, ed. Andrew A. Bonar (Glasgow: Charles Glass, 1877), 341.

14. George Gillespie, *A Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies* (Dallas: Naphtali Press, 2013), 94.

15. For Rutherford’s views on English Puritanism see Michael Brown, “A Half Reformation: English Puritanism according to Samuel Rutherford” in Matthew Vogan ed., *Samuel Rutherford: an introduction to his theology* (Edinburgh: Scottish Reformation Society, 2012), 321–36.

Puritan studies as one who both admired and debated John Cotton and Thomas Hooker.

Fresh Directions in Researching Rutherford's Historical Context

The emergence of the New British History at the close of the twentieth century helped replace the focus on England's Civil War with the British War of Three Kingdoms. This has invited greater appreciation in recent decades of the pivotal role of Scotland's Covenanting Revolution in bringing about these events.¹⁶ A number of historians have developed the way in which the Covenanting Revolution functioned as a political movement; the most prolific amongst them are John R. Young and Laura A. M. Stewart.¹⁷ The military dimension also has not been neglected.¹⁸ Important biographies of key figures that interacted with Rutherford such as the Marquis of Argyll and Robert Baillie offer fresh perspectives on current events.¹⁹ Various studies have focussed on how the Church functioned during this time in order to uncover a deeper understanding of social history. It would be useful to compare this research in relation to the practice of church discipline and worship with Rutherford's ecclesiastical writings. Chris R. Langley's

16. John R. Young, ed., *Celtic dimensions of the British Civil Wars: Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Research Centre In Scottish History University of Strathclyde* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1997); John Morrill, ed., *The Scottish national covenant in its British context 1638–51* (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 1990); David Stevenson, *Union, revolution and religion in 17th-century Scotland* (Variorum: Aldershot, 1997); Allan I. Macinnes, *The British Revolution, 1629–1660* (Basingstoke, 2005); David Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637–1649* (Palgrave: Basingstoke, 2004); Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in a European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Allan I. Macinnes and Jane H. Ohlmeyer eds. *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2002).

17. See Laura A. M. Stewart, *Rethinking the Scottish Revolution: Covenanted Scotland, 1637–1651* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) and John R. Young, *The Scottish Parliament 1639–61: A Political and Constitutional Analysis* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1996).

18. Raymond Campbell Paterson, *A Land Afflicted: Scotland and the Covenanter Wars, 1638–1690* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1998); Edward M. Furgol, *A Regimental History of the Covenanting Armies, 1639–51* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2001); Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch, *Alexander Leslie and the Scottish Generals of the Thirty Years' War, 1618–1648* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016).

19. Allan I. Macinnes, *The British Confederate: Archibald Campbell, Marquess of Argyll, c. 1607–1661* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2011) and Alexander D. Campbell, *The Life and Works of Robert Baillie (1602–1662): Politics, Religion and Record-Keeping in the British Civil Wars* (Woodbridge, England: The Boydell Press, 2017).

*Worship, Civil War and Community, 1638–1660*²⁰ and Scott Spurlock's *Cromwell and Scotland: Conquest and Religion, 1650–1660* open up significant perspectives on the context Rutherford experienced.²¹

Aspects of Rutherford's life remain to be investigated further. His childhood and youth are still rather shadowy in terms of our understanding of the context, events, and relationships.²² Much of Rutherford's network of contacts and supporters in Galloway could be pieced together and explored in terms of its political and social significance.²³ The recent publication of Rutherford's Latin poems from the 1630s, translated by Dr. Jamie Reid-Baxter, also gives an intriguing view of a Covenanting pastor employing pagan and mythological vocabulary to produce accomplished neo-classical verse.²⁴ Much might be gained from an increased understanding of Rutherford's use of the Latin language and classical authors.

Rutherford's period in London is marked by more obscurity than might be expected. Our understanding of the Westminster Assembly and its context has grown considerably in the past ten years with Chad van Dixhoorn's multi-volume set of *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly 1643–1652*. Rutherford's role at the Westminster Assembly and engagement with key debates are still waiting to be developed with

20. Chris R. Langley, *Worship, Civil War and Community, 1638–1660* (Abingdon, England: Routledge, 2016) and "A Sweet Love-Token betwixt Christ and His Church": Kirk, Communion and the Search for Further Reformation, 1646–1658," in J. McCallum, ed., *Scotland's Long Reformation: New Perspectives on Scottish Religion, c. 1500–1660* (Leiden: Brill, 2016). For explorations of church discipline and the role of women, see Harriet J. Cornell, "Gender, Sex and Social Control: East Lothian, 1610–1640" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2002) and Margaret M. Belof, "The situation of women in seventeenth century Fife: as illustrated by the records of the Church courts" (PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 1991).

21. Scott Spurlock, *Cromwell and Scotland: Conquest and Religion, 1650–1660* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2007).

22. The only contribution to build on Coffey's biography is Matthew Vogan, "Samuel Rutherford's Experience and Doctrine of Conversion," in *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal*, 5 (2015), 35–62. The following was completed before it could take account of Coffey. Kingsley Rendell, *Samuel Rutherford: A New Biography of the Man and His Ministry* (Fearn, Ross-shire, UK: Christian Focus, 2003).

23. Michael S. Griggs made a start with this analysis in "Yours in his sweet Lord Jesus': The Letters of Samuel Rutherford as Evidence of his Practical Politics" (MLitt Diss., University of Glasgow, 2013).

24. Such poetry was by no means an exception among Covenanting ministers. See Rutherford's poems at <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/rutherford/> (accessed August 30, 2018). Dr. Jamie Reid-Baxter gave a paper on "Rutherford's Latin Poetry" at the St. Andrews Conference.

greater context in the light of recent scholarship.²⁵ His engagement with the exploding London print culture might be a fruitful field for someone with an interest in understanding the reasons for selecting certain printers and booksellers. Rutherford expended significant time engaging in the Protester-Resolutioner dispute of the 1650s, but his contribution remains to be examined, along with his views of the Cromwellian regime.²⁶ He maintained a very close relationship with James Guthrie during this period and further understanding of Guthrie in his context might assist in better understanding Rutherford's views during this time.

Fresh Directions in Researching Rutherford's Theology

A fresh appreciation for Post-Reformation theology and the scholastic method means that the time is ripe for exploring Rutherford's theology in its international context.²⁷ The translation and publication of his Latin theological treatises will be key to this endeavor. Most important will be the translation of *Examen Arminianismi* which functions as a systematic theology textbook.²⁸ It would be helpful, for instance, to compare his theology with that of his friend Voetius or others like William Ames.²⁹ This would also open the way for further exploration of his debate with theologians of the Saumur school as well as Strang, Owen, and Baxter, or the Aberdeen Doctors. It would be useful to understand what elements of the medieval tradition form part of Rutherford's theology by focusing on continuity with individuals such as Aquinas, Bradwardine, and Bernard of Clairvaux.

Aza Goudriaan and Simon Burton have already engaged with more metaphysical aspects of Rutherford's theology.³⁰ Rob Sturdy's PhD

25. See, for instance, Hunter Powell, *The Crisis of British Protestantism: Church Power in the Puritan Revolution, 1638–44* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015).

26. See Spurlock (above) and Kyle David Holfelder, *Factionalism in the kirk during the Cromwellian invasion and occupation of Scotland 1650 to 1660* (PhD Diss., University of Edinburgh, 1999).

27. See volumes such as Mark Jones and Michael A. G. Haykin, eds., *Drawn Into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity And Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

28. The translation from Latin is being completed by Dr. David Noe (Calvin College) under contract to Reformation Heritage Books.

29. See Andreas Johannes Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), and Aza Goudriaan, *Reformed Orthodoxy and Philosophy, 1625–1750: Gisbertus Voetius, Petrus van Mastricht, and Anthonius Driessen* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

30. Aza Goudriaan, "Samuel Rutherford on the Divine Origin of Possibility and Impossibility" in Aaron Clay Denlinger, ed., *Reformed Orthodoxy in Scotland: Essays on*

research (Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven) is similarly on “Freedom from Fatalism in Samuel Rutherford’s Scholastic Disputation on Divine Providence.” Aspects of sanctification, antinomianism and the law are a key focus for Sam Poon (Highland Theological College, PhD) and Robert McCurley (Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, MTh). A number of recent publications have explored this area in relation to the Westminster Assembly.³¹ Martin Bakker (University of St. Andrews, PhD) is exploring Rutherford’s doctrine of assurance. Another study has compared his covenant theology with that of John Brown of Haddington.³² There remains significant potential for investigating Rutherford’s theology in areas of current interest, such as the obedience of Christ, lapsarian issues, providence, hypothetical universalism, and pneumatology.³³ The translation of the *Examen* would open up most of the theological loci for comparison with other Post-Reformation dogmatists.

Apart from preaching, Rutherford’s ecclesiology and practical theology have been comparatively neglected since William Campbell’s 1937 thesis.³⁴ Even Rutherford’s views on the sacraments have been virtually

Scottish Theology (1560–1775) (London: T&T Clark, 2015), 141–56. Simon Burton has also researched “Samuel Rutherford and the Metaphysics of Morality” (unpublished invited conference paper, Leverhulme workshop, Scottish Philosophers in Seventeenth-Century Scotland and France, St. Andrews, December 2013), “Necessity, Contingency and Freedom in Samuel Rutherford: Investigations of the Scottish Influence on Seventeenth-Century Scottish Reformed Scholasticism” (unpublished invited conference paper, Leverhulme workshop, Scottish Philosophers in Seventeenth-Century Scotland and France, Clermont-Ferrand, June 2012), and “The Philosophical Significance and Influence of Scottish Reformed Scholasticism” (unpublished invited conference paper, Function, Form and Funding: What are Universities for — and who should pay for them? St. Andrews, August 2012).

31. Whitney Gamble, *Christ and the Law: Antinomianism at the Westminster Assembly* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2018); Steven J Casselli, *Divine Rule Maintained: Anthony Burgess, Covenant Theology, and the Place of the Law in Reformed Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2016); and Youngchun Cho, *Anthony Tuckney (1599–1670): Theologian of the Westminster Assembly* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2017); David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in pre-Civil War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004).

32. Israel José Guerrero Leiva recently completed an MTh at Edinburgh Theological Seminary.

33. For lapsarian issues, see Guy M. Richard, “Samuel Rutherford’s Supralapsarianism Revealed: A Key to the Lapsarian Position of the Westminster Confession of Faith?” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59 (2006): 27–44 and Richard’s book *The Supremacy of God*.

34. One ecclesiological study is Sherman Isbell, “Introduction to Samuel Rutherford’s *The Due Right of Presbyteries*,” in Matthew Vogan, ed., *Samuel Rutherford: An Introduction to*

uninvestigated. Sang Hyuck Ahn has recently explored the controversy with Thomas Hooker at the doctoral level.³⁵ Mark Koller (PhD, Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary) is completing research on Rutherford's voluminous contributions to the field of church government. Rutherford set out to provide a full and direct refutation of the ideas of Thomas Erastus on church government. Recent studies could assist a fuller appreciation of this interaction.³⁶ I delivered a paper at the St. Andrews Conference on Rutherford's elaboration of the concept of scandal in relation to matters of church practice and government. Rutherford also wrote various manuscripts in the area of church government which remain both unpublished and unresearched (see appendix).

Rutherford's approach to pastoral work could easily be illuminated through his letters, sermons, and other evidence, perhaps in light of current interest in pastor-theologians. His approach to exegesis and hermeneutics might be inferred from a study across his treatises and sermons, in particular his abilities with Hebrew might be assessed in the light of the historical context.³⁷ There is no extensive, close study of the Scottish use of the Song of Solomon (centering on Rutherford) equivalent to the study by Elizabeth Clarke.³⁸ Those interested in this area could, however, build on the work that Guy Richard has opened up in the area.³⁹ Recent emphasis on emotions during the early modern period could be used as the background for considering Rutherford's piety.⁴⁰ Recent studies in relation to the letters

His Theology (Edinburgh: Scottish Reformation Society, 2012), 213–28. For preaching, see Matthew Vogan, "Samuel Rutherford and the Theology and Practice of Preaching," in *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal*, 1 (2011): 13–37. Further access to unpublished sermons should open further possibilities. Roy McDaniel has an unpublished paper titled "The Humanity of Christ in the Preaching of Samuel Rutherford."

35. Sang Hyuck Ahn, "Covenant in Conflict: The Controversy over the Church Covenant between Samuel Rutherford and Thomas Hooker" (PhD Diss., Calvin College, 2011).

36. See Colin Gunnoe, *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate. A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

37. See Stephen G. Burnett, *Christian Hebraism in the Reformation Era (1500–1660): Authors, Books, and the Transmission of Jewish Learning* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

38. Elizabeth Clarke, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

39. Guy M. Richard, "Clavis Cantici: A 'Key' to the Reformation in Early Modern Scotland?," in *Reformed Orthodoxy in Scotland: Essays on Scottish Theology 1560–1775*, ed. Aaron Clay Denlinger (London: T&T Clark, 2015), 157–173.

40. See Susan Broomhall, *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (Abingdon, England: Routledge, 2016).

provide a platform for a fuller exploration of the piety that they exude.⁴¹ Much could also be gained from a deeper understanding of the reception and popularity of Rutherford's letters during the early modern period.

Fresh Directions in Researching Rutherford's Political Thought

Rutherford's *Lex, Rex* has been a constant source of interest, but it takes significant appreciation of these matters and Aristotelian thought to draw out his full conclusions.⁴² At the St. Andrews Conference, Rob Sturdy indicated the way in which a failure to understand such philosophical categories of thought in relation to concepts such as necessity can lead to mistaken conclusions in relation to *Lex, Rex*. It can also yield intriguing possibilities, however, such as Nevada Levi de Lapp's study of Rutherford's use of the David and Goliath narrative.⁴³ Much could be done to locate Rutherford's political theology within his wider theological concerns, the chapter on the Civil Magistrate from the *Examen Arminianismi* would be a good place to start.⁴⁴ Other studies trace the lineage of Rutherford's theory of resistance back to the Reformation.⁴⁵

41. See Paul Tonks, "Scottish Presbyterian Piety: Samuel Rutherford and the Literature of Civil War-era Puritanism," *Memes* 17 (2007), 127–39; Alison Searle, "The Biblical and Imaginative Interiority of Samuel Rutherford," *The Dalhousie Review*, 85 (2005), 307–20; and Robert Arnold, "Was Samuel Rutherford a Mystic?" *Puritan Reformed Journal* 2, no. 1 (Jan 2010), 182–96.

See also John Coffey, "Letters by Samuel Rutherford (1600–1661)" in Kelly M. Kopic and Randall C. Gleason, eds., *The Devoted Life: an Invitation to the Puritan Classics* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 92–107; and Hans Meier, "Love, law and lucre: images in Rutherford's letters," in M. Arn and H. Wirtjes, eds., *Historical and Editorial Studies in Medieval and Early Modern English for John Gerritson* (Groningen: Walters-Noordhoff, 1985), 77–96.

42. The following gives something of a brief introduction to Rutherford's political theory: W. D. J. McKay, "Samuel Rutherford on Civil Government" in Matthew Vogan, ed., *Samuel Rutherford: an Introduction to His Theology* (Edinburgh: Scottish Reformation Society, 2012), 253–64.

43. Nevada Levi De Lapp, "Wielding Goliath's Sword: 16th and 17th Century Reformed Political Readings of the David Story" (PhD. Diss., Texas Christian University, 2012).

44. See Guy M. Richard, "Samuel Rutherford: Of the Civil Magistrate," translation with introduction of chapter 19 of *Examen Arminianismi* [Utrecht, 1668], *The Confessional Presbyterian* 4 (2008), 270–76.

45. David W. Hall, "Calvin's Ideas Emigrate to Scotland and Great Britain: *Lex Rex* ("Law is King");" in *The Genevan Reformation and the American Founding* (New York: Lexington, 2003), 229–84. Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "From Heinrich Bullinger to Samuel Rutherford: The Impact of Reformation Zurich on Seventeenth-Century Scottish Political Theory," in Emidio Campi and Peter Oplitz, eds., *Heinrich Bullinger: Life, Thought,*

Andries Raath and Shaun de Freitas have written a great deal on Rutherford's political theory during the past two decades.⁴⁶ One article relates to the more complicated area of Rutherford's views of toleration and religious freedom, which others have also addressed.⁴⁷ In an age of pluralism this is an area that requires careful understanding so that we do not transpose our views about politics onto the past or assume that the only alternative to unlimited toleration was outright persecution. *A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience* awaits a fuller close reading and analysis against the historical context.⁴⁸ With equal controversy, Rutherford has been drawn into the historic justification for the right to bear arms.⁴⁹ Resistance is of course a perennially popular theme in studies of *Lex, Rex*.⁵⁰ Calum Wright has also recently drawn a wider canvas against

Influence: Zurich, Aug. 25–29, 2004 International Congress Heinrich Bullinger (1504–1575) (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2007), 2:853–79.

46. Shaun De Freitas, "Samuel Rutherford on Law and Covenant: The Impact of Theologico-political Federalism on Constitutional Theory" (MLaw Thesis, University of the Free State [South Africa], 2003); Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "Samuel Rutherford's theologico-political federalism and early American Society," *Journal for Christian Scholarship* 48 (2012): 1–42; Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "A reply to John Coffey's analysis of Samuel Rutherford's theology and political theory," *Journal for Christian Scholarship* 51 (2015), 69–84; Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "Theologically United and Divided: The Political Covenantalism of Samuel Rutherford and John Milton," *Westminster Theological Journal*, November (2005); Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "Samuel Rutherford and the Neo-Thomists. Juristic Corporation Theory and Natural Law Arguments in *Lex, Rex*," *Journal for Christian Scholarship* 51, no. 2 (2015), 27–53; Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "Samuel Rutherford's contribution to Reformed Republicanism," *Journal for Christian scholarship* 51, no. 1 (2015), 93–115; Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "Reformation Britain, the Political Dimension of the Covenant, and the Contribution of the Scots," *Journal for Christian Scholarship* 40 (2004), 117–47; Shaun De Freitas, "Samuel Rutherford and the Soteriological Implications of the Office of Magistracy in the Covenanted Christian Community," *Journal for Christian Scholarship* 43 (2007), 31–50.

47. Andries Raath and Shaun De Freitas, "Samuel Rutherford and the protection of religious freedom in early seventeenth-century Scotland," *Westminster Theological Journal* 78 (2016), 231–48. See also Crawford Gribben, "Samuel Rutherford and liberty of conscience," *Westminster Theological Journal* 71 (2009), 355–73; and Paul Helm, "Rutherford and the Limits of Toleration," in *Tolerance and Truth: The Spirit of the Age or the Spirit of God?*, ed. Angus Morrison (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2007), 57–74.

48. Samuel Rutherford, *A Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience* (London, 1649; reprinted in 1651).

49. David B. Kopel, "The Scottish and English Religious Roots of the American Right to Arms: Buchanan, Rutherford, Locke, Sidney, and the Duty to Overthrow Tyranny," *Bridges* 12, nos. 3/4 (Fall/Winter, 2005), 291.

50. See David Field, "Put not your trust in princes: Samuel Rutherford, the four

which to understand Rutherford's political thought, while Peter Herz has explored the theological aspects of establishing the rule of law.⁵¹ Natural law theory and jurisprudence have enjoyed a greater degree of attention in recent years.⁵² There will be ways in which Rutherford's use of natural law can be developed beyond the focus of John L. Marshall's thesis, using wider studies published within the last two decades.⁵³

Conclusion

A fifty-six foot granite obelisk stands as a monument to Rutherford on the Boreland hill above the parish of Anwoth. Erected in 1842, its inscription focuses on Rutherford's "distinguished public labours in the cause of civil and religious liberty." Shattered into fragments by lightning in 1847, it was rebuilt within the years following. In recent years the top courses of the monument began to come loose and drone footage showed that the monument was in imminent danger of collapse. A fundraising initiative gained the support necessary to make the monument safe in 2017, with restoration work being completed in 2018. This restoration project is a useful metaphor for the state of Rutherford studies. For many years, Rutherford has

causes, and the limitation of resistance" in Stephen Clark (ed.) *Tales of Two Cities: Christianity and Politics* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 83–151 and Ryan McAnnally-Linz, "Resistance and Romans 13 in Samuel Rutherford's *Lex, Rex*" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 66 (2013), 140–58.

51. Calum Wright, "Conflicts of Conscience: English and Scottish Political Thought, 1637–1653" (PhD Diss., Birkbeck University, 2018); Peter J. Herz, "Covenant to Constitutionalism: Rule of Law as a Theological Ideal in Reformed Scotland" (PhD Diss., Southern Illinois University, 2001).

52. Stephen John Grabill, *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006). John Witte, *The Reformation of Rights. Law, Religion, and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

53. John L. Marshall, "Law and the Covenant: The Place of Natural Law in the Covenantal Framework of Samuel Rutherford's *Lex Rex*" (PhD Diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1995); Simon J. G. Burton, "Samuel Rutherford's Euthyphro Dilemma: A Reformed Perspective on the Scholastic Natural Law Tradition," in Aaron Clay Denlinger, ed., *Reformed Orthodoxy in Scotland: Essays on Scottish Theology (1560–1775)* (London: T&T Clark, 2015), 123–39; Peter Judson Richards, "The Law Written in Their Hearts?: Rutherford and Locke on Nature, Government and Resistance," *Journal of Law and Religion* 18, no. 1 (2002–2003):151–89; Raath and De Freitas, "Juristic corporation theory and natural law arguments in *Lex, Rex*"; Andreas Raath, "The Transformation of Reformed Natural Law Doctrine in Samuel Rutherford's *Lex, Rex*" *Koers* 80, no. 4 (2015). On the relationship between Rutherford and Locke see Robert Arnold, "Was Samuel Rutherford A Source For John Locke's Political Theories?" *Global Journal of Classical Theology* 7, no. 1 (February, 2009), 1–24.

been largely neglected by scholars. Much of the study available was from the nineteenth century and, while solid and painstaking in its way, it reflected the predilections of the time. Some aspects were passed over—almost in silence—while others were understood through Victorian notions of liberty and progress. Now, however, there is hope of both momentum and a critical mass of scholars working on Samuel Rutherford in order to assess his significance against a historical context which is engaging considerable academic interest.⁵⁴ This can only be abundantly fruitful for the study of Puritanism and post-Reformation historical theology.

54. Dr. John Coffey drew this comparison in his conference paper at St. Andrews (May, 2018).

Appendix: Rutherford's Unpublished Works

1. Latin notes of lectures given by Rutherford in 1654. National Library: 16475, small volume. There are brief notes on matters such as *de necessitate, de autoritate and de dignitas scripturae*. These are notes from lectures on Scripture similar to those recorded in 1648 (below) but much more concise. Guy Richard draws from both in a discussion of Rutherford's theology of Scripture in *The Supremacy of God*, 51.
2. "Dictates of praelectiones." Dictates of prelections on the Holy Scriptures, from the lectures of Samuel Rutherford (Latin), taken down by William Tullideph (1648, started November 20) St. Andrews University Library: BS 540 R8. 10 (188 pages). Includes an index of topics and questions discussed, and indices of texts discussed and points raised.
3. Treatise on the nature of obedience to a usurped power and on the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. Edinburgh University Library: La. Ill. 69 number 5 folio 9. http://archives.collections.ed.ac.uk/repositories/2/archival_objects/15789
4. Portions of a discourse on Ephesians 1:4 signed by Samuel Rutherford. 18 pp. Edinburgh University Library: La. Il. 394. This contains a defense of supralapsarianism (Guy Richard draws from this in *The Supremacy of God*, 161). <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1842/21088/La.II.1-654.pdf>
5. A passage with which a manuscript copy of "The Last Speeches and Departure of John Viscount Kenmuir" begins. 1 p. Edinburgh University Library: La. Ill. 263/3. It gives a one-page account of an unusual experience relating to the illness and death of the Viscount Kenmure. http://archives.collections.ed.ac.uk/repositories/2/archival_objects/15983
6. Latin Epitaph to Viscount Kenmure (3 poems). National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Quarto LXXXIV, fols. 245v–246.
7. Latin epitaph on Viscount Kenmure. National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Wod. Fol. XXIX vi. This is a holograph in Rutherford's own handwriting. It appears to have been among the papers of Thomas Wylie.
8. Manuscript on congregationalism and church government (c.1650). New College Library, Edinburgh: MSS Box 28.5 63pp, pp1–4 missing.

Although not attributed to Rutherford, this is certainly by him (as Scott Spurlock argues).⁵⁵

9. Three sorts of Bishop. A short piece against episcopacy. National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Wod. Qu. LXXXIV, fol. 172.

Possible Unpublished Manuscript Works

10. Treatise in favor of private meetings (c.1640). National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh: Oct XXVII f.120, together with Treatise against read prayers f.145–163. The latter seems almost certainly by Rutherford which tends to make it probable that the other is too. The arguments and language (many syllogisms and Latin quotations) point toward Rutherford. The date is likely to 1640 and it is unlikely that anyone else so similar to Rutherford in his language and thinking would have produced this at that time.
11. Two Letters “to a friend” in a style reminiscent of Samuel Rutherford in correspondence with Thomas Wylie. National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Octavos XXVI f.34.
12. A treatise in confutation of the hierarchical domination and episcopacy (c.1634). National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Wod. Qu. LXXXIV, fol. 248.

Unpublished Sermons⁵⁶

John Coffey’s biography *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* contains several useful bibliographies, including works published in Rutherford’s lifetime; posthumously published works; Protester documents drafted or signed by Rutherford, and unpublished manuscript works by Rutherford. This short note updates the bibliography of unpublished manuscript works in relation to Rutherford’s sermons. John Coffey refers to “unpublished contemporary notes on forty of his sermons surviving in Scottish libraries.”⁵⁷ The evidence presented here demonstrates, however, that this figure can be more than doubled.

55. R. Scott Spurlock, “Sectarian Religion in Scotland: The Impact of Cromwell’s Occupation (1650–1660).” (PhD Diss., University of Edinburgh, 2005), 216.

56. This part of the appendix is a revised version of my article “Samuel Rutherford’s Unpublished Sermons,” *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal* 8 (2018): 58–69. The original article included a transcript of a manuscript lecture on Judges 10.

57. These bibliographies are contained in pp. 259–273, and the bibliography of unpublished manuscript works of Rutherford is on p. 272.

Rutherford's Published Sermons

Rutherford himself prepared very few sermons for the press. The main collections were the two preached before the House of Commons and House of Lords (1644 and 1645)⁵⁸ and twenty-seven sermons in *The Tryal and Triumph of Faith* (1645).

All other published sermons have been taken from the notes of hearers. *Communion Sermons* (1876) and *Quaint Sermons* (1885) comprise fourteen and eighteen sermons, respectively, gathered together by A. A. Bonar and J. H. Thomson. This amounts to a total of thirty-four published sermons (not thirty-two, as Coffey asserts). Adding the twenty-seven sermons in *The Tryal and Triumph* brings the complete figure to sixty-one.

It is worth observing that *Christ Dying and Drawing Sinners to Himself* (1647) also largely comprises sermons on John 12:27–33. The difficulty, however, is that the volume is not separated into numbered sermons in the same way as *The Tryal and Triumph*. *Christ Dying* also has many more lengthy “necessary Digressions, for the times” (as the title page identifies). Rutherford identifies the various clauses of the verses in this pericope and moves from expounding one to the next. At times this may seem to indicate the boundaries of the original sermons, yet sometimes he spends only a few paragraphs opening up a clause. Since progressing clause by clause is his ordinary method within sermons, it is not possible to draw absolute conclusions from this aspect of *Christ Dying*.

The Power and Prevalency of Prayer (1713) evidently arose from sermons on Matthew 9:27–31, but as with *Christ Dying*, it does not identify distinct sermons. The introduction does, however, list eight distinct sections which may indicate a series of eight sermons noted down by a hearer. Despite the list in the introduction, the published version does not include the full eight sections but ends abruptly in the sixth part with the statement that “the rest of this discourse cannot be found.”

National Library of Scotland, Acc.9270 nos. 3 and 4

These manuscript volumes contain sermons by ministers belonging to the Presbytery of St. Andrews, such as Andrew Honeyman (minister of the Second Charge), Robert Blair (minister of the First Charge) and James Wood (minister of Dunino). They originate from the Library of the Kirk

58. These have been reprinted in *Sermons Preached before the English Houses of Parliament by the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1643–1645* (Dallas: Naphtali Press, 2011).

of Saltoun (East Lothian) and are contained in quarto oblong volumes. The notebooks are portable but not pocket size. The script does appear to be written in some haste and there are abbreviations and some crossings out.⁵⁹ This makes it less likely that they were written fair from notes made at the time of the service.

The volume Acc.9270 No.3 is labelled “MS Sermons 1658” and inscribed “volum 1” on the flyleaf with the sermons beginning from July 4, 1658. Acc.9270 No.4 is labelled “MS Sermons 1659” and the sermons begin from January 2, 1659. Coffey does not list this volume, but it contains notes of sermons by Rutherford.⁶⁰

As Coffey notes, none of the sermon notes from Acc.9270 No.3 have ever been published, and in some cases there are only two or three sides of notes on each sermon.⁶¹ Since he only refers to Acc.9270 No.3, Coffey counts only twenty-four sermons whereas, if Acc.9270 No.4 is consulted, there are many more. There is a total of fourteen sermons on Psalm 88, but disappointingly there are no sermons on the final two verses of the Psalm.

The discourses in the manuscript are usually identifiable as either a sermon or lecture. A lecture was a relatively detailed exposition of a chapter or part of a chapter by way of running commentary, rather than opening up a single verse or passage in the way of a sermon. It was a practice that appears to have begun in 1648 and lasted in the Scottish Church until the later nineteenth century. Often the minister began his sermon immediately following the prayer after the lecture, although it could also be delivered in the afternoon.⁶² The sermons usually follow lectures immediately, indicating that they would have been delivered on the same day.

It is especially interesting to have access to these as none of the volumes of published Rutherford sermons have included any lectures.⁶³ Wodrow

59. Portable inkwells and writing sets existed during the seventeenth century. See G. D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Scotland in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937), 195.

60. There is a further volume Acc.9270 No.5, which begins on September 2, 1659, and concludes September 27, 1660. It is inscribed “volum 4” on f.2, which seems to indicate that there may have been another volume that is now lost. The sermons contained in this volume are all by Andrew Honeyman.

61. Coffey, 272.

62. Wodrow *Analecta*, I, 274.

63. Strictly speaking the lectures are not sermons (nor are the communion exhortations), but we have included all pulpit expositions in the list under the general term of sermons for ease of reference.

reports that Rutherford “had an excellent gift for lecturing.”⁶⁴ The example he provides in the appendix shows Rutherford providing a running commentary on each verse and then concluding with some application. The lecture was often brief, so while these notes may not have captured the exposition verbatim, the substance is certainly recorded.

It is not clear whether there is a missing volume for the period until Rutherford was deprived of his charge in the church and university office in November 1660. The latest sermons that appear to be extant are presumably in the volume National Library of Scotland, Adv. 15.2.20, since these were preached in 1660.

1. Lecture on Mark 15 (No. 3 p. 5–7).
2. Sermon on Hebrew 3:6 (No. 3 pp. 7–9).
3. Sermon on Psalm 88:1–2 (No. 3 pp. 12–15).
4. Lecture on Mark 15:29ff. (No. 3 pp. 31–32).
5. Sermon on Isaiah 5:16–17 (No. 3 pp. 32–36).
6. Lecture on Mark 16 (No. 3 pp. 58–59).
7. Sermon on Hebrews 3:6–7 (No. 3 pp. 59–61).
8. Lecture on Luke 1:1–4 (No. 3 pp. 77–78).
9. Sermon on Hebrews 3:8–9 (No. 3 pp. 79–82).
10. Lecture on Luke 1:5 (No. 3 pp. 85–86).
11. Sermon on Psalm 88:1–3 (No. 3 pp. 87–90).
12. Sermon on Psalm 88:1–3 (No. 3 pp. 95–97).
13. Lecture on Luke 1:13 (No. 3 pp. 117–119).
14. Sermon on Psalm 81:1 (No. 3 pp. 119–122).
15. Lecture on Ezekiel 9 “September 12, 1658” (No. 3 pp. 128–29).
16. Sermon on Psalm 88:1–3 (No. 3 pp. 130–32).
17. Lecture on Ezekiel 9, apparently on the afternoon of a fast on September 19 (No. 3 pp. 151–53).
18. Sermon on Psalm 88:4 (No. 3 pp. 153–56).
19. Lecture on Judges 10 (No. 3 pp. 179–80).
20. Sermon on Psalm 88:6–7 October (No. 3 pp. 181–83).
21. Lecture on Luke 1:19ff. (No. 3 pp. 222–24).
22. Sermon on Psalm 88:7–9 (No. 3 pp. 224–29).
23. Lecture on Luke 1:28 (No. 3 pp. 238–40).
24. Sermon on Psalm 88:8–9 (No. 3 pp. 240–44).

64. *Analecta*, III, 89.

25. Sermon on Psalm 88:11–12 (No. 3 pp. 294–8).
26. Sermon on Psalm 88:11–12 (No. 3 pp. 318–23).
27. Lecture on Luke 1:36 'February 2, 1659' (No. 4 p. 1).
28. Lecture on Psalm 17 (No. 4 pp. 2–6).
29. Lecture on Psalm 17:15 (No. 4 pp. 19–24).
30. Sermon on Revelation 3:2 (No. 4 pp. 24–28).
31. Sermon on John 17:25 (No. 4 pp. 84–91).
32. Lecture on Luke 1:49ff. (No. 4 pp. 102–4).
33. Sermon on John 17:25 (No. 4 pp. 105–11).
34. Sermon on Psalm 88:13–14 (No. 4 pp. 162–68)
35. Lecture on Luke 1:68 not named (No. 4 pp. 204–6).
36. Sermon on Psalm 88:14–15 (No. 4 pp. 206–11).
37. Lecture on Luke 2:1ff (No. 4 pp. 261–63).
38. Sermon on Psalm 88:15 (No. 4 pp. 263–69)
39. Lecture on Luke 2:8 "S Reterfort [Latin]" (No. 4 pp. 327–29).
40. Sermon on Psalm 88:15–16 (No. 4 pp. 329–35).

National Library of Scotland, Wodrow Octavo XLVII

41. Communion Exhortation at f.42, evidently a table address, but at an unspecified location. The handwriting appears to be mid-seventeenth century, but the ink is faded which makes it challenging to read. This sermon is not listed by Coffey. It is in fact a fuller transcript of the only published communion exhortation by Rutherford, which was delivered in London, 1643 and is Sermon 12 in *Communion Sermons* (pp. 278–90). The beginning of the exhortation alludes either to Matthew 26:24 or Mark 14:21.

National Library of Scotland, Wodrow Manuscripts Quarto VIII

This manuscript appears to have been made in 1673, probably by John Veitch, minister of Westruther. There are twenty-six sermons in the volume, mostly by David Dickson but with others that seem to be by Andrew Cant and even John Welsh of Ayr, whose last Scottish sermon would have been preached before his imprisonment in July 1605. Sermons 16 and 17 are by Rutherford, on Song of Solomon Chapter 5. Wod. Qu. VIII No. 16 is on Song 5:2 (ff. 78), and appears to be Sermon IX from *Communion Sermons* (the wording is extremely close but not always identical). It

is dated April 5, 1637 (according to *Communion Sermons*).⁶⁵ The volume is not listed by Coffey.

42. Sermon on Song 5:6–9 (f.93v; Sermon No. 17). This unpublished sermon is dated 1647. If preached in Scotland it would have to have been in very late November or during December, as it was only then that Rutherford returned from the Westminster Assembly in London.

National Library of Scotland, MS.1759, Sermon Notebook of Sir Hugh Campbell of Cessnock

43. Sermon on Exodus 20:12, ff. 28v–32v: MS.1759.

National Library of Scotland, Adv. MS.5.10

44. Sermon on Isaiah 45:19, p. 62–64 or ff. 38v–39v.
 45. Sermon on Isaiah 48:20, p. 95–98 or ff. 55r–56v.
 46. Sermon on Isaiah 49:1, p. 101–4 or ff. 58r–59v.
 47. Sermon on Isaiah 49:1, p. 124–27 or ff. 69v–71r.
 48. Sermon on Luke 15:2, p. 144 f.79v.
 49. Sermon on Isaiah 49:3, p. 150–53 or 82v–84r.
 50. Sermon on Luke 15:14, p. 156–57 or 85v–86r
 51. Sermon on Luke 15:18, p. 172 or 93v.
 52. Sermon on Isaiah 49:6, p. 183–87 or 99r–101r.
 53. Sermon on Luke 15:21, p. 187–88 or ff. 101r–101v.
 54. Sermon on Luke 15:25, p. 204–5 or 109v–110r.
 55. Sermon on Isaiah 49:7, p. 230–34 or ff. 122v–124v.
 56. Sermon on Matthew 13:24, p. 237–239 or ff. 126r–127r.
 57. Sermon on Isaiah 49:8, p. 268–72 or 141v–134v.
 58. Sermon on Psalm 28:1, p. 274 or f1. 44v.
 59. Sermon on Isaiah 49:9, p. 282–286 or ff1. 148v–150v.
 60. Sermon on Isaiah 49:13, p. 302–5 or 158v–160v.
 61. Sermon on Isaiah 49:14, p. 322–26 or 168v–170v.
 62. Sermon on Mark 6:48/Matthew 14:28, pp. 326–332 or 170v–73v.
 63. Sermon on Isaiah 49:15, p. 337–41 or 176r–178r.

⁶⁵ *Communion Sermons*, 200. This date is not possible as Rutherford was still in Aberdeen at this time.

64. Sermon on Isaiah 49:17, p. 395–97 or 205r–206v.
65. Sermon on Isaiah 49:18, p. 407–11 or 211r–213v.
66. Sermon on Isaiah 49:21, p. 428–32 or 221v–223v.
67. Sermon on John 14:18, p. 437–40 or 226r–227v.
68. Sermon on Isaiah 49:22, p. 454–57 or 234v–236r.
69. Sermon on Isaiah 49:23, p. 471–74 or 243r–244v.
70. Sermon on Luke 7:2, ff. 86v–88r, Adv.MS.5.2.10 NLS.

National Library of Scotland, Adv. 15.2.20 'LXIX Sermons by XVII Presbyterians in 1660'

71. Lecture on Luke 7:1, ff. 63r–64v.
72. Isaiah 1:16 ff. 64v–67v.
73. Lecture on Luke 7:11, ff. 86v–88r.
74. Sermon on Isaiah 1:17, ff. 88r–90v.

Edinburgh University Library, Dc. 5.30—31

Notes on nine sermons of Rutherford in two volumes of notes on Covenanter sermons. These volumes also include sermons by Blair, Honeyman, Wood, Douglas, and Cant. Some of the Blair and Honeyman sermons appear to be similar to National Library of Scotland, Acc. 9270 Nos. 3 and 4. As Coffey notes, the manuscript is quite easy to read.

75. First Sermon on Genesis 28:10–15 (vol 30, ff. 17–24).
76. Second Sermon on Genesis 28:10–15 (vol 30, ff. 25–31).
77. Third Sermon on Genesis 28:10–15 (vol 30, ff. 31–38).
78. First Sermon on Hebrews 4:15–16 (vol 30, ff. 45v–52r).
79. Second Sermon on Hebrews 4:15–16 (vol. 30, ff. 52v–58v).
80. Sermon on Revelation 3:20 "Saturday befor the Communion" (vol. 30, ff. 61v–69r).
81. Sermon on Isaiah 1:18 (August 10, 1656, vol. 31, ff. 54v–57r).
82. Sermon on Isaiah 5:3–4 (September 14, 1656, vol. 31, ff. 70r–71).
83. Sermon on Isaiah 1:12 (September 25, 1659, vol. 31, ff. 135r–138r).

New College Library, Edinburgh, B. b. b. 12

84. Sermon on Galatians 2:20 (9 pages). The handwriting of this copy appears to date from the later seventeenth century or early eighteenth century.

University of St. Andrews Library, MS 30386

This volume comprises notes of Rutherford sermons preached between c. 1630 and 1647, 332 pp. Coffey states that only six of these twenty-five sermons have never been published, i.e. the three on Revelation 3, two on Song of Solomon 5, and one on Hebrews 13, but he has overlooked one of the two sermons on Revelation 19.⁶⁶

The index to the manuscript volume identifies three sermons on Song of Solomon 2:8–13, said to be from the Communion at Anwoth 1630. The first two (beginning at ff. 89r) are the same as the single sermon published as *Communion Sermons XIV* (pp. 338–62).⁶⁷ The second sermon on this text is not very clearly marked in the manuscript but begins ff. 100r (where there is a number 2 in the margin) and runs to f.111r. The third sermon on Song of Solomon 2:14–17 (rather than 2:8–13) is unpublished.

85. Sermon on Revelation 19:7–17 “A preparation sermon at Kirkcudbright” (ff. 22–31v).
86. Sermon on Song of Solomon 2:14–17 (ff. 111r–123v).
87. Sermon on Revelation 3:11–13, “A sermon for thanksgiving at Kirkcudbright” (ff. 136r–136v).
88. Exhortation on Hebrews 13:12–13, “Mr Rutherford exhortation at ye sacrament Kirkcudbright July 1634” (f. 137r–137v).
89. Sermon on Song of Solomon 5:1–5.
90. Sermon on Revelation 3:20–22, “A Sermon preached for preparation to the communion preached by Mr Samuel Rutherford at Elie May 1, 1641.” (ff. 210r–221v). Elie is in the East Neuk of Fife, about 12 miles from St. Andrews.
91. First Sermon on Revelation 3:12, “Two Sermons preached by Master Samuel Rutherford at Saint Andrews June 24, 1638

66. *Communion Sermons I* on Revelation 19:11–14 is found in this manuscript at f.31v–33r and is dated June 12, 1634, “Upon the sabbath afternoone for Thanksgiving.” *Communion Sermons* only notes that it was preached on a day of thanksgiving at Kirkcudbright but it has the full sermon, evidently from another manuscript source (*Communion Sermons*, 7).

67. This manuscript therefore attests the authenticity of *Communion Sermons XIV*.

Rev 3 v 12 at the midst of the verse and v 13" (ff. 222r–226r). Rutherford arrived in St. Andrews as professor in October, 1639, so this preceded his time there (see date of no. 62). Rutherford had left Aberdeen in March, 1638 and on June 3, 1638 preached in the college kirk in Edinburgh and later at the swearing of the covenant in Edinburgh (Baillie, vol. 1, p. 88). It is possible that Rutherford was preaching in other locations in connection with covenant swearing. The session minutes for St. Andrews show that Rutherford also preached there on June 10 1638 together with James Bonar.⁶⁸

92. Second Sermon on Revelation 3:12–13 (ff. 226r–229v).

93. Sermon on Song of Solomon 5:9–10 (ff. 229v–238r).

94. Sermon on Song of Solomon 5:2–3, "A Sermoun preached at Kylrynnie the 26 of June 1638 by Mr Samuel Rutherford" (ff. 238r–248r). This is James Melville's former charge, just to the west of Anstruther and about 9 miles from St. Andrews. This sermon was preached two days after the above sermon preached in St. Andrews, June 24, 1638.

Incompletely Recorded or Inaccessible Sermons

There are some notes of a Rutherford sermon in shorthand as recorded by Alexander Brodie of Brodie in 1642 or 1643. It is listed in the published diary as being in a (possibly undecipherable) shorthand, some efforts have been made to search through the Brodie Castle records, and it is hopeful that the manuscript may yet be located.⁶⁹

There are also brief references to a sermon preached by Rutherford in his home district of Ancrum in *The Covenanters of Teviotdale and Neighbouring Districts*. The sermon was preached at a communion at Wilton Church on June 22, 1656. He preached from Psalm 119:38. He insisted on separation unto God: "The Lord is not content with outward profession. He searcheth the secrets of the hearts. Our Lord's way with a sinner is, first, He lets him taste of the sour before He brings him into the sweet, to try their faith in Him; but Satan does not so. His best is first." The notes were made

68. Quoted W. I. Hoy, *The Early Covenanting Movement as reflected in the life, work and thought of James Guthrie of Stirling* (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1952), 21–22.

69. *The diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie, MDCLII–MDCLXXX. and of his son, James Brodie of Brodie, MDCLXXX–MDCLXXXV. consisting of extracts from the existing manuscripts, and a republication of the volume printed at Edinburgh in the year 1740* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1863), xix–xxi.

by Robert Bennet, laird of Chesters and Raffle.⁷⁰ Andrew Bonar mentions that the first sermon Rutherford preached at Anwoth was on John 9:39, but there is no source for this nor trace of a manuscript.⁷¹

Conclusion

This brief note has identified ninety-four unpublished sermons by Samuel Rutherford, as opposed to the forty estimated by John Coffey in his book, meaning that the unpublished sermons now greatly exceed the total number of those that were published.⁷² The latter tend to be those recorded at communion occasions and are therefore not typical of his ordinary ministry.

Even the brief bibliographical information provided above gives useful insight into the regular preaching ministry exercised by Rutherford in St. Andrews, particularly his lectures.⁷³ The list of sermons shows the range of biblical books that he addressed. The unpublished lectures include expositions of chapters from Ezekiel and Judges as well as sermons on Genesis, parts of Scripture not covered in the published sermons. While there are lectures and sermons covering individual chapters (e.g. Mark 15–16; Revelation 3; Song 5) there is no complete set of expositions on a particular book.⁷⁴ The list also makes clear the length of time he might preach on his “ordinary,” i.e. a given chapter or indeed book. The fourteen sermons on Psalm 88 cannot be precisely dated but must represent a period of around five to six months.

70. *The Covenanters of Teviotdale and Neighbouring Districts*, Duncan Stewart, ed. John Smith (Galashiels: A. Walker & Son, 1908), 34–35.

71. *Letters*, xxv.

72. It may be that there are further manuscript sermons extant that are not well catalogued. This article also focuses on unpublished sermons. It should be noted, however, that there is a small amount of unpublished material (either by Rutherford or attributable to him) that Coffey has also overlooked. These include certain poems and treatises.

73. It is interesting that Rutherford’s sermons are interspersed with those by Resolutioner ministers. This may indicate that some people in the pew were not prepared to avoid hearing ministers depending on their position within this controversy which is confirmed by diaries from the time including Archibald Johnston. Rutherford was, however, about the only Protester minister in the Presbytery of St. Andrews.

74. Rutherford’s commentaries on Isaiah and Hosea do not appear to have survived in manuscript (see Letter CX to David Dickson in 1637 and A. A. Bonar ed. *Letters of Samuel Rutherford* (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier, 1891), xl.

Biographical information may also be gleaned from the basic facts recorded above. These hints include Rutherford's movements during 1638, the number of occasions when he assisted at the Kirkcudbright communion services and the ministry that he exercised during his closing years.

The task remains of transcribing the material catalogued here. This, in turn, would invite the deeper work of assessing what these sermons tell us about Rutherford's expository method, preaching style, theology, and practical teaching.⁷⁵

75. See Matthew Vogan, "Samuel Rutherford and the Theology and Practice of Preaching" *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal* 1 (2011):13–37.

Bunyan on the Christian Mind: Good Company and the Formation of Intellectual Virtue in *The Pilgrim's Progress*

WILL TARNASKY

John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* is a book that needs little introduction. It was an instant success when it was first published in 1678 and is still regarded today as a classic in Christian literature. As one of the most widely read works in the history of English literature, *The Pilgrim's Progress* has been the object of serious literary, historical, theological, and even psychological analysis. While scholars have noted Bunyan's influence in several areas, he is often chiefly identified as a key figure in the development of early-modern individualism—particularly as offering an individualistic vision of the Christian life.¹ This historical reading of Bunyan has been challenged recently by Galen K. Johnson. Johnson does not deny that Bunyan participated in the trend toward individualism, but he does seriously qualify this interpretation. Johnson provides a thorough survey of Bunyan's writings to demonstrate how Bunyan was, in fact, “on the alert against subjectivist trends in his century.”² Johnson dedicates a chapter of this study to *The Pilgrim's Progress*, in which he discusses the importance of Christian's (and Christiana's) desire for company. Johnson notes that the role of communal relationships in *The Pilgrim's Progress* is severely undertreated, even by the best Bunyan scholars.³ This chapter highlights Christian's desire for company in Part I, but focuses primarily on Christiana in Part II. In this paper, I hope to further build on Johnson's observations by exploring

1. In his monumental study, *The New England Mind*, Perry Miller notes, “the figure of the pious and trembling individual closeted alone with his Bible, of the solitary walker with God, is often taken to be the true symbol of the Puritan Spirit.” Miller mentions Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* in relation to this claim, as it “records the inward quest with no reference to the external and social scheme.” Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Eastford, Conn.: Martino Fine Books, 2014), 297.

2. Galen K. Johnson, *Prisoner of Conscience* (Carlisle, Pa.: Paternoster, 2006), 5.

3. Johnson, *Prisoner of Conscience*, 141–43.

the role of good company in the formation of the Christian mind. I argue that for Bunyan, good company is essential in the acquisition of intellectual virtue—particularly the virtue of prudence. I will begin by briefly demonstrating why Bunyan is a figure whom we can engage in the broader conversation of virtue ethics. I will then discuss the nature of prudence as it is historically understood in the virtue ethics tradition. Finally, I will conduct a close reading of Part I of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, paying close attention to Christian's friendship with Faithful and Hopeful, to establish the central role of company in the acquisition of intellectual virtue.⁴

Virtue Ethics and John Bunyan

Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* is often compared with other Christian pilgrim narratives such as Langland's *Piers Plowman* and Spencer's *The Faerie Queen*. Given the centrality of virtue, both moral and intellectual, in these other two allegories, it is surprising that the language of virtue is almost totally absent from Bunyan scholarship.⁵ Isabel Rivers notes that Bunyan, like some of his nonconformist contemporaries, disapproved of the vocabulary of moral virtue.⁶ This is mostly due to the fact that the language of virtue was associated with the Latitudinarians, whom Bunyan and his allies opposed.⁷ It is worth noting that virtue ethics does, in fact, have a promi-

4. The purpose of this paper is to examine the role of company in the formation of the Christian mind. We will therefore not only be focusing on Christian's formation in the company of Faithful and Hopeful, but also Faithful and Hopeful's formation in the company of Christian. Christian's companions, as we shall see, are just as benefited from his company as he is of theirs. There is a certain tendency when reading *Pilgrim's Progress* to solely identify with Christian. Faithful and Hopeful are, however, also *Christians* on pilgrimage, whom we are supposed to learn from. Faithful, for example, is meant to show us that some pilgrims will be killed for their faith—a reality that all Christians must accept.

5. Barry E. Horner provides a helpful overview of Bunyan scholarship in his book, *Pilgrim's Progress: Themes and Issues*. He surveys the work of eight major Bunyan scholars. There is no reference to virtue in this overview. In his discussion of modern assessments of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, the language of virtue is likewise absent. Horner summarizes twentieth-century Bunyan scholarship in the areas of literary criticism, historical investigation, psychological analysis, political and social theory, and theological appreciation. Bunyan's moral theology and his understanding of Christian intellectual life is not addressed. Barry Horner, *John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress: Themes and Issues* (Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, 2003), 380–414.

6. Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: Volume 1, Whichcote to Wesley: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England 1660–1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 141.

7. "The Latitudinarian view of morality... may be summarized as follows: men are by nature sociable and disposed to act well; sin is an unnatural deviation from this disposition;

ment place in Reformed moral theology, from the time of the Reformation to the present.⁸ Despite Bunyan's hesitancy to use the language of virtue, there is evidence in his work that gives us reason to treat him within the virtue ethics tradition. While he viewed classical philosophy as heathenistic and suppressing to the gospel, Bunyan's work suggests that he was, perhaps, more absorbed in this tradition than he might have realized.⁹ Rivers hints at this in her observations. She notes that Richard Baxter employs a principle reminiscent of Aristotle's golden mean when he warns his readers to beware of extremes. She sees Bunyan's image of the narrow path that lies between the ditch and the mire as another instance of this Aristotelian doctrine. Interestingly, Rivers does not mention Christian's first two "companions": Pliable and Obstinate. These vices, which are the vicious extremes of the intellectual virtue, firmness, have a secure place in the virtue ethics tradition, tracing back to Aristotle's *Ethics*.¹⁰

Christian's visit to the Palace Beautiful, an allegorical representation of the church, further suggests that Bunyan is operating from within the wider tradition of Christian virtue ethics. In Palace Beautiful, Christian meets three damsels: Piety, Charity, and Prudence. Bunyan was not careless in choosing these three figures. Charity and Prudence, above the other virtues, both have a special place in the virtue ethics tradition. Charity is understood in the Christian tradition to be the greatest of all the theological virtues. While faith, hope, and charity all have God as their object, faith and hope by their very nature imply a certain distance from their object; faith concerns what is not seen and hope what is not possessed. "But the love of charity is about what is already possessed, for what is loved is in a certain way in the one who loves, and also the one who loves is drawn by affection to a union with what is loved."¹¹ Whereas charity is distinct among the theological vir-

men naturally pursue happiness, though they often miscalculate the method of attaining it; happiness is achieved through holiness, and understood properly is in fact the same thing; the religious life is the most advantageous because religion enables men to act according to their true nature and in their best interest by choosing the path that will make them holy and therefore happy." N. H. Keeble, ed. *John Bunyan: Conventicle and Parnassus: Tercentenary Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 51.

8. Pieter Vos, "Calvinists among the Virtues: Reformed Theological Contributions to Contemporary Virtue Ethics," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 28, no. 2 (2015): 201–12.

9. Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, 111.

10. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, VII.7, VII.9. Also see Robert C. Roberts, and W. Jay Wood, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

11. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae (ST)*, Question LXVI, Art. 6.

tues, prudence is likewise distinct among the intellectual virtues. Wisdom is upheld by Aquinas to be the greatest of the intellectual virtues. However, while wisdom is not necessary for the acquisition of moral virtue, prudence is.¹² Prudence and Charity are distinct, for both are virtues on which other virtues depend. One cannot be morally virtuous without prudence; likewise, one cannot be morally virtuous without charity.¹³

It is not insignificant that Piety accompanies Charity and Prudence, especially for John Bunyan, being a Puritan. While piety was considered *one* of the virtues for Aquinas, it had a more central role in Puritan moral theology.¹⁴ Jerald C. Bauer notes that for the Puritans, virtue and piety were not the same; piety was the source of virtue. “Piety as understood by the Puritans was a person’s essential religiousness which underlies all religious obedience, actions, and virtues.”¹⁵ Considering this observation, it is fitting that Piety not only accompanies Charity and Prudence, but that she is also the first to speak. Now that we have demonstrated that *The Pilgrim’s Progress* is a text that can be read from within the broader conversation of virtue ethics, we will further discuss the nature of Prudence, the main object of our discussion.

The Nature of Prudence

For our discussion on prudence, we will be relying primarily on Roberts and Woods’ study on the intellectual virtues. Prudence, as stated above, has a privileged place in the array of virtues. Along with love of knowledge, prudence, or practical wisdom, serves as the prerequisite for the other virtues. It is also unique in that it is historically understood as a hybrid virtue, being counted as both an intellectual and a moral virtue. Specifically, “it is the intellectual dimension of the moral virtues.”¹⁶ Aristotle defines prudence as the means by which we deliberate well about what is good and expedient

12. “Since prudence is concerned with human affairs, and wisdom with the highest cause, it is impossible for prudence to be a greater virtue than wisdom.” *ST*, Question LXVI, Art. 5. “Moral virtue can exist without some of the intellectual virtues, such as wisdom, science, and art, but not without the virtues of understanding and prudence.” Aquinas, *ST*, Question LVIII, Art. 4.

13. Aquinas *ST*, LXV, Art. 2.

14. Brian Davies, *Thomas Aquinas’s Summa Theologiae: A Guide and Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 264.

15. Jerald C. Brauer, “Types of Puritan Piety,” *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 56, no. 1 (1987): 39–58.

16. Robert C. Roberts and W. Jay Wood, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 305.

for the good life in general. Hence, Roberts and Woods establish prudence as an “aiming virtue.” It is the ability to deliberate well about what actions ought to be taken in order to achieve a certain end. Because actions are always particulars, prudence is virtue that is concerned with the particulars in any given situation. “Because of the great variability of situations in their details, even the best formulas do not by themselves determine what is to be done. Instead, the determiner is the person of practical wisdom, the agent who interprets and applies the formulas (if such there be) and judges what is particularly to be done in these situations.”¹⁷ It is noted that unlike courage, which is a particular intellectual virtue, prudence is, in a sense, the whole of intellectual virtue.¹⁸ Prudence is chiefly concerned with right action and therefore it always functions hand in hand with other intellectual virtues. For this reason, prudence cannot be spoken of completely divorced from other intellectual virtues such as firmness, humility, and generosity. It works alongside these virtues, in order to deliberate how these virtues are best practiced in particular circumstances to achieve a certain end. Therefore, in our discussion, although we are primarily concerned with prudence, we will speak of other intellectual virtues, for there is a certain extent to which all intellectual virtues are informed by prudence. It is important to note the moral component of prudence. Insofar as it is also a moral virtue, prudence presupposes a morally good end. Someone who deliberates well how to achieve an evil end is not properly called prudent. For someone to act prudently, one must choose the right action, toward the right end, and with the right intention. Finally, prudence is a virtue that is acquired by experience.¹⁹ While Christian is first introduced to Prudence at Palace Beautiful, his own acquisition of the virtue, we shall see, is an ongoing process over the course of his pilgrimage.

Christian’s Companion, Faithful

Now that we have a grasp on the nature of prudence, we turn to our text. In Bunyan’s allegory, company is no minor theme. *Pilgrim’s Progress* is indeed about a pilgrimage from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City. However, it might just as well be called a pilgrimage from the city of bad company to the city of good company. When Christian asks Hopeful how he came to begin his pilgrimage, Hopeful replies that he had to escape from

17. Roberts and Woods, *Intellectual Virtues*, 306.

18. Roberts and Woods, *Intellectual Virtues*, 310.

19. See Aristotle, *Ethics*, VI.8.

“not only my sins, but sinful company too.”²⁰ When Christian is asked by Prudence why he wants to go to Mount Zion, he replies,

Why, there I hope to see him *alive*, that did hang *dead* on the Cross; and there I hope to be rid of all those things that to this day are in me, an annoyance to me; there they say there is no death, and there I shall dwell with such a Company as I like best...I would fain be where I shall die no more, and with this Company that shall continually cry *Holy, Holy, Holy!*²¹

And again, when Christian and Hopeful approach the Celestial City, we read, “Here also they had the City itself in view, and they thought they heard all the Bells therein to ring, to welcome them thereto: but above all, the warm and joyful thoughts that they had about their dwelling there, with such company, and that for ever and ever.”²² This pilgrimage begins and ends with company, and the actual journey itself is full of shifting company. Christian is constantly graced with good company, while, at the same time, is in ever-present peril of bad company. As stated above, the goal of this discussion is to further challenge the accusation that Bunyan’s vision of the Christian life is thoroughly individualistic. The following close reading of key passages in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* will demonstrate the centrality of good company in the formation of the prudent Christian mind.

Before we treat any particulars, there is one important image that we must keep in mind. We know that the path to eternal life is a narrow one. For Bunyan, the way is narrow because Pilgrims are constantly in danger of two perils: moral and doctrinal error.²³ These two dangers, for Bunyan, are equally deadly to the soul. The Christian on pilgrimage, therefore, must be on constant alert against these two perils. We mentioned above that prudence is an “aiming virtue.” It is the virtue of the mind which allows one to deliberate how to act in particular circumstances, in order to achieve a certain end. The end for Christian is safe arrival to the Celestial City. In order to reach this end, Christian and his companions must deliberate well on how to protect their souls from the constant threats of moral and doctrinal error.

20. John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, ed., W. R. Owens, rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 133.

21. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 51.

22. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 152.

23. The danger of moral and doctrinal error is the allegorical interpretation of the Ditch and the Quag. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 62–63.

While there are many figures of good company in the course of Christian's voyage, Faithful and Hopeful are his two most consistent companions, and will therefore be the chief objects of our study. It is not until after his stay at the Palace Beautiful that Christian has any permanent company. Up until his arrival at Palace Beautiful, Christian has been traveling alone, with the exception of a few brief interactions. It is important to note that it is in his solitude that Christian is led astray by Worldly Wiseman. Christian leaves Palace Beautiful with a sudden desire for companionship.²⁴ He hears from the Porter that another Pilgrim called Faithful has passed by the Porter's house and Christian sets out to find him.

When Christian and Faithful meet, they immediately share with one another what they have experienced in their respective pilgrimages. Here we see one instance of how prudence is acquired amongst good company. If prudence, as we have noted, is acquired through experiencing different particularities, then the sharing of past experiences can result in mutual acquisition of prudence. In this exchange, Faithful tells Christian of his encounter with an old man, whom Christian identifies for Faithful as Moses. We know that Faithful passed by Palace Beautiful, without going into it. Christian tells Faithful, "But I wish you had called at the house; for they would have shewed you so many rarities."²⁵ These "rarities" that Christian speaks about are the lessons and stories from the Old Testament that Christian received at Palace Beautiful. Christian thus passes this wisdom along to Faithful for his own intellectual formation. Christian is demonstrating the virtue of intellectual generosity, but this virtue cannot be separated from prudence, since prudence directs the intentions and navigates the particularities of other intellectual virtues.²⁶

The clearest example of the intellectual formation in Christian and Hopeful's friendship comes with their encounter with Talkative. Talkative tells the two friends that he too is traveling to the Heavenly City, and Faithful suggests the three enter into profitable discourse. Talkative replies that there is nothing more pleasant and profitable than discussing the things of God. He tells them that through such talk, one can arrive at the knowledge

24. Stevenson notes that at Palace Beautiful, three privileges are disclosed to Christian. The solace and inspiration of Christian friendship is one of these three privileges. Robert Stevenson (1861–1947), *Exposition of the Pilgrim's Progress, with Illustrative Quotations from Bunyan's Minor Works* (Folcroft, Pa.: Folcroft Library Editions), 1977, 117.

25. Stevenson, *Exposition of the Pilgrim's Progress*, 70.

26. For more on the relationship between intellectual generosity and prudence see Roberts and Woods, *Intellectual Virtues*, 319.

of the necessity of the new-birth, the insufficiency of works, the need for Christ's righteousness, the vanity of the world, and what it means to believe, pray, and repent.²⁷ Faithful is beguiled by Talkative's fair speech and his knowledge of spiritual things. He tells Christian, "what a brave companion have we got! Surely he will make a very excellent pilgrim."²⁸ Christian, however, is able to discern Talkative's falsehood. He tells Faithful that Talkative is all tongue; he has no place for religion in his heart. "For my part I am of the opinion, that he has, by his wicked life, caused many to stumble and fall; and will be, if God prevent not, the ruin of many more."²⁹ If weren't for Christian's discretion, Faithful would have been led astray by Talkative's *fine* speech.

After Christian explains Talkative's error to Faithful, Faithful is able to make his own Old Testament application. He recalls Moses (whom Christian has told him about) and likens Talkative to the unclean animals in the Mosaic law. The clean animals are those which chew the cud and have a parted hoof. Talkative is like the hare—"he cheweth upon the Word, but he divedeth not the hoof, he parteth not with the way of sinners; but as the hare he remaineth the foot of a dog, or bear, and therefore is unclean."³⁰ This demonstrates how Faithful's intellect has been formed in company with Christian. Christian teaches Faithful the "rarities" that he learned at Palace Beautiful, and now Faithful can prudently apply these lessons to avoid being led astray.

Faithful's discourse with Talkative further establishes this scene as one of intellectual formation. Christian suspects Talkative of falsehood, but encourages Faithful to enter into discourse with Talkative to test him. This is itself a prudent maneuver on Christian's part, for it displays his ability to deliberate what action to take in a particular situation. Faithful too, displays discernment in his exchange with Talkative. Faithful, per the advice of Christian, presses Talkative, asking him how God's grace is made known to the human heart. Talkative answers confidently, "where the grace of God is in the heart, it causeth there a great out-cry against sin." While this answer appears orthodox on the surface, Faithful, having been warned by Christian, is able to detect the subtlety of the error. Faithful replies, "I think you should rather say, it shows itself by inclining the soul to abhor its

27. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 75.

28. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 76.

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

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

sin.”³¹ Talkative does not see a difference between crying out against sin and abhorring sin. Faithful reminds him that there is a great difference. One can cry out against sin in the pulpit and yet abide with it in the heart, home, and conversation.³² Faithful here uses another Old Testament application: Potiphar’s wife, who cried out against sin as if she was holy, and yet would have committed sin with Joseph. Finally, Faithful explains that a mother can cry out against her child one moment in an instance of frustration, and then in the next hold the child close again.³³ Hence we see significant intellectual formation as a result of the friendship between Christian and Faithful. Faithful learns the Old Testament and is able to prudently apply its teaching. He also goes from being almost deceived by Faithful, to discerning the subtleties of his errors and rebuking them.

To conclude our discussion on the companionship between Christian and Faithful, we will consider one of the most iconic scenes in the whole text—the visit to Vanity Fair. We will engage Augustine as a conversation partner in this section, to help with our analysis of intellectual formation. We are told that the fair was erected in the town, Vanity, in the ancient days. Its founders, Beelzebub, Apollyon, and Legion, saw that all pilgrims must pass through Vanity on their way to the Celestial City and elected to build a fair. The fair would last all year long and therein would be sold “*all sorts of Vanity*.”³⁴ We are also told the variety of merchandise sold at the fair: houses, lands, honors, trades, whores, husbands, pleasures, children, bodies, souls, silver, and gold. As Christian and Faithful pass through the fair, they incite a great commotion among the people. There are three reasons that are said to have sparked the “hubbub.” First, for the townspeople, the pilgrims are very strange. They are clothed with a certain raiment that is sold nowhere in Vanity Fair. Secondly, their speech is unintelligible for the townspeople. Thirdly, the pilgrims walk through the fair without paying attention to the things sold. When a merchant asks Christian and Faithful what they will buy, they reply, “We buy the Truth.”³⁵ Their response causes an uproar in the town, for now the townspeople have an occasion to despise them even more.

31. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 79.

32. “Conversation” as Bunyan uses it, refers to behavior, not spoken conversation as it is commonly understood today.

33. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 80.

34. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 85–86.

35. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 87.

Christian and Faithful are arrested for their crime (causing the hub-bub), and Faithful is given an opportunity at his trial to give an account. The formal accusation states “that they were enemies to, and disturbers of their Trade; that they had made Commotions and Divisions in the Town, and had won a party to their own most dangerous Opinions, in contempt of the law of their Prince.”³⁶ To the accusations, Faithful replies, “that he had only set himself against that which had set itself against him that is higher [than] the highest.” Faithful claims that he made no such disturbance, for he is a man of peace. In regards to the Prince of Vanity Fair (the devil), Faithful concedes that he must defy him and his angels, for this Prince is an enemy of the Lord. At the trial, Envy, Superstition, and Pickthank all testify against Faithful. It is Envy’s accusation, and Faithful’s response, that we will focus on. Envy testifies before the Judge,

My Lord, this man, notwithstanding his plausible name, is one of the vilest men in our Country; He neither regardeth Prince nor People, Law nor Custom; but doth all that he can to possess all men with certain of his disloyal notions, which he in general calls Principles of Faith and Holiness. And in Particular, I heard him once my self affirm, *That Christianity, and the Customs of our Town of Vanity, were Diametrically opposite, and could not be reconciled.* By which saying, my Lord, he doth at once, not only condemn all our laudable doings, but us in the doing of them.³⁷

Faithful is thus accused of rejecting all laws and customs of the town, by setting them in stark opposition to his duties as a Christian. To answer this accusation from Envy, Faithful replies, “I never said ought but this, *That what Rule, or Laws, or Custom, or People, were flat against the Word of God, are diametrically opposed to Christianity.*”³⁸ This echoes back to Faithful’s initial defense—he does not oppose *everything* in the town, but only that which has set itself against “him that is higher than the highest.”

This episode could be read as Bunyan’s own application of Augustine’s call in *De Doctrina Christiana* to “take the spoils of the Egyptians.” In this text, Augustine addresses the relationship between pagan and Christian wisdom. To advance his position, Augustine provides an allegorical interpretation of the Exodus story. When the Israelites fled Egypt, they were commanded by God to salvage from the Egyptians’ treasures all that could

36. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 90.

37. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 91.

38. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 92.

be claimed for good use. This meant that gold, silver, clothes, and various vessels could be taken from the Egyptians, this being done not under their own authority, but the authority of God.³⁹ Augustine uses this event to establish an analogous relationship between the treasures of Egypt and the wisdom of the pagans. In the Exodus account, the Israelites were commanded to take the treasures that could be salvaged for good use and to leave behind and shun those items that were used explicitly in pagan worship. Augustine exhorts Christians to a similar task: to search through the wisdom of the pagan world and claim for God what can be salvaged. If all truth is God's truth, then Christians have, according to Augustine, the duty to find this truth (even if it be among pagans) and claim it for good use. This likewise means rejecting the teaching of the world that is directly contrary to the wisdom that comes through revelation. Augustine writes that the true claims found among the pagan philosophers are like treasure—"silver and gold, which they did create but dug, as it were, from the mines of providence." Much of this wisdom can be claimed by Christians and "applied to their true function, that of preaching the gospel."⁴⁰

Faithful's defense at his trial in Vanity Fair resonates with this teaching from Augustine. Faithful is clear that Christians do not reject *all* of the laws and customs of the world, *only* those that are in direct contradiction to God's will. There are significant implications here regarding the formation of the Christian mind. The Christian life, as we have seen, for Bunyan, is a pilgrimage along a narrow way between the two dangers of moral and doctrinal error. The Christian must therefore be prudent in discerning this fine line. Faithful here provides Christian with invaluable wisdom. The laws, customs, and wisdom of the world can be both greatly beneficial as well as treacherous to the Christian. The Christian must therefore search and carefully consider what can be salvaged for good, and what ought to be rejected altogether. Faithful's trial at Vanity Fair is therefore yet another critical scene where we see the role of company in the formation of intellectual virtue.

Faithful and Christian's friendship comes to an unfortunate end when Faithful is martyred at Vanity Fair. Even this event, however, can be seen as an instance of formation for Christian. Until Faithful's death, Christian, had not experienced the true cost of going on this pilgrimage. Faithful's

39. Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), II.144–46.

40. Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, II.145.

martyrdom is, in a sense, the greatest act of prudence, for by becoming a martyr he makes the ultimate sacrifice to achieve his intended end. Christ tells His disciples to be “wise as serpents.” In *De Doctrina Christiana*, Augustine helps us understand the meaning of this command.

The well-known fact about the snake, that it offers its whole body to assailants in place of its head, marvelously illustrates the meaning of the Lord’s injunction to be wise as serpents, which means that in place of our head, which is Christ, we should offer our body to persecutors, so that the Christian faith is not as it were killed within us when we spare our body and deny God.⁴¹

Augustine shows us while martyrdom does indeed require the virtue of courage, it is also an act of prudence—practical wisdom. Faithful did not lose sight of his true aim and was, therefore, willing to die for it, lest his soul be lost by denying his faith.

After Faithful’s death, Christian is immediately introduced to Hopeful, who will be his companion throughout the rest of his pilgrimage: “thus one died to make testimony to the truth, and another rises out of his ashes to be a companion with Christian.”⁴² We will turn our attention to Christian and Hopeful’s friendship and continue to consider the role of company in acquisition of intellectual virtue.

Christian’s Companion, Hopeful

Christian and Hopeful’s imprisonment by Giant Despair in Doubting Castle is perhaps the greatest scene of formation in *The Pilgrim’s Progress*. Despair locks up the pilgrims for trespassing in his land. His wife, Diffidence, counsels Despair to have the pilgrims kill themselves. He brings the pilgrims a knife, a noose, and poison, and allows them to choose the manner in which they want to end themselves. “For why should you choose life, seeing it attended with so much bitterness?”⁴³ Christian asks Hopeful, “Brother, what shall we do? The life that we now live is miserable: for my part, I know not whether [it] is best, to live or to die out of hand. *My soul chooseth strangling rather than life*, and the grave is more easy for me than this dungeon. Shall we be ruled by the Giant?”⁴⁴ Christian says his soul

41. Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), II.59.

42. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 97.

43. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 110.

44. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 112.

chooses death. We might therefore say that had he been alone, he would have killed himself.

Hopeful is able to “moderate the mind” of Christian: “Indeed our present condition is dreadful, and death would be far more welcome to me than thus for ever to abide: but let us consider the Lord of the Country to which we are going.”⁴⁵ He reminds Christian that they are commanded by their Lord not to murder, and that taking their own life would break that commandment. Hopeful also reminds him that the Lord is sovereign and He could cause either their release or the giant’s death. With these words, Christian makes it through the first night without taking his life.

Giant Despair returns to the cell the second night to see if the pilgrims have taken his counsel. When he sees that they are still living, he falls into a “grievous rage” which causes the pilgrims to tremble greatly. We are told that Christian again contemplates suicide, but Hopeful comforts him with his second reply. He beseeches Christian to *remember* his encounter with Apollyon, his passage through Vanity Fair, and the many other trials Christian has faced on his pilgrimage. He tells him too to remember that he is not alone but that Hopeful, who is far weaker than he, is with him. These promptings stir patience in Christian and he lives through the second night.

The third night the Christians spend in prayer, and at the break of day Christian bursts out in passionate speech, “What a fool I am, thus to lie in a sinking dungeon, when I may as well walk at liberty? I have a key in my bosom, called Promise, that will (I am persuaded) open any lock in Doubting Castle.”⁴⁶ The key (God’s promises) does indeed open the lock and the pilgrims escape Doubting-Castle.

Vincent Newey sees Christian’s escape from Doubting Castle as a quintessentially individualistic episode. The fact that Christian realizes that the key lies entirely within himself is, according to Newey, a testament to this individualism.⁴⁷ I argue that this is an unfair reading of this event. It does not take into account Hopeful’s critical role in the affair. In Hopeful’s first two speeches, his approach to counseling Christian is to prompt his memory. He reminds Christian of God’s law and His providence in the first speech and Christian’s past trials in the second speech. What is more, Christian and Hopeful were praying together when Christian remembered the key he possessed. It should also be noted, that Christian was first shown

45. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 112.

46. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 114.

47. Johnson, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, 142.

the Promises by Help when he was rescued from the Slough of Despond.⁴⁸ We thus cannot ignore the importance of Hopeful prompting Christian's memory in Doubting Castle.

We must also say a brief word about the nature of memory as it relates to prudence. Aquinas writes, "memory, intelligence, and foresight, as well as caution, docility, and the like, are not virtues distinct from prudence but are in a certain way connected with prudence as integral parts, insofar as they are required for the perfection of prudence."⁴⁹ This scene is, therefore, a fitting example of prudence being formed in the context of good company. Without Hopeful's prompting, Christian would not have exercised his memory, which is what ultimately led to their rescue.

While there are many more passages we could treat, we will conclude our discussion by considering Christian and Hopeful's journey across the Enchanted Ground. The pilgrims have been instructed by the shepherds to beware of flatterers and to take heed not to fall asleep on the Enchanted Ground.⁵⁰ When Hopeful and Christian enter the Enchanted Ground, they are immediately overcome with drowsiness. Christian remembers the shepherds' warning and suggests he and Hopeful "fall into good discourse" to keep themselves from falling asleep:

When saints do sleepy grow, let them come hither,
And hear how these two pilgrims talk together:
Thus to keep ope their drowsie slumbring eyes.
Saints' fellowship, if it be manag'd well,
Keeps them awake, and that in spite of hell.

There are two things to be noted from this episode. On the one hand, we see a clear display of Christian's prudence. Christian deliberates well as to which action should be taken to travel across the Enchanted Ground. He recognizes that by conversing with one another, the two pilgrims will be able to overcome their drowsiness. On the other hand, Bunyan is making a comment on the importance of Christian companionship. The nature of their discourse is also important to note. Among other things, Christian and Hopeful discuss with one another what the true fear of God consists in. The fear of God is called the beginning of wisdom. Christian and Hopeful arrive at an understanding of this fear through discourse. This further

48. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 16.

49. Aquinas, *ST*, LVII Art. 6.

50. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 119.

establishes that for Bunyan, wisdom is not something acquired in solitude. Pilgrims acquire wisdom by deliberating with one another in discourse. It is precisely in these moments of discussing past experiences and contemplating with one another the things of God that prudence is acquired. As demonstrated in the verse above, well-managed fellowship guards Christians against spiritual drowsiness. Spiritual drowsiness can lead to moral and doctrinal error. Company is, therefore, for Bunyan, necessary for pilgrims who wish to guard themselves against these perils.

While Christian and Hopeful make it in the end to the Celestial City, it is safe to say that they would not have made it had it not been for their good company. In this paper we have considered some scenes of key intellectual formation, in which virtues of mind, namely prudence, were acquired in and because of good company. Bunyan imagines the Christian life as a pilgrimage along a narrow path. This path is narrow, for the pilgrims are constantly threatened with the peril of moral error on the one side, and doctrinal error on the other. The last thing we see in Part I of *The Pilgrim's Progress* is not Christian and Hopeful entering the City, but rather Ignorance, the one who prides himself on preferring to travel alone, being led away to hell. Bunyan's vision of the Christian life is far from solitary. For Bunyan, the life of Christian is a life of carefully deliberating a fine line. The virtues of the mind that allow pilgrims to carefully navigate this fine line are acquired, cultivated, and practiced not in isolation, but rather in the presence of good company.

Puritan Preaching and Pathos: Some Uses from “Puritan Rhetoric”

MAARTEN J. KATER
Theological University Apeldoorn

As man is not so prone to live according to the truth he knows except it do deeply affect him, so neither doth his soul enjoy its sweetness, except speculation do pass to affection. The understanding is not the whole soul, and therefore cannot do the whole work.... The understanding must take in truths, and prepare them for the will, and it must receive them and commend them to the affections.... The affections are, as it were, the bottom of the soul.

—Richard Baxter¹

This article would like to function as an incentive to become better acquainted in our homiletical courses with “the Puritan style” of preaching.² Especially in the face of the times we live in, an age of stirring up our emotions as high as possible, this seems to be very helpful. Since the 1980s so-called “emotions studies” have come up in many scientific disciplines, some theological disciplines included.³ Therefore, I would like to stimulate

1. Cited by Leland Ryken, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 99.

2. While “Puritanism” is a slippery term whose definition is much debated by historians, this article just focuses on some practitioners of English Reformed “practical divinity.” Cf. W. B. Patterson, *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 90–113.

3. A few examples are as follows. In practical-theological research: Heleen Zorgdrager, “Homosexuality and Hypermasculinity in the Public Discourse of the Russian Orthodox Church: An Affect Theoretical Approach,” *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology* 74/3 (2013): 214–19; in biblical studies: Waller, Alexis G., “Violent Spectacles and Public Feelingstrauma and Affect in the Gospel of Mark and the Thunder,” *Biblical Studies*, 22/4–5 (2014), 450–72; and in the field of systematic theology: Sarah Coakley, *God, Sexuality and the Self. An Essay “On the Trinity”* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), Coakley makes “affections” her central theme.

some further research on the use and, of course, misuse of *affections* in the field of homiletics.⁴

First of all, I want to plead for—as I already did—using the word *affections* instead of *emotions* because what is connoted by emotions suffers from the danger of shallowness and superficiality. Too often emotions are seen just from a psychological perspective, deprived of the connotations of *passions* or *affections* of the inner Christian life. Therefore, we should go back to the basics in this respect to refrain from the miserable division of the head from the heart as in modernism, or the other way around as in our postmodern times, as is shown from the history of rhetoric. The way back to the basics ultimately brings us to the biblical-theological use of the term “heart” in the Holy Scriptures, especially in the Old Testament.⁵

Why, then, is it very profitable for our times to listen to our heritage from Puritan preaching? Among homileticians and preachers, too often just one classification of Puritan preaching is given—at least in many Dutch homiletical studies; namely, the so-called *plain style*, which is postulated as the most important characteristic of how Puritans preached. This, however, sounds not to be a very attractive quality at first glance. Plain preaching often seems to correspond with boring and dull sermons. One reason why Puritans tend still to be seen as anti-rhetorical is the dichotomy drawn by older scholarship on preaching between “plain style” Puritan preaching and the more ornamented “metaphysical” preaching of literary preachers as, for example, the great poet and cleric in the Church of England, John Donne (1572–1631).⁶ Second, therefore, I want to demonstrate from some leading examples within the Puritan movement—Perkins, Baxter, and Sibbes—how they did use rhetoric in a very profound and balanced way, using affectionate language which—and this is very crucial—was accompanied by and savored with good reasoning. Of course, these Puritans need not be our only “masters” as there are many before and after them who did and do

4. I am looking forward to the defense and publication of the dissertation which Michael Keller has written: *Experiencing God in the Words: Rhetoric, Logic, Imaginative Language, and Emotion in Jonathan Edwards' Sermons. A Computational Analysis*. By means of the *Dictionary of Affective Language*, he mapped out in which period of his life Edwards used which kind of language in his sermons (categorized as abstract-concrete, active-passive, nasty-fun, and high or low imagery).

5. For a short overview, see Alex Luc, “72,” in William van Gemenen, ed., *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis* (Carlisle, Pa.: Paternoster Press, 1997), 2:748–53.

6. As Horton Davies, *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588–1645* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1986).

preach from the love of Christ and to love Christ with all their minds and all their hearts.

Finally, after we shortly have gone the way “back to the basics” in rhetoric and “back to the Puritan examples” in homiletics we will discuss some practical directions for preaching with *pathos* today.

Back to the Basics—the Art of Persuasion

Rhetoric as the art of persuasion uses several instruments. It is helpful to know what the most important terms originally meant in order to have a clear understanding of them today.

Classical Rhetorical Notions

From Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, we inherited the well-known classical-rhetorical triplet, *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*, as three ways of persuasion. In this article, just one of them, *pathos*, is central in our thought, which also is central in the second book of Aristotle’s handbook on eloquence. When reading Aristotle it becomes very clear that for him “emotions” or—better and more literally—“passions” are not considered as instinctive, spontaneous feelings, but really are connected with cognitive, rational elements.⁷ In his second book, Aristotle gives a systematic account of human psychology, arranged in contrasting pairs (anger-calmness, friendship-enmity, etc.). He underscores the cognitive side of these *passions* or *affections*.

Another famous rhetorician from the Latin tradition, Cicero, adopted these three elements into his triplet: to teach (*docere*), to delight (*delectare*), and to move (*movere*) as the three goals of an address. *Pathos*, then, in classical rhetoric has especially to do with these last two elements: to delight and to move. But an ethical use of *pathos* should always be connected with truth and reality. *Pathos* could be used to lead someone to believe what is not true, but what is humbug, or worse. The power of *pathos* can be a great danger.⁸

7. D. Konstan, “Rhetoric and Emotion,” in I. Worthington, ed., *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Malden/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007), 411–25; W. W. Fortenbaugh, *Aristotle on Emotion. A Contribution to Philosophical Psychology, Rhetoric, Poetics, Politics and Ethics* (London: Duckworth, 2002).

8. Quintilian in his *Institutio Oratoria* illustrates the (mis)use of that power: “The man who can carry a judge with him, and put him in whatever frame of mind he wishes, whose words move men to tears and anger, has always been a rare creature. Yet this is what dominates the courts, this is the eloquence that reigns supreme.... Where force has been brought

In his homiletical handbook *De Doctrina Christiana*, Augustine—very well schooled in Cicero’s rhetoric—touched on these aspects in this way:

Just as the listener is to be delighted if he is to be retained as a listener, so also he is to be persuaded if he is to be moved to act. And just as he is delighted if you speak sweetly, so is he persuaded if he loves what you promise, fears what you threaten, hates what you condemn, embraces what you commend, sorrows at what you maintain to be sorrowful; rejoices when you announce something delightful, takes pity on those whom you place before him in speaking as being pitiful, flees those whom you, moving fear, warn are to be avoided; *and is moved by whatever else may be done through grand eloquence toward moving the minds of listeners, not that they may know what is to be done, but that they may do what they already know should be done.*⁹

In an *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* this special aspect and effect of *pathos* is stated as follows: “Of the three appeals of *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*, it is the last that impels an audience to act. Emotions range from mild to intense; some, such as well-being, are gentle attitudes and outlooks, while others, such as sudden fury, are so intense that they overwhelm rational thought. Images are particularly effective in arousing emotions, whether those images are visual and direct as sensations, or cognitive and indirect as memory or imagination, and part of a rhetorical task is to associate the subject with such images.”¹⁰

It is important to highlight two things from this description. The first one to underscore is the relation between *pathos* and “act.” There is a connection between using *pathos* and our will as the captain and steering wheel of our behavior. Second, as far as our language is concerned, the use of an audience’s imagination to spark emotion consists in employing images and/or metaphors—visual language.

Ramist influences

All this has been mentioned to see that *pathos* always was united with *logos* and *ethos*. After Augustine, during the Middle Ages, *meditation* and

to bear on judges’ feelings and their minds distracted from the truth there the orator’s true work begins.”

9. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, Book IV, 229. Emphasis mine.

10. L. D. Greene, “Pathos,” *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

disputation went their way, and a rift grew between *logos* and *pathos* in the art of persuasion.

Although it is an overgeneralization, there is much truth in positing the Ramist influence on much Puritan preaching from William Perkins's homiletical manual *The Arte of Prophesying* (1592),¹¹ which influenced so many preachers. The most striking thing is Ramus's division or even divorce between *logos* and *pathos*. The customary order of the process to create a presentation was, traditionally, invention, arrangement, style, delivery, and memory. Petrus Ramus (1515–1572), however, proposed that invention and arrangement belong to "logic," while style and delivery are considered as "rhetoric." In this method, the sermon is primarily a design with a clear and logical argument. After this composition preachers can use style elements and inspiring and moving language as an ornament, but these elements are ultimately irrelevant to effective preaching. "More fundamentally, his whole way of looking at dialectic and rhetoric was not in terms of speech and debate, but in terms of writing and visual images."¹²

Affections more than Emotions

Thomas Dixon, in his high-impact book *From Passions to Emotions*, describes the history of the term emotion.¹³ Most important: in the 19th century, Charles Darwin and William James gave birth to "emotion" as a psychological category. They cast off the Christian- and inner-connotations of *passions* or *affections*. Dixon shows that the "emotions" became confined to sensorial bodily expressions measured by biological and quantifiable explanations.¹⁴

Therefore, I prefer to speak of *affections* instead of emotions because our *affections* stem from level that is deeper than what people often consider when hearing the word *emotion* or *feeling* nowadays. *Affections* are connected with our mind, heart, and will. *Pathos*, then, has to be in keeping

11. Walter J. Ong, Adrian Johns, *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of discourse to the Art of Reason* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Mordechai Feingold, Joseph S. Freedman, Wolfgang Rother, eds., *The Influence of Petrus Ramus: Studies in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Philosophy and Sciences* (Basel: Schwabe, 2001); Donald Keith McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987).

12. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 249–52.

13. Thomas Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions. The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

14. Think of the dogmatic view in New Atheism that religion is just feeling, an emotional activity which you can measure on screens, and that it has nothing to do with rationality and science.

in line with the two other components, namely, *logos* and *ethos* in preaching. Theologically seen, this preference has to do with the *image of God* and the central biblical idea of our “heart” as the center of our feelings and knowledge. Moreover, using *affections* corresponds with the current use of it in social science and theology.

Back to Puritan Rhetoric—Lessons from *Exempla*

We will now show the diversity among the Puritans when thinking about their use of rhetoric. We will see that none of them appears radically opposed to the use of language as an instrument of persuasion, although the only one who really can persuade is the Holy Spirit. These men all use affective language.

William Perkins

The importance of William Perkins (1558–1602) lies especially in his writing of the first English preaching manual.¹⁵ It was published in 1592 in Latin as *Prophetica* before it was translated into English as *The Arte of Prophecyng* (1607). His outline for a sermon follows Melancthon: Text, Doctrine, and Application.¹⁶ We already mentioned another influence, namely the Ramist influence, in his thinking on preaching and his directions on how a sermon should be prepared and composed.¹⁷ Thus he favors *logos*, the appeal to rational argument, since he understands faith particularly to be a persuasion to right understanding (using the word “mind,” which has in its biblical-theological sense broader connotations). In this way, the propositional aspects of Christian faith are elevated above the experiential. Perkins is rather defending propositions than appealing to affections, though pathos and ethos also have their place in Perkins’s recommended practice of preaching:

15. W. B. Paterson, *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) sees Perkins not so much as a “Puritan” because he avoided controversies over ecclesiology. In another sense, he was, because Perkins was a key figure in the development of English Reformed practical divinity in the line of Richard Greenham, esp. 40–63, 216–19.

16. I used the abbreviated edition of William Perkins, *The Art of Propheying with The Calling of the Ministry* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1996); cf. Melancthon’s *Supplementa Melancthonia*, II, in Paul Drews and Ferdinand Cohrs, eds., *Homilletische Schriften* (Leipzig, 1922).

17. For some nuances see Joseph A. Pipa, “William Perkins and the Development of Puritan Preaching” (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1985), et passim.

What I am stressing is this: a minister must be a divine interpreter, an interpreter of God's meaning. And therefore he must not only read the book but eat it. He must not only have the knowledge of divine things flowing in his brain, but engraved on his heart and printed in his soul by the spiritual finger of God.... If he himself is not reconciled, dare he present another man to God's mercy for pardon when he has never presented himself? Can he commend the state of grace to another without ever having felt the sweetness of it in his own soul? Dare he preach on sanctification with polluted lips, and out of an unsanctified heart?¹⁸

Perkins presents striking thoughts as he meditates on the position of a minister of the gospel as an interpreter in connection with what Isaiah referred to as the "tongue of the learned" (Isa. 50:4).

To be able to speak with this tongue is to possess three things: (1) human learning; (2) divine knowledge insofar as that may be learned from others; and (3) whoever speaks with this tongue must be inwardly taught and instructed by the Spirit of God.¹⁹

An important characteristic of Perkins's view on using philosophical and rhetorical wisdom in the pulpit is his reference to Horace's proverb: *artis etiam celare artem*, i.e. "it is also the point of art to conceal the art."²⁰

How do we properly use affectionate language? Perkins's pneumatology definitely provides the actuating power to communicate the salvific work of Christ in and through preaching. The holiness of the preacher is the grand ethos when using pathos:

An inward sense of the doctrine we are to preach. Wood that is capable of burning is not set alight unless a fire is put to it. Similarly, anyone who would encourage godly affections and desires in others must first have godly affection himself. Thus, whatever responses a particular sermon requires should be first stirred up privately in our minds, so that we can kindle the same flame in our hearers.²¹

Richard Sibbes

Richard Sibbes (c. 1577–1635) preached in Cambridge and London during the reigns of James I and Charles I. Sibbes did not write any treatise

18. Perkins, *Prophesying*, 90–91; cf. *Calling of the Ministry*, 170–74.

19. Perkins, *Prophesying*, 89.

20. Perkins, *Prophesying*, 71.

21. Perkins, *Prophesying*, 74.

or book on homiletics as such, as Perkins earlier and Baxter later did, and so his thoughts have to be collected from diverse documents wherein he shows his principles and practice. For that reason, I offer some illustrations to show that Sibbes (1) was not an anti-rhetorical preacher and (2) that he placed a greater emphasis on pathos over logos as his preferred mode of persuasion.

He writes in a prefatory epistle to his famous sermon-treatise *The Bruised Reed and the Smoking Flax* that

No creature can take off wrath from the conscience, but he that set it on, though all the prevailing arguments be used that can be brought forth, till *the Holy Ghost effectually persuadeth, by a kind of divine rhetoric*, which ought to raise our hearts to him who is the comforter of his people, that he would seal them to our souls. Now God dealing with men as *understanding* creatures, the manner which he useth in this powerful work upon their consciences, is by the way of *friendly intercourse*, as *entreaty and persuasion*, and discovery of his love in Christ, and Christ's gracious inclination to the weakest and lowest of men.²²

Surely, when Sibbes speaks about "a kind of divine rhetoric" he draws for the divine persuasion by the Spirit an analogy to the human persuasion through speech. But to express what happens in this divine persuasion Sibbes applies affective language as it is recommended in several handbooks on rhetoric as such. This divine rhetoric consists more of affective words than rational reasons because ultimately it is by the love of Christ that one's heart is persuaded and will receive peace. It's amazing how many times Sibbes works with words such as, *affections, love, delight, desire, relish, sweetness, feel*, and *taste* to persuade everybody of the goodness of the Lord, the love of Jesus Christ, the willingness to receive sinners, and so on. Following this perspective on the triune God as the "God" who "is Love," Sibbes's sermons expose a great affectionate pathos for his message and to his audience.

In connection with an affectionate language, he very often uses another rhetorical means to persuade, namely imaginative language referring to our senses like taste, touch, hearing, and sight. Sibbes opens the windows or gates of the soul. From the hundreds and hundreds of possible illustrations, consider just the following to "taste" his use of affective language:

A man that is born in a dungeon, and never saw the light, when he hears the discourse of the sun and stars, and earth, and flowers, and

22. Richard Sibbes, *Works*, 1:39 (emphasis mine).

plants, he hath imaginations what they should be, but he fancies other things. So a man that never had spiritual eye-sight to see spiritual things in their kind, he fancies them to be this and that, but he sees them not by their own light.²³

Isn't this the most proper way to deliver an affective appeal, to lower the level of abstraction? Feeling originates in experience, and the more concrete we are, the more feeling is implicit in it.

Sibbes sees even Christ Himself using affectionate rhetoric. Commenting on the words from the Song of songs (5:2), "My love, my dove," in a posthumously published series of sermons on this song of love beautifully entitled *Bowels Opened*, Sibbes writes:

There are all words of sweetness. He labors to express all the affection he can. For the conscience is subject to upbraid, and to clamor much. So that there must be a great deal of persuasion to still the accusing conscience of a sinner, to set it down, make it quiet, and persuade it of God's love. Therefore, he useth all *heavenly rhetoric to persuade and move the affections*.²⁴

But this divine seeking for favor and love, or to say God's wooing, entails not only the rhetorical mode of pathos, but of logos as well. Sibbes argues that the reason why Christ persuades utilizing a human preacher, and not through an unmediated communication to the soul—is precisely this: Christ respects the rational nature of humanity:

Because he will preserve nature, and the principles thereof; and so deals with us, working accordingly. *The manner of working of the reasonable creature is to work freely by a sweet inclination, not by violence.* Therefore when he works the work of conversion, he doth it in a sweet manner, though it be mighty for the efficaciousness of it. He admonisheth us with entreaty and persuasion, as if we did it ourselves. But though the manner be thus sweet, yet with this manner there goeth an almighty power. Therefore he doth it strongly as coming from himself, and sweetly, as the speaking is to us, preserving our nature.²⁵

When we consider this quotation it appears to be that even when Sibbes touches the rational element, *pathos* functions for the benefit of *logos*.

23. Sibbes, *Works*, 6:530.

24. Sibbes, *Works*, 2:84 (emphasis mine).

25. Sibbes, *Works*, 2:63.

And what about the third part of persuasion, *ethos*? Ministers are Christ's mouth and their *ethos* has to be transparent as the *ethos* of Christ, given to them by the Spirit. Many times Sibbes exhorts ministers and all who love Christ to be sincere and earnest:

If we would be happy instruments to convert others, being converted ourselves, labour to be such as the world may turn to be good and gracious.... Let us labour to be such as the world may conceit are good persons. We say of physicians, when the patient has a good conceit of them, the cure is half wrought. So the doctrine is half persuaded when there is a good conceit of the speaker. Again, labour to be earnest. If we would kindle others, we must be warmed ourselves; if we would make others weep, we must weep ourselves.... Let us labour to be deeply affected with what we speak, and speak with confidence as if we know what we speak... for when we are confident from spiritual experience, it is wonderful how we shall be instruments of God to gain upon others.²⁶

Note the repeated exhortation to "labour:" sincerity does only come after much work. Again, this plea for the good *ethos* is accompanied by and fostered by an effortful *pathos*.

Of course, I could but skim the surface of the rhetorical aspects in Sibbes's work in this article. Nevertheless, through these few examples, we have at least a taste of it and the whole rhetorical landscape of his sermons and treatises is open to further elaboration for us. *Logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos* are all present in Sibbes's work, but for him, the greatest of these is *pathos*.

Richard Baxter

Richard Baxter (1615–1691) surely has given some reason to suggest that Puritans were anti-rhetorical men. They made stylistic critiques, warning of preachers who are more concerned about polished speech than about living uprightly *Coram Deo*. Baxter's exclamation in his famous book *Gildas Salvianus*, better known as *The Reformed Pastor*, sounds as follows:²⁷

26. Sibbes, *Works*, 2:167.

27. The full title reads: "*Gildas Salvianus: The Reformed Pastor*, showing the nature of the Pastoral work; especially in Private Instruction and Catechizing; with an open Confession of our too open Sins: Prepared for a Day of Humiliation kept at Worcester, December 4, 1655, by the Ministers of that County, who subscribed the Agreement for Catechizing and Personal Instruction at their entrance upon that work, By their unworthy fellow Servant, *Richard Baxter*, Teacher of the Church at Kederminster."

Oh how curiously have I heard some men preach; and how carelessly have I seen them live! They have been so accurate as to the preparations of their sermons, that seldom preaching seemed to them a virtue, that their language might be more polite, and all the rhetorical *jingling* writers they could meet with were pressed to serve them for the adorning of their style (and gauds were oft their chiefest ornaments). They were so nice in hearing others, that no man pleased them that spoke as he thought, or that drowned not affections, or dulled not, or distempered not the heart by predominant strains of a fantastic wit.²⁸

Baxter here voices the tradition of the anti-rhetorical polemic wherein rhetoric is associated with empty wit and insincere style. Such a preacher is the antonym of the one “that spoke as he thought.” It is always very nice to see how the anti-rhetorical polemic’s means are used rhetorically, as is the case here in Baxter’s exaggeration as quoted. For the sake of clarity, two illustrations will suffice. First, the “how curiously” and “how carelessly,” in itself, is parallelism, using anaphora, consonance, and similar word endings (*homoioleuton*). Second, the sincere preacher is distinguished from the witty preacher by a tricolon of negatives: “drowned not... dulled not... distempered not.”

Baxter’s understanding of rhetoric certainly reflects the Ramist restricted concept: instead of Cicero’s five canons, there are just two of them, namely style and delivery. The most important thing in this Ramist strain of thought ultimately was the “logic” part: the invention and arrangement of the sermon, while all other elements are but ornaments. Yet, there is much more to take into account before a one-sided picture predominates our view of Baxter’s theology and his ideas of rhetoric.²⁹ Given the purpose of this paper, I will just mention that although Baxter was the most scholastic of all Puritans and his *Methodus* itself the Puritan *Summa* par excellence,³⁰ his emphasis on theology was on the affective and practical nature of theology, as his definition of theology makes very clear: *scientia-affectiva-practica*.³¹ In

28. Baxter, *Reformed Pastor*, 64. It is a pity that one word in this abbreviated edition has been eliminated, namely the thought-provoking word “jingling,” because it brings in remembrance Paul’s words in 1 Corinthians 13:1. Cf. Baxter, *The Practical Works of Richard Baxter* (Morgan, Pa.: Soli Deo Gloria, 2000), 4:371.

29. J. I. Packer, *The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter: A Study in Puritan Theology* (Carlisle, Pa.: Paternoster, 2003).

30. Carl Trueman, *The Claims of Truth: John Owen’s Trinitarian Theology* (Carlisle, Pa.: Paternoster, 1998), 26, 32.

31. Simon J. G. Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic. The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter’s Methodus Theologiae* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 4–44.

this respect, in Baxter's work as a whole, logos, on the one hand, and ethos and pathos, on the other hand, go perfectly hand in hand. We should be careful in highlighting but a few famous passages.³² As Perkins and Sibbes, Baxter stresses time and again how ethos and pathos are connected,

When your minds are in a holy, heavenly frame, your people are likely to partake of the fruits of it. Your prayers, and praises, and doctrine will be sweet and heavenly to them. They will likely feel when you have been much with God: that what is most on your hearts, is like to be most in their ears.³³

Baxter was opposed to the use of rhetoric in sermons that does the opposite of what it should do when used correctly. Ultimately, Baxter opposed the deficiencies in preaching; its rational content unclear, the person of the preacher insincere, and the affections dulled instead of evoked. Baxter seems above all to reject a style of preaching wherein polish seems of greater importance than earnestness.³⁴ This seems to be perfectly in keeping with the seventh point from the *Directory of Publick Worship* (1645). At the end it says, "But the servant of Christ, *whatever his method be*, is to perform his whole ministry." So, it's not about the method as such, but seven important prerequisites follow. How has a minister to perform his ministry? Painfully, plainly, faithfully, wisely, gravely, with loving affection, and as a godly man (Acts 20:28).

Some Uses for Preaching Today

From what we have seen in these illustrations from the Puritan history of preaching, a few remarks follow on preaching with pathos and the use of affectionate language today.

Preaching without pathos definitely and ultimately is impossible. A preacher does not rather have a message, but he *is* a messenger. The message becomes flesh and blood in the person of the messenger, and in the sound of what he is voicing in preaching the Word there will be a kind of

32. Besides the quote cited above, very often a passage from Baxter's *A Treatise of Conversion* is mentioned to show how Baxter contrasted "witty" and "plain" preaching (cf. Keeble, *Richard Baxter*), 51.

33. Baxter, *The Reformed Pastor*, 61, cf. 111–124 ("The manner of this oversight").

34. I am indebted to the research David Perry (University of Exeter, UK) has already done and am looking forward to the publishing of his study, called *Puritan Persuasion: The Rhetoric of Conversion and the Conversion of Rhetoric*. I am sure this will be very helpful for further investigations.

resonance in his voice and his whole body. The affections of Jesus Himself are worth recalling and taking into account in our homiletical courses. The Gospel writers paint their portraits of Jesus using a kaleidoscope of "affectionate" colors. His affections reflect the image of God without any deficiency or distortion.³⁵ Lessons from a "Puritan rhetoric" are meant to reflect on our only Master.

We all consider Christian preaching as a communicative form. Every communication is rhetorical because it uses some technique to affect the beliefs, actions, or emotions of an audience. The simplest verbal techniques are pitch, volume, and repetition (i.e., help, Help, HELP). In this way, we use affective language, and there are many other means to paint with words. All these kinds of things we encounter in "Puritan rhetoric."

But the most important reason for the involvement of pathos in preaching has to do with what communication itself is about. There is no communication without communion. Whoever wants to preach must have his audience in his heart. We are to open our hearts before we open our mouth. We have a passion for them in heart and soul. There is much to consider when thinking about a real "inter-esse," a being among. The well-known homiletician Rudolf Bohren mentions the wonderful German word "Sehnsucht" (there is no exact translation, but something like "deep longing," "yearning").³⁶ Without this *Sehnsucht* there never will be preaching with passion, or affectionate preaching. Our speech will be empty without this. *Sehnsucht*, as Bohren mentions in his book, describes for him especially the mystery of love as the mystery of Christ's presence wherein preacher and listeners are brought together. When our heart is involved in what we want to communicate, it is impossible to speak without *pathos*. It is because of love deeper than the ocean and higher than the sky. Preaching is the communication of love, the love of the triune God. This involves preaching of the wrath of God as well, because of His wounded love.

So pathos is a given in a certain sense. Stuart Olyott posits this question, and it may be of some help especially for European homileticians and preachers, "Why are we so afraid of emotion? As long as it is moved by truth, and *only* moved by truth, how can it be dangerous? Is, perhaps, the problem inside us? Are we scared of being accused of being 'beside ourselves' (see

35. Just some illustration from the Gospel of Mark: in anger and deeply distressed (3:5), he had compassion (6:34), he sighed deeply and said (8:12), he was indignant, and showed his great love for children (10:14).

36. Rudolf Bohren, *Predigtlehre* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1993, 1971), 484–88.

2 Corinthians 5:13)?... Have we become so hypocritical that we honor men like Daniel Rowland, but conveniently forget that he only preached 'as if on fire'?"³⁷

But, on the other side, we have to realize that we all live in what is called *post-truth* times. Truth seems not to be based on facts, but is treated just like fiction. Truth is a matter of view or a certain perspective on a certain truth which seems to be exchangeable with any other perspective one could have. In our Twitter culture, emotions are viewed as being decisive of what is going on. Therefore, in preaching the truth, we once more have to debunk the forgery of feelings by showing the power of arguments. But in this process, we are to reckon with the problem that the captain of feeling and the captain of reason have their courses and are like ships passing in the night. So we should make connections between feeling and thinking.

Anyhow, "Puritan rhetoric" shows us that the first condition for preaching is to prepare our hearts by living attentively. Attend to Scripture deeply and immerse yourself in it. Attend to the world around us and prayerfully be open to what God is doing. "Puritan rhetoric" teaches us that the goal of our sermons is, besides teaching, to evoke affections to move heart and will. Love and reasonableness are interconnected.

The most important use from "Puritan rhetoric" in my opinion is to see once again that preaching is "sacred rhetoric." Homiletics reduced to the latest "how-to" ideas and strategies "quickly forgets the mystery of divine revelation and the working of grace that are necessary to make sacred rhetoric truly sacred as the Word of God."³⁸

Ultimately, how happy we might be if preaching were just a part—surely a very important part—of the liturgy as a whole. Performative, formative, affective, and imaginative words should sound around during the whole service in songs and silence, in prayer and preaching.

37. Stuart Olyott, *Preaching Pure and Simple* (Wales, UK: Bryntirion Press, 2005), 152.

38. Michael Pasquarello III, *Sacred Rhetoric: Preaching as a Theologica land Pastoral Practice of the Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 1–13, 134–39.

“Oft Have I Seen Thee Look with Mercy’s”: A Brief Biography of John Cotton¹

NATHAN TARR

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

John Cotton (1584–1653) is perhaps best remembered today as the theocratic foil in the debate with Roger Williams over religious toleration. Or he represents the forces of patriarchy in contest with Anne Hutchinson. In his own day, however, Cotton was respected as a man of principled non-conformity, genuine piety, immense pulpit gifts, and formidable intellectual acuity. His emigration to the new world at the height of his ministerial career supplied New England with its greatest preacher of the initial generation. He quickly became “the acknowledged leader in the acknowledged leading class” of New England Puritanism.² And yet his arrival in the wilderness did not isolate his influence to the new world. Rather, the Massachusetts Bay Colony elevated his visibility in old England. Cotton went on to correspond with Oliver Cromwell, to win both Gisbertus Voetius and John Owen to the cause of Congregationalism, and to present the Westminster Assembly with *The Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*, a work sent in his stead designed to do the same.

The resurgence of Puritan studies inaugurated over the early decades of the twentieth century, however, has largely passed Cotton by. The most recent biographical examinations he has received came in the 1960s, and from critics not entirely sympathetic to Cotton’s own convictions.³ Paving

1. Upon his death in 1652, Cotton’s heirs discovered a brief autobiography written in verse. The five stanzas of the poem, each comprised of four lines, proceed through his birth, physical condition, youth, ministry, and spiritual state. The poem was included in John Norton’s biography of Cotton, published in 1658. The title is taken from the first line of the final stanza. John Norton, *Abel being Dead yet Speaketh; Or, the Life and Death Of that deservedly Famous Man of God, Mr John Cotton, Late Teacher of the Church of Christ, at Boston in New-England* (London, 1658), 45.

2. Larzer Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962), vii.

3. Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton*; Everett Emerson, *John Cotton* (Boston, Mass.:

the way for a new biography, Cotton letters have been impressively edited by Sargent Bush.⁴ In addition, some of his more accessible works have recently been presented to a broader audience.⁵ Nevertheless, no critical edition of Cotton's historically significant and spiritually vibrant body of work is currently underway. This short biography does not attempt to fill these unfortunate gaps. By suggesting, even in brief compass, the significant influence Cotton's life and work exercised over Puritan individuals and institutions on both sides of the Atlantic, the aim of this article is to introduce John Cotton as a man and minister worthy of academic consideration and spiritual emulation.

Cotton at Cambridge

John Cotton was the second of four children born to the "pious" lawyer Rowland Cotton (c.1550–1604), and the "gracious" Mary Hurlbert Cotton (1560–1595).⁶ Born on December 4, 1584, Cotton was baptized at St. Alkmund's Church in Derby eleven days later.⁷ In Cotton Mather's words, his maternal grandfather grew up, "of a clear, fair, sanguine complexion, and like David of a ruddy countenance. He was rather low than tall, and rather

Twayne Publishers, 1965). The second edition of Emerson's work, published in 1990, does not substantially revise his bewilderment at Cotton's popularity with his contemporaries.

4. Sargent Bush ed., *The Correspondence of John Cotton* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

5. Charles Hambrick-Stowe, "Christ the Fountaine of Life by John Cotton (1584–1652)," in Kelly Capic and Randall Gleason, eds., *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2004), 66–78; Nate Pickowicz and John Manning eds., *John Cotton: Christ the Fountain of Life* (Gilmanton Iron Works, N.H.: Entreating Favor Books, 2017); Nathan Tarr, "Whatever May Befal Thee, Know it is so much Soap to Cleanse Thee: John Cotton of God's Design in a Believer's Suffering," *The Journal of Discipleship and Family Ministry* 6 (Fall, 2017): 45–58; Nathan Tarr, "A Pervasive and Self-Effacing Spirit: John Cotton's Chief Contribution to Puritan Spirituality," *Churchman*, Summer (2016): 161–77.

6. Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (1853 ed.; repr., Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1979), 1:253. Cotton's older sister was Mary. His two younger brothers were Roland and Thomas. To trace Cotton's descendants, see LaVerne C. Cooley, *A Short Biography of The Rev. John Cotton of Boston and a Cotton Genealogy of His Descendants* (Batavia, N.Y.: Higginson Book Company, 1945).

7. The baptismal records of St. Alkmund's Church in Derby have Cotton born and baptized there in 1584. Bush, *Correspondence*, 17. This record can adjudicate between the biographical sketches of Cotton's life that disagree over whether he was born in 1584 or 1585. Bremer, for example, has Cotton born in 1585, but cites no support. Francis Bremer, "Cotton, John" in *New Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* 13, ed. H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 613–17.

fat than lean, but of a becoming mediocrity. In his younger years his hair was brown, but in his latter years as white as the driven snow.”⁸

The vicar of St. Alkmund’s during the years of Cotton’s attendance was Thomas Swetnam. Swetnam mingled conformity to the demands of his bishop, William Overton (c.1525–1609), with sympathy to the Puritan cause, sending his son Joseph, the future Presbyterian minister in Derby, to Cambridge.⁹ Cotton found a similar model of what he would later call “the old non-conformity” at the Derby Grammar School, mastered by Richard Johnson. An ordained Anglican priest and graduate of Trinity College, Johnson successfully prepared Cotton for entrance into his own college. The doctrine Cotton imbibed from both the Anglican vicar and Anglican master was Calvinism. At this time, Larzer Ziff reminds us, “a man’s doctrine was no accurate reflection of the degree of his conformity.”¹⁰ What distinguished non-conformists from bishops, Cotton learned, was not their theology but their polity.¹¹

Cotton entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1598.¹² He was thirteen years old. If Derby taught him that a man’s doctrine did not guarantee

8. Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:253.

9. Overton licensed less than one fifth of the Derbyshire clergy to preach according to Larzer Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962), 8. For this and other reasons, Overton does not come off well in the Marprelate Tracts. See William Pierce, ed., *An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts: A Chapter in the Evolution of Religious and Civil Liberty in England* (London: E.P. Dutton and Company, 1909), 90, 156–57.

10. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 11. This is illustrated by the expulsion of two Lady Margaret Professors of Divinity at the hands of Archbishop Whitgift. In 1595, Whitgift ejected Peter Baro for preaching predestination in a Lutheran manner. But in 1570, while Master of Trinity, Whitgift had also evicted Thomas Cartwright for the latter’s Presbyterian polity.

11. The theological sea change that was taking place as Cotton entered Cambridge meant he would soon see the rise of doctrinal as well as ecclesiological distance from Calvin in the form of an ascendant Arminianism. Regarding the Calvinism of Cotton’s day, R. T. Kendall identifies Cotton with Calvin while calling into question the “Calvinism” of the majority of the post-Bezan Reformers. See R. T. Kendall, “John Cotton—First English Calvinist?,” in *The Puritan Experiment in the New World* (London: Westminster Conference, 1976), 38–50. More broadly, see R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 1997). For a thorough discussion of the state of the “Calvin and the Calvinists” question, see Shawn Wright, *Our Sovereign Refuge: The Pastoral Theology of Theodore Beza*, Studies in Christian History and Thought (Carlisle, Pa.: Paternoster, 2004).

12. For the curriculum Cotton would have encountered at Cambridge see William Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958). Margo Todd provides a helpful corrective when Costello over-interprets the statutory requirements to argue for an indebtedness in Tudor

his conformity, Trinity would teach him that neither did it assure his conversion. His principal tutor in this painful lesson was William Perkins (1558–1602), fellow at Christ's College and a frequent preacher in Cambridge pulpits. Perkins preached Calvin's doctrine with an immediacy that unsettled the adolescent Cotton. He not only emphasized the absolute freedom of God in dispensing (or withholding) saving grace, but Perkins also insisted that orthodox belief, facility with Scripture, and even zeal for continued reformation in the church were but shifting sands in the issue of salvation. Salvation required one to feel God's Spirit moving within him, a feeling anticipated by a prolonged and prayerful vigil kept over one's soul. Cotton responded to this picture of his own passivity by absenting himself from Perkins' lectures. When Perkins died in the final year of Cotton's time at Trinity, he may have imagined that he had eluded such troubling questions about the state of his soul.

Cotton's academic success, especially in rhetoric and ancient languages, assured him of an offer of a fellowship as graduation approached in 1602.¹³ As a sizar at Trinity, the lowest class of paying students, Cotton had performed menial tasks for scholarship students, such as waiting on their tables and running their errands. His father's fortunes had now improved, but Cotton sought a fellowship both for its maintenance and its academic mobility.¹⁴ Funds for fellowships at Trinity were severely depleted in 1603, however, as Thomas Neville (d. 1615) led the College through extensive architectural revisions. And so Cotton looked elsewhere within Cambridge. He accepted a fellowship at Emmanuel College.

Emmanuel, founded in 1584 by Sir Walter Mildmay (c.1523–1589) and mastered by the extraordinarily long-lived Laurence Chaderton (1536–1640), was a circumspectly Puritan college in its theology as well as in its polity. Public prayer at Emmanuel did not follow the Prayer Book. Clerical vestments and academic regalia were abandoned. Students received communion in both kinds, seated around the large communion table, in an

and Jacobean Cambridge to medieval views. Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

13. Cotton's biographer relates that in testing for his fellowship, Cotton was examined on the Hebrew of Isaiah 3, which "hath more hard words in it, than any place of the Bible within so short a compass." And still his examiner could not impede the promptness of his answers. Norton, *Abel being Dead yet Speaketh*, 10.

14. This proved to be a providential decision as Cotton's father died in 1604, a year after Cotton commenced his graduate work. Bush has Rowland dying "while Cotton was still an undergraduate." Bush, *Correspondence*, 17.

unconsecrated chapel, which did not face east. For John Cotton to move into Emmanuel College, therefore, was to make his Puritan sympathies explicit.¹⁵

Still, if non-conformity at Emmanuel was biblically derived, it was not radical or bellicose. Chaderton remarked that, “Those who dislike the government of the Church by bishops will substitute something far less beneficial to both Church and State.”¹⁶ Even Perkins had not spoken against graduates agreeing to the Three Articles.¹⁷ This was still the Elizabethan age and, though many anticipated the ascension of James I, there was a certain degree of wideness to the Puritan tent.¹⁸ Such was the milieu in which Cotton absorbed Cambridge Puritanism.

After receiving his MA in 1606, Cotton continued at Emmanuel for another six years. It was during these years that he distinguished himself as both teacher and preacher. Cotton served the young college as tutor, catechist, dean, and head lecturer.¹⁹ Cotton Mather reports that he was “much admired” by students and colleagues alike.²⁰ But it was as a preacher that Cotton’s star shone most brightly. When, in 1609, he delivered the funeral sermon for Robert Some (1542–1609), the sermon was, “so accurately performed in respect of Invention, Elegancy, Purity of Style, Ornaments of

15. I will use the term “Puritan,” following Crawford Gribben, as those who craved “further reformation of the protestant church within the three kingdoms.” This definition agrees with Cotton’s own occasional use of the term when he includes himself among those who sought reformation of the Church of England. Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature & Theology, 1550–1682* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2008), 7–8.

16. William Dillingham, *Laurence Chaderton, D.D. (First Master of Emmanuel)*, ed. Richard Farmer (Cambridge: Macmillan and Bowes, 1884), 5–10. Quoted in Bush, *Correspondence*, 17.

17. Such a pledge, required after 1608, compelled one to agree that “The Book of Common prayer, and of ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God, and that it may lawfully be used, and that he himself will use said Book prescribed in public Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and none other.” *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, 1604* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923), Canon xxvi.

18. Chaderton was one of four Puritan divines appointed to make their case before James I at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. The conference was a failure for the Puritan cause. James left unchanged both the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity initiated under Elizabeth. The king did agree to a new translation of the Bible, however, to which Chaderton also contributed.

19. Joan Schenck Ibish, “Emmanuel College: The Founding Generation, with a Biographical Register of Members...1584–1604” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1985), 390–91. Larzer Ziff provides a list of the responsibilities in each of these roles. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 27.

20. Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:234.

Rhetorick, Elocution, and Oratious beauty of the whole, as that he was henceforth looked on as another *Xenophon*, or *Musa Attica* throughout the University.”²¹

The sermon was a triumph that could solidify his career. But all was not well. Cotton’s increasing public profile only accentuated his spiritual uneasiness. Larzer Ziff paints the picture: “Once achieved, his outward gains seemed less sweet, for they were not matched by any change in his inner disposition...as the index of John Cotton’s fame rose, his spiritual barometer sank until, in desperation, he all but convinced himself of the most horrible fact known in the world—he would die in sin never to live again; he was not a saint; he was damned.”²²

Success had not muted the questions formerly raised through Perkins’s preaching. It was by availing himself of the counsel of Richard Sibbes (1577–1635), lecturer at Holy Trinity Church, in whose hand the doctrine of double predestination ministered humility and hope rather than despair, that Cotton came to a spiritual apprehension of his own election.²³ Both the Spirit’s gracious agency and the believer’s resultant “sense” of salvation are apparent in the record of Cotton’s conversion: “The grace of God made him a thoroughly renewed Christian, and filled him with a sacred joy, which accompanied him unto the fullness of joy forever.”²⁴

Significantly, the evangelical humility and hope he experienced under Sibbes’s preaching now became Cotton’s own homiletical aim; a commitment that raised the question of sermonic style. At the time, his reputation traded on a style adorned for academic acceptance. Cotton had come to see, however, that without the Spirit, his elegant words were empty; “their divinity proveth humanity.”²⁵ Sibbes, on the other hand, preached in the plain

21. Norton, *Abel Being Dead Yet Speaketh*, 13.

22. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 26.

23. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 29–31. See also Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2000), 40–41.

24. Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:255. Notice the way these two themes continue and intensify in Mather’s account of Cotton’s experience of assurance: “And it was remarkable that on the very day of his wedding to [Elizabeth Horrocks], he first received the assurance of God’s love to his own soul, by the Spirit of God, effectually applying his promise of eternal grace and life unto him...for which cause he would afterwards often say, ‘God made that day, a day of double marriage to me!’” Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:255. Cotton was married on July 3, 1613.

25. Cotton explained his view of the difference between the two styles in a letter prefixed to Arthur Hildersham, *Lectures upon the Fourth of John* (London, 1629): “When scholars furnish themselves with store of other writers, besides the Scriptures, and being

style. But if it was plain, it was also profitable, speaking not only to the mind but “to the conscience” of the hearer. Sibbes’s apologetic for an unadorned delivery best explained Cotton’s own experience under the preached Word: “When the love of God in Christ and the benefits by Christ are laid open in preaching of the Gospel to us, God gives His Holy Spirit.”²⁶ The plain style was the saving style.²⁷

Thus, while it meant humiliating himself and scandalizing the fellows, Cotton resolved to preach in a manner that matched the matter of his subject.²⁸ If his audience required a work of the Spirit, he would preach in a way that honored the Spirit’s work. His first plain, evangelical sermon was delivered at Great St. Mary’s between 1610 and 1612. After the sermon, during which “many of his listeners pulled their caps about their ears,” Cotton returned, disconsolate, to his rooms.²⁹ His conviction was rewarded that very afternoon, however, as John Preston (1587–1628), philosopher

little conversant in the Scriptures...their divinity proveth humanity, and their ministry speaketh to the brain, but not to the conscience of the hearer. But he that diggeth all the treasures of his knowledge and the ground of religion out of the Scriptures, and maketh use of other authors, not for ostentation of himself, nor for the ground of his faith, but for the better searching out of the deep wisdom of the Scriptures, such a one believeth what he teacheth, not by an human credulity from his author, but by a divine faith from the Word.” Cited in Everett Emerson, *John Cotton* (New York: Twayne, 1965), 35.

26. Richard Sibbes, *The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (1862–1864; repr., Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1983), 1:23–24. Cotton had tasted what he would later teach in his popular catechism; “Q: How do we come to have part and fellowship with Christ in his death and resurrection?” And the answer, “By the power of His word and Spirit.” “Milk for Babes,” reproduced in Emerson, *John Cotton*, 128.

27. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 32.

28. Thomas Allen gives us a glimpse into the wrestling match Cotton endured, as he heard the story from Cotton himself: “He, being according to his course to preach before the University and scholars in Cambridge, had a great conflict in himself about the composing of his sermon, viz. whether after the plain and profitable way, by raising of doctrines, with propounding the reasons and uses of the same, or after the mode of the University at that time, which was to stuff and fill their sermons with as much quotation and citing of authors as might possibly be. On the one side ‘twas suggested to him that if he should not go the former way, he should not be faithful to the Lord in seeking His glory, but his own &c. And on the other side, if he should not show his learning, it would not only be a disparagement unto himself but also unto the College.” Thomas Allen, “Prefatory epistle to John Cotton,” *An Exposition upon the Thirteenth Chapter of the Revelation* (London, 1655), 34.

29. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 32. The exact date of Cotton’s sermon is unknown. Bush places this St. Mary’s sermon in “about 1608.” Bush, *Correspondence*, 18. Haller, following the old DNB, gives a date of 1611. See William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism, or the Way to the New Jerusalem set forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570–1643* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), 71. In his biography of Preston,

and future master of Emmanuel, visited Cotton to confess, "it has pleased God to speak effectually unto [my] heart by that sermon."³⁰

Cotton at St. Botolph's in Boston, Lincolnshire

With his skill in the Scriptures now matched by a spiritual sense of his own salvation, Puritan leaders were eager to see Cotton begin a pulpit ministry. He had been ordained in 1610, before serving a further two years at Emmanuel. With the retirement of Thomas Wooll (m. 1600–1612), St. Botolph's in Boston, Lincolnshire, sought Cotton as its vicar. As an Emmanuel graduate, and a justly famous scholar, carrying the recommendation of both Sibbes and Paul Baynes (1573–1617), Cotton was well equipped to extend the tradition of non-conformity in Lincolnshire.³¹

The process of Cotton's appointment in 1612 proved to be a microcosm of his twenty-year pastorate. The Bishop of Lincoln, William Barlow (d. 1613), initially resisted Cotton as "too young a man to be set over so turbulent a parish."³² The aldermen of Boston, however, were of a different mind, and understanding that one Simon Biby was to be spoken with, which was near the Bishop, they presently charmed him; and so the business went on smooth, and Mr. Cotton was a learned man with the Bishop, and he was admitted into the place, after their manner in those days.³³

The bishop lost the battle over Cotton's appointment but his words cast a long shadow. Under Bishop Barlow, and his successors Richard

Jonathan Moore gives a date of 1610. Jonathan Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 5.

30. Norton, *Abel Being Dead Yet Speaketh*, 14; Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:256.

31. See, for example, Church of England and Diocese of Lincoln, *An Abridgement of That Booke Which the Ministers of Lincolne Diocesse Delivered to His Majestie upon the First of December 1605*. In December of 1605, ministers from the Diocese of Lincoln petitioned James I against the "subscription and conformitie" then being required. Their apology worked to describe, "in what the State of the Church shall be in this last age of the world." This eschatological state, the ministers maintained, was decidedly non-conformist. Though this was well before Cotton's tenure began in Boston, Robert Sanderson's *Ad Clerum* sermons of 1621 worked to paint Cotton with this same "troubling" brush.

32. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 39. The bishop's concerns were well founded. See "The Lincolnshire Rising and the Pilgrimage of Grace," in Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, 5th ed. (Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited, 2004), 26–47.

33. Samuel Whiting, "Concerning the Life of the Famous Mr. John Cotton, Teacher to the Church of Christ at Boston, in New-England," in Alexander Young, *Chronicles of the First Planters of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston, Mass.: Little and Brown, 1846), 419–31. The quote is from page 423. Whiting, related to Cotton through his second wife, is considered to have written the first biography of Cotton, upon which Norton drew.

Neile (1562–1640), George Montaigne (1569–1628), and John Williams (1582–1650), Cotton's ministry experienced the ebb and flow of ecclesiastical supervision and investigation. He was twice suspended: in 1616 for gathering the elect in the congregation, while using a chaplain to perform the church ceremonies that he found offensive; and again in 1621, when the stained-glass windows and statuary were shattered in the beautiful church. But Cotton was never silenced.³⁴ His examiners came away impressed by his learning, his "sweete temper of spirit,"³⁵ and the loyalty of his people.³⁶

The popular response to Cotton's ministry proved the wisdom of his supporters. The "feast of preaching" now offered at St. Botolph's, set against the restriction suffered by many other Puritan ministers, drew large numbers of congregants from the surrounding villages. Soon lecture days were added throughout the week—Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays—as "the People...doe very diligently, & throngly frequent the Publique Prayers of the Church."³⁷

Within a year of beginning at St. Botolph's, Cotton had returned to Emmanuel to fulfill the obligations for his Divinity Act and receive his BD. Cotton's opponent for the required disputation was William Chappell (1582–1649), a fellow at Christ's, an enemy of Calvinism, and considered

34. The indulgence Cotton received was widely observed. Samuel Ward, minister at Ipswich, Suffolk, remarked, "Of all men in the world I envy Mr Cotton, of Boston, most; for he doth nothing in way of conformity, and yet hath his liberty, and I do everything that way, and cannot enjoy mine." Cited in Bush, *Correspondence*, 30.

35. Norton, *Abel being Dead yet Speaketh*, 33. The full quote, from John Davenport, runs, "The reason of our desire to confer with him rather than any other touching these weighty points, was our former knowledge of his approved Godliness, excellent learning, sound judgment, eminent gravity, candor, and sweet temper of Spirit, whereby he could placidly bear those that differed from him in their apprehensions." Cotton Mather painted his grandfather's temperament with his usual flare, "He would not set the beacon of his great soul on fire at the landing of a little cockboat." Mather, *Magnalia* 1:277.

36. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 51–54. For a helpful overview of Cotton's role in the struggle over conformity in the Church of England, see Jesper Rosenmeier, "Eaters and Non-Eaters': John Cotton's *A Brief Exposition Of...Canticles* in Light of Boston's (Lincs.) Religious and Civil Conflicts, 1619–22," *Early American Literature* 36 (2001): 149–81. For the struggle over the scope of Elizabethan conformity more generally see Alan Jacobs, *The Book of Common Prayer: A Biography* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2013).

37. "Cotton to Bishop Williams," in Bush, *Correspondence*, 98–103. Cotton Mather reports that, on the Lord's Day in Lincolnshire, Cotton preached through John, Ecclesiastes, Zephaniah, Zechariah, and "many other Scriptures." On Lecture Days, he covered 1 and 2 John, Song of Solomon, and the parables to Matthew 17. There are also regular references to him preaching at home on various texts. Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:259–260.

the University's best disputant.³⁸ Nevertheless, Cotton defended his thesis to the satisfaction of the president. Within this same year, Paul Baynes introduced Cotton to Elizabeth Horrocks (1588–1631), who came from a nonconformist family in Lancashire. They were married in 1613. While they had no children, the Cotton home was often full. John Preston, now Master of Emmanuel, regularly sent recent graduates to Boston to serve as Cotton's apprentice. The stream of students was so steady that Cotton became known as "Dr. Preston's seasoning vessel."³⁹

Cotton's marriage to Elizabeth lasted until 1631, when they both contracted malaria from the mosquitoes thriving in the marshy fens around Boston. They convalesced at the home of Theophilus Clinton (c.1600–1667), the fourth Earl of Lincoln. A staunch Puritan, the Earl's seat served as a staging area for emigration, especially to New England. Cotton was aware of the migration to Massachusetts Bay, and had given careful thought to legitimate motives for emigration. He had laid these out in 1630 when he traveled to Southampton to preach the farewell sermon for John Winthrop's (1587–1649) party of some 400 emigrating settlers.⁴⁰ But news from the Naumkeag church, pastored by his former Cambridge colleague Samuel Skelton (c.1592–1634), concerned him. Skelton was evidencing a separatist mindset that Cotton found objectionable.⁴¹ Nevertheless, during the twenty-one fits of malarial fever Cotton endured over the next year, he began to regard New England as preferable to Continental havens.

After Elizabeth died from the disease, Cotton anticipated a return to Boston but discovered that the contours of ministry had been redrawn with the ascendancy of William Laud (1573–1645). Laud, Chancellor of Oxford and Bishop of London, was also at this time exercising the powers of the sequestered Archbishop of Canterbury before his own appointment to that office in 1633. Now, not even a favorable bishop and loyal parishioners

38. This is the Chappell who would "go on to astound King James with his ability in disputation, to tutor John Milton, and to become a recipient of Laud's favors." Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 27, n. 37.

39. Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:260.

40. This sermon was printed as John Cotton, *God's Promise to His Plantation* (London, 1630).

41. See "John Cotton to Samuel Skelton," in Bush, *Correspondence*, 141–49. Cotton wrote, "Two things herein I conceive to be erroneous, first that you think that no man may be admitted to the Sacrament, though a member of the catholic church, unless he also be a member of some particular reformed church: secondly that none of our congregation in England are particular reformed churches, but Mr. Lathrop's [a Jacobite congregation] is."

could shield their vicar from the court of high commission.⁴² When Cotton received a summons to appear before Laud in the Fall of 1632, he disappeared into the Puritan underground. In so doing he left behind his wife of less than one year, Sarah Hawkridge Story Cotton (c.1598–1676), and a young daughter the widow had brought into the marriage. The threat against Cotton’s life is palpable in the letter he wrote to her from hiding: “[My friends] desire also to see thee here, but I think it not safe yet, till we see, how God will deal with our neighbors at home. For if you should now travel this way, I fear you will be watched, & dogged at the heels. But I hope, shortly God will make way for thy safe coming.”⁴³

Husband and wife were re-united, but only to flee for New England. On May 7, 1633, Cotton wrote to Bishop Williams, resigning his post, and on July 13, the Cottons boarded the *Griffin* bound for the new world.⁴⁴ The urgency they felt in escaping England is evident in the fact that Sarah Cotton was eight months pregnant when they put to sea.

Cotton at Boston, Massachusetts

The Cottons arrived in Boston Harbor on September 4, 1633. The following Saturday Cotton was invited to address the church of Boston, pastored

42. Under Bishop Williams, “the huge diocese of Lincoln remained the great loophole in the Laudian system.” But that loophole closed as Williams fell out of favor with Charles I, carrying consequences for Cotton. Clive Holmes, *Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire History of Lincolnshire 7* (London: History of Lincolnshire Committee, 1980), 113–14. For an overview of Bishop Williams see John Dew, *Mitre and Musket: Lord Keeper, Archbishop of York, 1582–1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938).

43. “John Cotton to Sarah Hawkridge Cotton,” in Bush, *Correspondence*, 173–75. This letter is of significant interest since it is the only surviving copy of Cotton’s correspondence to an immediate family member. This period of concealment also proved seminal for Cotton’s ecclesiology. It was during this period, at the invitation of Henry Whitefield, that Cotton and Thomas Hooker met with Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, John Davenport, and William Twisse to argue the merits of non-conformity. The purpose of the meeting was to convince Cotton and Hooker to compromise in matters of church practice so that their ministry would not be lost to the church in England. Instead, Cotton and Hooker so thoroughly persuaded their friends of the idolatrous nature of the disputed ceremonies that all, except for Twisse, soon departed England as a result of their own non-conformity. This meeting thus prepared the way for the partnership of this same group during the Westminster Assembly exercised, for example, in the preface by Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye to John Cotton, *The Grounds and Ends of the Baptism of the Children of the Faithful* (London, 1647).

44. See “John Cotton to John Williams,” in Bush, *Correspondence*, 178–81. For the date of Cotton’s departure see Francis Bremer, “John Cotton (1585–1652),” in H. C. Matthew and Brian Harrison, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 13:614.

by John Wilson (1591–1667).⁴⁵ After speaking from Canticles 6 on the marks of a true church, Cotton and his wife were admitted to membership, and Seaborn (1633–1686), their infant son, was baptized.⁴⁶ One month later, on October 10, Cotton was chosen as Teacher of First Church, a post he would hold until his death in 1652.⁴⁷ At forty-eight years old, Cotton gave himself to this new ministry with customary vigor. The practice of weekday lectures was carried over from old Boston, and the next two decades of ministry saw Cotton preach through the Old Testament once and again to Isaiah 13, and the New Testament once and again to Hebrews 11.⁴⁸ He studied some twelve hours a day, depending on his ruling elders to inform him about the state of his flock.⁴⁹

This approach did not yield entirely happy results.⁵⁰ Initially, it served him well. John Winthrop recorded: “It pleased the Lord to give special

45. Wilson came to new England with John Winthrop in 1630. Originally settling in Charlestown, he moved to Boston that same year. He was elected pastor of First Church Boston on November 23, 1632 and served in that capacity until his death in 1667. Emery Battis, *Saints and Sectaries: Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian Controversy in the Massachusetts Bay Colony* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1962), 104–5.

46. It is significant that Cotton waited to baptize his son until being received into membership in Boston. Though at least three men onboard the *Griffin* were ordained in the Church of England, and in spite of the compounding threat an open-ocean voyage represented to a newborn, Cotton declined to have him baptized because of what he had come to believe about the nature and power of the church, expressed in its local congregation. Winthrop records, “He gave two reasons why he did not baptize [Seaborn] at sea: (1) because they had no settled congregation there; (2) because a minster hath no power to give the seals but in his own congregation.” John Winthrop, *Winthrop’s Journal* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1908), 1:96–100.

47. Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:105–113. If Thomas Shepard “saw the Lord departing from England when Mr. Hooker & Mr. Cotton were gone,” the faithful in Massachusetts rejoiced at the arrival of their first eminent ministers. Thomas Shepard, “Autobiography,” ed. Allyn Bailey Forbes, *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 27 (Boston, Mass.: Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1932), 375.

48. Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:271.

49. Mather, *Magnalia*, 1:276.

50. Williston Walker reminds us that Puritans distinguished between the offices of pastor and teacher in the ministry of a local church. “The Pastor’s special work is, to attend to exhortation...the Teacher is to attend to Doctrine.” Since Cotton was the Teacher of the Boston church, he was only infrequently called upon to reprove unruly members. Williston Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2005), 211. In *Mr. Cotton’s Rejoynder*, Cotton makes use of this distinction in an attempt to demonstrate his own fidelity, “Reproof you know doth rather belong to the Pastors office: The truth of Doctrine, as I have here expressed it to you, our Church can bear me witness I have plainly taught it (according to my place) and have refuted to contrary.” David D. Hall, ed.,

testimony of his presence in the church of Boston, after Mr. Cotton was called to office there. More were converted and added to that church, than to all the other churches in the bay.... Divers profane and notorious evil persons came and confessed their sins, and were comfortably received into the bosom of the church.”⁵¹

Cotton’s preaching, used to stir these embers of awakening in Boston, emphasized the absolute covenant God made with the believer. Rather than holding out an “if” that, when fulfilled, motivated a divine “then” in response, Cotton proclaimed a God who took responsibility for requirements on both sides of the covenant. He downplayed man’s responsibility to prepare himself for God. Rather, he spoke of God giving His Spirit to convict of sin, to bring to faith, and to empower our subsequent obedience. In stressing an absolute covenant, and in making the primitive proof of salvation the witness of the Spirit rather than the marks of progressive sanctification, Cotton differed in emphasis from John Wilson and the rest of his New England colleagues.

This difference was accentuated by Anne Hutchinson (1591–1643), lately arrived from England.⁵² A skilled midwife, Hutchinson hosted a weekly gathering to discuss the doctrine and application of Cotton’s sermons. In the reports he received, Hutchinson stressed that good works may prove a lying evidence of salvation, since they could rise from a heart dependent on its own works for right standing with God. This much Cotton too regularly warned. When she began to weave deprecations of other Bay ministers together with her commendation of Cotton, however, he rebuked her. His concern, at this point, was that her lack of propriety was corrosive to unity among the churches. He had not detected any doctrinal deficiency.⁵³

The Antinomian Controversy, 1636–1638: A Documentary History (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1968), 84. Nevertheless, such a tidy division of labor is difficult to maintain in practice, and the dynamic of the Antinomian Controversy, where members of the church were claiming the cover of Cotton’s doctrine for their positions, refused to allow him this refuge.

51. Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:116. Church records show that the membership grew from 80 to 124 within the first four months of Cotton’s arrival. Another 93 were added in 1634. Bremer, “Cotton, John,” 615.

52. The Hutchinsons had lived in Alford, some 24 miles from St. Botolph’s, but they were frequent auditors of Cotton’s preaching. When her brother-in-law, John Wheelwright, was silenced in 1632, and Cotton emigrated in 1633, Hutchinson, her husband, and their twelve children followed him to Boston in the Fall of 1634. Emerson, *John Cotton*, 86.

53. Michael Winship argues that, “for a conflict assumed to be irrepressible, the Antinomian Controversy was slow to emerge.” He credits Cotton and Wilson, the teacher and

In October of 1636, a consortium of Bay elders confronted Cotton on the pneumatological deviance that the Hutchinsonians continued to teach in his name. Alarmed at their report, and the discrepancy with his own understanding of the matter, Cotton again interviewed Hutchinson. And again he heard only his own views mirrored in her claims. In November, therefore, the elders presented Cotton with *16 Questions of Serious and Necessary Consequence*, asking him to spell out what he believed, in an attempt to smoke out those who hid behind his name while transgressing his doctrine. Cotton's *Rejoynder* to the elders made their differences clear, but resisted carrying the attack to his colleagues as Hutchinson and John Wheelwright regularly did.⁵⁴

The next step, according to fledgling congregational polity, was to call a synod of area ministers. The aim of the synod, convened in Newtown in August of 1637, was to convince Cotton to abandon a series of (84!) positions the elders identified as questionable, and thus to reconcile with the rest of the New England ministry. The synod did result in Cotton's surprise, not at his own opinions but at those positions many in his congregation proved willing to defend.⁵⁵ Writing to Samuel Stone just five days after Hutchinson's excommunication in March of 1638, Cotton lamented,

the Iniquities of sundry members of our Church, who (like Achan, without my Privety) had harbored & secretly disseminated such Erroneous & dangerous Opinions, as (like a Gangrene) would have corrupted & destroyed Faith and Religion had not they been timely discovered, & disclaimed both by our own & other Churches.⁵⁶

pastor the Boston church respectively, for maintaining harmony in the midst of diversity. He lays the blame for the division on Henry Vane and Thomas Shepard, who were "convinced that doctrinal purity overrode the practical realities of a diverse movement." Michael Winship, "'The Most Glorious Church in the World': The Unity of the Godly in Boston, Massachusetts, in the 1630s," *Journal of British Studies* 39 (January, 2000): 77, 82.

54. Compare Cotton's *Rejoynder* with John Wheelwright's "Fast Day Sermon" of January 1637. See Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 79–151 and 152–172.

55. Perry Miller suggested that Cotton was forced to surrender to the elders. Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), 62. Emery Battis, however, has convincingly shown that, "Although subjected to humiliating pressures, he was, in the last analysis, obliged to do little more than restate his original position in less equivocal terms." Battis, *Saints and Sectaries*, 172.

56. "John Cotton to Samuel Stone," in Bush, *Correspondence*, 272–75. As Cotton repented to John Davenport, he had been too slow to see that "they propagated their opinions under my expressions." Bush, *Correspondence*, 52.

A similar lament appears often in his letters of this period. While there had been high points, the initial years of his New England ministry were humbling for John Cotton.⁵⁷ They came on the heels of the general court’s rejection of *Moses His Judicials*, Cotton’s civil code that proved too conservative for Boston’s needs;⁵⁸ a public retraction of his former ecclesiology in *A Sermon Delivered at Salem*;⁵⁹ the dissolution of the theocracy engineered with Henry Vane as the magistrates claimed the right to interview prospective settlers on religious opinions;⁶⁰ and the dispute with Roger Williams that ended with Williams’s eviction, but only because Cotton had failed in his preferred route of convicting Williams’s conscience.⁶¹ At the end of the Antinomian Controversy, Cotton briefly considered relocating to New Haven but was convinced by a conciliatory Winthrop to remain in Boston.

A significant motivation for Cotton to remain was that his removal would signal England that all was not well in Massachusetts. Cotton was aware that many in England were judging the viability of the New England Way through its viability in the new world.⁶² In February of 1637, as the Antinomian Controversy reached its pitch, Cotton asked that the heart of the dispute be represented to England as a celebration of grace, with one group celebrating the grace given to man in justification, while the other celebrated the grace working in man through sanctification.⁶³ When the

57. Not all believed him sufficiently humbled. Thomas Shepherd confided to his diary, “Mr. Cotton: repents not: but is hid only.” Thomas Shepard, *Autobiography*, 386. High points would have included the birth of his daughter Sarah in 1635, Elizabeth in 1637. John would be born in 1640, Mariah in 1642, and Rowland in 1643.

58. Though it did serve as the foundation for New Haven under Cotton’s friend John Davenport. See the discussion in Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 104–5.

59. See “A Sermon Delivered at Salem, 1636,” in Larzer Ziff, ed., *John Cotton on the Churches of New England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), 41–68.

60. Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 129. Henry Vane, son of the Comptroller to Charles I, came to the new world seeking to enjoy “the purity of the ordinances.” He built an addition to Cotton’s house and lodged with him during his time in Boston, even after becoming Governor.

61. See Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 89–91.

62. This is why Cotton could preach, in reference to the homeland, “Great pity were it that they should want any light which might possibly be afforded them.” John Cotton, *The Pourring Out of the Seven Vials: or, An Exposition of the Sixteenth Chapter of the Revelation, with an Application of it to our Time* (London, 1643), 4. A thorough analysis of the colonial contribution to England’s ecclesiastical debates is Ralph Young, “Good News from New England: The Influence of the New England Way of Church Polity on Old England, 1635–1660” (PhD diss., Michigan State University), 1971.

63. Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:209.

events of these years were eventually published in England, of course, such glosses did not prevent his Presbyterian opponents from suggesting that the instability periodically convulsing the colony exposed inherent deficiencies in a structure that lacked sufficient centralization.⁶⁴

Nevertheless, when the Puritan-controlled Parliament rooted episcopacy out of the Church of England in 1642, Cotton was one of three New England divines invited to attend the Westminster Assembly that would determine its replacement. While he sent his regrets, Cotton enhanced the New England way for the Assembly's consideration to the best of his epistolary ability. In 1642 Cotton published *The True Constitution of A particular visible Church, proved by Scripture*. This work was republished in 1643, and again in 1644, as *The Doctrine of the Church, To which is committed the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*. That same year he published a treatise against set forms of prayer, and a work on Revelation 16 that equated the actions of the Long Parliament with the fifth vial.⁶⁵ Perhaps most significantly, in 1642 Cotton coined the term by which his model would be known: Congregationalism.⁶⁶

Cotton's labor on behalf of Congregationalism continued. In the following year, 1643, Cotton moderated a conference condemning Presbyterianism in New England, whose minutes reached England.⁶⁷ He also published a defense of his controversy with Williams, and wrote, but did not publish until 1647, a defense of infant baptism that displayed the compatibility between covenant theology and congregational polity. In 1644, his *The Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven* went through six printings, easily the most influential, if not the most personal, of his apologies.⁶⁸ Despite

64. Thomas Weld published John Winthrop, *A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruine of the Antinomians* in 1644. Among the more stinging responses from the Presbyterian side were Robert Bailie, *Dissuasive from Errors of our Time* (London, 1645); Thomas Edwards, *Antapologia* (London, 1644); and Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right of Presbyteries* (London, 1644).

65. Cotton, *Powrring Out*, 42.

66. Cotton coined the terms "Congregational way" and "Congregationalism" in the course of defending the New England polity from its (largely Presbyterian) critics during the 1640s. The terms only "gained currency after 1648." See Marion Starkey, *The Congregational Way: The Role of the Pilgrims and their Heirs in Shaping America* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), 2–3.

67. Frederick W. Loetscher, "Presbyterianism in Colonial New England Pt 1," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 11 (1921): 83–93. See also "Presbyterianism in Colonial New England Pt 2," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 11 (1921): 97–118.

68. Ziff rightly maintains that, because he is answering Baillies's personal attacks, Cotton's *The Way of the Congregational Cleared*, written in 1647 and published in 1648, is his most personally revealing work. Ziff, *Cotton on the Churches*, 33. Additional insight is gained

a small band of influential allies, the Congregational cause faltered at the Assembly.⁶⁹ In New England, however, this flurry of activity had returned Cotton to his prior position as chief among colonial divines.

Embodying the dynamic Francis Bremer terms “congregational communion,” Cotton remained as connected to events in England as the English Puritans were to the results emerging from the laboratory of the new world.⁷⁰ On January 30, 1649 the High Court of Justice carried out the execution of Charles I (1600–1649). When Oliver Cromwell (1599–1658) defeated the Scottish supporters of Charles II (1630–1685) in September of 1650, Cotton preached a Thanksgiving sermon in which he applauded these recent events and sought to “rally his fellow colonists to support those English co-religionists whom he believed to be cooperating with God in bringing about the millennium.”⁷¹

Cotton also preached, in July of 1651, before the trial of three Baptists who had entered the colony from Newport: John Clark (1609–1676), John Crandall (1618–1676), and Obadiah Holmes (1610–1682). In his sermon, Cotton reminded the colony that while baptism did not make children into members of the local church, it is a sign of God’s covenantal favor that welcomes the children of believers into the care of that church. The means of grace, uniquely operative in the church, were what God used to bring children on to salvation.⁷² In denying infant baptism, therefore, Clark, Cran-

by reading the contemporaneous stream of personal correspondence during this period recorded by Bush.

69. See the *Apogetical Narration* issued by Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Jeremiah Burroughes, William Bridge, and Sidrach Simpson in 1643. John Owen would defend Cotton against the charge of self-contradiction in 1658.

70. Francis Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610–1692* (Boston, Mass.: Northeastern University Press, 1994). As evidenced by Bush’s *Correspondence*, Cotton engaged prodigiously in letter writing during his entire ministry. For an analysis of colonial political and religious support of the Puritan revolt see Bremer, “Puritan Crisis: New England and the English Civil Wars, 1630–1670” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1972).

71. The sermon was delivered on November 10, 1650. Francis Bremer, “In Defense of Regicide: John Cotton on the Execution of Charles I,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 37 (1980), 103–24. Bremer suggests that news of the execution may not have arrived until March, and possibly as late as June, 1650. Demonstrating his awareness of where Pride’s Purge and the first civil war might lead, Cotton had, in 1644, already distinguished between the role of the true church to endure persecution from an unjust magistrate, and the role of the civil authorities to ensure that “neither the church nor the state might suffer any loss.” Ziff, *Cotton on the Churches*, 125.

72. Cotton stressed the unique efficacy of preaching. In his sermons series *Christ the*

dall, and Holmes were exposed as “soul-murderers” whose doctrine would “overthrow all” in the way of a stable, godly society.⁷³ The fines of Clark and Crandall were paid, but rather than permit his fine to be paid, Holmes consented to be “well-whipped.”

When news of the whipping reached England, Cotton faced both public and private rebuke. In the court of English public opinion, John Clark’s *Ill News from New England* allowed Roger Williams to continue his publishing assault on the magistrates and ministers who had banished him.⁷⁴ Privately, Cotton received letters from the likes of Sir Richard Saltonstall (1586–1661), who was “not a little grieved to hear what sad things are reported daily of your tyranny and persecutions in New-England as that you fine, whip and imprison men for their consciences.”⁷⁵ How could the same men who fled persecution in England now take up the whip? Having corresponded with Oliver Cromwell after his endorsement of the Protectorate, Cotton was not over-awed at this rebuke, but chose to remind his old friend of “the vast difference between men’s inventions and God’s institutions. We fled from men’s inventions, to which we else should have been compelled. We compel none to men’s inventions.”⁷⁶ The issue was not persecution in itself, Cotton maintained, but the truth of the doctrine that was at stake. Besides, Boston’s position, along with the wider colony, was clear. There were plenty of other opportunities available in the new world if one insisted on a different polity.

Fountain of Life, preached in the first decade of his Lincolnshire ministry but only published in 1651, Cotton argued that the Scriptures, “have ever yielded matter to the ministers of the gospel, to preach and expound to the people, that by preaching they might bring on men to salvation.” In a curious argument Cotton then produced apostolic itineraries as evidence that the mere reading of Scripture, for all the good it can do, cannot beget faith. John Cotton, *Christ the Fountain of Life* (London, 1651). Charles Hambrick-Stowe, “Christ the Fountaine of Life,” in Kelly Kapic and Randall Gleason, eds., *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2004), 71.

73. See Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 230–243. Much of Ziff’s attention is given to the differences between Baptist and covenantal (Puritan) hermeneutics. For an account of this trial from a Baptist perspective see Keith Durso, *No Armor for the Back: Baptist Prison Writings, 1600s–1700s* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2007).

74. John Clark, *Ill News from New England: Or, a Narrative of New-England’s Persecution* (London, 1652). Roger Williams, *The Bloody Tenet Yet More Bloody* (London, 1652). The full title of Williams’s book includes a reference to Clark’s narrative as well as a rebuke to John Endicott, governor of Boston. John Cotton would not live to read it.

75. “Sir Richard Saltonstall to John Cotton,” in Bush, *Correspondence*, 497.

76. “John Cotton to Sir Richard Saltonstall,” in Bush, *Correspondence*, 502. For Cotton’s letters from and then to Oliver Cromwell, see Bush, *Correspondence*, 458–64, 468–70.

Cotton continued to preach and to write to great effect to the end of his life. William Emerson has documented 1,034 children baptized in the 20 years of Cotton’s New England ministry, along with 652 adults admitted to membership.⁷⁷ Many of his auditors went on to pastor churches in New England, multiplying the impact of his theology and his polity.⁷⁸ Even in November 1652, when it was evident that he was dying, Cotton pressed on in his preaching, apologizing for covering so much of 2 Timothy at a time, but explaining that he desired to finish the book. He did; and as a comet fell across the New England sky, Cotton died on December 23, 1652.⁷⁹ He is buried in the King’s Chapel burying ground in Boston.

77. William Emerson, *An Historical Sketch of the First Church of Boston* (Boston, Mass.: Munroe and Francis, 1812), 81–21. Several of these would have been Cotton’s own children, including: Seaborn (b. 1633), Sarah (b. 1635), Elizabeth (b. 1637), John (b. 1640), Maria (b. 1642), and Rowland (b. 1643). Sarah and Rowland both died in the smallpox epidemic of 1649–1650.

78. James Cooper includes Richard Mather, John Eliot, John Davenport, Edward Norris, Zechariah Symmes, Thomas Allen, John Knowles, “and numbers other future divines” as early members of Boston’s First Church. James Cooper, *Tenacious of their Liberties: The Congregationalists in Colonial Massachusetts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 22. Cotton also served several terms on the Board of Governors of Harvard College, thereby continuing his interest in the education of future ministers.

79. Joshua Scottow explicitly connected the comet with Cotton’s death in Joshua Scottow, *Old Mens Tears for Their Own Declensions* (London, 1691), 16. Cited in Ziff, *Career of John Cotton*, 254.

Lay Leadership and the Foundations of American Congregationalism

FRANCIS J. BREMER

Millersville University of Pennsylvania

The study of early New England religion has traditionally focused on the Puritan clergy and their role in shaping the religious beliefs of the population.¹ This owes much to the fact that the earliest histories of the region—by William Hubbard, Cotton Mather, and others—were written by clergymen who stressed the role of their forbears in creating the “New England Way.” By the late seventeenth century, New England’s clergy had succeeded in parlaying their university education into a justification for increasing their authority over individual congregations and over the churches as a whole, and this success strongly influenced the way that clerical historians viewed the past. For the most part later historians followed this lead, and the fact that the clergy left the preponderance of sources on New England church history in sermons and notebooks reinforced that perspective. But an examination of the earliest years of the region suggests a different story, one of lay believers taking the lead in organizing churches, leading worship, and seeking to better understand the divine plan. And that story begins in the Plymouth colony.

The religious identity of the Plymouth colony was initially shaped by lay leadership. Sermons were preached, prayers were offered, and counsel provided primarily by the congregation’s lay elder, William Brewster. The first New England sermon that we have the text of was preached in Plymouth in December 1621 by a lay congregant who had been a grocer in England and a wool comber in Leiden, Robert Cushman. The responsibility of explaining the Pilgrim church order to the early settlers of

1. NB: references to *OPP* are to Bradford’s *Of Plimoth Plantation*. They will be updated with page references to the new edition being completed.

I am guilty myself, particularly with *Shaping New England: Puritan Clergymen in 17th Century England and New England* (New York: Twayne, 1994).

Massachusetts was entrusted to the Plymouth deacon Samuel Fuller, who had learned enough about medicine to serve as the community's physician. In the 1640s the task of explaining the history and polity of the congregation to the next generation was assumed by the laymen and governor William Bradford in a series of written "Dialogues" between the "Young Men" of the colony and the "Ancient Men." This, then, is a different story about New England's church history. It begins in the earliest traces of lay empowerment in England's pre-Reformation history.

Lay Empowerment in England

The valuation of the laity which was at the heart of Congregationalism had deep roots in English history. While the Lollard movement of the fourteenth century drew inspiration from the Oxford priest and theologian John Wycliffe, it involved lay believers, women as well as men, gathering in secret meetings where they "read and discussed the scriptures, heard sermons, and distributed books."² One of the spokesmen for the movement asserted that "every man, holy and predestined to eternal life, even if he is a layman, is a true minister and priest ordained by God to administer the sacraments necessary for the salvation of man, although no bishop shall ever lay hands on him."³ Lollardy was never completely suppressed, continuing as an underground tradition of friends, families, and neighbors gathering in secret to exchange their understanding of God's will. For lay believers to act in this fashion it was necessary for such individuals to draw guidance from the Scriptures, so a central tenet of Lollardy was the demand that the Scriptures be made available in the vernacular.

We can assume that the Lollard underground would have been encouraged by the call of Martin Luther for vernacular Bibles and the priesthood of all believers. Influenced by Luther, and perhaps the Lollard heritage, the English reformer William Tyndale set out to translate the Bible into English, stating that his goal was to enable "the boy who drove the plow to know more of the scriptures" than many clergymen, arguing that "there are many found among the laymen which are as wise as their officers."⁴ He opposed the monopoly on authority claimed by ordained clergy, and went

2. Christopher Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth-Century England* (Basingstoke, England: Macmillan, 1998), 169.

3. Quoted in Claire Cross, *Church and People, 1450–1660: The Triumph of the Laity in the English Church* (Hassocks, England: Harvester, 1976), 9–10.

4. William Tyndale, *The Whole Works of W. Tyndal, John Frith, and Doc. Barnes* (Iohn Daye under Aldersgate, 1573), 285–86.

so far in one statement to argue that women could preach and administer the sacraments “if necessity required.”

Efforts to advance what many perceived as further reforms of the church continued, following Henry VIII’s break with Rome, the reforms that were instituted by Edward VI, the Catholic counter-Reformation of Mary Tudor, and into the reign of Elizabeth, whose state church was deemed insufficiently reformed by the hotter sort of Protestants. There were university graduates, ordained clergy, and even some bishops who worked within the structures of the church to achieve reforms such as the abandonment of clerical vestments, signing with the cross in baptism, the provision of an educated preaching ministry in all parishes, and a more rigorous denial of the Lord’s Supper to those who were deemed spiritually ineligible.

From these first days of the Reformation there was a tension between the belief in the ability of believers inspired by the Spirit of God to directly understand the demands of Scripture and the concerns of church authorities to maintain control over doctrine and practice. Henry VIII opposed Tyndale’s efforts and helped engineer his arrest and execution for heresy by imperial authorities. Yet it was a layman, Thomas Cromwell, whom Henry appointed Vicegerent in Spirituals, who helped shape the structure of the Protestant Church of England. Thomas Cranmer, Henry’s Archbishop of Canterbury, was skeptical of lay empowerment but during the reign of Edward VI welcomed to England continental reformers such as Martin Bucer, who had a broader view of the role of the laity. When Mary Tudor succeeded Edward and sought to restore Catholicism, it was lay men and women who organized underground churches to sustain the Protestant spirit in England while prominent reformers such as Cranmer were executed and others departed into exile on the continent.

Following the accession of Elizabeth I in 1558 the Protestant character of the Church of England was restored, but not all reformers were satisfied with the extent of the changes. Unable to gain the support of the church hierarchy, those who were seen as the hotter sort of Protestants—Puritans as they were called—drew upon lay support and emphasized the role of the laity. Some laymen used their right to install clergy in parishes that they controlled to appoint Puritan ministers. In these and other parishes fervent lay believers often pressured their ministers to resist episcopal demands to conform to matters such as wearing prescribed vestments and requiring that recipients of the Lord’s Supper kneel to receive it.

Some believers, finding themselves in parishes where reform was successfully resisted, separated themselves from the church and began to

worship on their own. Such gatherings, branded conventicles by the authorities, who deemed them illegal, were a way for men and women to engage in proper worship without tarrying for changes that might eventually be approved by the bishops. In some cases a group of friends and neighbors could all be laypeople; in other cases someone who had held a ministerial living could be part of the group. In the early years of the seventeenth century such a group came together in Scrooby, Lincolnshire, where believers were hosted for prayer, psalm singing, and the sharing of spiritual insight by William Brewster.

Brewster and the Scrooby Congregation

Brewster was a layman who had studied for a year or so at Peterhouse College in Cambridge at a time when the university had a strong Puritan presence. He left his studies to take up a post in the household of William Davison, a prominent figure in the court of Queen Elizabeth who eventually became the Queen's Secretary of State, and was inclined to support Puritanism.⁵ Brewster accompanied Davison on two separate missions to the Netherlands in the mid-1580s and there observed the practices of the churches there. But any hopes Brewster may have had for his own advancement were ended when Davison was scapegoated by the queen for his role in delivering the death warrant for the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1587. Brewster returned to Scrooby by 1588.

A decade later the churchwardens of St. Wilfrid's in Scrooby reported the parish curate for not wearing the surplice during services, and Brewster for "repeating sermons publicly in the church without authority." Puritans were known for taking sermon notes and meeting with family and friends to discuss the points raised, and often these discussions could stray into other areas of faith and practice. Justifying such efforts, the layman Robert Cushman would write "that if the country and kingdom where we live take no public course for preaching, yet the Gospel may still be found in families, and from neighbor to neighbor."⁶ The complaint against Brewster also noted that on occasion he traveled to neighboring churches to hear

5. Davison is said to have been an elder of a Puritan church in Antwerp. Winnifred Cockshott, *The Pilgrim Fathers: Their Church and Colony* (London : Methuen, 1909), 57, citing add. MSS. 6394 for elder & on Cartwright SP Dom (July 22, 1586).

6. Robert Cushman, *The Cry of a Stone: A Treatise showing What is Right Matter, Form and Government of the Visible Church of Christ*, ed. Michael R. Paulick, transcribed and annotated by James Baker (1642; repr., Plymouth, Mass.: General Society of Mayflower Descendants, 2016), 147.

sermons preached, likely referring to nearby Babworth and Bawtry, where the Puritans Richard Clyfton and John Deacon could be heard.⁷ At the time Brewster only received an admonition.

By 1602 there was clearly a group of godly men and women who had gathered around Brewster to enrich their spiritual lives. In 1603 they were probably among the many Puritans who hoped that the new king, James I, would bring about the type of religious changes they had lobbied for. But the king dashed those hopes at the Hampton Court Conference, and in the aftermath the church authorities began to demand and enforce closer conformity to prescribed practices, with many clergymen who refused removed from their positions.

Puritans were forced to decide whether or not to continue in the church or to separate. According to William Bradford, the Scrooby conventicle organized into a congregation around 1605 or 1606 when “the Lord’s free people joined themselves (by a covenant of the Lord) into a church estate, in the fellowship of the gospel, to walk in all his ways made known, or to be made known to them, according to their best endeavors, whatsoever it should cost them.”⁸ The process they used—what would become the norm in Congregationalism—was described by John Murton, a disciple of a neighboring Separatist clergyman, John Smyth: “Do we not know the beginnings of [Robinson’s] Church?” he wrote, “That there was first one stood up and made a covenant, and then another, and these two joined together, and then a third, and these became a church, say they, etc.”⁹ In a world where parishes and ecclesiastical jurisdictions were created from above, the lay believers gathered in the Scrooby Manor House formed their own church. The congregation then chose Richard Clyfton, who had been deprived of a clerical living in nearby Babworth in 1604 as their minister. John Robinson, who had been ejected from a curacy in Norwich, joined the congregation. Both had been troubled by the implications of Separatism and had discussed it with fellow Puritans but finally accepted the need for it.

To understand the expanded role of the laity in the period we are looking at, it is helpful to realize that this was a time in which there were no

7. Jeremy Dupertius Bangs, *Strangers and Pilgrims, Travellers and Sojourners: Leiden and the Foundations of Plymouth Plantation* (Plymouth, Mass.: General Society of Mayflower Descendants, 2009), 13.

8. *OPP*, 9.

9. William Eleazar Barton, *Congregational Creeds and Covenants* (Chicago: Advance Publishing Company, 1917), 44.

hard and fast barriers between the individual self and the spiritual cosmos. Ordinary men and women believed that they could be touched by the divine—and potentially by the devil. Belief in being led to truth by the power of the Holy Spirit was the more positive side of a continuum that included belief in demonic possession. As valuable as university training was, natural reason was deemed insufficient alone to understand Scripture. It was possible for ordinary believers, with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to discern God's will to a degree that could be greater than that of formally educated clergy. Robert Cushman wrote of the clergy that "not one of twenty of them that are trained up in the university are fit to be Preachers, seeing as it is not human learning that maketh a man a preacher but other helps of nature and grace, without which human learning makes a man play the fool rather than the wise man."¹⁰

At the same time, the lay and clerical leaders of congregationalism recognized that even with the guidance of the Spirit, men were fallible and agreement was not always possible, for, as Cushman explained, "whilst we are here, we are frail men and some frailties will still appear in us."¹¹ Robinson himself, according to Bradford, recognized his insufficiency "and was ever desirous of any light, and the more able, learned and holy the persons were, the more he desired to confer and reason with them." Another member of Robinson's congregation, Edward Winslow, captured the point in a recollection he published of Robinson's teachings. Robinson, he remembered, "was very confident the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of his holy Word." Robinson bemoaned "the state and condition of the Reformed Churches, who would come to a period in Religion, and would go no further." Thus, "for example the Lutherans they could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw, for whatever part of God's will he had further imparted and revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. And so also," Robinson lamented, "you see the Calvinists, they stick where he left them, a misery much to be lamented; for though they were precious shining lights in their times, yet God had not revealed his whole will to them." He exhorted his own congregation "to take heed what we received for truth, and well to examine and compare, and weigh it with other Scriptures of truth, before we received it. For, saith he, *It is not possible*

10. Robert Cushman, *The Cry of a Stone*, 141.

11. Robert Cushman, *The Cry of a Stone*, 147.

the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick Antichristian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once."¹²

When believers approached discussions of faith with such humility, recognizing that others might have better insight than they did, they could unite in dynamic discussions of their faith. Individuals needed to test their insight against the insights of other godly individuals. In cases where agreement was not a possibility, the advice of John Eliot to someone who disagreed was "brother, learn the meaning of these three little words, bear, forbear, forgive."¹³ Similarly, Robert Cushman wrote that "in things therefore probable and doubtful, it better becomes us to seem ignorant than to grow presumptuous."¹⁴ When a congregation included some who discarded such advice because they were closed-minded, presumptuous, and convinced that their beliefs were true reflections of God's truth, the result could be schism.

The Way to Leiden and Plymouth

Having formed themselves into a separate congregation, the Scrooby believers found themselves, as Bradford wrote, "hunted and persecuted on every side;... some were taken and clapped up in prison, others had their homes beset and watched day and night,... and the most were fain to flee and leave their habitations, and the means of their livelihood."¹⁵ After two failed attempts, most successfully left England. They first settled in Amsterdam, worshiping with the congregation of the "Ancient Brethren" as it was called. That congregation had existed in some form since 1593, but in welcoming new arrivals from England—not merely the Scrooby congregation, but others such as members of John Smyth's Gainsborough congregation—the unity of the church was challenged. Bradford tells us that after about a year Robinson, Brewster, and other leaders of the Scrooby group, seeing "that the flames of contention were like to break out in that

12. Edward Winslow, *Hypocisie Unmasked* (London: Printed by Rich. Cotes, for John Bellamy at the three Golden Lions in Cornhill, neare the Royall Exchange, 1646), 97–99.

13. Cotton Mather, *The Life and Death of the Renown'd Mr. John Eliot* (London, 1691), 39. In an email communication David Luper has suggested that this is a Christian adaptation from the advice of the Stoic Epictetus to "Bear and forbear." Also see David A. Luper, *Greeks, Romans, and Pilgrims: Classical Republicanism in Early New England* (Brill, Leiden: 2017), 117–21.

14. Stone, *Cry of a Stone*, 173.

15. *OPP*, 10.

ancient church, . . . thought it was best to remove, before they were any way engaged with the same."¹⁶

They chose to move to Leiden, a city that Brewster had visited when in Davison's service. Clyfton chose to remain in Amsterdam. Those who moved to Leiden chose Robinson as their new pastor, and Brewster as their elder.¹⁷ In Leiden the openness to further light led Robinson and Brewster to engage in dialogue with faculty at the University of Leiden and discussions with other English exiles such as Henry Jacob, William Ames, and Robert Parker, and with the Dutch Mennonite Pieter Twisck. Robinson shifted his position on engagement with non-Reformed churches and their believers as a result of such exchanges. Robinson had previously subscribed to the positions that had been set out by early separatists such as Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, labeling parish church buildings as "idol houses" which no godly believer should enter. But during the Leiden years he came to accept that it was acceptable for saints to listen to sermons and join in prayer in such churches, condemning only the sharing of the sacraments.¹⁸ This was the position of Henry Jacob, who allowed the members of the separatist church he established in London to have such interaction with parish assemblies, and it was an important concession for the Scrooby believers when they settled in New England.

This was a shift that was undoubtedly discussed within the congregation because Robinson was one of the strongest advocates of lay preaching and discussion, which was referred to as "prophesying." This practice was one in which, as Cushman (who was a deacon of the church) wrote,

all the gifts and graces of the spirit are freely shown forth without restraint; there the Word of God is not bound in by policy, tradition, custom, &c.; . . . if you have a word of wisdom or exhortation, there you may utter it. If you would learn anything, there you may ask and receive freely. . . . Stand you in need of instruction, exhortation or comfort, they are ready to give it to you. Do you stumble or fall, either by error of judgment, of failing in conversion? Why, they will help both to raise and hold you up. Have you need of some gentle rebukes as a balm to your soul or of some sharp and severe threatenings to beat down your proud flesh, yea, need you aught either for soul or body?

16. *OPP*, 16.

17. By far the best study of the Pilgrims in Leiden is Bangs, *Strangers and Pilgrims*.

18. Timothy George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1982), 184.

Why, there it is to be had freely, and whatsoever is wanting in the outward glory is supplied seven-fold in the inward grace.¹⁹

After about a dozen years in Leiden, some members of the congregation proposed moving yet again. While these Englishmen were able to exercise their faith freely in the Netherlands, life in other ways was difficult. Most hadn't learned to speak the language, earning a living was more difficult than what it had been in England, and their children were drawn to the looser cultural standards of the Dutch, among other things. The fact that a truce between Spain and the Netherlands would soon expire cast a further cloud over them. Discussions about various options, negotiations to obtain a charter, and efforts to gain financial support for a move to the New World eventually led to the departure of the *Mayflower* and the eventual settlement at Plymouth.

Organizing the Plymouth Congregation: The Plymouth Way

John Robinson remained in Leiden with those members of the congregation who did not choose to emigrate at the time. While he hoped that he would later join the group in Plymouth, he died before he could realize that plan; he blamed this in part on the unwillingness of the colony's English investors to bear the cost of sending other members of the congregation to America. This meant that when the settlers held their first service in the New World they were led in their prayers by Elder William Brewster. Not having an ordained clergyman did not hinder the members of the congregation from having the spiritual communion that they valued, but it did mean that the sacraments—baptism and the Lord's Supper—were not available to them, at least in their traditional form. Brewster evidently wrote to Robinson to solicit his views as to whether he, as Elder, could administer the sacraments, but the pastor responded in December 1623 indicating that as he understood the Scriptures, this was not a duty an Elder could perform.²⁰

It has been suggested by one scholar that Robinson's concern only related to the Lord's Supper, since Robinson, Jacob, and others had acknowledged the appropriateness of lay baptism in cases where a congregation did not have a minister.²¹ At the same time, there is some evidence

19. Stone, *Cry of a Stone*, 87.

20. *OPP*, 376–77.

21. Stephen Brachlow, *Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570–1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 195. But it is to be noted that the English investors recorded complaints of the lack of *both* sacraments.

suggesting that having children baptized was not as urgent a priority as we might suggest. Charles Chauncy came to the colony in 1637 and ministered at Plymouth and then Scituate before moving on to become president of Harvard. He advanced the controversial view that baptism should be by full immersion. Many felt that this was inappropriate in the winter given the harsh climate in New England, and the records indicate that some declined to rush their infants to be baptized at certain times of the year.²²

Of course, not all of the colonists were former members of the Leiden congregation, which raises a question about who attended the religious services. Strict separatists would have forbidden sharing prayer with the ungodly, but presumably Robinson's willingness to have members of his congregation listen to sermons and pray in parish churches would have also meant that non-members could join the members in praying together and listening to sermons in Plymouth. They would not have been allowed to receive the sacraments, but that was not relevant if they were not available.

The fact that Brewster asked Robinson about whether or not he could administer the sacraments might indicate that the non-congregants were complaining about the absence of the sacrament—no Lord's Supper, and in the case of baptism, no baptism or a disorderly administration of it. This appears to have been the rationale when the colony's English financiers sent a clergyman over in 1624. The individual was John Lyford, who may or may not have been a Puritan, but who believed that his ordination as a Church of England minister gave him the authority to administer sacraments.²³ But Lyford was not called to the ministerial office by the Plymouth congregants. The separatist settlers had not formed a new congregation by entering into a new covenant. They still considered themselves part of the Leiden congregation with John Robinson as their pastor, which would explain why they were not willing to empower Lyford, but also why they didn't elect William Brewster as their pastor. Lyford gathered the support of some colonists and evidently began to preside over separate religious meetings. It is possible that he administered or planned to administer the sacrament of baptism

22. I have benefited from discussion of the issue of baptism in emails from Jeremy Bangs, April 21, 2014; and Diarmaid MacCulloch, May 25, 2018.

23. Michael Winship disputes the accounts that label Lyford an "Anglican"—a term not in use at the time—and suggests that he was a nonconforming Puritan who believed his powers derived from his acceptance by the members of a godly parish. But there is no direct evidence of this and we don't know enough about the parish he had served to make it persuasive. See Winship, *Godly Republicanism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012), 120–33.

to children born in the colony. While the details of his actions are unclear, it is well documented that he wrote letters to the colony's English backers that were harshly critical of the Pilgrim leadership and church. Those letters were intercepted by Governor Bradford, leading to Lyford's eventual expulsion from the colony.

John Robinson died in 1625.²⁴ Some members of the Leiden congregation had trickled into Plymouth during the 1620s, but the colony did not receive its first acceptable clergyman until July 1629, when Ralph Smith was chosen to be pastor of the congregation. So, with the exception of the brief time in which Lyford was in the settlement, William Brewster presided over the colony's religious life throughout its first decade. What was that like?

What had emerged as the Plymouth Way rested on a congregation being formed by believing Christians who came together to draw up and subscribe to a covenant. Members were admitted on the basis of an assessment of a profession of faith but were not required to offer a personal narrative claiming that they were saved. The members then chose church officers based on an assessment of their gifts. Worship was in a plain, unadorned meetinghouse which was not considered to be holy ground. The service itself featured prayers, the singing of psalms, a sermon, and on occasion discussion of doctrine with questions and contributions made by members. Discipline of erring members was ultimately the responsibility of the congregation as a whole, though before it came to that, efforts would have been made by individuals and then the church officers to correct the individual.

The Role of Women in the Congregation

There is a mystery surrounding the early life of the congregation, and it centers on the role of women. There was a strain in the English reform movement that gave significant opportunities to women. There was certainly no gender bias when it came to urging Christians to read the Scriptures. William Tyndale so distrusted the authority of ordained clergymen that he accepted that in special circumstances, "if necessity required," women could preach and even administer the sacraments.²⁵ Stephen Geree believed that

24. The members of the congregation still in the Netherlands did not find a replacement, and eventually merged with the English Reformed Church in Leiden in 1644.

25. Ethan Shagan, "The Emergence of the Church of England, c. 1520–1553," in Anthony Milton, ed., *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520–1662* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 38.

the grace that enabled believers to understand Scripture was available to women as well as men, so that “sharpness of apprehension and soundness of judgment” was found among them as well as men.²⁶ Certainly women often played a significant role in gatherings of godly men and women who came together to discuss religious matters. We have examples of this in Bridget Cooke in Kersey, England and in Anne Hutchinson, first in Alford, England and then in Boston, Massachusetts.²⁷ It comes from a later period, but it is worth noting that John Bunyan recounted how his own progress in faith had been prompted by encountering a group of women sitting in a doorway talking “about a new birth, the work of God on their hearts, and also how they were convinced of their miserable state by nature.”²⁸ The Dedham Conference debated but could reach no conclusion on the proposition that a woman could lead family prayers if she had a greater gift than her husband. There was no disputing that a woman *could* have a greater gift.²⁹

Certainly, if such a group of believers organized into a congregation, women were expected to swear to the covenant to establish themselves as members. But what was their role once the church was formed? It is generally believed that they had a subordinate role, but there is no actual policy statement denying them rights. A striking piece of evidence to the contrary is to be found in the reconstitution of the English church in Rotterdam in 1633 under the leadership of Hugh Peter. John Forbes, representing the classis of English churches in the Netherlands, presided over the election of officers. The vote favored Peter’s selection as pastor. But Forbes addressed the congregation, saying, “I see the men choose him, but what do the women do?” at which point the women raised their hands as well.³⁰ This is one case, but there is no way of knowing how representative it was.

The next question is whether women could express their views in a congregation and vote on disciplinary and other matters. As for voting they may well have been able to vote, since the principle that distinguished

26. Stephen Gere, *The Ornament of Women* (London: Printed by T. B[adger] for L. F[awne] and S. G[ellibrand] and are to be sold at the signe of the Brazen Serpent, in Pauls Church-Yard, 1639), 20. As quoted in Diane Willen, “Godly Women in Early Modern England: Puritanism and Gender,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43, no. 4 (1992), 567.

27. See Bremer, *Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

28. John Bunyan, *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* (1666; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), 10.

29. Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 266–67.

30. Stephen Goffe in the Hague to William Laud, 26 April 1633, SP 16/286/202.

Congregationalism from Presbyterianism and other polities was the understanding that Christ had entrusted the keys of discipline to the whole church and not just its elders. As for speaking, John Robinson never went so far as to allow unrestrained participation by women (or men, for that matter) in congregational discussions, but did allow that in cases where they were "immediately, and extraordinarily, and miraculously inspired," women might speak without restraint.³¹ He further held that despite Paul's strictures against the role of women in the church, women were free to speak up against perceived injustice or impropriety of doctrine. He wrote that "It may seem most plain that he [Paul] hath no eye, nor respect at all, to these extraordinary gifts and endowments of prophecy authorizing even women furnished with them, to speak publicly, and in men's presence, as appears in Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Anna, as also in Jezebel herself in regard of order, and others."³² With the breakdown of ecclesiastical controls during the English Civil Wars, many women took to the streets to preach. It is likely that they had some experience of sharing their beliefs in less public settings, in conventicles and congregations, earlier.³³

Ministries of the Word and Charity

The Plymouth congregation met twice on the Sabbath and likely for a Thursday lecture. According to an account by Isaack de Rasieres, secretary at New Amsterdam, who visited the colony in the late 1620s, the settlers worshiped in the lower level of a large square house which served as the colony's fort, the upper level holding cannon that commanded the surrounding countryside. As was common among Puritans, the congregation gathered Sunday for services in both the morning and afternoon. De Rasieres noted that the settlers "assemble by beat of drum, each with his musket or firelock, in front of the captain's door; they have their cloaks on and place themselves in order, three abreast, and are led by a sergeant without beat of drum. Behind comes the Governor, in a long robe; beside him, on the right hand, comes the preacher with his cloak on, and with a small cane."³⁴ The actual service would have consisted of prayer, a sermon by Brewster or another lay preacher, and psalm singing. As was the case

31. George, *John Robinson*, 149–50.

32. Bangs, *Strangers and Pilgrims*, 167.

33. See Keith Thomas, "Women and the Civil War Sects," *Past & Present*, 13 (1958), 45; Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (1992).

34. Sydney V. James, Jr., ed., *Three Visitors to Early Plymouth* (Plimoth Plantation, 1963), 76–77.

in Leiden, individuals were free to raise questions or add insight by way of prophesying.

According to Bradford, Brewster's sermons were plain and direct, and capable of moving the emotions. As for leading the congregation in prayer, Bradford wrote that Brewster "had a singular good gift in prayer, in ripping up the heart and conscience before God in the humble confession of sin and begging the mercies of God in Christ for the pardon of the same." He believed that it was better "for ministers to pray oftener and divide their prayers, than be long and tedious in the same."³⁵ Brewster, of course, was not the only one to preach. Robert Cushman had written that "every Christian that hath received a gift of God for that purpose may preach the word, and so consequently be heard in any assembly where there may be an audience."³⁶ During a brief stay in the colony in the Fall of 1621 he preached a sermon on *The Danger of Self-Love, and the Sweetness of True Friendship*. It is likely that Samuel Fuller and Bradford also offered lay sermons in the 1620s.

Cushman's sermon captured the essence of what may be called the Puritan social gospel, a call to serve community above self. The text he took was 1 Corinthians 10:24: "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." Like other Puritans he opposed the growing individualistic ethic that was gaining strength at this time. He urged his listeners to "let this self-seeking be left off, and turn the stream another way, namely, seek the good of your brethren, please them, honor them, reverence them, for otherwise it will never go well amongst you." He feared that the hardships the colonists had faced in their first year had tempted many to focus on their personal welfare rather than the common good. It was this temptation that Cushman feared and addressed. He warned that "that bird of self-love which was hatched at home, if it be not looked to, will eat out the life of all grace and goodness. And though men have escaped the danger of the sea, and that cruel mortality which swept away so many of our loving friends and brethren, yet, except they purge out this self-love, a worse mischief is prepared for them." In words very similar to those that John Winthrop would utter in 1630, Cushman exhorted the Plymouth colonists to "labor to be joined together [as one body] and knit by flesh and sinews. Away with envy at the good of others, and rejoice in his good, and sorrow for his evil. Let his joy be your joy, and his sorrow thy sorrow. Let his sickness be thy

35. OPP, 327–28.

36. Cushman, *Cry of a Stone*, 139.

sickness, his hunger thy hunger, his poverty thy poverty. And if you profess friendship, be friends in adversities; for then a friend is known and tried, and not before."³⁷

A sense of how prophesying fit into the service can be found in an account John Winthrop recorded in 1632 on a visit to Plymouth on which he was accompanied by Boston's Rev. John Wilson. Ralph Smith was the pastor at the time, with Brewster the Elder and Roger Williams a member of the congregation. During the afternoon service Williams "(according to their custom) propounded a question, to which the pastor, Mr. Smith, spoke briefly, then Mr. Williams prophesied, and after, the Governor of Plymouth [Bradford] spoke to the question; after him the Elder [Brewster], then some two or three more of the congregation." Brewster then invited Winthrop and Wilson to speak to the issue, "which they did."³⁸

The congregation held itself responsible for supporting members in special need, and Winthrop's account of his visit indicates how funds were gathered for the purpose. At the end of the afternoon service, "Mr. Fuller put the congregation in mind of their duty of contribution whereupon the Governor and all the rest went down to the deacon's seat and put it into the box and then returned."³⁹

Beginnings of the Salem Congregation

Samuel Fuller had served as a deacon in the church in Leiden and had been engaged in some of the religious disputes that troubled the separatist congregations in the Netherlands. In New England he would play a key role in informing the first settlers of Massachusetts of what Plymouth congregationalism consisted of. In 1628 the Massachusetts Bay Company dispatched an advance party of settlers to New England. They were led by John Endecott and settled on the coast at Naumkeag, which was soon renamed Salem. No clergyman accompanied them and they were not

37. Robert Cushman, *A Sermon Preached at Plimoth in New-England December 9, 1621. In an Assembly of his Majesty's faithful Subjects there inhabiting. Wherein is Showed the Danger of Self-Love, and the Sweetness of True Friendship. Together with a Preface Showing the State of the Country, and Condition of the Savages. Rom. 12. 10. "Be affectioned to love one another with brotherly love."* Written in the year 1621. (London: Printed by I[ohn] D[awson] for Iohn Bellamie, and are to be sold at his shop at the two Grey-hounds in Corne-hill, neere the Royall Exchange, 1622), 11–12.

38. John Winthrop, *The Journal of John Winthrop 1630–1649*, edited by Richard S. Dunn, James Savage, and Laetitia Yeandle (Cambridge, 1996), 82.

39. Winthrop, *Journal*, 82.

provided with any blueprint detailing how they were to worship. It is likely that they gathered together informally to pray and Endecott or someone else may have preached. Such conferences of lay believers were common in areas of strong Puritan influence in England, and had been recommended by the clergyman Richard Rogers in his popular *Seven Treatises, containing directions out of Scripture, leading to true happiness* (1610).

As had been the case in Plymouth, the Salem settlers soon found themselves suffering from disease. Endecott wrote to Governor Bradford seeking assistance, and the Plymouth Governor dispatched Samuel Fuller, who served as the Pilgrims' physician as well as a deacon of the church. We don't know how Fuller diagnosed and treated the Salem colonists, nor how successful he was. But there is clear evidence of the impact he had on the faith of the settlers. On May 11, 1629 Endecott wrote to Bradford expressing his sense of unity with the Plymouth colonists, believing that they were "servants to one master, . . . marked with one and the same mark, and sealed with one and the same seal." They had, "for the main, one and the same heart, guided by one and the same spirit of truth; and where this is there can be no discord, nay, here must needs be sweet harmony." Thanking Bradford for sending Fuller, he rejoiced that Fuller had satisfied him, and presumably many other Salemites, of the validity of "your judgments of the outward form of God's worship." The Plymouth Way—if we can so designate it—was "no other than is warranted by the evidence of truth, and the same which I have professed and maintained ever since the Lord in mercy revealed himself unto me." Furthermore, he was pleased that Fuller had made clear that the Plymouth Way was "far differing from the common report that hath been spread of you touching" church practice.⁴⁰ During this period there were other contacts between the two settlements (as noted in the letter from Charles Gott, discussed below), during which Salem residents may have learned more about the congregational practices of the Plymouth church.

Shortly after this, on June 29, six shiploads of colonists arrived in Salem, including three English clergymen—Samuel Skelton, Francis Higginson, and Francis Bright. It is likely that they found that there already existed a covenanted church in Salem, formed in accord with the congregational principles that had led to the organization of the Scrooby congregation, members of whom were then resident in Plymouth. Evidence for this can

40. Governor William Bradford's Letter Book, reprinted from *The Mayflower Descendant* (Bedford, Mass.: Massachusetts Society of Mayflower Descendants, 2001), 46–47.

be found in Governor Bradford's *Letterbook*. Immediately after copying out Endecott's letter of May 11 the Plymouth governor wrote that some in Salem "quickly grew into church order and set themselves roundly to walk in all the ways of God."⁴¹

The way in which this occurred was set out by Charles Gott, a resident of Salem who would become a deacon of that church and who wrote to Bradford on July 30. Gott began by thanking Bradford for the hospitality that had been shown to him and his wife when they had visited Plymouth earlier, another indication of contact between the two groups of English colonies. Writing of the religious situation in Salem, Gott indicated that "it hath pleased God to lay a foundation, the which I hope is agreeable to his word, in every thing." This included the formation of a church and, likely, some form of covenant. Francis Bright, who had been a curate of John Davenport's at St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, in London, left Salem and soon returned to England. Davenport was still a conformist, and if Bright shared that rector's views Bright may have found the proceedings in Salem troublesome.⁴² A congregation having been formed, Endecott had set aside July 20 "for a solemn day of humiliation for the choice of a pastor and teacher." The Salem congregation did not accept the validity of the English ordination of Higginson and Skelton, and members questioned the two men "concerning their callings" to the ministry. The two men agreed with the laity and acknowledged the Lord gives a two-fold calling, "the one an inward calling, when the Lord moved the heart of a man to take that calling upon him, and fitted him with gifts for the same; the second (the outward calling) was from the people, when a company of believers are joined together in covenant to walk together in all the ways of God, every member (being men) are to have a free voice in the choice of their officers."⁴³

After Skelton and Higginson addressed the issues of their two-fold calling, every "fit member wrote, in a note, his name whom the Lord moved him to think was fit for a pastor, and so likewise, whom they would have for a teacher." Skelton was chosen to be pastor, and Higginson teacher. "Three or four of the gravest members of the church"—often called the pillars of the church—then ordained the two with an imposition of hands. Some elders and deacons were chosen, but not ordained, August 6 being

41. *Bradford's Letterbook*, 7.

42. Francis J. Bremer, *Building a New Jerusalem: John Davenport, a Puritan in Three Worlds* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2012), 95.

43. *Lettrbook*, 47–48.

set for that. According to Nathaniel Morton, William Bradford's nephew, the Plymouth governor "and some others with him" planned to attend that ceremony, but "coming by sea, were hindered by cross winds, [so] they could not be there at the beginning of the day, but they came into the Assembly afterward, and gave them the right hand of fellowship."⁴⁴

Williston Walker, in his magisterial *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, argued that a reading of Gott's letter makes clear that the congregation had been formed after Fuller's visit and before the selection of Skelton and Higginson to be pastor and teacher.⁴⁵ When, in the 1630s and 1640s, English and Scottish Presbyterians sought to discredit the New England Way by emphasizing the role played in its establishment by the Plymouth separatists, defenders of the colonial churches such as John Cotton rejected that narrative and argued for other, non-separatist Puritan influences. Many scholars, notably Perry Miller in *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts* (1933), followed this lead, contending that there was a sharp difference between the separatism of Plymouth and the related but very different non-separating Puritanism of the Bay colony and the sister Bible commonwealths of Connecticut and New Haven. Miller not only sought to establish a separate, distinctly intellectual, line of thinking that led to Massachusetts orthodoxy, but also to prioritize the role of a hierarchical elite in crafting that orthodoxy. Others, such as Michael P. Winship in *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (2012), have reasserted the role of Plymouth, though those who write on the subject generally date the formation of the congregation as occurring on August 6, thus (like Miller) emphasizing the role of the clergy and diminishing the importance of what Walker clearly demonstrated was the lay formation of the church.⁴⁶

The Plymouth Pattern, the New England Way, and Congregationalism

The influence of Plymouth on Salem, and therefore on all of the churches later formed in New England, is important not only for properly understanding the history of the region, but the broader history of Congregationalism.

44. Nathaniel Morton, *New-Englands Memorial* (1669) Morton, 75.

45. Williston Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, 102–7.

46. Nathaniel Morton, Bradford's nephew, who acquired his uncle's papers, wrote an account of the formation of the Salem church in which he implied that Higginson and Skelton played a large role. But this was written long after the events, at a time when enhanced clerical authority had been established in the region.

There are a number of other incidents that reinforce the role that Brewster, Fuller, and the congregation that was first formed in Scrooby played in the shaping of the New England Way.

A good indication of the fact that Salem had largely copied the Plymouth model is to be found in the story of how later Puritan arrivals in Salem were allowed to worship there. In June 12, 1630 the *Arbella* and other vessels carrying John Winthrop and the first large influx of settlers arrived in Salem. The Salem congregation welcomed the arrivals, but, as John Cotton soon complained in a letter to Samuel Skelton, denied “the Lords Supper to such godly & faithfull servants of Christ as Mr. Governor [Winthrop], Mr. [Isaac] Johnson, Mr. [Thomas] Dudley, Mr. [William Coddington],” and “denied baptism to Mr. Coddington’s child.” The justification, as Cotton understood it, was because they were not “members of any particular reformed church.” Moreover, the church had “admitted one of Mr. [John] Lathrop’s congregation, not only to the Lord’s Supper, but his child unto baptism, upon sight of his testimony from his church.” Trying to understand the reasons for these decisions, Cotton concluded that “your change hath sprung from new-Plymouth men, whom though I much esteem as godly & loving Christians, yet their grounds which they received for this tenant from Mr. Robinson do not satisfy me.”⁴⁷ Interestingly, and ironically, Samuel Fuller was again in the Bay in the summer of 1630 and reported to Bradford that Coddington himself had told him that “Mr. Cotton’s charge [to the departing Winthrop fleet] at Hampton “was, that they should take advice of those at Plymouth, and should do nothing to offend them.”⁴⁸

After he arrived in Massachusetts, Cotton’s tune changed. He accepted the same practices that he had complained about, while later denying that the New England Way drew its inspiration from Robinson and Plymouth. But a close look at the behavior of the Salem congregation shows that it had in effect adopted the policies of their friends to the south. Robinson had concluded that members of his church could interact with non-covenanted individuals in listening to sermons and joining in prayer in parish churches—and presumably welcome such individuals to join in those aspects of their own services—but not share in the sacraments with them. All of the newcomers were evidently allowed to join in prayer with the Salem church members and to attend sermons. The exclusion of Winthrop

47. Cotton to Skelton, in Sargent Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 141–49.

48. Fuller to Bradford, June 28, 1630 in *Bradford’s Letterbook*, 56–57.

and others from the sacraments until they had been accepted as members of covenanted churches is a reflection of the Plymouth Way, as was allowing a member of Lathrop's recognized covenanted congregation in London (originally organized by Jacob) to share in their sacraments.

As for the administration of Baptism, we are told that "letters did pass between Mr. Higginson, and Mr. Brewster, the reverend Elder of the Church of Plymouth, and they did agree in their judgments, viz. concerning the church-membership of the children with their parents, and that Baptism was a seal of their membership, only when they were adult, they being not scandalous, they were to be examined by the church-officers, and upon their approbation of their fitness, and upon the children's public and personal owning of the Covenant, they were to be received unto the Lord's Supper." A result of this exchange was the admission of the young Francis Higginson Jr. to the Salem church based on the membership of his father.⁴⁹

During Fuller's 1630 visit in Massachusetts, he did indicate that there were mixed views in the Bay colony on adopting the Plymouth pattern, "opposers there is not wanting, and satan is busy." In Mattapan, the Rev. John Warham held "that the visible church may consist of a mixed people, godly, and openly ungodly"—a mix that replicated the situation in England's parishes. In Watertown, the Rev. George Phillips told Fuller "in private, that if they will have him stand minister, by that calling which he received from the prelates in England, he will leave them." Fuller had "conference with them till I was weary." But though Plymouth had "some privy enemies in the Bay but (blessed be God), more friends." Among the latter was John Winthrop, "a godly, wise and humble gentleman," and "Captain Endecott (my dear friend, and a friend to us all), is a second Burrow," a reference to the Separatist pioneer and martyr Henry Barrow.⁵⁰

Fuller remained in Massachusetts for a time, discussing religious matters while ministering to the many new arrivals who had fallen ill. He, along with Plymouth's Edward Winslow and Isaac Allerton, were in Charlestown to witness the first steps in the formation of the church there, which would soon move to Boston. A day was set apart, Fuller wrote on July 26, for the settlers to "humble themselves before God, and seek him in his ordinances," and "then also such godly persons that are amongst them and are known each to other, publicly at the end of their exercise, make known their godly desire, and practice the same, viz. solemnly to enter into covenant with the

49. Morton, *Memorial*, 76.

50. Fuller to Bradford, June 28, 1630 in *Bradford's Letterbook*, 56–57.

Lord to walk in his ways." Rather than proceeding rashly, they determined to advise with the Plymouth representatives already there and to ask that the Plymouth church would raise its voice to God to "direct them in his ways." On August 2 Fuller reported that "Some are here entered into a church covenant, the first four, namely, the Governor, Mr. John Winthrop, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Dudley, and Mr. [John] Wilson; since that, five more are joined unto them, and others it is like will add themselves daily."⁵¹ As in the case of Scrooby, and Salem, the congregation was formed by laymen (and John Wilson, acting here as a private believer) entering into covenant. In that last letter Fuller announced his plans to return to Plymouth and that he would be accompanied by John Endecott. Over the following years there would be numerous visits between the key figures in both colonies and each would turn to the other for advice.

Most New England Puritans shared the belief that over time God might provide further light that could lead to modifications in belief and practice. During the seventeenth century there were modifications to Congregational practices regarding membership and the administration of baptism. There was also a movement toward emphasizing the role of clergy over the laity and that of clerical associations over individual congregations. The controversy that centered on Anne Hutchinson led many clergy to take positions against prophesying. In June 1647 the Rev. Ezekiel Rogers addressed the re-assembled Cambridge Synod, denouncing among other things the practice of lay congregants "making speeches in the church assemblies." William Bradford was at that session as an observer and would have seen this as a clear attempt to roll back the influence of Plymouth on the New England Way.⁵² Bradford defended lay prophesying strongly in his unpublished "dialogue" between the young men of Plymouth and the colony's ancients.⁵³ That distinguished layman was not willing to abandon that key element of Plymouth's legacy.

51. Fuller to Bradford, July 26 & August 2, 1630 in *Bradford's Letterbook*, 57–59.

52. Walker, *Creeks and Platforms*, 182. It is interesting that the two congregations most worried about changes that might be made in the New England Way at the synod were those of Boston and Salem.

53. William Bradford, *First Dialogue (A Dialogue or the sum of a Conference between some young men born in New England and sundry Ancient men that came out of Holland and Old England Anno dom. 1648)* in *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, vol. 22 (Boston, 1920), 120.

Jonathan Edwards Reads John Owen

KENNETH P. MINKEMA

Yale University

Arguably, two of the most studied and resourced figures in the Puritan tradition today are John Owen and Jonathan Edwards. However, aside from some occasional passing considerations of the two, and the odd article,¹ the two are rarely brought together. Interestingly, the few forays we have relate to issues integral to the nature of grace and experience, particularly divine communion and participation. So in this brief essay, I would like to lay what I hope is some helpful, though by no means comprehensive, groundwork to access how Owen and Edwards can productively be brought into conversation—or, as the case may be, distinguished. My method is to approach Owen through Edwards. First, I'll discuss the availability of Owen's works in colonial New England, particularly for Edwards. Then, I'll examine, through a series of topics, where and how Edwards utilized Owen in his own printed and manuscript writings as a means of highlighting the areas of Christian theology and experience in which Owen was a resource for Edwards.

Owen in Colonial New England

Libraries that were easily accessible to Edwards, from an early age, had selected titles by Owen. His father, Timothy Edwards, longtime pastor of East Windsor, Connecticut, possessed *Theomachia autexousiastike; or, A display of Arminianisme* (1643), *The labouring saints dismission to rest* (1652), and *Synesis pneumatike; or, The causes, waies, & means of understanding*

1. See, for example, Ryan J. Martin, "Violent Motions of Carnal Affections": Jonathan Edwards, John Owen, and Distinguishing the Work of the Spirit from Enthusiasm," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 15 (2010): 99–116; Kyle C. Strobel, *Jonathan Edwards's Theology: A Reinterpretation* (T&T Clark, 2013); and Brandon G. Withrow, "The Erotic Side of Divine Participation: Jonathan Edwards, Gregory of Nyssa, and Origen of Alexandria on Song of Songs," in *The Ecumenical Edwards: Jonathan Edwards and the Theologians*, ed. Kyle C. Strobel (Ashgate, 2015), 181–94.

the mind of God as revealed in his word (1678), the third of a five-volume work on the Holy Spirit.² Edwards's grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, whom Edwards succeeded at Northampton, Massachusetts, had within his personal library as a student at Harvard College a copy of *Diatriba de Justitia Divina*, the *Dissertation on Divine Justice* (1653).³ Edwards's friend Thomas Prince, a Boston minister and fellow promoter of the revivals, had a renowned library of several thousand volumes, including no less than twenty titles by Owen.⁴ And other relatives and colleagues would have had similar or other works by Owen in their trunks or bookcases. However, it is worth pointing out that New Englanders born after the first decade of the eighteenth century seemed increasingly not to have had Owen among their personal collections;⁵ my survey is small, so that would be something someone could explore in more depth—to prove me wrong.

This is not to say that rising generations of early eighteenth-century provincial collegians did not have access to Owen as part of their education, because his works littered the stacks of the libraries of regional colleges. As a member of the learned elite, and a former librarian himself, Edwards would have been able to take advantage of those repositories. His alma mater, Yale College, from which he received his BA in 1720 and his MA in 1723, had in its holdings a number of titles by Owen—though I must say that his nemesis Baxter is represented far more, which is not surprising given the overwhelming number of Church of England clerics, Presbyterians, and moderate Dissenters among the many benefactors. The substantial donation of books in 1714, orchestrated by Jeremiah Dummer, Connecticut's agent in London, included *Pneumatologia; A Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* (1674); and three volumes of the *Exercitations* on Hebrews, apparently the first three, with the third inscribed "Ex dono auctoris" to

2. "Timothy Edwards' Library and Reading," in *WJE* 26:387, 392, 399.

3. Norman Fiering, "Solomon Stoddard's Library at Harvard in 1664," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 70 (1972), 267.

4. Catalogue of the collection of books and manuscripts which formerly belonged to the Rev. Thomas Prince, and was by him bequeathed to the Old South Church, and is now deposited in the Public Library of the City of Boston (Boston, 1870), 47, 119.

5. For example, neither of the libraries of John Sargeant (b. 1710) or of Joseph Bellamy (b. 1719) contained works by Owen (Estate of John Sargeant, Massachusetts Archives, 1750, Probates, Box. 129, no. 19; Last Will & Testament, and Inventory of the Estate of Joseph Bellamy, Connecticut State Library Probate Records, 1790, no. 392). Also, perhaps attesting to the lack of engagement with Owen among mid-century students, Edwards in Nov. 1753 lent "two vols of Owen on Hebrews" to Cotton Mather Smith, who graduated with an MA from Yale College in 1751. Edwards, "Account Book," *WJE* 26:341.

the benefactor of the volumes, "Mr. Waters" (perhaps James Waters, the chaplain of Francis Lord Holles).⁶ The first printed catalogue of the Yale College library, from 1743, listed Owen's *Mystery of the Gospel Vindicated* (1655); "on the Sabbath," which I take to be the *Day of Sacred Rest* (1671); *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (1677); and his "Survey of Ecclesiastical Polity," presumably the *Inquiry into the Original, Nature . . . and Communion of Evangelical Churches* (1681).⁷

Edwards would also have been able to consult the library at Harvard College whenever he was in Boston, which was fairly frequently. That institution, not surprising for one founded by emigré Puritans who to a significant extent were Independent high Calvinists, had a robust selection of Owen's writings. Its first printed catalogue of 1723 included *Dissertation on Divine Justice* (1653), *Doctrine of the Saints' Perseverance Explained and Confirmed* (1654); *Mortification of Sin in Believers* (2nd ed., 1658); *Brief Instruction in the Worship of God* (1667); all four volumes of the commentary on Hebrews; *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (1669); *Day of Sacred Rest*; *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*; *A vindication of some passages in a discourse concerning communion with God from the exceptions of William Sherlock* (1674); *Christologia: or, a declaration of the glorious mystery of the person of Christ* (1678); *A discourse of the work of the Holy Spirit in prayer* (1682); *True nature of the gospel church* (1689); *Temptation: The nature and power of it* (originally published 1658, reprinted 1689); *Meditations and discourses on the glory of Christ* (first published in 1691, reprinted in 1696); *Evidences of the faith of God's elect* (1695, reprinted 1709); and the posthumous *Works of 1721*—really, "Selected Works."⁸

Edwards himself owned or referred to a number of Owen's publications. The one surviving book by Owen that has Edwards's signature in it is actually one to which he never referred, *An enquiry into the original, nature, . . . and communion of evangelical churches* (1681). Edwards was of course part of the congregational heritage, so it's not surprising to see this classic defense of Independency in his library. Owen intermediated for John

6. Louise M. Bryant and Mary Patterson, "The List of Books Sent by Jeremiah Dummer," in *Papers in Honor of Andrew Keogh, Librarian of Yale University* (New Haven, privately printed, 1938), 440, 444.

7. *Eighteenth-Century Catalogues of the Yale College Library*, ed. James E. Mooney (New Haven: Yale University-Beinecke Library, 2001), A28–30.

8. *The Printed Catalogues of the Harvard College Library, 1723–1790*, ed. W. H. Bond and Hugh Amory (Boston: Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1996), A25, A55–56, A88–89, A100, A111.

Cotton, who was also a signal influence on Edwards, including in matters of church polity, so there is an interesting triangulation there—though it should be said that by the end of his time at Northampton, Edwards was entirely fed up with Congregationalism, and, not coincidentally, wound up his career at a Presbyterian college.

In Edwards's "Catalogue" of reading, which is his list of books he read or wanted to read, we see mention of several pieces by Owen. Three date from very early in Edwards's career, when he was still a graduate student or shortly thereafter. The very earliest, entry no. 21, reads "Austins Conversion." This sounds like it would mean Augustine's *Confessions*. However, it actually referred to the last chapter of book III of Owen's *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, which contained an analysis of Augustine's relation.⁹ Two other items from this early period include *The doctrine of justification by faith through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ* and *The causes, waies, and means of understanding the mind of God*.¹⁰ In the early 1730s, by then established as the senior pastor of Northampton, Edwards was reading the memoirs of Thomas Halyburton, Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews, in which Owen's works were "Recommended... to the Young students of Divinity... above all human writings for a true view of the mystery of the Gospel," possibly a reference to the posthumous one-volume edition of select writings.¹¹

The Work of the Spirit, Common and Saving Grace

However different the contexts of Owen and Edwards, theologically they both lived in times that saw a renaissance in pneumatology, primarily because of the range and variety of religious experiences and claims to divine inspiration or "impulses" going on in the antinomian hothouse of pre-Civil War England and in the revelatory morass of the Great Awakening. Consequently, interest in the nature, office, and work of the Holy Spirit occupied a significant part of our pair's attention. Both gave a heightened role to the Spirit in the work of redemption, and even of creation. Edwards approvingly cited Owen's position that the "Forming and Perfecting of this Host of Heaven and Earth, is that which is assigned peculiarly to the Spirit of God," who "garnishes" the heavens, making them "glorious

9. Morris, *Young JE*, p. 235.

10. "Catalogue" entries nos. 30 and 47, *WJE* 26:125.

11. "Catalogue" entry no. 341, *WJE* 26:189.

and beautiful.”¹² Both seemed to share an instinct about God as Artist, with the Spirit as Muse.

Along with an interest in what was a true work of the Spirit went a concern for distinguishing what was *not* a work of the Spirit. In his *Treatise concerning Religious Affections*, Edwards’s citations range broadly across the Calvinist spectrum, relying mostly on Thomas Shepard’s *Parable of the Ten Virgins*, but Owen makes appearances at telling moments. In particular, Edwards cites his *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* on the difference between a moral life and life graced by the Holy Spirit. As John E. Smith observes, “The passages quoted concern the difference between a common work of the Spirit as it operates on the affections’ and a spiritual operation in the proper sense.” Just as Owen defined regeneration as “the infusion of a new real Spiritual Principle into the Soul,”¹³ so Edwards too used the language of infusion, declaring that the Holy Spirit “becomes” or acts in the soul “after the manner of” an indwelling disposition or “vital principle.” Both were concerned to uphold the supernatural, God-initiated nature of conversion over against the moralism of Socinians and Arminians, as well as a compatibilist view of agency in the soteriological relation of the Spirit and the soul. This is not to say that here, or in other ideas discussed below, Owen necessarily was Edwards’s direct source or influence, but rather that Edwards could look to Owen for confirmation and elaboration.

Related to the issue of how the Holy Spirit dwells in the regenerate are their respective views of the internal relationships of the Trinity. In a “Miscellanies” entry on the Trinity in which Edwards considers the Third Person as the “Spirit of God’s holiness,” he notes that the “creature’s holiness” is not only “from him” but also “consists in him.” He summons Owen to sound a view of the Holy Spirit that matches his own neo-Augustinian one: the Spirit as the love or fellowship between the First and Second Persons. The passage cited in *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* describes the Spirit as the “mutual love” of Father and Son: the “mutual Knowledge and Love of Father and Son,” Owen asserts, “are Absolute, Infinite, Mutual and Necessary unto the Being and Blessedness of God”; and “in these mutual internal Actings of themselves, consists much of the infinite *Blessedness* of the Holy God.”¹⁴

12. Edwards, “Blank Bible” entry on Job 26:13, *WJE* 24:451; Owen, *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, 71–72.

13. Owen, *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, 182.

14. Edwards, “Miscellanies” no. 1047, *WJE* 20:389; Owen, *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, 45–46.

In the Second Distinguishing Sign of *Religious Affections*, Edwards identified an “objective ground of gracious affections” in “the transcendently excellent and amiable nature of divine things, as they are in themselves.” In the course of his discussion, he states that a “gracious gratitude” towards God consisted not in how a person is “concerned in” or has an “interest” in “God’s goodness and free grace...but as a part of the glory and beauty of God’s nature.” He goes on to say, “The first foundation of the delight a true saint has in God” is God’s “own perfection; and the first foundation of the delight he has in Christ, is his own beauty.”¹⁵ In a footnote to this point, Edwards quotes Owen on the Holy Spirit: a “common work of the Spirit, which reaches only the mind,” Owen avers, does not give “delight, complacency and satisfaction.” But “*Saving Illumination*” gives the mind “a direct *intuitive* insight and prospect into Spiritual Things.”¹⁶ Persons who are subjects merely of a common work of the Spirit only look for “some benefit or advantage” they might have by God’s grace. Edwards made this notion of “complacency” an integral part of his notion of true virtue, in which the “love of complacency,” or the love of a being for its own sake, precedes a “love of benevolence.”

Edwards’s tenth distinguishing sign posits that truly gracious and holy affections differ from false ones in their “beautiful symmetry and proportion.” Some persons are religious “only by fits and starts,” which arises from “unsoundness of affections,” from a merely common stock of grace. Here again, Edwards calls upon Owen (as well as Preston and Flavel after him) on the work of the Spirit. Such an incomplete or partial experience, Owen states, “comes short in two things of a thorough-Work: it doth not *fix*” the affections, and “it doth not *fill* them.” The faith of such individuals is unstable, vacillating, whereas “the *constant bent* and inclination of renewed Affections is unto Spiritual Things.”¹⁷

Owen therefore proved an important resource for Edwards on the issue of common versus saving grace, and, relatedly, on true versus counterfeit faith, issues he pursued in *The Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God* and in “Treatise on Grace,” which bear comparison with Owen’s close examinations of the nature and operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul.

15. Edwards, *Religious Affections*, WJE 2:240, 250.

16. Owen, *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, 199–200.

17. Edwards, *Religious Affections*, WJE 2:265, 272; Owen, *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, 200–201.

Discourse on Hebrews 12

In April of 1740, as anticipation was building for the arrival of George Whitefield at Northampton in a few months, Edwards preached an eight-sermon series on Hebrews 12:22–24, on *Christians Coming to Mt. Zion*.¹⁸ With its exploration of the church's ascent into heaven, the discourse does not readily reveal the influence of Owen's commentary, but a closer examination of the sources tells us otherwise. Indeed, Edwards's entries in his "Blank Bible" on the later chapters of Hebrews, particularly on the twelfth chapter, are studded with references to the third and fourth volumes of Owen's *Exercitations* that echo through the discourse.

We can highlight a couple points of contact to show where Edwards found Owen helpful in contemplating the nature of heavenly sainthood. So, when the writer of Hebrews states, as part of the litany (Heb. 12:23), that the saints have "come to the church of the firstborn," Edwards affirmed with Owen that the "firstborn" were not the Apostles and first-generation disciples, but the entire elect church. Edwards also explored the "separate state" of departed souls, just as Owen did, who stated that the souls of deceased saints "come unto them, in those Actings of our Minds, wherein this Evangelical Communion doth consist"—that is, they have the exercise of their "intelligent Powers and Faculties," and are not asleep or in limbo or purgatory. Like Owen, Edwards confuted "the error of those that suppose that the soul sleeps till the resurrection." But where Owen asserted that departed souls "live in the same *Love of God* which animates the whole *Catholic Church* below," Edwards, while agreeing, went further and developed his notion that "the saints in heaven are acquainted with the state of the church on earth."¹⁹

Where the text states that Christians come to "the blood of sprinkling," Edwards agreed with Owen on how this alludes to the sacrificial institutions under the Old Testament, on what the blood of sprinkling "speaks," and how it speaks "better things" than the blood of Abel. Both our theologians have much to say about the significance of the blood of Abel. Owen emphasized that it represented innocent blood shed everywhere and that God will take revenge on the "murderous Persecutors" of the church, while

18. MS sermons on Heb. 12:22–24, nos. 546–50, April–May 1740, Beinecke Library, Yale University. To be published as *Sermons on the Church by Jonathan Edwards, Volume I: How Christians Are Come to Mt. Sion*, ed. Kenneth P. Minkema et al (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, forthcoming).

19. "Blank Bible" entries on Heb. 12:22–24, WJE 24:1162–63; Owen, *Exercitations*, 4:265–67.

Edwards argued that Abel's blood did not cry for vengeance but "peace and pardon for the guilty."²⁰ Also, in his comment on Hebrews 11:4, Owen wrote of Abel's "justifying" faith versus Cain's "common and temporary" faith; what was important was the "inward Principle" from which duties proceed, which accounts for whether they are accepted or not as a spiritual sacrifice. Edwards concurred. In his entry in "Notes on Scripture" on Genesis 4:3–4, entitled "Cain's and Abel's Sacrifice," citing Owen's comment on Hebrews 11:4, he stated that sacrifices need to be accompanied by a spirit of "atonement" or propitiation, a sense of one's unworthiness to approach God and of one's need for divine assistance.²¹

While we are on the nature of Christ's sacrifice, we should mention here, briefly, Edwards's further employment of Owen on Hebrews in a late "Miscellanies" entry on "Christ's Sacrifice or Atonement, Etc." The first part of the entry is a collection of scriptural and other sources on the topic, while the second part is an essay "Concerning the Reasonableness of the Doctrine of the Imputation of Merit." In the first part are references to the third and fourth volumes of the *Exercitations*. What this suggests is a change in Edwards's method: where he previously sought to express an issue in his own terms, and then reach out for confirmation to other authors, here he is going first to trusted sources such as Poole, Owen, and Johan Friedrich Stapfer, and then following up with his digested thoughts.²²

Justification of Saints Under the Old Testament

Flowing from the issue of the exaltation of the elect as described in Hebrews 12, and the issue of the separate state of departed souls, was the question of how those under the Old Testament or old covenant, who had no explicit knowledge of the name of Christ, were nonetheless justified to salvation. In his reflections on Hebrews 6:20, Owen wrote, in part, "I think the Fathers that died under the Old Testament had a *nearer Admission* into the Presence of God, upon the Ascension of Christ, than what they enjoyed before.

20. "Blank Bible" entry on Heb. 11:4, *WJE* 24:1156.

21. Owen, *Exercitations*, 3:18; Edwards, "Scripture" entry on Gen. 4:3–4, *WJE* 15:533–34. Here, as in a few other places, Edwards notes to himself to consult "the place marked in the margin." We can clearly see, from the surviving books that we know were in Edwards's library, that he did not normally write in his books. There were, however, two—just two—special cases. One set was Matthew Poole's *Synopsis Criticorum*, which Edwards cross-referenced extensively with his "Blank Bible"; the other was Owen's *Exercitations* on the Hebrews.

22. Edwards, "Miscellanies" no. 1352, 23:481–92; *Exercitations*, 3:464–71.

They were in *Heaven* before, the Sanctuary of God; but were not admitted *within the Vail*, into the most holy place...before his own entrance thither.” This quote from Owen makes up the entirety of a late “Miscellanies” entry by Edwards on “The Glory of Heaven Advanced at Christ’s Ascension.”²³ (Incidentally, Edwards posited that the faithful angels also experienced a similar “nearer Admission” upon Christ’s ascension, and that it was not till then that they were confirmed in their eternal state; it would be interesting to determine whether Owen had anything to say about this.)

Edwards again cited Owen in the very next “Miscellanies” entry, entitled, “Old Testament Saints Saved by Christ.” Here he referred to Owen on Hebrews 9:26, where, discussing the “*necessity of the Expiation of the Sin of all that were to be saved from the Foundation of the World*,” Owen affirmed that those who were redeemed before the birth of Jesus were redeemed “by Vertue of the Sacrifice or *one offering of Christ*.”²⁴ Owen also dealt with this issue in his *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, where, in Book III, he demonstrates how “regeneration” was “wrought under the Old Testament” and was of the same kind as in the New.²⁵

These “Miscellanies” relate to Edwards’s ongoing refinement of his views on the doctrine of justification, to which Owen seems to have been instrumental. In a compendious manuscript notebook called “Controversies” are found several late, lengthy, and cohesive essays relating to justification, the covenants of works and grace, and still another entitled “In What Sense Did the Saints Under the Old Testament Believe in Christ to Justification?” Here, Edwards made heavy use of a prophetic-typological hermeneutic to show that Christ was known to the ancient Jews as being distinct from the Father, under titles and presences such as the *Shechinah*, “the angel of the Lord,” “the angel of God’s face,” “the messenger of the covenant,” God’s “name,” “the glory of the Lord,” and so forth. These issues were addressed at length by Owen in essays such as *The doctrine of justification by faith* (1677), which, as we have seen, was in the Yale College Library, and *A declaration of the glorious mystery of the person of Christ*, reprinted in the *Works* of 1721, a copy of which Edwards owned or at least cited. For example, in chapter VIII, “The Faith of the Church under the Old Testament in and concerning the Person of Christ,” Owen argued that “the faith of the saints under

23. Owen, *Exercitations*, 3:178; Edwards, “Miscellanies” no. 1282, WJE 23:229.

24. Owen, *Exercitations*, 3:459; Edwards, “Miscellanies” no. 1283, WJE 23:229.

25. Owen, *Discourse concerning Holy Spirit*, 174–76.

the Old Testament did principally respect the person of Christ.”²⁶ Edwards could therefore draw on Owen to show that he was squarely within Calvinist orthodoxy.

At the very conclusion of Edwards’s essay, “In What Sense Did the Saints Under the Old Testament Believe in Christ to Justification?” appears an entry about what constitutes the “natural fitness” of faith. “The great office that Christ sustains and executes in order to his being the means of our justification, reconciliation and acceptance with God is that of a Mediator,” Edwards states. “But now, in order to our having an interest in Christ as our Mediator, or his being a mediator for us, and our having the benefit of his mediation, ‘tis fit, as Dr. Owen observes [...], ‘That he who is *Mediator*, be *accepted*, *trusted* and *rested* in on both sides or Parties.’” Edwards continues, “On God’s part he is chosen, appointed, accepted and entirely trusted in. He is the mediator in whom he is well pleased, his elect in whom his soul delighteth. And therefore how fit that he should also on our part be in like manner chosen, trusted and acquiesced in [in] order to his being a mediator for us, as we are also intelligent beings capable of act and choice.”²⁷ Owen spoke of conditions under the gospel, but the position of this entry, and this citation, suggests that Edwards wanted to apply this view of natural fitness to old-testament believers whose faith eventuated in justification because they had chosen, trusted and acquiesced in God’s laws and covenant promises and in pre-incarnational manifestations of Christ.²⁸

The Names of Christ

We’ve invoked the unlikely name of Whitefield once in our consideration of Edwards’s reading of Owen and, building on the name (or names) by which Christ has been known or is known, we can do it again—creating a strange triangulation. Immediately before Whitefield visited Northampton a second time, in July 1745, Edwards preached a five-sermon discourse on Revelation 1:5–6, treating in turn the different titles of Savior, Christ, Faithful Witness, First Begotten, Prince of the Kings of the Earth, and Man of War. These all had typological and political import, as at this time Edwards was compiling a treatise-length piece on “Types of the Messiah,” England was dealing with the Jacobite Rebellion, and New England was preparing for the campaign against Louisburg.

26. Owen, *Works*, 55.

27. Edwards, “Controversies,” sec. on Justification, quoting Owen, *Exercitations*, 3:215.

28. Edwards, “Controversies,” 21:408; Owen, *Exercitations*, 215e.

Owen clearly informed Edwards's typology, though Edwards probably went farther than Owen would have. Towards the end of "Types of the Messiah," Edwards is assembling references to secondary works. In an entry on the topic, "It was common for NAMES to be given by a spirit of prophecy," he cites Owen on Heb. 7:2. In that passage, Owen is discussing the names Paul gives Christ, including King of righteousness, King of peace, etc. Owen and Edwards shared a typological-prophetic fascination in the person and "mystery" of Christ, in His offices as prophet, priest, and king. One such figure in that history was Melchisedec, King of Salem, which, Edwards affirms, citing Owen, was Jerusalem. Here was a type of Christ both "personated," as Edwards put it, and of heaven. Owen himself has a lengthy consideration of Melchisedec in his commentary on Hebrews 7, asserting that his story was "Mystical and Figurative," suggesting that both Owen and Edwards shared the belief that Melchisedec purveyed the *prisca theologia*, or special teachings passed down from the dawn of time. And that Edwards was further reading Owen for succeeding entries is indicated by his arguing the typological significances of things mentioned in Hebrews 8:5 and 9:3–5.²⁹

The final reference to Owen in Edwards's "Catalogue" dates from the mid-1750s, when Edwards was working as a missionary at Stockbridge, Massachusetts. It's clear from references in the "Miscellanies" and other private writings that Edwards was engaging with Owen most intently in the last two or three years of his life. Here, while reading the third volume of the commentary on Hebrews, he jotted down a citation to volume two, noting the "Exercitations about the Priesthood of Christ" (1674).³⁰ This, along with other references in his corpus, strongly suggests that Edwards had only the third and fourth volumes in his possession, and that he had not seen the first two installments. Whatever the case, the notice about Christ's priestly office encouraged Edwards's ongoing consideration, in private writings and in sermons, of the roles and names of Christ.

29. Edwards, "Types of the Messiah," *WJE* 11:322–23, Owen, *Exercitations* 3:112c-e. On Salem, see "Blank Bible" entry on Gen. 14:18 (24:156), citing Owen on Heb. 7:1, *Exercitations*, 3:96b-c; and Douglas A. Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete: Biblical Interpretation and Anglo-Protestant Culture on the Edge of the Enlightenment* (Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2016), 80.

30. "Catalogue" entry no. 681 (*WJE* 26:304), citing *Exercitations*, vol. 3, "ch. 9. 14. p. 384a."

Conclusion

I have by no means exhausted the range of Edwards's use of Owen.³¹ Rather, gathering the references to Owen found in Edwards's writings, and grouping some of them topically, I have, I hope, provided some idea of where the two resonated, or at least where Edwards felt he resonated with Owen. Issues in Owen's and Edwards's thought, such as communion with God or divine participation or marks of true grace, are attracting attention, as are the similarities in their appreciation of the aesthetic aspects of Christian life—the beauty of holiness, the loveliness of divinity. As legitimate as it is to look at those commonalities, Edwards did not cite Owen on those issues. Here I've attempted to isolate areas of contact as Edwards himself identified them. I trust they will provide points of departure for scholars of both theologians, not only in comparing and contrasting their formal theological works, but also examining them as exegetes and as preachers.

31. Other citations of Owen include: "Table" to "Miscellanies," entry on "Septuagint, the writers of the NT seldom cite the Old from thence, referencing Owen on Heb. 10:5, 4:27d–28b" (*WJE* 13:146); "Blank Bible" entry on Gen. 19:1, "And there came two angels," citing Owen on Heb. 13:3, 4:210e–221a (*WJE* 24:161); "Blank Bible" entry on Deut. 10:18, "The fatherless and the widow," citing Owen on Heb. 13:2, 4:207e (*WJE* 24:293); "Blank Bible" entry on 2 Samuel 5:7, "Zion," quoting Owen on Heb. 12:22, 4:257a, *WJE* 24:361; "Blank Bible" entry on Jeremiah 31:32, "Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers," citing Owen on Heb. 8:9, 3:264a-b (*WJE* 24:720); "Blank Bible" entry on Matthew 5:34, citing Owen on Heb. 6:16 (*Exercitations*, 3); "Blank Bible" entry on Eph. 1:3, citing Owen, *A Declaration of the Glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ*; MS, "History of Redemption," bk. I, p. 28: "Why the time of the gospel DISPENSATION introduced by Christ and his apostles is called the END OF THE WORLD, the FULLNESS OF TIME, etc.," see Owen on Heb. 9:26, 4:461c-e.

The Process of Sanctification: A Bourdieusian Approach to the Declension of Power in New England Puritan Clergy

W. SCOTT JACKSON
Snow College

Introduction

This paper explains the declension of Puritan clerical power following the Great Migration up until when Massachusetts lost its charter in 1684. Historian Perry Miller argued that an overall declension in Puritan culture occurred during this period. However, that notion has been dispelled. There is a resurging field exploring declension in areas outside of Miller's scope of Puritan culture. I determine that colonial New England existed as a functional theocracy by using Pierre Bourdieu's theory of symbolic capital to explain clerical power through symbolic and religious misdirection and conversion. I explore civil and economic power struggles in colonial New England during the decades following the Great Migration to establish that Puritan culture did not largely decline. Instead, it was the Puritan clergy's power that waned during this period.

Most Puritan families kept a copy of the Geneva Bible in their home. Puritans read the Bible as families, congregations, and as a government. The Puritans' literacy rate was higher than their contemporaries because they taught children to read in hopes of biblical familiarity. Puritans had separated from the Catholic Church, in part, because their God-given right to read the Bible was restricted. In short, the Bible was vital to the Puritans of New England. The Puritans pointed to many scriptures to justify their intertwined religious government. Surely, Exodus 19 was one of those examples.

In this chapter of the Old Testament, Moses, Aaron, and the newly freed Israelites wander through the "wilderness" searching for the promised land, an image often borrowed and rhetorically invoked by the leader of the first wave of Puritan immigrants, John Winthrop.¹ In Exodus, Moses

1. Alan Heimert, "Puritanism, the Wilderness, and the Frontier," *The New England Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (1953), <https://doi.org/10.2307/362849>.

travels to the top of Mount Sinai where Jehovah reminds him of Israel's covenant that, if kept, will cause Israel to prosper.

Verse six recounts Jehovah telling Moses: "Ye shall be unto me also a kingdom of Priests, and an holy nation."² Moses is commanded that no one outside of whom Jehovah commands is allowed to climb the mount. In the penultimate verse of the chapter, Aaron is commanded to ascend Mount Sinai with Moses.³ Thus, Israel's civil government had the power of God through covenant, and the Puritans would too.⁴ The symbolism of this chapter invokes God's blessing for the New England Puritans' functional theocracy.⁵

The Puritans infused religion into every aspect of their lives. This worked during the Great Migration and for years after. However, it was impossible for Puritan orthodoxy to maintain its control for long in the face of a changing society, economic fluctuations, and governmental upheaval. By employing a Bourdieusian analysis toward New England economics and civil government, I conclude that, while Puritan culture did not decline

2. *The Bible and Holy Scriptvres contened in the Old and Newe Testament* (Geneva: Rouland Hall, 1560), Ex. 19:6.

3. Aaron, Moses's brother, stood in place for Moses on several occasions during the Israelites' deliverance from Egypt. The priesthood is directed through Aaron's line. Ex. 40:12–15, Num. 16:40, 2 Chron. 26:18. The priesthood, while religious in many aspects, played a more significant role in the civil administration of the theocratic state than the Levites. 1 Kings. 8:4, Ezra 2:70, John 1:19.

4. Ex. 24:14, 18. This verse shows that Aaron was appointed a judge in Israel. While not completely divorced from religious duties, judges in Israel played a largely secular role. Ex. 23:2, 6.

5. I classify Massachusetts Bay as a functioning theocracy because it required religious adherence to be a freeman—a voting member. Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts 1630–1650* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1965). While clergy members were banned from holding office, they did hold power in terms such as advisory and oversight. Francis J. Bremer, *The Puritan experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1995), 93. Most importantly, from a Bourdieusian perspective, New England Puritan clergy gained symbolic capital which "functions to mask the economic domination of the dominant class and socially illegitimate hierarchy by essentializing and naturalizing social position...noneconomic fields...legitimate class relations through misrecognition. Craig Calhoun and Moishe Postune, "Habit, Field, and Capital: The Question of Historical Specificity," in *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, ed. Edward LiPuma and Craig Calhoun (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 66. Bourdieu explains that symbolic capital works through the means of transubstantiative transfer of symbolic capital into other forms of capital such as economic, political, social, or most importantly, the meta-field of power. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," trans. Richard Nice, in *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, by John G. Richardson (New York: Greenwood, 1986), 242.

in the years following the Great Migration, New England's functional theocracy lost control of New England by the time England revoked the Massachusetts Bay charter in 1684.

Theoretical Framework

For the purpose of this paper, I will be analyzing the power structure between ministers, magistrates, and common individuals through an approach based on the theories and studies of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu is particularly useful because his social theories are designed to “unveil domination and the least visible forms of domination, so often hidden by common sense.”⁶ Bourdieusian theory is perfect to address the power structure in New England culture because the contest for dominion was generally unseen. Bourdieu's theory will be used and explained throughout the paper, but a brief framework is necessary.⁷

Bourdieu views power through a Marxist lens, but instead of focusing purely on material capital, he gives voice to unseen capital.⁸ While economic and cultural capital are widely understood, I focus on symbolic capital because it sheds light on the inherent hegemonic structure of New England's functional theocracy. Symbolic power is based on “assumptions in the constitution and maintenance of power relations.”⁹ Symbolic capital requires legitimation through symbolic labor performed by those that it benefits, but the affected group must not recognize how the actor benefits.¹⁰ For example, a preacher only produces symbolic power in a society that agrees that religion is important for reasons besides material capital. Then he must misdirect the laity by obscuring his real intentions.¹¹ The preacher's interest must be seen as legitimate, e.g. doing God's will. This process legitimates the preacher, leading the laity to deference and obedience, thus the clergy becomes a ruling class. The magistrates need the ministers because they consecrate magisterial decisions through their symbolic power. Thus,

6. Monique De St Martin, “Une inflexible domination?” ed. Pierre Encrevé, in *Travailler avec Bourdieu*, ed. Rose-Marie Lagrave (Paris: Flammarion, 2007), 326.

7. It is important to note that while there are some definitions offered in this paper, Bourdieu's “thinking tools” are meant as guidelines that are “intended to be flexible and adaptable” for the study at hand. Terry Rey, *Bourdieu on religion: imposing faith and legitimacy* (Routledge, 2014), 43.

8. These terms will be used interchangeably throughout this paper.

9. David Swartz, *Symbolic power, politics, and intellectuals: the political sociology of Pierre Bourdieu* (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 2013), 43.

10. Swartz, *Symbolic power*, 43.

11. Bourdieu contends that, generally, this process happens subconsciously.

the functional theocracy forms when the religious field is so powerful that all decisions must be consecrated by the clergy.

Historiography

Perry Miller, one of the foremost intellectual Americanists, resurrected Puritan studies which led to an outpouring of Puritan scholarship that continues. Throughout his career, Miller focused throughout his career on Puritan declension. He studied Puritan jeremiads, which were essentially diatribes directed at a congregation. The jeremiad granted extensive power to ministers. These sermons led Miller to conclude that a general "apostasy" occurred amongst the Puritans.¹² Margaret Sobczak, a critic of declension, sums up Miller's version of declension as "a waning of spiritual commitment to the survival of particular ideas and a particular social order."¹³ It is important to note that Miller's argument was mostly concerned with spiritual apostasy, rather than an overall cultural decline.

Miller's conclusion on declension was roundly criticized by numerous scholars including Edmund Morgan, one of Miller's doctoral advisees.¹⁴ Morgan acknowledged that Miller set the framework for future Puritan studies, but he criticized Miller for depicting the Puritans as a one-dimensional people.¹⁵

Although Miller's original declension argument has lost support, a new field of Puritan declension has emerged along secular lines. Mark Valeri's monograph, *Heavenly Merchandise*, argued that international trade, although initially controlled by functional theocracy, eventually altered

12. Perry Miller, "Errand Into The Wilderness," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1953): 8, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2936876>.

13. Margaret Sobczak, "Hoopes's Symposium on Perry Miller," *American Quarterly* 34, no. 1 (1982): 45, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2712789>.

14. Edmund S. Morgan, "An Address to the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, on the Occasion of Its Centennial," *The New England Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (1993): 357, <https://doi.org/10.2307/366001>.

However, not all of Morgan's statements of Miller's work were negative. It should be noted that Morgan referred to Miller's work as "the most imaginative and the most exhaustive piece of intellectual history that America has produced." In Edmund S. Morgan, "The Historians of Early New England," in *The reinterpretation of early American history; essays in honor of John Edwin Pomfrey*, by Ray Allen Billington and John E. Pomfret (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1969), 52.

15. Morgan, *Historians of Early New England*, 53. Also, see Michael McGiffert, "American Puritan Studies in the 1960s," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (1970): 52, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1923838>.

Puritan morality.¹⁶ I seek to situate my exploration of power relations along theocratic lines. I seek, not to just note the changing circumstances in New England, but to define the periods that provided critical mass for significant alterations in New England politics and culture.

In this paper, I explore the notion of capital held by Puritan clergy held in seventeenth-century New England. Historians, Ira V. Brown and David E. Smith, proved that ministers gained extensive power through millennialism preaching.¹⁷ James West Davidson supplemented this conclusion by showing that Congregationalists firmly believed in ministerial prophecy. Furthermore, they believed that they could bring about Christ's Second Coming.¹⁸

During the seventeenth century, only ministers connected the Bible to the symbols that revealed New England's destiny. Sacvan Bercovitch, the preeminent scholar of Puritan typology, demonstrated that typological rights endowed ministers with a consecrated power over their congregation.¹⁹

Recently, scholars have focused on the dismantling process of Puritan hegemony in New England. Darren Staloff forcefully addresses the power struggle between competing groups in his work, *The Making of an American Thinking Class*.²⁰ He concluded that as power was removed from the government, common New Englanders justified political radicalism through the Bible, which led to the implementation of democracy.

This paper builds upon Davidson's, Bercovitch's, and many other historians' arguments that demonstrated the power imbalance in colonial New England. I begin with examples of early religious control of civil government that slowly eroded as the clergy lost its control over orthodox standards. As

16. Valeri, *Heavenly merchandize: how religion shaped commerce in Puritan America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010).

17. Ira V. Brown, "Watchers for the Second Coming: The Millenarian Tradition in America," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39, no. 3 (1952): 445, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1895004>; David E. Smith, "Millenarian Scholarship in America," *American Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (1965): , <https://doi.org/10.2307/2710907>.

18. James West Davidson, *The logic of millennial thought: eighteenth century New England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977), 75.

19. Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan origins of the American Self* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2011); Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Puritan imagination* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Sacvan Bercovitch, *Typology and early American literature* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972).

20. Darren Staloff, *The making of an American thinking class: intellectuals and intelligentsia in Puritan Massachusetts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

with my economic argument, I identify critical junctures in New England history where the functional theocracy began unraveling.

Civil Government

The civil and ecclesiastical fields were the most heavily intertwined fields in colonial New England. The magistrates, as Puritan churchman Thomas Cartwright stated, were intended to be “nursing fathers” and protectors of the church.²¹ This relationship was stable for several years. While the ministerial class maintained control, civil officers were comfortable with their allotted power. However, the two fields could not coexist indefinitely as long as they both sought to control the preeminent field of power.

The Massachusetts Bay Company was the initial investment of wealthy merchants seeking to replicate a profit-maximizing colony similar to Virginia. Religious thinkers, like John Winthrop and Richard Saltonstall, arrested control of the company, hoping to create a religious haven for Puritans where civil and religious power worked in concert as it did in ancient Israel. Winthrop, first governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in a letter to his wife, prophesied that they would avoid a great calamity that would soon befall the wicked that remained in England:

It is a great favour, that we may enioye so much comfort and peace in these so euill and declininge tymes and when the increaseinge of our sinnes giues vs so great cause to looke for some heauye Scquorge and Judgment to be comminge vpon us: the Lorde hath admonished, threatened, corrected, and astonished vs, yet we growe worse and worse, so as his spirit will not allwayes striue with vs, he must needs giue waye to his furye at last: he hath smitten all the other Churches before our eyes, and hath made them to drinke of the bitter cuppe of tribulation, euen vnto death.²²

Winthrop’s utopian thinking was common among Puritans. They often invoked the typology of their fleeing into the wilderness of Massachusetts to that of Israel.²³ These comparisons motivated founding company mem-

21. Thomas Cartwright and B. Brook, *Memoir of the life and writings of Thomas Cartwright, including the principal ecclesiastical movements in the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London: J. Snow, 1845), 185.

22. John Winthrop, “John Winthrop to Margaret Winthrop,” May 15, 1629, accessed February 11, 2018, <http://www.masshist.org/publications/winthrop/index.php/view/PWF02d052>.

23. Naoki Onishi, “Puritan Historians and Historiography,” in *The Oxford handbook of early American literature*, ed. Kevin J. Hayes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 95.

bers to recruit likeminded people for their venture. As a result, the future Massachusetts Bay government would be homogenous.

The New England Puritans' repeated use of the civil covenant shows that church and state were hardly distinct. Aboard the ship that brought the first wave of immigrants to the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the *Arbella*, Winthrop delivered his renowned speech: "A Modell of Christian Charity," where he emphasized the Puritans' covenants with the Lord. He referred to the legal and religious meanings of covenant simultaneously. A portion of Winthrop's speech lays out the responsibility that each group member had for each other, known as the civil covenant, "Wee must...make others' conditions our oune; rejoyce together, mourne together, labour and suffer together, allwayes haueing before our eyes our commission and community in the worke, as members of the same body."²⁴ Despite the strong references to civil government, all covenants bound individuals to God, not just to each other. The powerful covenant arrangement shows that religion was the essence of New England's civil government.²⁵

Individual participation in the civil covenant acted as a precursor to the establishment of towns, the regulation of voting members, and just being a member of the community.²⁶ Philip Gorski, a sociologist of religion, summarizes the covenant experience: "the Puritans did not envision their polities as mere aggregations of individuals pursuing their private welfare, but as sacred corporations dedicated to higher principles."²⁷ It is upon the backdrop of the covenant that we can comprehend just how much power the clergy held in colonial New England government.

Unlike a traditional theocracy, secular and clerical leaders were distinct. The clergy could not hold public office. However, the religious covenant continually intersected the civil covenant. Every formal civil covenant called upon the name of God. This notion of a binding between God and a community of individuals can be found in the Salem Covenant of 1629, which

24. John Winthrop, "John Winthrop: A Modell of Christian Charity, 1630," *John Winthrop: A Modell of Christian Charity*, 1630, August 1996, accessed February 14, 2018, <https://history.hanover.edu/texts/winthmod.html>.

25. See generally, Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014). Also, David D. Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgement: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990).

26. David A. Weir, "Early New England: A Covenanted Society," in *Emory University Studies in Law and Religion* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 154.

27. Philip S. Gorski, *American covenant: a history of civil religion from the Puritans to the present* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2017), 44.

reads, "We Covenant with the Lord and one with another; and do bind our selves in the presence of God, to walk together in all his waies, according as he is pleased to reveale himselfe unto us in his Blessed word of truth."²⁸ Officials consulted ministers when creating and enforcing law. With a few notable exceptions, like John Cotton, ministers were paid from community taxes.²⁹ Clergy members, under instruction from the magistrates, delivered Election Day sermons. During these sermons, preachers often advocated for specific governmental changes and officials.³⁰ These instances of mixing between church and state show that, while there was some delineation, there is enough evidence to conclude that the clergy held a substantial amount of power in the field of civil governance during the Great Migration. In the upcoming decades, the magistracy challenged the clergy, causing disruption within the functional theocracy.

Despite the functional theocracy's rigid control, it would be challenged throughout its reign. Accounts of the banishments of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson have received excellent treatment from numerous sources. Williams's separation doctrine and Hutchinson's antinomianism both challenged the religious-secular alliance. However, the appearance of the Quakers in colonial New England reveals a darker side to the alliance than previously witnessed in New England. Quakers were more determined civil ingrates than earlier dissidents. They relentlessly pushed Puritan leaders to the position where they were forced to determine whether religious toleration was an option or not. However, for the theocracy, tolerance was unallowable. During the latter half of the seventeenth century, Massachusetts Bay diversified. They saw their religious and civil covenants as the opposing side to the same coin. Without the civil covenant, leaders reasoned, separate covenants that protected English orderliness and godliness would disintegrate.

28. Jeffrey Barz-Snell, "The Long History," *The First Church in Salem*, accessed February 11, 2018, <http://www.firstchurchinsalem.org/the-long-history/>.

29. John Cotton argues that payment should be given "not of constraint but freely, brought by the givers as an offering to the Lord & laid down." See John Cotton, *The true constitution of a particular visible church, proved by Scripture. Wherein is briefly demonstrated by questions and answers what officers, worship, and government Christ hath ordained in his church* (London: Printed for Samuel Satterthwaite, at the Signe of the Black Bull in Budge Rowe, 1642).

30. Michael Besso, "Thomas Hooker and His May 1638 Sermon," *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 10, no. 1 (2012): 206–7, <https://doi.org/10.1353/eam.2012.0002>.

Quaker beliefs focused on an inner light that God gave liberally to all people. Quaker doctrine undermined the authority of ministers, the Bible, and the entire covenant system. In 1657, Quakers continued to disregard Puritan authority. The clergy could not stand by and watch Quakers dissuade their followers. Their covenants would not allow it, so they punished the heretical Quakers. Punishments were mild at first, but they quickly progressed to floggings, banishments, and, eventually, execution.³¹

Quakers were undeterred. They stoically bore their punishment. One specific account told of the execution of the Quaker—and former Puritan—Mary Dyer. Her last words were of forgiveness: “for those that do it in the simplicity of their hearts, I desire the Lord to forgive them.”³² Still more Quakers were killed during the crisis, but the brutal punishment did not have the intended effect. One of Dyer’s prosecutors spoke for the entire ruling class when he expressed the failing sentiment, “Mary Dyer did hang as a flag for others to take example by.”³³ Among many sympathetic outcries, a dismayed utterance came in response to Herodias Long’s whipping: “Surely if she had not the spirit of the Lord she could not do this thing.”³⁴

Eventually, England demanded answers. New England responded by appealing to British secular law despite its rare use in the New England colonies. England was eventually mollified, but significant damage to the functional theocracy was done. Quaker numbers expanded. Many of their neophytes defied compulsive church attendance laws. Patricia Bonomi concludes, “Thus the Quaker incidents denote a crisis and a turning point in New England’s attitude toward religious toleration.”³⁵

31. Patricia U. Bonomi, *Under the cope of Heaven: religion, society, and politics in colonial America* (New York: ACLS History E-Book Project, 2005), 27–29.

32. William Sewel, *The history of the rise, increase and progress of the Christian people called Quakers* (Philadelphia, Penn.: Friends Book Store, 1856), 291.

33. Horatio Rogers, *Mary Dyer of Rhode Island, the Quaker martyr that was hanged in Boston* (Providence, R.I.: Preston & Rounds, 1896), 67.

34. Humphrey Norton et al., *New-Englands ensigne: it being the account of cruelty, the professors pride, and the articles of faith: signified in characters written in blood, wickedly begun, barbarously continued, and inhumanly finished... by the present power of darkness possess in the priests and rulers in New-England, with the Dutch also inhabiting the same land.... This being an account of the sufferings sustained by us in New-England... 1657, 1658. With a letter to Iohn Indicot, and Iohn Norton, governor, and chief priest of Boston, and another to the town of Boston. Also, the several late conditions of a friend upon Road-Iland* (London: Printed by T.L. for G. Calvert, 1659), February 1659.

35. Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven*, 29.

The Quaker-Puritan conflict was the quintessential challenge to orthodoxy from the heretical. Bourdieu's theory on the struggle for power within the religious field is tailored for the study of the Puritan-Quaker conflict. The Puritans represented the orthodox hierarchy, while Quakers were the subversive heterodox. Bourdieu contends, "religion has social functions in so far as the laity expects justification of their existence as occupants of a particular position in the social structure."³⁶ Puritan ideology emphasized that colonists had been led into the "wilderness," just as Moses and the children of Israel. If these settlers lost faith, they might leave the church. While this is upsetting to a congregation, departure would be damning for a functioning theocracy because of the likelihood of civil rebellion.

Quakers came as humble zealots, but they challenged the elite ruling ministers and magistrates of New England. Bourdieu explains that dominant culture, or religion, replicates itself—the method of maintaining power. The Puritan elite had replicated power for thirty years based on laity misrecognition. The laity mistakenly believed that the ruling class was superior because they controlled access to most forms of capital. With the arrival of the Society of Friends' gospel, the monopoly on the field of power was broken up. If this doctrine was accepted by the laity, Puritan hegemony would fall.

Still, the Quakers did not ring the death knell to Puritanism. However, New England's religious field had changed because the power within the Puritan religious field was fundamentally altered. Future Puritans were raised more tolerant towards religion because Quakers challenged Puritan orthodoxy. As a modern observer of tolerance, Ta-Nehisi Coates argues, tolerance does not appear immediately, rather it is a "bet on the future."³⁷ Ordinary religious protestors and thinkers continued to bet on a more tolerant future.

However, the most significant blow to the Puritan functional theocracy was the period surrounding the removal of Massachusetts Bay's charter. During this period, New England Puritans definitively lost the power capital that enabled their control. Moving into the First Great Awakening, the church no longer directly governed as it had during the Great Migration.

36. Pierre Bourdieu, "Legitimation and Structured Interests in Weber's Sociology of Religion," in *Max Weber, rationality and modernity*, by Sam Whimster and Scott Lash (London: Routledge, 2009), 124.

37. Ta-Nehisi Coates, "The Importance Of Being Politically Correct," *The Atlantic*, May 29, 2009, accessed February 14, 2018, <https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2009/05/the-importance-of-being-politically-correct/18471/>.

Puritan churches became much less hierarchical and authoritative than the Puritanism of seventeenth-century New England.

In an effort to maintain control of the religious field, ministers, over several years, preached a series of jeremiads—sermons focused on the degenerate nature of Puritan society because of the apostasy among the second and third generations. The clergy had lost its monopoly as the gatekeeper to material capital because of the Quaker menace, so they took an alternate approach to maintaining control. Social historian Robert Pope provided ample evidence that a religious decline during the latter half of the seventeenth century did not take place, as the “need” for jeremiads suggested. Rather, it was the clergy that unnecessarily instigated a hysterical fear of religious declension to persuade younger generations of the need for their correction.³⁸

John Norton, similar to other preachers, typified God as a physician when he claimed, “God proposeth to us Remedy or Calamity; we have our option...accept it...or look at sorrow.”³⁹ Thomas Walley analogized apostasy to illness, but he excused the ancient Hebrews for their sickness as they lost prophetic guidance.⁴⁰ Walley’s obvious implication was that Puritans retained their prophetic council, in the form of ministers, and therefore had no excuse for their declension. Walley continued to focus on the power of orthodox preaching by any other doctrine as “occult and hid.”⁴¹

According to the minister Samuel Torrey, the only healing balm available for the younger generations was to become submissive and humble.⁴² After the metaphor of sickness and apostasy ran its course, Puritan preachers turned to the familial narrative of a disappointed father. In an often

38. Robert G. Pope, *The half-way covenant: church membership in Puritan New England* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969).

39. John Norton, *Three choice and profitable sermons* (Cambridge, Mass.: Usher, 1664), 7.

40. Thomas Walley, *Balm in Gilead to heal Sions wounds: or, A treatise wherein there is a clear discovery of the most prevailing sicknesses of New-England, both in the civill and ecclesiasticall state; as also sutable remedies for the cure of them: collected out of that spirituall directory, the Word of God.: Delivered in a sermon preached before the Generall Court of the colony of New-Plimouth on the first day of June 1669. Being the day of election there.* (Cambridge, Mass.: Printed by S. G. and M. J., 1670), 3.

41. Walley, *Balm in Gilead to heal Sions wounds*, 6.

42. Samuel Torrey and Increase Mather, *An exhortation unto reformation: amplified, by a discourse concerning the parts and progress of that work, according to the word of God, delivered in a sermon preached in the audience of the General Assembly of the Massachusetts colony, at Boston in New-England, May 27, 1674, being the day of election there* (Cambridge, Mass.: Printed by Marmaduke Johnson, 1977), 37, accessed February 18, 2018, <http://name.umdl.umich.edu/N00141.0001.001>.

replicated sermon, William Stoughton predicated God's bestowal of His inheritance on the pious behavior of His children. He castigated his congregation by pronouncing that "a Parent expects more from a Child than from any other because of the Relation."⁴³ One of the famed New England Mathers, Eleazar, delivered a cutting line in his sermon, *A Serious Exhortation to the Present and Succeeding Generation*, when he ridiculed the second generation by asserting that their parents "will be so far from helping you that they will rejoice and bless God for executing Justice upon you to all Eternity; neither your fathers nor the God of your fathers will own you."⁴⁴ Despite condemning sermon after condemning sermon, religious hegemony was coming to an end in New England. Governmentally tolerated religion was gaining more traction in the Old World, and soon it would be imposed on its colonists.

Quakers and religious leaders were not alone in upsetting the New England Way. In 1669, John Locke wrote portions of *The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina*. In Article 97, Locke argued, "there will unavoidably be of different opinions concerning matters of religion...and it will not be reasonable for us, on this account, to keep them out, that civil peace may be maintained amidst diversity of opinions, and our agreement and compact with all men may be duly and faithfully observed."⁴⁵ Locke's language mandated tolerance, but his argument was more nuanced. He contradicted the Puritans' sacramental belief that a civil covenant only worked when it accompanied a religious covenant. Rather, Locke claimed that the only way a civil covenant could function is by removing the religious requirement because religious views would always be unavoidably different.

Massachusetts Bay's functional theocracy was ultimately torn apart in 1684 with the annulment of the Massachusetts charter.⁴⁶ In October 1684,

43. William Stoughton, *New-Englands true interest ; not to lie: or, A treatise declaring from the word of truth the terms on which we stand, and the tenure by which we hold our hitherto-continued precious and pleasant things.: Shewing what the blessed God expecteth from his people, and what they may rationally look for from him.: Delivered in a sermon preached in Boston in New-England, April 29. 1668. Being the day of election there.* (Cambridge, Mass.: Printed by S. G. and M. J., 1670), 8.

44. Eleazar Mather, *A serious exhortation to the present and succeeding generation in New-England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Drucker: Green and M. Johnson, 1671), 31.

45. Francis Newton Thorpe, *The Federal and state constitutions, colonial charters, and other organic laws of the states, territories, and colonies now or heretofore forming the United States of America. Vol. II. Florida-Kansas* (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1909), *The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina*, Article 97.

46. A charter similar to the first was restored in 1691, but there were significant

Massachusetts Bay lost its authority for self-governance when Britain removed its charter. Instead of Massachusetts' *Sola Scriptura*, it was reincorporated into an administrative system to be governed by England known as the Dominion of New England. Edmund Andros was instated as the royal governor. He quickly enraged colonists by suppressing civil liberties, but the ultimate transgression came when he used Boston's sacred Old South Church for Anglican services.⁴⁷

Colonists resisted by appealing to the civic-minded notion of being taxed without representation. The decades of the functional theocracy's declension came to a head as a strong separation developed between clergy and civil officials over the method of opposing Britain and Governor Andros. Merchants and civil officials opposed Andros, but ministers remained aloof, preferring to urge covenant renewal.⁴⁸ The clergy sought to regain the symbolic power that they had slowly lost. Instead of outright resistance, ministers attempted to walk a middle ground by subtly misguiding the laity through outward concern for their spirituality. Harry Stout explains, "Sermons...show how carefully ministers avoided pulpit commentary on explosive political issues."⁴⁹ With William of Orange's ascension to the throne in England during the Glorious Revolution, New England hoped for a reestablished charter and return to old ways. They felt so empowered that the British colonists overthrew Andros.

However, William of Orange, who became William II of England, did not prove to be a saving grace for the clergy. The new King instituted stronger policies of religious tolerance. This, combined with the revocation of the charter in 1684, brought the clergy's power over civil affairs to an end.

Philosophers, such as John Locke, articulated William III's notion for religious tolerance. Locke reasons: "I esteem it above all things necessary to distinguish exactly the business of civil government from that of religion.... If this be not done, there can be no end put to the controversies that will

changes from the original. Religious qualifications to vote were exchanged for property requirements, the English monarch appointed senior governmental officials rather than being elected, and King William made efforts to ensure that New England would not return to religious rule. David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (Scranton, Penn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1987).

47. William Henry Whitmore, *The Andros tracts* (Boston, Mass: Printed for the Society by T. R. Marvin & Son, 1868), 26, October 17, 2011, accessed February 19, 2018, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/37773/37773-h/37773-h.htm>.

48. Harry S. Stout, *The New England soul: preaching and religious culture in colonial New England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 116.

49. Stout, *The New England soul*, 117.

be always arising between those that have, or at least pretend to have...a concernment for the interest of men's souls."⁵⁰

Locke highlights the Bourdieusian theory that individuals use their status to procure symbolic power. People are in danger when a civil government does not tolerate religion because, in Locke's words, "God has never given any such authority to one man over another, as to compel anyone to his religion. Nor can any such power be vested in the magistrate."⁵¹ He seemingly attacks the Puritan functional theocracy because the civil covenant only functions when it is divorced from religion.⁵²

The clergy's symbolic capital had been eroding for decades. They would never regain their capital that they held during the time of the Great Migration. It became completely impossible following the changing way of thinking as expressed by Locke because symbolic power is produced when lay perception is misguided and misinterpreted as selfless acts. He conceptualized what the New England laity had been experiencing for years. With the removal of the charter and the advent of religious tolerance and years of ministerial intolerance, the clergy lost its capital in colonial New England.

Economy

Historians often describe merchants as the preeminent citizens of eighteenth-century New England.⁵³ Things were not the same in the seventeenth century. Merchants were forced to bow to the clergy's doctrine. A specific example of clergy dominance can be shown through Robert Keayne. Keayne was a notable merchant during the Great Migration. He plied his trade with obeisance to the clergy's dogma. For a time, Keayne's story demonstrates how a strong Puritan religious field dominated New England, but then slowly declined until religion had little input on trade.

Robert Keayne "was a good citizen, a man who obeyed the laws, carried out his social obligations, never injured others."⁵⁴ The preceding sentence is the opening sentence of Edmund Morgan's masterpiece, *The Puritan Family*. This description, although not meant directly for Keayne, could not

50. John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government and a Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Ian Shapiro (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003), 218.

51. Locke, *Two Treatises*, 218.

52. Locke, *Two Treatises*, 219.

53. Bernard Bailyn, *The New England merchants in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1955).

54. Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan family. Religion & domestic relations in seventeenth-century New England* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 1.

describe a colonist better. Morgan continues, "This man, this paragon of social virtue, the Puritans said, was on his way to hell, and their preachers continually reminded him of it."⁵⁵ This begs the question: Why remind people of this "civil man" going to hell?

By all accounts, Keayne was a strict adherent to Calvinism, as practiced in Puritan New England. He attended sermons in London and New England, taking fastidious notes.⁵⁶ Keayne also recorded instances where he accompanied John Cotton on church discipline hearings of Ann Hibbens and Richard Waits.⁵⁷ During the antinomian scare, Keayne distanced himself from wealthy Boston merchants that gravitated toward the heresy, despite many of them being his commercial partners.⁵⁸ Despite his zeal, Keayne was not purely devoted to Puritanism. Prior to his conversion, he was a guild member to the Merchant Taylors' Company.⁵⁹ As with many guilds, the Merchant Taylors remained fairly agnostic about religion.⁶⁰ Rather, the guild was directed by guiding principles. Indeed, Mark Valeri contends that Merchant Taylors was essentially a Christian church without the theology.⁶¹ While guilds engaged in many of the same projects as churches, guilds' motives were entirely wrong. Instead of invoking God as the source of their charity, merchant guilds were humanists.

Keayne saw no conflict between humanism and Puritanism. There were some minor incongruences, like usury, but the Merchant Taylors fought against unsavory business practices as well.⁶² Still, Keayne, the "civil

55. Morgan, *The Puritan family*, 1.

56. Robert Keayne, *Note-Book kept by Capt. Robert Keayne, an early settler of Boston*. (Cambridge, Mass.: J. Wilson & Son, 1889), 5.

57. Keayne, *Note-Book*, 4–7.

58. Emery Battis, *Saints and Sectaries: Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian Controversy in the Massachusetts Bay Colony* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 268, 273–75.

59. Valeri, *Heavenly Merchandize*, 18.

60. There were periods where the guild would throw allegiance to one religion or another based on increased economic opportunity. At one point, under Sir Thomas White, the Merchant Taylors built the College of St. John as an expression of Anglican piety, but even ties to the college were severed when later economic benefit arrived. See: "The College of St John the Baptist was founded in 1555 by Sir Thomas White, a wealthy London merchant tailor," St John's College, accessed February 3, 2018, <https://www.sjc.ox.ac.uk/discover/about-college/history/>.

61. Valeri, *Heavenly Merchandize*, 17.

62. Charles M. Clode, *The early history of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the fraternity of St. John the Baptist, London: with notices of the lives of some of its eminent members* (London: Harrison, 1888), 2:278.

man," threatened the clergy legitimacy. They derived their power from the community's uniform belief that ministers were the group that granted access to prosperity in Massachusetts. Bourdieu tells us that the religious specialist must convince the laity that the clergy hold the majority of prestige, honor, biblical knowledge, and educational credentials.⁶³ Keayne was threatening to disrupt religious power with the doctrine of humanism that undercut the core tenets. As Keayne served for reasons besides God's command, he gained prestige and honor, not the church and its officials. While humanism did little to enhance Keayne's biblical knowledge, it did enhance his standing in the community as having a highly sophisticated knowledge that could contend with the Puritans' widely accepted notion that the Bible was the only reliable source of divine revelation.

The magistrates, the visible power of the functional theocracy, brought Keayne to trial for price gouging. Keayne lost the trial and was fined an unseemly £200.⁶⁴ Despite the church being an active participant in the civil trial, nonetheless it still censured Keayne, a punishment just below full excommunication. Even after the draconian sentences, Keayne devised nearly a third of his worldly wealth toward civic and religious projects to improve a community that had rejected him.⁶⁵ Robert Keayne certainly was a civil man, and if the seventeenth-century Puritans are correct, he, just like any other Puritan, could be in hell.

Eventually, colonial New England would transition from an agrarian economy to a mercantile economy. Interestingly, it took a major depression that lasted throughout the 1640s for the church to tolerate merchants. It was the New England merchants that dragged New England out of the bleak depression that nearly ruined its colonial mission.

Massachusetts Bay developed in the 1630s because of immigration during the Great Migration. Each new wave built homes, boosted the

63. David Swartz, "Bridging the Study of Culture and Religion: Pierre Bourdieu's Political Economy of Symbolic Power," *Sociology of Religion* 57, no. 1 (1996): 76, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3712005>. In regard to these conditions, it was imperative that the ministers maintained a working relationship with the magisterial class. To this end, the magistrates, at least early in New England history, often deferred to the elders' decisions, and they almost always consulted them on important decisions, lest the magistrates lose clerical support via the election sermon, etc.

64. This would later be reduced to £80.

65. Robert Keayne and Bernard Bailyn, *The apologia of Robert Keayne; the last will and testament of me, Robert Keayne, all of it written with my own hands and began by me, mo: 6:1:1653, commonly called August; the self-portrait of a Puritan merchant* (Gloucester, Mass.: Harper & Row, 1970), <https://www.colonialssociety.org/node/654#rw101>.

agricultural market, and required imports. Beginning in 1640, migration to New England nearly ceased.⁶⁶ The circumstances that allowed New England's unusual economy to thrive concluded, and with it, a decade-long depression commenced.⁶⁷

Creditors refused to loan money because the General Court protected the debtor at the money lender's expense. Religious power continued to restrict financiers' and merchants' actions throughout the 1640s. Finally, when the colony was on the verge of ruin, the General Court reluctantly loosened its economic grip. The depression lifted once credit was established. As merchants began business, an immigrant-dependent economy was replaced by a robust Atlantic trade that would sustain Massachusetts for centuries.⁶⁸

Bourdiesian theory explains that the overlap of the religious and economic fields allowed merchants to challenge the clergy in this contest. Ministers had crossed into the sphere that traditionally belonged to financiers and merchants. In this way, the ecclesiastical field opened themselves up to be challenged not just in the economic field, but also in the religious field.

Bourdieu's notion of symbolic power is pertinent for this conflict. Clergy members gained symbolic power or legitimacy because they were able to misrepresent their interest in economics. Instead of appearing to be concerned with the task of everyday business, clergy members misrepresented their interests as spiritual, thus "legitimizing the social order" they had created.⁶⁹ Ministers lost their control of the economic field, because as Bourdieu states, the "monopoly of cultural legitimacy and the right to withhold and confer this consecration in the name of fundamentally opposed principles: the personal authority called for by the creator and the institutional authority favoured by the teacher."⁷⁰ The decade-long depression

66. England began a reformation process that rectified Puritans' past reasons for leaving England. The mother country removed the desire to seek fortune across the ocean by increasing religious tolerance.

67. Marion H. Gottfried, "The First Depression in Massachusetts," *The New England Quarterly* 9, no. 4 (1936): 655–57, <https://doi.org/10.2307/360989>.

68. Gottfried, "The First Depression," 658–59. A specific industry that was crucial for New England discharging its depression was the advent of the shipbuilding industry. The industry did not just procure profit for owners and laborers, but it provided a valuable export and ready access to ships for New England merchants.

69. Swartz, *Bridging*, 77.

70. Pierre Bourdieu, "Intellectual field and creative project," in *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education: Conference Papers*, ed. M. F. D. Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), 178.

severely questioned the orthodox view that merchants were to be questioned and scrutinized for their business methods. Now, these despised merchants were the saviors of the colonies.⁷¹

The clergy retreated to form a dialectical doctrine known as providence. Interestingly, providence took on an economic approach to God's favor/disfavor similar to the invisible hand. Providence led one to believe that good or ill that befell people was an indicator of God's judgment on their activities. If you prospered, God was pleased, and if you did not, it was because God was unhappy with you. The clergy could no longer mandate appropriate business practices, as they had with Robert Keayne. Instead, God would be the judge.

Conclusion

Historians have argued over spiritual declension among New England Puritans for decades. Indeed, there was a decline, but not how Perry Miller described. The decline came in Puritan orthodoxy's power in New England's functional theocracy. In time, the Quaker issue, revocation of the Massachusetts Bay charter, and improved notions of religious tolerance led to significant change in the way clergy exercised their capital in colonial New England. They exhausted their symbolic capital during the fight to maintain their hegemonic status, and as a result they, lost most of their civil power. Indeed, an observer during America's Revolutionary period lamented that the clergy were "not as valuable an order of men now as they used to be."⁷²

Similarly, the Puritan clergy saw merchants encroaching upon their theocratic power. The magistrates had been the nursing fathers they were established to be for years, but merchants gave no indication of such support. During the Great Migration, and for years after, ministers prosecuted merchants on religious grounds. It worked until merchants dragged New

71. In London, a steady stream of articles, plays, and tracts started to portray the merchant as a hero and having an "Inquisitive Genius," rather than the villain. Thomas Sprat, the Bishop of Rochester, reflects the diminished power of the clergy, when he stated, But of the English Merchants I will affirm, that in all sorts of Politeness, and skill in the World, and humane affairs, they do not onely excel them, but are equal to any other sort of men amongst us." Thomas Sprat and Abraham Cowley, *History of the royal-society of London: for the improving of natural knowledge* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Oxford University Press, 2003), 88, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A61158.0001.001/1:7?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>

72. "Livingston Papers," Thomas Tillotson to Robert R. Livingston, January 7, 1779, in *Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2015).

England out of a severe depression, thus, dispelling the notion that the clergy was the source for all truth. Eventually, merchants challenged ministers for control. Clerical retreat is evidenced by the concept of God's providence replacing direct ministerial control.

When the Puritan preachers delivered jeremiad after jeremiad, enumerating the ills that infested Puritan culture, they revealed symbols from the Old Testament. Preachers rarely examined the New Testament. Closer scrutiny of Christ's responses to the religious leaders of the Jews would have been enlightening. In Mark, Christ condemns the Jewish clergy that so closely mirrored Puritan ministers, "Esai [Isaiah] hath prophecied wel of you, hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoreth me with their lippes, but their heart is farre away from me. 7) But they worship me in vaine" (Mark 7:6-7).

The Puritan clergy was so engorged by their religious power that they were blind to their own shortcomings. They connected so many symbols and types for the laity that they did not "first cast out the beam out of [their] own eye" prior to removing "the mote of [their] brother's eye" (Matt. 7:5). Because of the ministers' impaired vision, the functional theocracy lost its control of colonial New England, but New England culture flourished without the weight of guilt and shame imposed by a religiously controlled government.

Book Review

Chaoluan Kao, *Reformation of Prayerbooks: The Humanist Transformation of Early Modern Piety in Germany and England* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018). Hardback. 232 pp. £76.77.

Traditional prayer books were manuals meant to guide the personal devotion of the Christian laity. These manuals existed during the medieval period, but in the early and post Reformation eras, Protestants transformed the medieval model of prayer books into a way to disseminate and reinforce their developing theology. Chaoluan Kao has provided an in-depth study of the shape of prayer book piety in the early modern period using prayer books both from England and Germany. This is a finely-written study that helpfully explores an often overlooked aspect of the Protestant Reformation, namely its reception among the laity. It is, of course, absolutely necessary to consider the Protestant movement, in all its divisions, through academic works on theology and biblical studies. Kao, however, argues that another crucial inroad into Protestant history is to examine works that were intended for lay use, which gives insight into how piety was shaped in the Protestant home. This book is an excellent combination of social and theological history that makes use of sources in multiple languages and has an obvious mastery of the secondary literature on the topic. It is a helpful guide to what prayer books were, how Protestant prayer books transformed traditional models of personal piety from the medieval period, and how these prayer books functioned in household use. The study does not address the significance of texts like the Book of Common Prayer because the focus is on prayer books intended for private use rather than on the liturgical texts of institutional churches.

Kao seeks to demonstrate ways that Renaissance, humanist culture played a significant role in the shaping of Protestant prayer books, which

in turn shaped Protestant piety. An obvious way that these prayer books reworked medieval prayer books was the removal of images from the manuals, which indicates one simple way that traditional models of dissemination, the prayer books themselves, were used to promote the growing Protestant movement. The first chapter surveys the primary texts cited in this book, and explores their prefaces and distinct features to show the diversity of Protestant prayer books. Chapter 2 looks at the sources used in composing the new prayer books, which included, in addition to Scripture, ancient, medieval, and contemporary material. Sometimes even classical philosophy was incorporated. These sources were transformed from their use in medieval prayer books to present a new approach to spirituality. Chapter 3 shows how Protestant prayer books contained written texts that were typically modeled on the pattern of the Lord's Prayer, which are instances of reading texts as prayers. Chapter 4 demonstrates that Protestant prayer books changed the focus on love from medieval prayer books to the necessity of faith in prayer, which was a central theological transformation. Chapter 5 argues that Protestant prayer books focused on glorifying God through engaging in worldly vocations with prayer as a foundational way to improve personal piety in these endeavors, which contrasted with the medieval focus on monasticism as the path of holiness. Chapter 6 explores prayer books intended specifically for use by women, and the implications of these feminine prayer books for our understanding of early modern society. The final chapter looks at how prayer books show that Protestants thought of reading itself as an act of piety and personal devotion and the spread of vernacular prayer books and the translation of other Protestant prayer books indicates the deep connection between literary and theological culture in the early modern period.

This book has many strengths. Kao cites sources from several languages, and so this is not a one-sided work, and it does not default to being a collation of book reports on English texts. There is deep social analysis here that gets into the concerns of lay Christians. As important as historical analysis is of properly academic theological works from the early modern period, an unbalanced consideration of those might give the impression that every Christian in the Reformation and post-Reformation eras was a scholar. Kao's work reminds us that there had to be a process of disseminating ideas from the theological academy to the masses, and one of the mechanisms used to inculcate the burgeoning Protestant theology was the prayer book. Further, so many studies that examine gender studies in historical work deficiently read historical texts simply in light of modern

issues. Kao's consideration of women and prayer books avoids that error and helpfully describes what prayer books entail for our understanding of women's role in Christian society during the early modern period and how that was changing.

On the other hand, however, this is not a perfect work. The alternation between footnotes and in-text citation is not only distracting, but confusing. This reviewer thinks that in-text references need to be scrapped altogether, and citations moved to footnotes. It would have streamlined the body of this text. Further, although this book offered a rich intersection between theological and social history, this reviewer is not sure Kao delivered the social analysis promised. She demonstrates how prayer books shifted from the medieval to the Reformation era, but the full details of what that meant for early modern society are not spelled out at length, save perhaps in the chapter about women's prayer books. Still, overall, this work will be a helpful guide to those who are interested in the personal devotion of early Protestants

—Harrison Perkins, *Queen's University Belfast*