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ABSTRACT

The Crisis of Calvinism and Rise of Arminianism in Cromwellian England

Andrew J. Ollerton

Historians of religion have long been fascinated with the crumbling of the Calvinist consensus. To date, attention has largely focussed on either ‘Laudians’ in the early Stuart period or ‘Latitudinarians’ and ‘High-Churchmen’ in the post-Restoration church. This thesis will demonstrate that the 1650s were in fact the breakthrough moment for English Arminianism. Paradoxically, during the decade of puritan rule, Calvinist doctrines of absolute predestination and irresistible grace were challenged on an unprecedented scale. Part I charts the rise of three diverse styles of English Arminianism. Most surprisingly, anti-Calvinism began to emerge among puritans such as John Goodwin, John Horn and John Milton, who turned against the soteriology of Reformed theology. Episcopal Royalists including Henry Hammond, Thomas Pierce and Laurence Womock also issued aggressive anti-Calvinist publications in a bid to undermine the Reformed heritage of the Church of England. In addition, a cacophony of sectarian voices, including Baptists, Socinians and Quakers, registered their disapproval regarding the perceived arbitrariness of the Calvinist god. As a consequence, English divines spoke of an unfolding ‘Quinquarticular war’, as matters debated on the continent at the Synod of Dort now caused an episode of domestic controversy. Part II traces the theological arguments of the two leading English Arminians in the 1650s – John Goodwin and Henry Hammond. These chapters will highlight both the diversity and catholicity of English Arminians who made sophisticated use of resources from the Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed and Remonstrant traditions and situated their work within the mainstream of the Western theological tradition. By considering this episode of religious controversy, new light will be shed on both the radical reformation of theology during the English Revolution and its influence on the post-Restoration church.
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INTRODUCTION
During the seventeenth-century the theological tide was turning in England. Throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, despite significant diversity and episodes of protest, the doctrine of unconditional predestination formed a ‘common and ameliorating bond’. However, by the close of the seventeenth-century, the Calvinist consensus had crumbled and in its place there arose a widespread commitment to universal grace and conditional salvation, commonly referred to as Arminianism. The crisis of Calvinism and rise of Arminianism have previously been attributed to Laudians during the early Stuart period and to Latitudinarians and High-Churchmen in the post-Restoration church. However, this research will demonstrate that the hinge decades for this intellectual swing were in fact those of the English Revolution (1640-60).

In particular, the 1650s witnessed a paradoxical phenomenon: the rise of Arminianism during the decade characterized by puritan rule. Numerous publications, from scholarly folios to popular pamphlets, attacked the doctrinal commitments of Reformed Orthodoxy. Most surprising were those from within the puritan fold as the likes of John Goodwin, John Horn and John Milton formulated anti-Calvinist soteriologies predicated upon conditional election, universal atonement and resistible grace. The old enemy also reared its head as a new breed of episcopal anti-Calvinists, including Henry Hammond, Thomas Pierce and Herbert Thorndike, attacked the decretal and solifidian emphases of


\[3\] As a recent compendium of essays has argued, a ‘surprising lack of attention has been given to the Interregnum as a whole, and to the Protectorate in particular’. In Jason McElligott and David L. Smith, Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 2. This research forms part of a necessary corrective.
Reformed theology. Familiar battle lines were further confused by the insurgence of sectarians who flourished under the relative amnesty of Cromwellian toleration. Socinians, Ranters, Quakers and General Baptists laid siege to the pillars of the religious establishment, including Calvinist doctrines. This cacophony of ‘mechanick’ preachers and plebian pamphleteers represented a new style of anti-Calvinism, which also eroded the Reformed hegemony.

The unprecedented rejection of Calvinist soteriology, coupled with increased engagement with Catholic, Lutheran and Remonstrant alternatives, culminated in sophisticated Arminian publications on a scale that far exceeded the Laudian era. As William Lamont has noted:

[T]he theological issues raised by Arminians in the Netherlands at the end of the sixteenth century got a proper airing in England, neither just before the Civil War, nor even during it, but after it... the golden age of theological debate on Arminianism was in the England of the 1650s.4

This astute observation can be cross-referenced with other doctrinal loci, which also suggest that significant intellectual changes occurred during the 1640s and 50s. Alister McGrath has highlighted the divergence between pre- and post-revolution Caroline divines regarding the doctrine of justification. In particular, the English consensus regarding the imputation of Christ’s righteousness gave way to a moral condition of obedience, which undermined the Protestant axiom, sola fide. Crucially, it was ‘the intervention of the Commonwealth between these two schools of thought’, which caused the English church to adopt such ‘new directions’.5 Michael McGiffert demonstrated a similar trend regarding covenant theology, which migrated from a ‘moderate Calvinist orientation... in the 1620s’

---


to ‘the partially Arminianized reconstitutions of the 1650s’. Jonathan Moore has traced the softening of Reformed theology and the emergence of a more pastoral Calvinism committed to the hypothetical provision of universal atonement. However, though these modifications were privately pondered during the early Stuart period, ‘England as a whole saw no significant public or published debates on the extent of the atonement until the 1640s’. Even the Augustinian shibboleth of original sin was ‘contested as it had never been contested before in England’ during ‘the middle years of the seventeenth-century’. These scholarly clues suggest that decades known for political revolution, also witnessed a theological revolution. Suspension of subscription to the Articles of Religion and de facto removal of press licensing made this unique period an incubator for radical ideas, and led to England’s Reformed heritage being challenged on an unprecedented scale. Consequently, the longer-term English migration away from Calvinism, during the seventeenth-century as a whole, experienced an episode of rapid acceleration during these hinge decades. Focusing on the doctrines of predestination and grace, this thesis will build on previous scholarship in order to offer the first comprehensive analysis of one of the most important changes to the early modern English landscape – the crisis of Calvinism and rise of Arminianism.

---

Approach and Methodology

As interdisciplinary research, developed within both history and divinity faculties, this thesis will contribute a dual perspective on the crisis of Calvinism. The metaphor of cartography will be used to capture the distinct approaches of the two parts that comprise the whole. Part I is a mapping exercise, providing an historical survey of three broad styles of English Arminianism during the 1650s – puritan, episcopal and sectarian. Part II traces the detailed theological contours of individual Arminian divines, revealing their idiosyncrasies as well as points of commonality. The thesis therefore achieves both a diachronic survey of an episode of religious controversy and synchronic analysis of doctrinal formulations that emerged from it. Part I draws inspiration from historians of religion such as Nicholas Tyacke, who exemplify a contextual approach that situates early modern subjects within their native horizons and captures the flux and contingency characteristic of early modern history. Part II will adopt the analytical style of historical theologians such as Richard Muller, who eschew the imposition of confessional agendas and instead consider early modern doctrinal arguments within their historical contexts. As Muller has noted, the reception of Reformed theology in seventeenth-century England, was characterised by ‘response and adaptation to the changing political, social and intellectual contexts of Puritanism’. Though both perspectives have a growing appreciation of each other, religious historians and historical theologians rarely provide a joint framework for a single piece of research. This thesis therefore offers an interdisciplinary paradigm, which attempts to integrate both approaches, in

9 As Carl Trueman argues, ‘Historical theology is concerned to locate theologians and theologies within their particular contexts’ and to allow historical research to provide ‘the horizons of our subjects’. ‘Introduction’ in Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment, ed. by Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), xv.
order to consider the crisis of Calvinism by tracing the detailed migratory paths of individuals and charting broader intellectual trends.

The historical survey (Part I) and the theological analysis (Part II) both share the same contextual methodology, which endeavours to offer a thick description of early modern texts by considering their linguistic, political and religious contexts. Quentin Skinner has denounced the ‘mythology of prolepsis’, which is ‘more interested in the retrospective significance of a given episode than in its meaning for the agent at the time’.¹¹ Instead, texts should be interpreted according to the questions, concepts and concerns native to them. As Skinner himself observed:

My aspiration is not of course to enter into the thought-processes of long-dead thinkers; it is simply to use the ordinary techniques of historical enquiry to grasp their concepts, to follow their distinctions, to appreciate their beliefs and, so far as possible, to see things their way.¹²

This approach is of particular relevance in the study of early modern religious texts. Previous Whiggish and Marxist historiography approached religion as an ideological construct, ‘a fantasy of power which can, by a simple gesture of translation, be demystified back into politics’.¹³ These secularizing tendencies imposed a modernizing narrative, which assumed that mystery and faith were inevitably replaced by reason and science. Consequently, previous consideration of the crisis of Calvinism veered toward reductionism and anachronistic explanations. For example, Gerald Cragg considered the ‘Eclipse of Calvinism’ during the mid-seventeenth-century. His Whiggish narrative depicted an obscurantist and passé theology being displaced by the ‘mediating position’ of Arminianism, which in turn prepared the way for Enlightenment rationalism.¹⁴

¹² Ibid., 3.
According to this schema, puritans such as John Milton and John Goodwin were proto-Enlightenment prophets, no longer part of the puritan revolution but orchestrating the revolution of puritanism from within. Indeed, Cragg claimed that ‘no man of his period held such enlightened views’ as John Goodwin. The Whig approach therefore reduced the contingencies and complexities of history to ‘an unending series of butterflies bursting out of chrysalises’, with ‘impoverished’ explanations as a consequence.

Marxist historians displaced the Whig approach by interpreting religious categories according to underlying socio-economic causes. Christopher Hill interpreted “Puritanism” as the ideology of a rising bourgeois class in conflict with a traditional aristocratic ethos, which culminated in the first modern European revolution and catapulted England toward modernity. Within this narrative structure, Calvinism and Arminianism were squeezed into modern political categories of ‘right’ and ‘left’:

One of the fascinating problems in the intellectual history of seventeenth-century England is the collapse of Calvinism. It was as though it had performed its task within the establishment of a society in which the protestant ethic prevailed. Before 1640 Calvinism had been attacked from the right by sacramentalist Laudian Arminians; during the Revolution it was attacked by rationalist Arminians of the left.

Revisionist and post-revisionist historiography has since instigated a corrective turn, considering ‘religion qua religion - and not as a mere subservient vehicle to explain political processes or economic shifts’. This has brought increased

---

15 Gerald Cragg, From Puritanism to the Age of Reason, 17.
19 Paul Lim, Mystery Unveiled, 8-9. For an overview of the impact of the religious turn on historiography, Seeing Things their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion,
awareness of the pervasive nature of religious imagination in early modern thought and the decisive role religion played in the construction of meaning. Far from being a hermetically sealed or private discourse, religion was the ground beneath early modern society and the grammar that shaped early modern texts. Consequently, it is ‘an indispensable explanatory matrix’ that frequently provides the most satisfying interpretation of political episodes and intellectual trends.20 As John Morrill claimed in his revisionist riposte: ‘The English civil war was not the first European revolution: it was the last of the Wars of Religion’.21 This research has sought to embrace this methodological turn by considering the native horizons of religious texts in an attempt to ‘see things their way’. The goal has been a contextually sensitive explanation for the crisis of Calvinism, recognizable to a contemporary participant in these early modern debates.

**Historiography, Nomenclature and Religious Identity**

Religious historians face the perennial challenge of entering the fray of early modern skirmishes and emerging with suitable nomenclature that can capture both complexities and commonalities. Whilst the *Scylla* of nominalism threatens to further fragment an already messy scene by foregrounding idiosyncrasy, the *Charybdis* of realism promises to tidy up complex and disparate ideologies into neat battle lines, more akin to a board game than reality. In particular, older historiography tended to structure religious controversies around reductionist binaries, especially Anglican/Puritan and later Calvinism/Arminianism. Revisionist scholars have therefore called for the ‘rejection of a dialectical framework for history’ arguing that change does not always happen by a

---

Hegelian ‘clash of opposites’. This section will survey the relevant literature, with a view to navigating beyond black and white binaries and toward a more variegated approach to seventeenth-century religious identity. In addition, it will define the relevant terms upon which the rest of the thesis will depend.

Anglicans, Puritans and Early Modern Polemic

‘I am not, nor would be accounted willingly ARMINIAN, CALVINIST OR LUTHERAN (Names of division) but a CHRISTIAN.’

Richard Montagu’s incendiary publications sparked a major episode of religious controversy in early Stuart England. Central to the uproar was Montagu’s pejorative use of labels and associations in order to discredit and marginalize his opponents. His anti-Calvinism illustrated several tactics widely appropriated by early modern religious controversialists. Firstly, pejorative terms were deployed in order to associate rivals with dangerous extremes. In particular, aligning a doctrinal position with a single contemporary figure left it open to the charge of ‘noveltie’, which in an age that prized ancient tradition so highly was akin to heresy. Montagu therefore depicted ‘Calvin’ as the ‘founder of your fancies’ in a bid to isolate Calvinists as a sectarian ‘tribe’. The majority of early modern religious labels, including ‘Puritan’, ‘Calvinist’ and ‘Arminian’, were originally pejorative terms; equivalent to tabloid slurs and designed to injure reputations through guilt by association. As Lamont has noted ‘Political and religious polemic thrived on the assimilation of one’s opponent to a discredited polarity’.

---

24 Ibid., 51. In 1583, Walter Travers objected to being labelled ‘Calvinian’ on the grounds that only the ‘papists’ would ‘immortalize founders’. Wallace notes that it was only after the middle of the seventeenth-century that some divines appropriated the term positively. In Dewey Wallace, Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 10.
therefore eschewed such labels as self-referents, preferring instead broad terms that exuded an air of orthodoxy and moderation. Richard Baxter, after noting the various disparaging connotations of ‘Puritan’ and ‘Calvinist’, concluded that he was instead a ‘CATHOLIC’ or mere Christian. Older historiography tended to unwittingly appropriate pejorative labels and use them in an unqualified way. This has resulted in theological traditions such as ‘Arminianism’ being loosely defined and associated with the polemical parodies devised by opponents. Terms such as ‘Arminianism’ must therefore be carefully qualified, given that seventeenth-century English divines did not identify themselves as ‘Arminian’ due to the negative associations.

Having attributed pejorative connotations to one’s opponent, it was commonplace to contrast these with equally undesirable opposites. This strategy relied on parody and satire in order to structure the religious imagination according to extremes, such as ‘Puritan’, ‘Calvinian’, ‘Papist’ or ‘Pelagian’. With dangers conjured up on both sides, the golden mean between them became the most desirable and sought after location in England. Moderation was prized above all things, for according to the early modern psyche, ‘truth is in the middle betwixt two extreams’. Montagu therefore depicted the destructive influence of

---

26 Richard Baxter, The Grotian Religion Discovered (1658), [Title Page].
27 In the case of Arminianism, pejorative association with Pelagianism and popery proved particularly effective. Reformed divines such as Daniel Featley attempted to prove an unbroken chain of heresy from Pelagius, via Rome and Arminius to Montagu. The overall aim was to render Arminianism a foreign heresy that had no place in the Church of England. See Daniel Featley, A Parallel: of New-Old Pelagiarminian Error (1626). The association of ‘Arminian’ with ‘Pelagian’ was a particularly effective tactic to use against a professed Protestant. See Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640 (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 407.
28 However, as will be demonstrated, by the 1640s and 50s, an increasing number of English divines were prepared to openly defend Arminius and the Remonstrants and to associate with their core texts and tenets.
29 Montagu parodied Calvinism as a form of fatalism, riddled with internal strife: ‘they brawl at the shadow of their owne fancies, as dogs bark at the Moon’. Richard Montagu, Appello Caesarem, 88.
30 Richard Montagu, A Gagg for the New Gospell? No: a New Gagg for an Old Goose (1624), 112. Montagu’s fellow anti-Calvinist, Christopher Potter, also insisted: ‘I resolve never to be an Arminian and ever to be moderate’. However, he went on to reveal Arminian sympathies, arguing the Remonstrants should no more be excluded from communion
‘Papists and Puritans... who looking and running two several waies, doe like SAMPSON FOXES joine together in the taile’.31 By making Calvinism synonymous with puritanism, and comparing both to the threat of Catholicism, Montagu presented the Church of England as the mature via media between such errors.32 As will be demonstrated, concealing one’s own position within the English Articles and liturgy, and constructing an ‘Anglican' via media between bipolar extremes became a well-worn strategy during the contest for the Church of England in the 1650s. As Ethan Shagan argues, ‘One noteworthy feature of the English revolution was the desire of virtually all participants to claim the mantle of moderation’.33 However, as Shagan has also demonstrated, this appeal to moderation was in fact a highly charged political enterprise intent on domination.34

Previous Whiggish, Marxist and denominational historiography often failed to decipher these early modern tactics and instead took the labels and binaries at face value. In particular, a hoary divide was assumed to exist between moderate ‘Anglicans', who occupied the mainstream and puritan malcontents who opposed the Elizabethan settlement from the margins.35 The narrative proved particularly popular with historians of ‘Anglicanism’ who wished to cultivate an image of the

with the English church than the Lutherans whose ‘absurd' notion of 'ubiquity' is ‘farre worse’. See John Plaifere, Appello Evangelium (1651), 414-5, 433, 428, 424.
31 Appello Caesarem, 48.
Church of England as *via media* between Catholicism and Calvinism. Patrick Collinson began the work of deconstructing this Anglican/Puritan divide, by demonstrating the integrated nature of Elizabethan and Jacobean puritanism within mainstream Protestantism. As ‘one half of a stressful relationship’, puritans enjoyed considerable patronage and influence within the establishment. Nicholas Tyacke also made a seminal contribution, inverting Montagu’s narrative by demonstrating that Reformed theology was common to conformist episcopalians and non-conformist puritans: ‘Calvinism at the time was clearly establishment orthodoxy, and contemporaries would have found any suggestion that Calvinists were Puritans completely incomprehensible’. Consequently, according to Tyacke, it was not puritans but Laudians who were the revolutionary force, destabilising the mainstream Reformed tradition and precipitating civil war. Laudians were not renovators of a pre-existent ‘Anglicanism’ but innovators displacing the *status quo* and effecting a ‘major and aggressive reconstruction of orthodoxy’. Therefore, revisionist historians have largely concluded that the notion of an ‘Anglican’ *via media* was a ‘myth’ that should be rejected *tout court*. Indeed, Diarmaid MacCulloch argues that ‘Anglicanism’ has been nothing but ‘a theological Bermuda Triangle’ and Anthony Milton concludes that reliance on the term implies ‘more a shrug of the shoulders than an explanation’.

---


Therefore, despite resistance from some historians, the Collinson-Tyacke revisionist thesis has achieved a broad consensus regarding the early Stuart period and the build up to civil war.\(^{42}\) However, this scholarship has not yet been applied to the period post-1640, when the notion of ‘Anglican’ theology was rendered even more problematic by the suspension of the English Articles and Liturgy.\(^{43}\) During the period of the English Revolution, attempts to represent the theology of the ‘Church of England’ or to occupy the English via media were political assertions not abstract theological discussions. Failure to appreciate this unique context or to decipher contemporary tactics has obscured the sheer scale and radical nature of religious controversy during this tumultuous period. Most notably, episcopal Arminians attempted to conceal unconventional theologies and controversial strategies beneath a veneer of moderation, as they contested the Reformed heritage of the English church. This thesis will therefore further expose the myth of a stable and mature ‘Anglican’ theology, by demonstrating that during the 1650s, not only puritans and sectarians but also episcopal divines were capable of quite daring Arminian formulations that would have troubled even Laudian anti-Calvinists.

---


Laudians, Anti-Calvinists and Arminianism

I disavow the name and Title of ARMINIAN... I never read a word in ARMINIUS. The course of my studies was never addressed to moderne Epitomizers.44

The relationship between Laudianism and Dutch Arminianism has sparked further historiographical debate, leading to post-revisionist approaches. Nicholas Tyacke’s survey of the rise of English anti-Calvinists associated Laudianism with Arminianism.45 Many revisionist historians followed suit and English Arminianism quickly became shorthand for early Stuart divines who resisted the influence of continental Calvinism. However, more recent scholarship has called into question the relationship between Remonstrants from the Low Countries and high-church English ceremonialists. David Hoyle’s study of Cambridge (1590-1644) searched meticulously and concluded there was little Arminianism to speak of during this period.46 Whilst retaining the basic Tyacke-thesis, post-revisionist scholars have therefore increasingly argued that the primary focus of Laudian innovation was not predestination, but ‘novel ceremonialism and sacramentalism’ combined with attacks on puritan preaching and sabbatarian strictures.47 Peter Lake criticized the ‘bizarre obsession with predestination’, which risked replacing the much maligned Anglican/Puritan divide with an equally problematic alternative - Arminian/Calvinist. Instead, Lake preferred to consider a ‘distinct Laudian style’ comprised of ceremonial emphases, which subversively redefined ‘the line between the sacred and the profane’.48

44 Richard Montagu, Appello Caesarem, 11.
45 The sub-title of Tyacke’s Anti-Calvinists referred to ‘the rise of English Arminianism’.
46 David Hoyle, Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590-1644 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007). Debra Shuger also argues that ‘Arminianism’ was a slur used against Laudians due to connotations of treason and popery. She concludes that ‘only Samuel Hoard’s God’s love to all mankind [1633] is openly Arminian’, otherwise Laudians ‘rarely treat predestination’. Debra Shuger, Religion in Early Stuart England, 1603-1638: An Anthology of Primary Sources (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 8-10.
47 The Early Stuart Church, 1603-42, ed. by Kenneth Fincham (London: Macmillan, 1993), 5.
Consequently, post-revisionist scholars are more inclined to take Montagu’s disavowal (above) at face value, given that Laudians seemed more concerned to relocate the altar and restore the rail than to parse predestination or reorder divine decrees.49 When asked what position the Laudians held, George Morley allegedly quipped: ‘all the best bishoprics and deaneries in England’.50 His humour betrayed a serious concern to occupy ecclesiastical more than soteriological positions. As Collinson insightfully concluded, Laudianism was a ‘sudden and politically contrived renversement which toppled Calvinism from its throne’, rather than ‘the natural attenuation and exhaustion of Calvinism’. Crucially he added, ‘[t]hat might have occurred by 1650 but not in 1630’.51

Imprecision regarding the relationship between Laudianism and Arminianism has caused protracted debates in danger of missing the point. Lamont provocatively referred to ‘the controversy that never was’, for what has been labelled ‘Arminianism’ was in fact largely a concern to defend monarchical rule and episcopalian polity against the perceived threat of Genevan and Scottish Presbyterianism. For example, Montagu argued that Calvinism would put a ‘pope in every parish for the church’ and cause ‘Democraticall Anarchies in the State’. Peter Heylyn also insisted: ‘I do not find it in the Articles of the Church of England that Calvin or Beza are to bee preferred before Saint Austin or Aquinas’.52 These English concerns do not map neatly onto the soteriological objections raised by Jacobus Arminius, himself a Reformed pastor and professor, or the early Dutch

49 Anthony Milton concluded that John Overall was the ‘only major English divine who corresponded directly with the continental Arminians’. Consequently, ‘There is less evidence for direct links or substantial reading of Arminian treatises among the avant-garde conformists after the mid-1620s’ and there was certainly no equivalent of the Calvinist republic of letters. Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 435-6. Tyacke has since acknowledged the need for a ‘more inclusive definition’ of Laudianism. In Aspects of English Protestantism, 13. See also Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700 (Oxford: OUP, 2007).
50 Cited in Carl Bangs, "'All the Best Bishoprics and Deaneries': The Enigma of Arminian Politics', Church History, 42 (1973), pp. 5-16.
52 Peter Heylyn, A Briefe and Moderate Answer (1637), 119; Richard Montagu, Appello Caesarem, 44. See also Milton’s summary of anti-Calvinist attacks on Calvin and Beza due to their Presbyterian polity, which was perceived as a threat by English episcopalian. Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 448-61.
Remonstrants. A clearer differentiation is therefore required between the broad and multi-faceted genus of anti-Calvinism and the narrower species of Arminianism.\textsuperscript{53} Drawing a clear distinction will facilitate more nuanced understandings of two quite distinct episodes of religious controversy – Laudian anti-Calvinism in the 1620s and 30s and the rise of English Arminianism in the 1640s and 50s.\textsuperscript{54} Rather than an unremitting focus on the early Stuart period, this will enable fresh consideration of religious controversies, which occurred during the interregnum. For this period was no mere aftermath or cooling off period after the Laudians had been removed, but a decisive contest for the Church of England, which influenced the course of English theology through into the eighteenth century. Furthermore, from the vantage point of the 1650s, a new assessment can be made regarding Arminianism within the early Stuart church. As Chapter One will demonstrate, reliance solely on publications licensed in the 1620s and 30s fails to discern more subtle theological trends, which only surfaced publicly in Cromwellian England.

Calvinism, Arminianism and the Reformed Tradition

Arguably, the greatest hindrance to discussions of seventeenth-century religious controversy has been a systemic failure to carefully define doctrinal terms of reference. As Tyacke observed, ‘...[T]he whole topic of Calvinism and Arminianism has in recent years become bedevilled by disagreement over terminology’.\textsuperscript{55} Detached from its theological moorings, Arminianism has been pulled from ‘left’ to ‘right’ by Christopher Hill, dissolved into an Erasmian philosophia Christi by Hugh Trevor-Roper and heavily associated with

\textsuperscript{53} As Keith Stanglin has noted, ‘Arminianism, as a catchall term for anti-Calvinism, has since come to mean anything from high church Anglican order to Pelagianism to open theism’. Keith Stanglin, 'Arminius Reconsidered', in \textit{Reconsidering Arminius: Beyond the Reformed and Wesleyan Divide}, ed. by Keith Stanglin, Mark Bilby and Mark Mann (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 2014), pp. 161-167, 164.

\textsuperscript{54} Nicholas Tyacke briefly entertained this distinction between anti-Calvinism and Arminianism before dismissing it as ‘unduly pedantic’. Nicholas Tyacke, \textit{Aspects of English Protestantism}, 159.

\textsuperscript{55} Nicholas Tyacke, \textit{Aspects of English Protestantism}, 3.
Laudianism by Nicholas Tyacke. Lamont was surely correct: ‘Arminianism has become a football in the revisionist debate’. However, he proceeded to punt it in the wrong direction by labelling Richard Baxter ‘Arminian’. Though Baxter opposed the ‘hot Anti-Arminians’ and held a controversial neonomian doctrine of justification, he nevertheless firmly adhered to a basic Calvinist soteriology, as Simon Burton has ably demonstrated. Confusion over Baxter’s pedigree serves to illustrate new levels of complexity, which emerged within English Protestantism during the middle decades of the seventeenth-century. More precise taxonomical instruments are therefore required to enable accurate cartography of this period.

In particular, a more doctrinally oriented definition of ‘Calvinism’ and ‘Arminianism’ should form an essential frame of reference. Without careful qualification, these terms are problematic on several fronts. Firstly, the implied assumption of two static and homogenous positions simply cannot accommodate the variegated and complex nature of early modern formulations of predestination and related loci. Popular uses of ‘Calvinism’ still assume that the whole tradition can be reduced to a five-point acronym, TULIP. More recently, the heterogeneity of ‘Calvinism’ has been highlighted by a series of publications

---


59 As Sean Hughes argued, previous scholarship has failed to appreciate the diversity of positions housed within ‘Calvinism’. Consequently, divines that opposed stricter forms such as the notion of double-predestination associated with Beza and Perkins, were assumed to be de facto ‘Arminians’. Seán F. Hughes, ‘The Problem of Calvinism: English Theologies of Predestination c. 1580–1630’, in Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students, ed. by Susan Wabuda and C. J. Litzenerberger (1998), pp. 229-249.

60 It has often been assumed that the five points of TULIP map neatly onto the Synod of Dort. However, the controversy that culminated in the Synod of Dort bears only limited correspondence with TULIP. See Kenneth J. Stewart, Ten Myths about Calvinism: Recovering the Breadth of the Reformed Tradition (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2011), ch. 3.
arguing that: ‘underneath the label lay a whole spectrum of predestinarian beliefs’.\(^{61}\) Secondly, ‘Calvinist’ carries pejorative connotations of over-reliance on one second-generation reformer, John Calvin. The Reformed tradition was in fact far broader and included considerable internecine conflict.\(^{62}\) After repeated attacks on Calvin by the Catholic Bolsec, the Reformed divine Heinrich Bullinger stated in a letter to Calvin: ‘Now believe me, many are offended by your statements on predestination in your Institutes’.\(^{63}\) The English reception of Genevan theology was particularly cautious, with other centres of Reformed theology such as Zurich and Heidelberg held in high regard.\(^{64}\) Thirdly, commitment to Prayer Book liturgy and theology further complicated the relationship of English divines to Reformed theology. Some English conformist divines who were broadly aligned with Calvinism retained certain English idiosyncrasies; most notably regarding the possibility that those justified through baptismal regeneration may not persevere to final salvation.\(^{65}\)

Given these complexities, Patrick Collinson concluded: “Calvinist” is a stereotype and too blunt an instrument for any discriminating purpose’.\(^{66}\) Indeed, many historical theologians and some religious historians have abandoned ‘Calvinism’ altogether, preferring instead ‘the Reformed tradition’ or ‘Reformed Orthodoxy’

---


\(^{63}\) In Cornelis Venema, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Doctrine of Predestination: Author of “the Other Reformed Tradition”?* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 61, 63. John Calvin should therefore be considered alongside other Reformers such as Johannes Oecolampadius, Heinrich Bullinger, Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr Vermigli, Andreas Musculus, Theodore Beza and David Pareus.


\(^{65}\) Part II will discuss these matters in more detail.

as a way of demarcating a confessional tradition associated with the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession and the Canons of Dort.\textsuperscript{67} However, once carefully qualified, ‘Calvinism’ and ‘Arminianism’ still remain helpful terms for ‘loose coalitions, made up of more or less compatible ideological strands, rather than as tidy monolithic parties organised around tightly defined orthodoxies’\textsuperscript{68} This thesis will therefore retain the terms ‘Calvinism’ and ‘Arminianism’ as a convenient short hand to reference two theological traditions that formulated distinct approaches to divine predestination and saving grace.\textsuperscript{69}

The Synod of Dort offers the clearest contemporary snapshot regarding the crucial doctrines that divided the Reformed delegates from the Remonstrant party.\textsuperscript{70} Despite considerable internecine tensions on both sides, by 1619 a confessional boundary had been established that set Arminianism outside the parameters of the Reformed tradition, causing it to form a third major Protestant tradition. The negative consensus achieved by the Canons of Dort can be summarized according to two core tenets, \textit{unconditional decrees} of election and \textit{irresistible grace} for the elect. Axiomatic to Calvinist soteriology was the absolute and unconditional nature of divine decrees of election, irrespective of human action. As the Canons of Dort stated: ‘This election was not founded upon foreseen faith’. Equally, at the point of conversion, the Canons argued that grace ‘sweetly and powerfully bends’ the human will to receive salvation irresistibly and without any active contribution from the receiver.\textsuperscript{71} Crucially therefore, for

\textsuperscript{67} Dort was necessary in part because earlier Reformed confessions were primarily written with Roman Catholic opponents in mind. The Arminian challenge required a different response to ward off objections coming from \textit{within} the Reformed tradition.\textsuperscript{68} Peter Lake, ‘Predestinarian Propositions’, \textit{The Journal of Ecclesiastical History}, 46 (1995), pp. 110-123, 121.\textsuperscript{69} For a helpful defense of the continued use of the term, see Herman Selderhuis, ‘Calvinism as Reformed Protestantism: Clarification of a Term’, in \textit{Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller}, ed. by Jordan J. Ballor, David Sytsma and Jason Zuidema (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 723-735.\textsuperscript{70} For helpful summaries of the doctrinal debates at Dort see \textit{Revisiting the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)}, ed. by Aza Goudriaan and F. A. Lieburg (Leiden: Brill, 2011); \textit{The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)}, ed. by Anthony Milton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005).\textsuperscript{71} This is often referred to as ‘monergism’ in modern parlance. The term derives from Greek words signifying the action of a single will. Whereas ‘synergism’ insists that the human will co-operates with the divine will at the point of conversion.
Calvinists, the principle of predilection, which distinguishes elect and reprobate, should only be attributed to ‘the righteous discrimination’ of God.\textsuperscript{72} Calvinism will therefore be defined as a broad commitment to \textit{unconditional decrees} and \textit{irresistible grace} as a working definition throughout this thesis.

Arminianism initially emerged as a protest or remonstrance against these core tenets. Arminians argued that unconditional election and irresistible grace incurred both philosophical problems regarding the nature of God and pastoral problems, including the crisis of assurance and the rise of antinomianism.\textsuperscript{73} The early Remonstrants therefore made the \textit{conditional} nature of divine decrees and the \textit{resistibility} of grace points of departure. As Keith Stanglin has noted regarding Arminius’ relationship to Reformed theology, ‘[T]he first difference is the priority of faith, or, stated another way, conditional election, for faith is the condition... The second point of difference concerns the resistibility of grace’.\textsuperscript{74} These Arminian concerns received an English echo throughout the litany of primary sources considered in this research. For example, Henry Hammond neatly summarized the doctrines that sparked his Arminian protest as ‘irrespective Decrees, and Grace irresistible’.\textsuperscript{75} Arminianism will therefore be considered a broad intellectual tradition committed to the dual tenets of \textit{conditional decrees} and \textit{resistible grace}.\textsuperscript{76} This approach achieves sufficient definition to distinguish Arminianism from other modified forms of Calvinism (e.g. Amyraldianism), as well as expressions of anti-Calvinism motivated more by

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{72} Canons of Dort in \textit{Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation: Volume 4, 1600-1693}, ed. by James Dennison, (Michigan: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014), 122, 139. Though a minority of English divines such as Samuel Ward did oppose the term ‘irresistible grace’ (see Part II), it nevertheless represented the consensus opinion.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Arminius referred to these as ‘two fiery darts’, in Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, \textit{Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace} (New York: OUP, 2012), 177.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Keith D. Stanglin, \textit{Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609} (Boston: Brill, 2007), 112.
\item \textsuperscript{75} PD, ‘Preface’, sig. A3.
\item \textsuperscript{76} This doctrinal definition enables seventeenth-century English divines to be meaningfully considered ‘Arminian’, despite their attempts to eschew the pejorative title. Equally, considering Arminianism a broad theological tradition avoids a narrow comparison paradigm, which assesses later Arminians simply according to their correspondance with or divergence from the specific approach of Jacobus Arminius. As will be argued in Part II, this approach risks a form of reductionism that obscures the diversity and catholicity of English Arminianism.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
ecclesiological and political concerns (e.g. Laudianism). However, this definition of Arminianism is also sufficiently abstract to encompass a diverse theological spectrum, with significant historical precedents throughout patristic, medieval and early modern periods.

Thesis Structure and Primary Sources

The historical survey (Part I) begins with a bridge chapter, identifying certain historical contingencies and theological controversies that contributed to the rise of Arminianism during the 1650s. Chapters Two, Three and Four consider puritan, episcopal and sectarian styles of Arminianism. Each chapter surveys the main protagonists and publications before drawing conclusions regarding their distinct style of Arminianism. In order to achieve a synoptic panorama, Part I necessarily relies on a corporate approach that situates individuals within styles demarcated by shared social networks, doctrinal emphases and ecclesiastical commitments. These corporate identities or ‘styles’ are intended to denote common priorities and sensibilities not homogenous pigeonholes. As Peter Lake has argued, ‘style’ refers to ‘a synthesis of positions, opinions and modes of affect, constructed by a variety of contemporary groups always in polemical struggle the one with the other’. Puritan-style will refer to a cluster of attitudes common to the self-identified ‘godly’. This ‘hotter sort of Protestantism’ was united by a concern for spiritual reformation and characterized by experimental piety, along with practices such as sermon gadding, fast days and sabbatarianism.

---

77 As Levitin has rightly noted, ‘Arminianism is not a political or ecclesiological position: it is a set of theological principles’. Dmitri Levitin, Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, c. 1640–1700 (Cambridge: CUP, 2015), 512.
79 For this approach to English puritanism see Patrick Collinson, 'A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan', The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 31 (1980), pp. 483-
Puritanism will therefore be considered ‘a distinctive style of piety and divinity’, which was not tethered to a specific doctrinal system in an essentialist manner.\textsuperscript{80} Indeed, just as Collinson and Tyacke exposed Montagu’s myth that \textit{all Calvinists were puritans}, Chapter Two will demonstrate the reverse; by the 1650s, \textit{not all puritans were Calvinists}.

Episcopal-style will be contrasted with puritanism due to their differing approaches to politics, ecclesiastical polity and spirituality. Divergence on such matters served to instantiate social networks that were distinct though never divorced. As Jean-Louis Quantin has argued: ‘it would not do to conceive ”Anglicans” and “Puritans” as two well-defined cohesive groups with opposed doctrines’.\textsuperscript{82} Indeed, this research will help to further refute older paradigms by demonstrating surprising soteriological proximity between episcopal and puritan divines, otherwise fiercely divided by ecclesiastical and political matters. Sectarian-style refers to those who operated as sects outside the national church and parish system, which remained in place throughout the interregnum. Sectarian is preferred to ‘radical’ for precisely the reasons stated above. Episcopal divines matched their puritan and sectarian counter-parts for ‘radical’ doctrinal formulations, though they were more concerned to conceal them under the guise of moderation.\textsuperscript{83} Consequently, ‘sectarian’ is intended to avoid the unhelpful juxtaposing of ‘radicals’ and ‘moderates’.

After a consideration of corporate ‘styles’, Part II responds to the need for more in-depth studies of individuals, ‘so that religious categories can be refined and the capacity for religious identities to change and evolve can be built into our

\textsuperscript{81} John Coffey’s intellectual biography has demonstrated this point regarding John Goodwin. See John Coffey, \textit{John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in 17th-Century England} (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2006), ch. 7.
\textsuperscript{82} Jean-Louis Quantin, \textit{The Church of England and Christian Antiquity}, 15.
\textsuperscript{83} As Anthony Milton has noted, ‘Royalist divines were also capable of daring theological radicalism, lively providentialism and war-mongering rhetoric’. Anthony Milton, ‘Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s’, in \textit{The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49}, ed. by John Adamson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 61-81, 79.
analysis’. Chapter five forms a bridge into the theological chapters by considering the Calvinist/Arminian controversy within the broader context of the Western theological tradition as a whole. In addition, John Plaifere’s contemporary taxonomy in *Appello Evangelium* (1651) will help transition from the summative categories of ‘Calvinism’ and ‘Arminianism’, by highlighting the diversity of soteriological formulations and sophisticated intellectual resources available to divines from both traditions. Chapters Six and Seven then trace the intricate, and at times idiosyncratic, doctrinal contours of two of the most influential English Arminian divines during the 1650s, the puritan John Goodwin and the episcopalian Henry Hammond. Beginning with Richard Muller, several scholars have attempted a more sophisticated analysis of Arminius and the Arminian tradition in what has been dubbed a ‘New Perspective’. Part II adopts this approach and offers the most sustained analysis of seventeenth-century English Arminian theology to date.

Part I will concentrate on primary sources published in the vernacular in order to capture the public debate over predestination. These include diverse literary styles, from scholastic treatises to sermons, pamphlets and public debates. Sensitivity will be shown to the politics of writing and the carefully stylized images that divines cultivated by use of certain rhetorical tropes and literary strategies. As Brian Cummings has argued, ‘predestination is articulated differently, for different purposes and with different meanings. It is a travesty of history to reduce this to a generalized reconstruction of underlying “Calvinist” theory’. Part II will include detailed analysis of relevant theological texts by John Goodwin and Henry Hammond, including manuscript materials. Consideration will also be given to their intended audiences and publishing histories in order to trace reception and influence. Finally, a concluding chapter will consider some of the longer-term intellectual trends resulting from the crisis of Calvinism in Cromwellian England.

PART I.

‘This Quinquarticular war’
Charting the Rise of English Arminianism
CHAPTER ONE

The Crisis of Calvinism in the 1650s:
Background and Explanation
God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in his Church, ev’n to the reforming of Reformation itself.¹

This chapter will consider the social and intellectual contexts in which English puritans like John Milton began to extend the principle of reformation to the tenets of Reformed theology. Whereas Whiggish historiography assumed the demise of Calvinism was part of an inevitable modernizing trajectory, this chapter will highlight certain political contingencies, alongside longer-term theological trends, during a uniquely disrupted period of English history. In particular, Lamont has argued that historians have ‘not been imaginative enough about the appeal exercised on men in the 1650s by the idea of “a holy commonwealth”’. The Cromwellian decade has been overlooked as ‘the fag-end to the great revolutionary impulse of the 1640s’.² However, throughout the 1640s and 1650s, unprecedented religious freedoms combined with millenarian expectations generated remarkable intellectual exploration and fecundity.³ For puritans like John Goodwin, the sun had risen higher over the ‘commonwealth of Israel’. Consequently, ‘[many] shall discourse and beate out the secrets of GOD in the Scriptures with more libertie and freedome of judgement and understanding’.⁴ John Milton captured the heady atmosphere as he envisaged manual workers and scholars, ‘sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas… fast reading, trying all things’.⁵ The rise of Arminianism was therefore part of a broader impulse for theological reform during a period that witnessed ‘England’s Second Reformation’.⁶ This chapter

---

³ Lamont provocatively concluded: ‘I think that, in intellectual vigour, the England of the 1650s can produce a decade unmatched until we come to the England of the 1940s which gave us the Welfare State’ Ibid., 143.
⁴ John Goodwin, Imputatio Fidei, or, A treatise of Justification (1642), ‘Preface’, sig. c1v.
⁵ Areopagitica, 31.
⁶ Anthony Milton’s forthcoming work uses this helpful phrase to capture the scale of the contest that unfolded.
will consider key environmental factors that accelerated the crisis of Calvinism and rise of Arminianism during the 1650s.  

Political Contingencies, Print Culture and Cromwellian Toleration

After the decade of Personal Rule, the 1640s witnessed dramatic reversals of power as Cavalier defeats ushered in puritan rule. The first ecclesiastical intervention by the Long Parliament annulled the Canons of 1640, including the notorious \textit{et cetera} oath. In 1641, Laudian bishops were \textit{de facto} stripped of their powers, having been accused by the \textit{Grand Remonstrance} of being an unholy alliance of ‘Arminians and Libertines’ in fellowship with ‘Papists’. By 26\textsuperscript{th} January 1643, the abolition of episcopacy was enforced and the confessional status of the Church of England effectively suspended pending further investigation by the Westminster Assembly. Consequently, as Lynch has noted, ‘in 1643, the definition of orthodoxy changed, and the authority to determine that definition changed, as well’.\footnote{Kathleen Lynch, \textit{Protestant Autobiography in the Seventeenth-Century Anglophone World} (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 130.} On 10\textsuperscript{th} January 1645, Archbishop Laud was found guilty of popish sedition and beheaded on Tower Hill and by 1649, the Royalist cause ended in regicide. The Jacobean maxim now sounded like a prophetic mandate: ‘No Bishop, no King’.

Following the removal of Laudian prelates, parliament convened the Westminster Assembly in order to formulate a new \textit{Confession of Faith}. The chief aim for this impressive gathering of mostly Presbyterian divines, was to reconstitute the Church of England in line with the best Reformed theology.\footnote{See Chad B. Van Dixhoorn and David F. Wright, \textit{The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652} (Oxford: OUP, 2012), I. 39.} The \textit{Westminster Confession of Faith} (1646) delivered a decidedly anti-Arminian formulary, affirming that predestination was ‘without any foresight of faith, or

good works’ and the grace of ‘Effectual calling’ was only for the elect; the rest ‘cannot be saved’.\textsuperscript{10} This was a clear attempt to remove any remaining loopholes of ambiguity contained within the Thirty-Nine Articles, thereby rendering Arminianism unequivocally heterodox for the first time in English history.\textsuperscript{11} As the Westminster divines tabled a revised definition of English doctrinal orthodoxy, parliament also sought to clamp down on growing levels of sectarian heterodoxy. By May 1648, Presbyterian MPs, who held a majority, secured the passage of a lightly revised version of: \textit{An Ordinance for the Punishing of Blasphemies and Heresies} (1646). This notorious Blasphemy Ordinance not only deemed blasphemies such as anti-Trinitarianism worthy of capital punishment but also outlined a second tier of grievous errors worthy of imprisonment. Included among them was the alleged Arminian notion ‘that a man by nature hath free will to turne to God’.\textsuperscript{12} The heightened threat of magisterial coercion caused those desiring a more radical path of reformation to fear that: ‘New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ Large’.\textsuperscript{13}

With Laudian clergy sequestered, parliament also oversaw the reassignment of clerical and academic positions to puritan divines. On 8\textsuperscript{th} January 1650, the Westminster Assembly divine, Thomas Goodwin, was appointed by parliament to the presidency of Magdalen College, Oxford. Later in 1652, Cromwell’s chaplain became Oxford’s Vice-Chancellor. John Owen had previously impressed a parliamentary committee with \textit{A Display of Arminianism} (1643) written against the ‘old Pelagian idol free-will, with the new goddesse contingency’.\textsuperscript{14} Owen had experienced defeat at the hands of Oxford Laudians such as Christopher Potter during his student days and was now committed to the reassertion of Reformed Orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{15} As Tyacke therefore concluded: ‘one of the most striking Oxford

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{10} In James Dennison, \textit{Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries}, IV. 238, 246-7.
\textsuperscript{11} In particular, Article Seventeen ‘Of Predestination and Election’ was notoriously ambiguous.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{An Ordinance presented to the Honourable House of Commons} (1646), 2.
\textsuperscript{14} Subtitle on cover page.
\textsuperscript{15} See Gribben, \textit{John Owen and English Puritanism}, chs. 1 & 5.
\end{footnotesize}
features of the 1650s, is the re-establishment of Calvinist orthodoxy. The same thing happened at Cambridge'.

Consequently, with Laudians defeated, the *Westminster Confession* formulated and Presbyterians in power, Calvinism appeared to be more firmly established than ever as the definition of English orthodoxy. Indeed, by the late 1640s, the prospect of a significant surge of English Arminianism might have seemed as unlikely as a Cavalier comeback. However, the rise of the New Model Army triggered another major switch of power, this time from Presbyterians to Independents. The crisis between the army and parliament culminated in Colonel Pride’s regiment blocking access to the House of Commons for all but two hundred MPs who formed the Rump Parliament. The coup strongly favoured Independents and tolerationists, including some Baptists. The Rump Parliament ensured that the Presbyterian Blasphemy Ordinance failed to achieve statutory powers and the *Westminster Confession* was never fully adopted. As a result, ‘the cause of religious uniformity was doomed’. Indeed, any remaining consensus among the godly further fragmented as radical puritanism continued to spawn a plethora of divergent movements: ‘Presbyterians and Congregationalists, General and Particular Baptists, Seekers and Fifth Monarchists, Ranters and Quakers all emerged from the intense religious sub-culture of the godly’.

A major corollary of the demise of Royalist control and later the reversal of Presbyterian coercion was the *de facto* suspension of press censorship. Until 1641, the Star Chamber controlled licensing of publications and enforced a royal prohibition on predestinarian debates. As parliament abolished the Star

---

16 *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530-1700*, 244.
19 In 1628, a new edition of the English Articles was accompanied by a royal order to refrain from ‘curious contentions’ about the ‘deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility of God’s grace’. In White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 250. For more on early Stuart censorship, see
Chamber the lid lifted and resulted in an unprecedented surge of print, including previously prohibited scribal manuscripts and thousands of new titles.\textsuperscript{20} The democratization of print generated multiple public spheres for ideological exchange, which both galvanized social and religious movements and enabled fierce debates between them. Consequently, ‘the revolution had established a marketplace of religious ideas, and had advanced a sudden and often shocking “democratisation of Christianity”’.\textsuperscript{21}

Cromwellian toleration along with the new print culture allowed numerous sects to emerge, spawning increasingly radical heterodoxies. By 1650, the Rump Parliament felt the need to impose a Blasphemy Act to curb pamphlets by Ranters. However, the Act was surprisingly lenient, turning a blind eye to Arminianism and even Socinianism. Its breadth earned praise from the author of \textit{Areopagitica} who commended ‘that prudent and well deliberated act’.\textsuperscript{22} After the dissolution of the Rump Parliament and the inauguration of Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector, the \textit{Instrument of Government} (1653) issued new articles of state. However, their leniency was also heavily criticized, with article thirty-seven requiring only ‘faith in Jesus Christ’ to find shelter under the Cromwellian regime. Though papists and prelates were excluded from this umbrella of toleration, Reformed divines feared that anti-Trinitarians, Quakers, Baptists and even Ranters were being accommodated. The publication of a \textit{Twofold Catechism} (1654) by the Socinian John Biddle further exposed loopholes for heterodoxy and sparked another wave of protest.\textsuperscript{23} However, despite numerous attempts to form more rigid doctrinal confessions, the Cromwellian church remained ‘a loose

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{20} In particular, pamphleteering led to a transformation of print culture and lay involvement: ‘Pamphlets signified free and open communication and thus the possibility of a popular and participative forum of debate’. Joad Raymond, \textit{Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain} (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 247.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Crawford Gribben, \textit{John Owen and English Puritanism}, 151.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} John Milton, \textit{A Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes} (1659), 17.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} John Owen played a leading role in the Parliamentary committee that drew up \textit{A New Confession} (1654). Whilst this was not adopted, greater regulation was imposed in the later 1650s as Cromwell lost patience with Independents and sectarians and moved closer to the Presbyterians. The furore caused by the ‘horrid blasphemie’ of James Nayler in 1656 also prompted greater control.
\end{itemize}
confederation, containing within it and tolerating outside it an array of doctrines and practices'. Consequently, during the Interregnum (1649-60) those committed to political toleration and further doctrinal reformation, enjoyed a surprise Indian summer.

The Rise of English Arminianism

The aforementioned historical contingencies contributed to the ‘golden age of English Arminianism’ in several ways:

Anti-Calvinist Publishing Strategies

Suspension of press censorship allowed numerous Arminian works to be published in England. Subsequent chapters will consider new titles originating from English Arminians during the 1650s. In addition, several unpublished scribal manuscripts by English divines, along with continental Arminian works, were brought to print by those wishing to give voice to anti-Calvinist sentiment. In 1651, the same person anonymously registered *Articuli Lambethani* and *Fur Praedestinatus* for print. *Articuli Lambethani* recorded the reception and modification of William Whitaker’s Lambeth Articles following the Cambridge controversy of the 1590s. It placed Whitaker’s original formula alongside the revised wording of the ‘Lambethani’, who were unnamed divines that Archbishop Whitgift had involved in the revision process. The *Lambethani* glosses moderated Whitaker’s nine articles away from supralapsarianism and toward more ambiguous wording that could accommodate other interpretations.

---

26 For example, Article V on assurance was amended to accommodate a more Augustinian formulation: it is only ‘the elect’ who are guaranteed never to fall ‘totally or
publication of the *Lambethani* glosses in 1651 sought to marginalize strict Calvinism by demonstrating that Whitaker's original articles offended all and sundry.\(^{27}\) Having posed 'Whitakeri paradoxis' as the problem, the latter half of *Articuli Lambethani* privileged the verdict of Lancelot Andrewes and closed with a Latin tract by John Overall: *Sententia Ecclesiae Anglicanae De Praedestinatione*.\(^{28}\) This manuscript tract circulated widely from the 1610s onwards but was published here for the first time.\(^{29}\) Though Overall clearly articulated non-Calvinist tenets, especially regarding the conditional nature of perseverance, he portrayed his interpretation of the English Articles as a consensus document for the entire 'Church of England'.

_Fur Praedestinatus_, published a bolder strain of satirical anti-Calvinism, through a fictional dialogue between a rogue Calvinist thief sentenced to execution and a 'Calvinist Preacher'.\(^{30}\) The thief freely disclosed a life of persistent and gross apostasy, 'drinking and wenching', despite prolonged periods of study in Geneva where he was 'famous for a Lecture-monger'.\(^{31}\) Though prosecuted for robbery and prostitution, the thief displayed unerring confidence regarding his eternal destiny. When asked, 'where do you think you shall go?' he replied, 'To Heaven as

---

\(^{27}\) *Articuli Lambethani* included objections by the future Archbishop, Whitgift; Cambridge's Chancellor, Lord Burghley; Queen Elizabeth who intervened to ensure the Articles had no national legitimacy; and finally King James who refused the Articles any formal status at the Hampton Court conference.

\(^{28}\) MacCulloch argued that Andrewes 'can be regarded as the first and most important ideologue of the movement that became [English] Arminianism'. See 'The Latitude of the Church of England', 226. For the significance of Overall to English Arminianism see Part II.


\(^{30}\) This Latin work has been wrongly attributed to the future Archbishop William Sancroft. Thomas Jackson's _Life of John Goodwin_ (1822) noted it was Sancroft's biographer, Dr. D'Oyley, who first attributed the work to him (250). However as Collinson has argued, it is unlikely Sancroft translated the Dutch work into Latin for publication in England. Patrick Collinson, _From Cranmer to Sancroft_ (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), 175-6. Recent scholarship has continued the error. See Dewey D. Wallace, _Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology 1525-1695_ (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 122. The work was originally a Remonstrant tract by Henry Slatius, circulated in Holland as post-Dort propaganda.

\(^{31}\) Citations from _Fur Praedestinatus_ will be taken from the English translation: Henry Slatius, _The Predestinated Thief_ (1658), 3, 5.
well as you’.\textsuperscript{32} As the preacher probed, the thief revealed ‘Calvinistical’ tenets of absolute predestination and meticulous providence that underpinned his flagrant antinomianism. The thief even considered his sin necessary, for God ‘did excite and impel me to it, that he might bring to pass by me, what he had from all Eternity inevitably decreed for me’.\textsuperscript{33} With provocative irony, the jailor finally passed sentence not on the thief but on the Calvinist preacher: ‘Is this your Reformed Religion in good sooth? If you had call’d it the Deformed Religion you had hit it’.\textsuperscript{34}

John Plaifere’s \textit{Appello Evangelium} (1652) was another early Stuart manuscript first published in the 1650s. Plaifere outlined an irenic taxonomy of five soteriological positions before firmly siding with Arminius’ position.\textsuperscript{35} His work also published another of John Overall’s Latin tracts for the first time, along with a letter by the Oxford Laudian Christopher Potter. Overall’s tract, \textit{On the Five Articles disputed in the Low Countries}, exemplified the tactical appeal to moderation in its very structure and tone. For each of the five articles debated at Dort, Overall juxtaposed the Remonstrant and contra-Remonstrant positions, thus carving out a middle space in which to center ‘the Church of England’. As Anthony Milton has argued, this was ‘Anglicanism by stealth’, as Overall ‘created a new theologian, “the Church of England”, for whom he was merely the spokesman’.\textsuperscript{36} Overall’s posthumous success became apparent in the 1650s as his manuscripts were published and he became a name to conjure with for divines on both sides of the soteriological fence.\textsuperscript{37}

Several other relevant manuscripts were also printed for the first time during the 1650s, including:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 11.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 29-30.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 64. This work was significant enough to earn a riposte from the renowned heresiographer George Kendall, in \textit{Fur Pro Tribunali: Examen Dialogismi cui Insribitur fur Praedestinatus} (1657).
\item \textsuperscript{35} \textit{Appello Evangelium} will be discussed in detail in Chapter Five.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Anthony Milton, ‘Anglicanism by Stealth’, 171.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Overall’s soteriology and its reception among divines in the 1650s will be considered in Chapters Five and Seven.
\end{enumerate}
• Book X of Thomas Jackson’s vast commentary on the creed, which included a lengthy section entitled: ‘Concerning Election and Reprobation’. As a consequence, Archbishop Laud had refused to license this particular volume in the 1630s due to its overt Arminian soteriology.38

• A controversial anti-Calvinist sermon preached by Samuel Harsnett in 1594, which fuelled the Cambridge controversy of the 1590s.39

• Lectures and sermons by Lancelot Andrewes brought to press by the episcopal Arminian, Thomas Pierce.40

• The Golden Remains of John Hales (1659), which attempted to drive a wedge between the British Delegation and the rest of the Synod. Hale’s letters recorded acrimonious exchanges at Dort and included the infamous statement that at the Synod, John Hales ‘bade John Calvin good-night’. As Milton has noted, the publication of these letters in the 1650s ‘formed a deliberate assault upon doctrinal Calvinism’.41

Together these posthumously published manuscripts leveraged the reputational value of episcopal anti-Calvinists, in order to resist attempts by the Westminster Assembly and subsequent parliamentary committees to reconstitute the Church of England in a definitively Calvinist fashion. Hence manuscripts were carefully selected according to their potential to discredit previous attempts at formulating a narrow confession (the Lambeth Articles, the Synod of Dort). This seemingly concerted publishing strategy by episcopal divines in the 1650s relied on anonymity to conceal their identity, thereby constructing the appearance of a


39 Appended to Richard Steward, Three Sermons Preached (1656). God’s Love to all Mankind by Samuel Hoard was also reprinted in 1656. However, this work was licensed and published in 1633, despite containing overt discussions regarding providence and predestination.

40 Lancelot Andrewes, Apospasmatica Sacra, or, A collection of Posthumous and Orphan lectures (1657).

longstanding and venerable English tradition of anti-Calvinism, exemplified by John Overall and Lancelot Andrewes.

The Influence of Continental Arminianism

A second consequence of political toleration and press licensing was the increased profile of continental Arminianism in England. In 1657 Tobias Conyers, a Cambridge divine and protégé of John Goodwin, published Arminius’ *Declaration of Sentiments* making it the first English translation of this most controversial figure. He rather audaciously dedicated the work ‘TO HIS HIGHNESS, Oliver, Lord Protector’ and appealed for Cromwellian toleration to encompass Arminius who ‘was no such monster in religion as some men have attempted to represent him’. However, it was the Dutch jurist and Remonstrant, Hugo Grotius who surged in popularity with several of his Latin works translated and printed in England during the 1650s. By 1656, John Owen bemoaned the fact that Grotius’ works were ‘in the hands of most students’. Trevor-Roper therefore contended that ‘as far as England was concerned the

---

42 Arminius’ oral defense made before the States of Holland at the Hague in 1608 was translated into Latin and published as *Declaratio Sententiae de Predestinatione* (Leiden: 1612).

43 Jacobus Arminius, *The Just Mans Defence, or, The Declaration of the Judgement of James Arminius* (1657), 'Preface', sig. A4. Conyers also appealed to Cromwell to maintain a broad church based on a ‘confession of Faith drawn up in Scripture terms & phrases’ and not ‘by the sudden and extempore resolves... locked up in the breasts of some particular men’. ‘Preface’, sig. [B3].


most influential of the Dutch Arminians was not Arminius himself, but... Hugo Grotius.'

A litany of testimonies from puritan and episcopal divines acknowledged private engagement with these continental Arminian texts during the 1640s, which spilled over into the public arena during the 1650s. For puritan divines, the tonic of victory caused their defences to lower and the pejorative association of Arminianism with Popery began to disentangle. Lamont considered Richard Baxter the ‘first major Puritan to engage sympathetically with Arminianism in 1649’. Baxter admitted early ‘prejudice’ against Arminianism rooted in political concerns: ‘When the Wars began... the thoughts that the Church and Godliness itself was deeply in danger by Persecution and Arminianism, did much more to byas me to the Parliaments side’. However, post-war Baxter began to consider the actual texts and tenets of continental Arminianism, causing him to downgrade his concerns and to focus his efforts on charting a course for the ‘pacification’ of the controversies: ‘I thought worse of that called Arminianism than I should have done (and have proved in my Catholick Theology...) that the difference is not in any great and intolerable error on either side’.

Equally, John Goodwin, the London puritan and vicar of St Stephen’s in Coleman Street began to read Remonstrant publications after a member of his own congregation accused him of preaching Arminianism. Previously, Goodwin had referred to ‘those odious aspersions of Popery and Arminianisme’ and labelled the Remonstrants ‘Vipers that will easily shake into the fire when the time of shaking comes’. However, by the mid-1640s, Goodwin began to ‘search more
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46 H. Trevor-Roper, Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans, 52.
47 The Peace of Westphalia (1648) may also have contributed to a growing sense of relief. The threat of Popish plots and invasion was reduced once the Spanish had granted independence to the Dutch Republic.
49 Richard Baxter, Catholick Theologie (1675), 'Preface', sig. a2.
51 John Goodwin, Imputatio Fidei, I. 83. Goodwin at this stage still conflated Arminianism with popish Laudianism.
narrowly and thoroughly, then formerly I had done, into the Controversies agitated’. By the time he published *Hagiomastix* (1647) Goodwin confessed to having read widely ‘about the bondage and freedome of the will’. To his surprise, instead of finding ‘rank import’, he discovered in Arminius a ‘faire and reasonable construction... fully reconcilable with the judgments and expressions of some reformed churches’. Goodwin was careful to note the ‘materiall and considerable difference’ between Arminius and later Remonstrants, arguing that Arminius had more in common with English divines than with his own ‘disciples’. Goodwin therefore concluded that it was only out of sheer ignorance that ‘Presbyterie are scarce able to give any sensible account’ of Arminius or that they included ‘Arminianisme’ in their catalogue of heterodoxies. Ironically, continental Arminianism was beginning to gain a hearing among one of the least likely audiences – godly divines in Cromwellian England.

Episcopal divines also engaged more directly with continental Arminianism. Influential works by Henry Hammond such as *Of the Reasonableness of Christianity* (1649) and *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon... the New Testament* (1653) appropriated the methodological approach of Hugo Grotius to subtly undermine centuries of Augustinian interpretations of crucial Biblical texts. In addition, Grotius’ governmental theory of the atonement became a popular alternative for Arminian divines, who wished to avoid both the Socinian denial of the necessity of the atonement and the Calvinist notion of particular redemption. Simon Episcopius, successor to Arminius in Leiden and leader of the Remonstrant party at Dort, also influenced English divines. His *Opera theologica* was published in 1650 in Leiden as part of the emergence of a ‘wider

54 In particular, Romans chapter nine and Ephesians chapter one dominated debates during the 1650s regarding the nature of predestination. For Grotius’ method and Hammond’s appropriation of it, see Chapter Seven.
55 The Grotian theory rejected *solutio eiusdem* (exact penal substitution) in favour of *solutio tantidem* (equivalent penal satisfaction). Both Hammond and Goodwin adopted this Grotian side step (see Part II). Thomas Pierce also indicated that he came under the influence of Grotius and other Remonstrants and abandoned his Calvinist upbringing. See Chapter Three.
European tradition of anti-Calvinist thinking'. In an unpublished manuscript, the episcopal anti-Calvinist Jeremy Taylor praised Episcopius, claiming that his works ‘containe the whole body of orthodox religion’. Peter Heylyn also engaged with the writings of the Dutch Arminians during the interregnum. Provoked by ‘Mr Prinnes book of Anti-Arminianism’, Heylyn read Arminian texts and subsequently penned his most anti-Calvinist work: *Historia Quinquarticularis* (1660). In short, political toleration and press licensing opened the English door to Dutch Arminian texts, much to the consternation of Reformed divines.

The Downgrading of Arminianism

The Cromwellian decade witnessed an insurgece of radical ideas, which increasingly revised the polemical priorities of Reformed divines. The rise of anti-Trinitarian Socinians, anti-clerical Quakers and antinomian Ranters threatened English Protestantism as a whole. Consequently, fear of Arminianism was partially eclipsed as the defense of Dort took second place to the defense of Nicaea. Indeed, those who were foes with regard to Reformed confessions also appeared as comrades in arms in the fight to preserve creedal orthodoxy. John Owen asked Philip Nye to persuade his old friend John Goodwin to sign the *Humble Proposals*, in spite of the fact that he had just published his most substantial Arminian work, *Redemption Redeemed* (1651). This surprising coalition illustrated the provisional nature of theological identity during the turbulence of the 1650s. Faced with Socinians and Quakers, divines could still form a broad consensus that straddled the Calvinist/Arminian divide, in order to

---

57 CUL, Add MS, 711, fol. 8.
safeguard a more basic orthodoxy in an English church devoid of confessional status.60

Tolerance of Arminianism was further aided by the pervasive threat of antinomianism. Between 1636-38, the puritan colony at Massachusetts Bay was rocked by an antinomian controversy, which resulted in deep social divisions and political disturbance. Antinomian doctrines therefore became associated with the spectre of lawlessness and sedition.61 By the 1640s, England witnessed a similar reaction to a perceived legalism incurred by puritan notions of preparationism and experimental predestination.62 The publication of John Eaton’s *The Honey-Combe of Free Justification* (1642) along with the preaching and pamphleteering of John Saltmarsh and Tobias Crisp raised concerns that Calvinist tenets were vulnerable to hyperextension, resulting in dangerous notions of eternal justification and absolute assurance. As David Como has noted, unlike the more radical ‘inherentist’ antinomians who taught perfectionism through union with the divine, ‘imputative antinomians’ combined Reformed doctrines of predestination and forensic justification and concluded they were perfectly righteous and eternally secure, irrespective of actual behaviour.63 Consequently, ‘in the eyes of anti-Calvinists, the doctrine of unconditional predestination was, *ipso facto*, antinomian. By inculcating an absolute assurance of eternal election, it naturally led to a profound moral presumptuousness’.64 In response, some moderate Calvinists argued that substantial modifications were necessary if Reformed doctrines were to be intellectually and pastorally viable in the light of

---

60 Crucially, although according to Reformed confessions Goodwin was heterodox, in the face of Biddle’s *Twofold Catechism*, Owen considered a broader alliance beneficial.
62 Preparationism encouraged penitential activities as signs of contrition in preparation for receiving salvation. Experimental predestination emphasized good works as signs of election and a basis for assurance. These will be discussed further in Part II.
64 Ibid., 406.
new threats and challenges. In particular, several divines applied the framework of covenant theology to emphasise the conditional nature of salvation. Richard Baxter, horrified by the licentiousness he had witnessed as an army chaplain, set about developing his controversial neonomian approach to justification and in 1649 published *The Aphorismes of Justification*. Though the introduction affirmed his continued commitment to Reformed Orthodoxy, the rest of *Aphorismes* placed Calvinism in a straitjacket in order that the new covenant law might ward off antinomianism.

In this context, Arminianism, with its conditional approach to predestination, did not appear so out of place. As Collinson noted, for some, “‘Arminianism’ was simply a salutary correction of distortions perpetrated by extreme Calvinism.” Consequently, by the 1650s, amidst a kaleidoscope of heterodox ideas, ‘moderate’ Calvinists increasingly regarded Arminianism as an innocuous error rather than alarming heresy. High profile figures such as Benjamin Whichcote, Joseph Hall and Robert Boyle seemingly turned a blind eye to members of the godly who appeared to embrace Arminianism. John Goodwin dedicated

---

65 ‘Moderate’ and ‘strict’ Calvinism offer provisional categories that help to distinguish Reformed reactions to the threats of Antinomianism and Arminianism. As Tim Cooper has argued, the acrimonious relationship between Owen and Baxter was largely a result of differing assessments regarding the primary threat. Whereas for Owen, ‘[M]y eye was chiefly on the Socinians’ and the threat of human autonomy, for Baxter, ‘mine eye was upon the... Antinomians’. Tim Cooper, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 55. Baxter therefore referred to Owen and Francis Cheynell as ‘over-Orthodox Doctors’ or ‘rigid Calvinians’. See *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), II. 199.


67 His 44th Aphorism even argued that ‘Men that are thus but conditionally pardoned and justified may be unpardoned and unjustified again for their non-performance of the conditions’. However, in the 1655 edition, Baxter also argued in true Calvinist fashion that God’s secret ‘Will of Purpose’ ensures ‘the actual chusing or calling of some while others are past by’ and ‘the giving of perseverance’ to the elect. Richard Baxter, *Aphorismes of Justification* (1655), 196-7, 7.


69 Robert Boyle appeared sympathetic toward Arminianism and stated that the Calvinist approach to predestination was ‘not necessary to justify the freeness and greatness of God’s love’. Robert Boyle, *Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God* (1659), 105. In the 1659 edition, Boyle included a whole section as an irenic response to the ‘Controversies about Praedestination’ and ‘the dispute betwixt the Calvinists and
Redemption Redeemed, to Whichcote, then Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge. As progenitor of the Cambridge Platonists, Whichcote would have welcomed the Arminian emphasis on universal grace as it chimed with their frequent references to reason as the ‘candle of the Lord’ in the soul of man (Proverbs 20:27). Whichcote therefore refused to condemn Goodwin’s publication, much to the consternation of George Kendall, who worried that his silence would be interpreted as ‘approbation of him and his book’. Equally, in June 1651, shortly after the publication of Redemption Redeemed, Baxter wrote to Richard Vines: ‘I see now J. Goodwin is a flat Arminian: but that Condemneth not any charitable thoughts of him’. As Baxter worked throughout the 1650s to establish broad-church unity, he refused any place to ‘Seekers and Papists’ but argued that ‘Arminians & Anabaptists’ should ‘be Admitted, & we may easily Accommodate for Church union’. As Mark Goldie concludes, ‘after 1640, the fear of Arminians’ (pp. 111-112). However, an earlier version dating from the late 1640s appeared not to reference predestinarian disputes. This editorial development reflected growing levels of public controversy during the 1650s. See Jan Wojcik, Robert Boyle and the Limits of Reason (New York: CUP, 1997), ch. 3; Coffey, John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution, 229.

The Cambridge Platonists were a circle of Clergymen associated with Emmanuel College. Whichcote, Ralph Cudworth, Henry More and John Smith were central figures who became disillusioned with Aristotelianism and called for a renewal of Christian Platonism. Several of the Cambridge Platonists also appeared to migrate from their Reformed heritage to a decidedly anti-Calvinist stance. Consequently, ‘they assisted in the great transformation of English theology by which, in the second half of the century, the dominance of Calvinism gave way to Arminianism’. Mark Goldie, ‘Cambridge Platonists’, ODNB. The Cambridge Platonists will not be directly considered in this research as they represented a distinct approach that deserves its own designated research. Indeed, some scholars now prefer the term ‘Cambridge Origenists’ in order to differentiate the unusual interests of this Cambridge circle of scholars from a more common and widespread interest in ancient thought and Platonism during the seventeenth-century. See Dmitri Levitin, Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science, 15-17, 126-137. Consequently, their intellectual interests do not neatly map onto Calvinist/Arminian debates. However, several references will be made in Part II to aspects of Cambridge Platonism that relate to English Arminianism.

In John Coffey, John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution, 223. See also Whichcote’s exchange of letters with the former Westminster divine Anthony Tuckney. In his second letter (15th Sept. 1651), Tuckney voiced concerns regarding the influence of Goodwin, along with Thomas Jackson and Henry Hammond, and worried that Whichcote was drifting toward their Arminianism. See Whichcote, Moral and Religious Aphorisms, ed. By S. Salter (1753), 17-40.

Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter: Volume I: 1638-1660, ed. by NH Keeble and Geoffrey F. Nuttall (New York: OUP, 1991), 69, 89. However, as Dewey Wallace has noted, Baxter did not jettison his Calvinism and in the late 1650s began to
Arminianism came to be offset by the opposite fear of the consequences of hyper-Calvinism'.

During the 1650s, political contingencies led to unprecedented levels of religious toleration, freethinking exploration and a print culture that disseminated radical ideas. In this environment, as antinomians and heterodox sects elongated the theological spectrum, Arminianism began to acquire a strangely centrist aura. Though not yet considered ‘orthodox’, moderate Calvinists increasingly tolerated it as the lesser of many evils, while others spied in Arminianism the potential for ‘the reforming of Reformation itself’.

**Reflections on Arminianism in Early Stuart England**

From the vantage point of the 1650s, a retrospective appraisal can be made regarding the influence of Arminianism in early Stuart England. Despite the high profile anti-Calvinism of Richard Montagu, the number of publications by Laudians that overtly promulgated Arminian soteriology was surprisingly small. Samuel Hoard published the most influential anti-Calvinist treatise, *Gods Love to Man-Kinde* (1633), which warranted ripostes from John Davenant and William Twisse and was repeatedly cited by Arminians in the 1650s. In a biographical note, Hoard acknowledged his own ‘change of opinion in some controversies of late betweene the Remonstrants and their Opposites’. Significantly, his work moved beyond Montagu’s attacks on supralapsarianism and offered five refutations of the more moderate ‘sublapsarians’. Thomas Jackson, Dean of Peterborough, came closest to a systematic elaboration of Arminianism in Book VI of his commentary on the creed, entitled *Treatise of the Divine Essence and Attributes* (1628/9). Jackson began by depicting the Church of England as the increasingly repudiate Arminianism again. Dewey Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, 170.

---

74 Samuel Hoard, *Gods Love to Mankind* (1633), 'Preface', sig. a1, 43. The work was reprinted in 1635, 1656 and 1673.
‘middle course’, offering a way ‘betweene some other reformed Churches in points of Election and Reprobation’. However, this centrist guise was quickly betrayed in the dedication to the Earl of Pembroke, as Jackson defended Arminius and attacked the dangers of Calvinist determinism. When John Owen wrote *A Display of Arminianisme* (1643), these works by Hoard and Jackson were the only published texts he cited as examples of native English Arminianism.

Given this apparent scarcity, Lamont was surely right to argue that the ‘Golden Age’ of English Arminianism was not the 1630s but the 1650s. However, consideration of Jacobean and early Stuart manuscripts printed in the 1650s should add a rider to this conclusion. During the 1620s and 30s, the number of publications was necessarily limited due to the royal ban on predestinarian discussions. However, the profile of Arminian soteriology was on the rise, especially in the universities. Indeed, as Tyacke has argued, the original reason for the Jacobeonian ban was ‘a dramatic bust-up during the 1622 Cambridge Commencement, when the dons engaged in a very public slanging match about the pros and cons of Dutch Arminianism’. A mischievous Catholic publication entitled *An Apology of English Arminianisme* (1634), attempted to fuel these rising tensions. Dedicated to the ‘Heads, and Masters of the Colledges of both Universities’, this anonymous tract made the exaggerated claim that the doctrines of Arminius ‘touching Freewill, Predestination, and Reprobation’ were ‘being maintained & taught by many of the most Learned Protestants of England,

---

75 Thomas Jackson, *A Treatise of the Divine Essence and Attributes: Part I.* (1628), 167. Jackson embodied an eccentric combination of Arminian soteriology, episcopal sacramentalism and vehement anti-Catholic rhetoric. His Arminian writings will be considered further in Part II.


at this present time’. Written as fictional satire, *An Apology* narrated a conversation in Leiden between Arminius and an English divine (*Enthusiastus*). During the course of the dialogue, Arminius’ arguments converted the English Calvinist from absolute reprobation to conditional decrees and from irresistible grace to free will. *Enthusiastus*, now an Arminian proselyte, concluded: 'My selfe am now cured by this learned Mans discourse'.

On one level, this was merely a piece of Catholic propaganda. However, with the benefit of hindsight, this fictional dialogue captured the evolution of English Calvinism during the first half of the seventeenth-century. As the Tyacke thesis has shown, the English church began, like *Enthusiastus*, staunchly Calvinist. However, post-Dort, some English divines increasingly felt the need to modify Reformed theology, while others engaged in private ‘conversations’ with more radical alternatives, including Lutheran, Catholic and Arminian theologies. During the early Stuart period, this conversation was largely confined to the universities and circulated in manuscript-form below the radar. However, the democratization of religious debate during the English Revolution enabled the controversy to spread out from university cloisters to congregations, taverns and the *vox populi*. By the 1650s, the conversation had yielded some high-profile conversions as Arminian theology spread among puritans, episcopalians and sectarians.

---

80 O. N., *An Apology of English Arminianisme* (1634), 'Dedictory', sig. A4v, Title Page. This work was printed on the continent by Saint-Omer English College press. Written in the English vernacular, it was disguised as a Protestant tract in order to gain popular influence. It has not been discussed in secondary literature to date.

81 The example of Richard Thomson, a Cambridge divine who met with Arminius in Leiden in 1594 and later became known as 'Dutch Thomson', may have been the inspiration behind the plot line of *An Apology*. Thomson also defended Arminius in his theological treatise *De Amissione*, which was posthumously printed in Leiden through John Overall’s intervention. See Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 36.

82 *An Apology*, 195-6.

83 For the influence of Arminian and Lutheran sources on the Laudians see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 435-444.
CHAPTER TWO

Puritan-Style Arminianism
It is well known, that those flames that did utterly consume the peace of the Belgick Churches, have miserably of late broken out amongst us.¹

In 1655, Obadiah Howe voiced a growing concern among Reformed divines that the continental Arminian controversy had now spread to England. At the Synod of Dort (1618-19), the Remonstrant party represented five soteriological objections to Reformed Orthodoxy, inspired by the arguments of Jacobus Arminius. They were roundly rejected by an international synod of Reformed delegates, subsequently known as contra-Remonstrants. During the 1650s, English divines became aware of an unfolding domestic contest, which was aptly dubbed the ‘Quinquarticular controversy’.² The puritan Arminian, John Goodwin, wrote *Triumviri* (1658) against several Reformed divines 'who have appeared in arms against me in this Quinquarticular war'.³ Fellow puritans such as George Kendall and John Owen published lengthy ripostes against the one they dubbed 'the English Tilenus', provoking Goodwin to bemoan the underhand tactics of their ‘Quinquarticular warfare’.⁴ Concerned by the internecine nature of this conflict among the godly, Goodwin prayed that God would ‘speedily cause these civil wars, about matters of opinion, to cease to the end of the commonwealth of Israel’.⁵ However, Goodwin was also concerned to refute those who drew attention to his surprising affinity with ‘Oxford Cavaliers’ such as Thomas Pierce. In defending the Calvinist credentials of the Church of England, Henry Hickman had named Goodwin and Pierce among ‘many’ who ‘lift up an English pen against

² As will be demonstrated, several divines used this phrase during the 1650s, demonstrating contemporary awareness of a new episode of debate regarding Arminianism in England. The earliest use of the term appeared in Goodwin's *Triumviri*, ‘Preface’, sig. d2.
⁴ John Goodwin, *Triumviri* (1658), 'Preface’, sig. d2; George Kendall, *Sancti Sanciti, or, The Common Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints* (1654); John Owen, *The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance* (1654). Goodwin also bemoaned the way 'Mr. Hickman takes the honour unto himself, and his Party, in the Quinquarticular Controversie, of being, the Orthodox'. In *Banner of Justification*, 'Reader', sig. b1. Daniel Tilenus was a French Protestant who became an Arminian sympathizer and an open critic of the Synod of Dort.
the Orthodox, in this quinquarticular controversy’. By denouncing puritan and episcopal Arminians on the same page, Hickman demonstrated contemporary awareness of new battlelines. For, during the 1650s, a soteriological ‘civil war’ raged in pulpits and in print, only this time royalists and regicides, puritans and prelates appeared to be fighting on the same side. Such was the paradoxical nature of ‘this Quinquarticular war’.

The emergence of Arminianism within the puritan fold has been described as ‘another of the great paradoxes of puritan history’. The polemical conjoining of ‘Puritan’ with ‘Calvinist’, and the counter-slur of ‘Arminianisme’ against Laudians, made the whole notion of puritan Arminianism an oxymoron before the English Revolution. Indeed, these pejorative associations were so persistent that ‘we have been trained to think reflexively of puritans as Calvinists, and Calvinists as strict predestinarians’. However, more recent scholarship has begun to appreciate that the ‘puritan revolution’ also incurred a revolution within puritanism itself as some among the godly applied the Protestant topos of reformation to their Calvinism. In short, ‘puritans began to question and dispute the once-uncontested nostrums of reformed predestinarian orthodoxy’. This chapter will survey the main protagonists and publications before concluding with some distinct features that characterized puritan-style Arminianism.

John Goodwin

John Goodwin was the foremost example of this puritan paradox. His godly credentials were impeccable. Raised in the puritan heartland of Norfolk, educated at Queens’ College (Cambridge) under John Preston, he was later
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8 David Como, ‘Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy’, in Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660, ed. by Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000), pp. 64-87, 64.
9 Ibid., 64.
10 Several scholars have noted the emergence of Arminianism within the puritan fold and John Coffey’s intellectual biography of John Goodwin provides an important introduction. This chapter will build on this to offer the first in-depth and comprehensive survey.
appointed vicar of St Stephen’s Coleman Street, one of London’s flagship puritan parishes. Throughout his life, Goodwin remained committed to experimental piety, solifidian Protestantism and evangelical conversionism. His writings were replete with humanist exegesis, scholastic reasoning, reformed authorities and pastoral exhortations that exemplified a puritan style, with its ‘hotter sort of protestantism’. However, from the late 1640s, Goodwin became one of the most vocal critics of Calvinism. Indeed, from within the puritan fold, Goodwin became ‘the Great spreader of Arminianism’.

Goodwin’s conversion to Arminianism occurred around 1647. However, long before this, Goodwin had been wrestling with theological tensions derived partly from his study of Scripture but also as a result of being embedded within the broader migration of English Calvinism during the first half of the seventeenth-century. As a consequence, Goodwin’s early sermons and publications placed the soteriological accent more upon ‘Divine Philanthropie’ and human responsibility than divine sovereignty and absolute decrees. In 1645, a member of Goodwin’s own congregation, Samuel Lane, publicly challenged this, claiming: ‘You put us in mind of finding grace with God, if we will make endeavours to obtaine it’. As noted, Goodwin subsequently read some works by Arminius and other early Remonstrants. However, ironically, the most significant influence on Goodwin’s migration to Arminianism probably came from his Reformed tutors. In particular, John Davenant, the president of Queens’ and later Bishop of Salisbury, and John Preston whose influential lectures and catechetical sermons made him
something of a ‘Puritan pope in all England’.\textsuperscript{17} Both the conformist Davenant and the puritan Preston embodied evolutionary processes within English Calvinism, which Jonathon Moore has termed the ‘softening of Reformed theology’.\textsuperscript{18} Shortly after Dort, Davenant gave a series of public lectures in Cambridge, which Goodwin likely attended.\textsuperscript{19} In order to render God \textit{placabilis et reconciliabilis} to all humanity, Davenant posited a dual covenant structure. \textit{Foedus Evangelicum} (an Evangelical covenant) was rooted in the universal atonement made by Christ and offered to all, but \textit{Foedus Arcanum} (a hidden covenant) meant the intercessory ministry of Christ was efficacious only for the elect. Equally, Preston distinguished between general \textit{decrees} that intended mercy for all, and particular \textit{predestination}, which ensured the ‘Irresistibleness of converting grace’ for the elect.\textsuperscript{20} Consequently, the accent fell on the hypothetical provision of universal redemption: ‘[T]he Scripture makes no particular promise to any man; it saith not, thou Thomas, or thou John, shalt be saved, but it saith, \textit{Whosoever will, let him come, and drinke freely of the water of life’}.\textsuperscript{21}

Despite significant structural continuity, the shift of emphasis from Perkins to Preston was dramatic. The pulse beating through hypothetical universalism was not divine sovereignty but divine ‘philanthropie’, pledging ‘love to mankind’ in the Gospel. Though this pastoral Calvinism was by no means ‘Arminianism’, it certainly closed the gap. As Moore concludes, ‘[T]he whole thrust of such a system swings in a potentially Arminian or semi-Pelagian direction’.\textsuperscript{22} As a student of Davenant and Preston, Goodwin’s early sermons reflected their attempts to ward off Arminianism by making Calvinism more palatable. However, Goodwin’s tutors also relied on speculative distinctions in order to ensure that the Gospel should be ‘preached to all promiscuously’, yet only the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Patrick Collinson cited in Ibid., 17.
\textsuperscript{18} Jonathan Moore, \textit{English Hypothetical Universalism}. The following analysis of Davenant and Preston is indebted to Moore’s work.
\textsuperscript{19} The lectures were published posthumously as John Davenant, \textit{Dissertationes Duae Prima de Morte Christi} (1650).
\textsuperscript{20} Jonathan Moore, \textit{English Hypothetical Universalism}, 81.
\textsuperscript{21} John Preston, \textit{A Livelles Life: or, Mans Spirituall Death in Sinne} (1633), I. 74.
\textsuperscript{22} Jonathan Moore, \textit{English Hypothetical Universalism}, 207. However, these moderate Calvinists remained anti-Arminian and did not intend their theology to be a halfway house.
\end{flushright}
elect would finally be saved.\textsuperscript{23} Ironically, this approach came under criticism from both high Calvinists and Arminians who argued it made God duplicitous. In response, Preston offered an illustration: ‘A Prince may offer and give a pardon to a rebel, and yet know aforehand that the rebel to whom it is offered, out of pride and contempt will not receive it’.\textsuperscript{24} Far from resolving the matter, Preston’s illustration encapsulated the tension that John Goodwin found increasingly unbearable. In his first publication after his conversion to Arminianism, \textit{The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted} (1648), Goodwin echoed Preston’s analogy but radically altered the script. The Calvinist god was in fact like a Prince offering grace to a man with no tongue if he will only call out to him, or a King promising reward to a cripple if he will only run to him.\textsuperscript{25} As Goodwin moved to apply his illustrations, he self-consciously stepped out of the Calvinist hegemony and closed the door behind him:

> If God should deprive men of all ability and power to repent and believe, and then should be still moving and persuading... with that patheticalnesse of affection, wherein he expresseth himselfe in the scriptures... this would seem very hard, yea somewhat harder than injustice itself... Some indeed imagine that they see such a face of God as this, presenting it self in the glasse of the Gospel... [But] we shall demonstratively shew and prove in due time, that all such conceptions are most unworthy of God.\textsuperscript{26}

For Goodwin, the theology of his former tutors was riddled with irreconcilable contradictions that rendered God unjust and unjustifiable. Their attempts to soften Calvinist tenets of unconditional election and irresistible grace were merely cosmetic, or as Thomas Good quipped in a letter to Baxter, ‘rigide

\textsuperscript{23} In particular, the extent of the atonement and the nature of grace were structured by the distinction of universal \textit{sufficiency} but limited \textit{efficiency}.

\textsuperscript{24} John Preston, \textit{Riches of Mercy to Men in Misery} (1658), 423. Goodwin’s shift in perspective highlighted crucial differences of emphasis. Calvinists emphasized culpability (rebels), Arminians incapacity (cripples) that arguably made them victims more than villains.

\textsuperscript{25} John Goodwin, \textit{The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted} (1648), 168-9, 202. The depiction of a cruel tyrant making empty promises was poignant theopolitical imagery in 1648.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 168-9.
Calvinism in a softer dresse’. Consequently, ‘Goodwin himself saw his
pilgrimage as a journey towards theological consistency’. Having made the
turn, Goodwin never tired of exposing those he now considered ‘so
contradictious and inconsistent with themselves’. He expressed genuine surprise
that ‘men of learning and parts, should speak at such a rate of contradiction as
they do from time to time’. In particular he accused his ‘Janus-faced’ brethren of
hiding their views on predestination behind ‘many cautions, limitations and
proviso’s’, whilst reverting to essentially Arminian appeals in their sermons.
Softened Calvinists were ‘palpable self-inconsistents’ who constantly
‘Arminianiz’d’.

Goodwin’s first defense of his newly acquired Arminianism was in a series of
public disputations with Vavasour Powell and John Simpson. Conducted in
December 1649 and February 1650 ‘in the presence of divers Ministers of the
City of London, and thousands of others’, these disputations gained a certain
notoriety. A learned puritan divine contesting Calvinism in the free-air of
Cromwellian London was sensational and indicative of the ‘crumbling of the
Calvinist consensus among the godly’. During the debates, Goodwin used
conversion language to describe his journey: ‘it pleased God to enlarge my
understanding’ such that ‘all of my previous light and learning were of no value…
to stand up against the further light which came in to me’. Delivered from
Calvinism, he now contended for universal grace and conditional decrees with all
the zeal of a new convert: ‘I deny that these Decrees respect persons personally
considered: but they only respect species of men… the Decree of Election from

27 Keeble and Nuttall, Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter, I. 168.
28 John Coffey, John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution, 68. Ironically, when Richard
Resbury wanted to refute Goodwin’s Redemption Redeemed, he published Preston’s
work defending irresistible grace, and concluded that in the light of it Goodwin was a
‘Pelagio-Socinian’. See De Gratiae Convertentis irresistibilitate (1652) appended to
Richard Resbury, The Lightless-Starre, or, Mr. John Goodwin discovered a Pelagio-Socinian
(1652).
29 Truths Conflict with Error (1650), 117.
30 Eirenomachia. The Agreement & Distance of Brethren (1652), 15.
31 The Remedy of Unreasonableness (1650), 8,15.
32 The disputes were recorded verbatim and published by John Weekes, a supporter of
Goodwin. See John Goodwin, Truths Conflict with Error, [title page].
33 John Coffey, John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution, 205.
eternity was, that *whosoever believes should be saved*. Goodwin’s public defense of Arminianism had immediate effect. William Hartley, who had attended the disputations, published a sermon in 1650, which asserted ‘The Decree [of reprobation]... doth not condemn any as persons, but hath solely reference to Transgressors’. He proceeded to outline four problems with unconditional decrees of reprobation: ‘It chargeth God with Injustice’ and ‘partiality’, it leads men to ‘willfully continuing in notorious sin’ and it ‘Contradicteth the whole scope and generality of Scripture’. In a final postscript, Hartley acknowledged the influence of Goodwin and noted that others now considered him ‘one of Mr Goodwins Disciples’.

Ever since his ‘conversion’ in 1647, Goodwin had been working toward a substantial *apologia* that would redeem grace from Calvinist distortion. Goodwin’s *magnum opus* was finally published in folio in 1651. Comprising over six hundred pages, *Redemption Redeemed* remains one of the most substantial English tomes ever written in defence of Arminianism and will be carefully considered in Chapter Six. In the Preface, Goodwin conveyed his rejection of Calvinism in graphic terms: ‘I found it ever and anon gravellish in my mouth, and corroding and fretting in my bowels’. Emboldened by fresh revelation, Goodwin self-consciously stepped ‘out of the way more generally occupied’. Nevertheless, the most striking feature of Goodwin’s Arminianism was its Reformed style, consisting of relentless citations from the Scriptures, the Fathers but also continental and English Calvinist divines. Indeed, Goodwin controversially insisted that his arguments were confirmed by ‘many full and clear Testimonies of their Truth from the Pen of Calvin himself, and many others counted pillars on his side’. In *Redemption Redeemed*, only Augustine was cited more frequently or more positively than Calvin. Goodwin even claimed that ‘for the most part, Chrysostom among the Ancient Expositors, and Calvin himself

---

34 *Truth’s Conflict with Error*, 110.
36 Ibid., 26-28.
37 Ibid., 32.
38 *RR*, ‘Preface’, sig. a1.
among the Modern, are my companions in the paths of my greatest solitariness’.  

In order to justify these claims, Goodwin deployed several rhetorical strategies. On occasion he resorted to a version of the ‘Calvin versus the Calvinists’ thesis, arguing that later Reformed divines deviated from Calvin’s authorial intent. In a letter, Goodwin accused one of his Reformed opponents of formulating doctrines that would be ‘disclaimed by the great Founder and Father himself of your Faith in your Contra-Remonstrancy, Mr Calvin’. Thus, according to Goodwin it was other English Calvinists not himself who ‘Anti-Calvinize’. Given the size of Calvin’s corpus and the sheer diversity of doctrinal formulations among Reformed divines, it was not hard to find evidence of apparent divergence. However, though Goodwin utilized this approach regarding the nature and extent of saving grace, he had to admit divergence from Calvin regarding the doctrine of predestination. Nevertheless, he still refused to surrender Calvin, arguing instead that he was ‘sometimes overcome with a sight of the Truth, contrary to his Opinion’. Indeed, according to Goodwin, at the dawn of the reformation, Calvin glimpsed truths that had only now become clear:

His apprehensiveness was such, that now and then a sight of the Truth, even contrary to the standing purport of His Judgment, or Opinion, glanced in upon Him, and overcame Him, subjecting His Pen and Conscience at once, for a season, unto Her service, however, the Vision

---

41 As Anthony Milton has shown, some early Stuart divines had appealed to this ‘face-saving fiction’, arguing that Bezan supralapsarianism corrupted Calvin’s more moderate theology. Catholic and Reformed, 428. More recently, this discontinuity thesis experienced a renaissance through neo-Orthodox Reformed theologians such as Karl Barth and Thomas Torrance and later in R. T. Kendall, Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649 (Oxford: OUP, 1979) and other works by Brian Armstrong and Alan Clifford. However, it has since been widely discredited. For a helpful summary of the debate see Richard A. Muller, Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2012).
42 John Goodwin, Moses Made Angry (1651), 9.
43 Goodwin may have learnt this tactic from the Amyralidans who also argued that they were the true Calvinists, rescuing reformed doctrine from later corruption. See Richard A. Muller, Calvin and the Reformed Tradition, 107-125.
ceasing, anticipated thoughts soon (it’s like) recovered their former profession.\textsuperscript{44}

Thus Calvin and Goodwin were not at odds, but at different stages of the same Reformed trajectory.

These rather speculative and strained efforts revealed Goodwin’s determination to remain within the Reformed fold, whilst propagating Arminian tenets. He even queried: ‘why should my doctrine be termed \textit{Arminianism}, then either \textit{Calvinism}, \textit{Musculism}, \textit{Martyrism}, or the like’.\textsuperscript{45} However, under fierce criticism, Goodwin at times drew back to a more basic appeal to Protestantism. In particular, he argued that his position was entirely in accordance with Lutherans such as Melancthon, Hemmingius and Chemnitus, as exemplified in the ‘Confession of the reformed Churches of Saxony’.\textsuperscript{46} Goodwin therefore considered himself part of necessary further reform within Protestantism, for ‘Luther, Calvin and Melancthon… left it under so much craziness and unsoundness’, that ‘other Physicians’ must now complete the work.\textsuperscript{47} Consequently, the most striking and novel aspect of Goodwin’s puritan-style was that his vociferous \textit{anti-Calvinism} regarding absolute decrees and irresistible grace in no way equated to being \textit{anti-Calvin} or the Reformed tradition. On the contrary, Goodwin attempted in ironic fashion to turn citations from Reformed luminaries against the very doctrines associated with them.\textsuperscript{48}

\textit{Redemption Redeemed} caused seismic tremors among the godly. Coffey has conveyed the scale of the reaction, noting that ‘during the first half of the 1650s, \textit{Redemption Redeemed} attracted more published replies than Leviathan’, published in the same year.\textsuperscript{49} The ripostes flew in from every angle – Reformed episcopalians such as Thomas Barlow, puritan Calvinists such as Kendall and Owen, the Scottish Presbyterian Robert Baillie and even sectarians like the

\begin{thebibliography}{49}
\bibitem{44} \textit{RR}, 389. Goodwin therefore argued that Calvin ‘had many sore fits and pangs of Arminianism’. \textit{RR}, ‘Preface’, sig. c4.
\bibitem{45} John Goodwin, \textit{Confidence Dismounted} (1651), 19.
\bibitem{46} \textit{RR}, 394.
\bibitem{48} See for example, \textit{RR}, 548-62.
\bibitem{49} See John Coffey, \textit{John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution}, 220-1.
\end{thebibliography}
General Baptist Thomas Lamb. Goodwin’s *magnum opus* signalled the arrival of a new style of Arminianism in England: ‘Redemption Redeemed had created something of a sensation among England’s Reformed theologians. Having been thrown out with the Laudian bishops, Arminianism was back’.\(^{50}\) In response to his critics, Goodwin churned out several more works devoted to the defence of Arminianism. He responded to Thomas Barlow with *Pagan’s Debt and Dowry* (1651), which argued that divine justice ensures that all have a ‘sufficiency of means to believe’ and that ‘they are altogether unexcusable, if they do not’.\(^{51}\) In 1652, Goodwin’s gathered congregation published *Eirenomachia: The Agreement and Distance of Brethren* to display a united front in the face of the Reformed onslaught. It was signed by fourteen leading members and dedicated to Oliver Cromwell. Unlike other polemical works by Goodwin, this irenical piece emphasized the common ground shared with Calvinists regarding the five articles of remonstrance (i) Election and Reprobation (ii) The Death of Christ (iii) The Grace of God (iv) The liberty of the will (v) Perseverance. This chiselled and winsome approach concluded on a note of optimism:

> We are full of this beleef and expectation, that within the compass of a few years, if no sooner, there will be as great a change in the greatest part of the present opposers of these our Doctrines, as there was in Paul, when the Churches of Judea heard this of him, That he which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth the Faith which he once destroyed.\(^{52}\)

Goodwin’s later theological works maintained his Arminian shape and style. They included: *An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of Romans* (1653) the *locus classicus* of Calvinist arguments for absolute divine decrees; *Triumviri* (1658) as a collective response to several Reformed critics; and *A Being Filled with the Spirit* (1670), which ostensibly comprised sermons Goodwin had preached in defense of Nicene orthodoxy but also included a distinctly Arminian pneumatology. Even after the restoration Goodwin published a controversial tract by Thomas Goad, *Stimulus Orthodoxus ... A Disputation Concerning Necessity and Contingency in the*  

---

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 225.  
\(^{52}\) *Eirenomachia*, 4.
World, in Respect of God’s Eternal Decree (1661). In a note to the reader, Goodwin claimed his purchase of this otherwise unpublished manuscript gave ‘reason to bless the God of Truth for the discovery’. Goad was a high profile minister and ‘one of the most eminent divines’ who served on the British delegation to Dort. However, in this manuscript, he critiqued unconditional election and irresistible grace as fatalistic, favouring instead an emphasis on contingency. Goad’s apparent departure from Calvinism therefore lent further support to those who wished to discredit Dort and side with the Remonstrants in ‘these prickly Disputations’.53

John Goodwin embodied the paradox of puritan Arminianism. He remained committed to English Protestantism but embraced Arminian soteriology; he was devoted to the millenarian vision of the godly and yet rejected Calvinism as a stumbling block to it; he championed creedal orthodoxy against Socinians and Quakers and yet radically challenged Reformed Orthodoxy in the process.54 Fellow ministers sometimes sided with him but always respected his learned style. As John Owen noted, ‘Nothing not great, not considerable, not some way eminent, is by any spoken of him’.55 Moderate Calvinists especially seemed ‘unwilling to expel [Goodwin] beyond the pale... and treated him as an erring brother rather than an untouchable heretic’.56 Goodwin himself claimed that his doctrine had ‘gathered many thousands’ of supporters and that he had received letters of support ‘from several persons of considerable worth... inhabiting in several parts of the Nation, some of them Ministers of the Gospel, and others of

53 Thomas Goad, Stimluus Orthodoxus, sive Goadus Redivivus: A Disputation Partly Theological, Partly Metaphysical (1661), 'To Reader'.
54 A Door Opening into the Christian religion (1662) was almost certainly Goodwin’s catechetical work, which embodied this paradox. The doctrinal sections were thoroughly Arminian and yet the moral sections exhorted a puritan piety and argued for extemporary worship. Elsewhere, Goodwin denounced arguments for reduced episcopacy and liturgical conformity, calling them ‘a mentrous rag of Popish devotion’. John Goodwin, Prelatique Preachers none of Christ’s Teachers (1663), 1.
55 In Crawford Gribben, John Owen and English Puritanism: Experiences of Defeat, 159.
56 John Coffey, John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution, 225. Ralph Venning illustrated this tension. As a moderate Calvinist, he wrote the dedicatory epistle for Goodwin’s defense of Trinitarian orthodoxy and yet felt the need to clarify that he was ‘not of the same mind and opinion’ as Goodwin. John Goodwin, Pleroma to Pneumatikon, or, A Being Filled with the Spirit (1670), 'Epistle Dedicatory', sig. a4v.
them Students in the University’. John Goodwin successfully pioneered a new style of Arminianism and others followed in his wake.

Those connected with Goodwin’s gathered church formed a loose network of puritan Arminians. Tobias Conyers was Goodwin’s closest disciple who propagated Arminianism whilst also pursuing ministerial duties. He caused a furore in Cambridge when his election to a fellowship at Peterhouse was blocked due to maintaining ‘some Arminian tenent’. On moving to London, he became embedded in St Stephen’s and followed in his master’s footsteps by publishing in 1657 a rebuttal to Presbyterian coercion, *A Letter of Adдресse*, and a tract defending Arminius in his own words, *The Just Mans Defence*. On the eve of the Restoration, Conyers preached a daring sermon before General Monck that harnessed an Arminian depiction of divine benevolence in order to plead for a proportionate ‘bounty and liberality’ of toleration. This Goodwinesque nexus of Arminianism and tolerationism was so obvious that Conyers later felt obliged to publish an ‘Author’s Apology’ in which he acknowledged ‘communion’ with ‘that Christian people to whom Mr John Goodwin is pastour’. However, after the restoration, any alliance soon unraveled as key figures such as Conyers, Thomas Firmin and William Allen became associated with Latitudinarian tendencies. Though they retained the Arminianism they had inherited from their puritan pastor, they chose the more hospitable environment of conformity rather than identifying with ejected dissenters.

In addition to disciples, Goodwin also had puritan Arminian peers in John Horn and Thomas Moore Senior. Together they identified as ‘The Universalists’ and shared a common puritan-style, which remained indelibly etched on their

57 *The Banner of Justification*, ‘Epistle’.
58 Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 226. The widespread reaction and support for Conyers demonstrated the spread of Arminian sympathies in Cambridge. Charles Hotham issued a lengthy appeal to parliament and more than thirty divines signed a letter of protest including Cambridge Platonists such as Henry More, Ralph Cudworth and John Smith. Charles Hotham, *Corporations Vindicated in their Fundamental Liberties* (1651).
60 Ibid., sig. A4.
sermons, disputations and publications.\textsuperscript{62} They originated from the puritan heartland of the fens and both Goodwin and Horn were Cambridge divines. During the 1650s, Goodwin ministered in St Stephens, Coleman Street, and in 1672 Thomas Moore was buried there, with John Horn preaching his funeral sermon. As ordained ministers, they each published works against Calvinists to the ‘right’ and Baptists or Quakers to their ‘left’.\textsuperscript{63} They also leapt to each other’s defence when reformed divines attacked and sought the patronage of moderates like Baxter.\textsuperscript{64} Indeed, Horn wrote to Baxter commending him for upholding the doctrines of ‘General Redemption’ and urging him not to refrain from publishing a manuscript he had written defending universal atonement\textsuperscript{65}

John Horn

Having studied at Trinity College, John Horn was ordained in Peterborough Cathedral and later became rector of All Saints Church in King’s Lynn until his ejection in 1662. Horn’s Arminianism had a certain subtlety to it. His most significant work \textit{The Open Door} (1650) was dedicated to his patron, Colonel Valtentine Walton who was Cromwell’s brother-in-law. Horn thanked him for supporting his controversial work, claiming he was ‘imboldened to thrust it out into the world under your protection and Patronages’.\textsuperscript{66} Horn displayed a learned style throughout, with an opening quotation from Socrates, substantial Latin and Greek marginalia and a concluding litany of patristic citations. \textit{The Open Door} was ostensibly a work to defend general redemption by standing toe

\textsuperscript{62} Horn referred to himself as one of ‘The Universalists’ and Moore also owned the term.
\textsuperscript{63} John Horn, \textit{The Quakers proved Deceivers} (1660). Both Horn and Moore disputed against the Quakers in Lynn. George Fox himself later published a work entitled: George Fox, \textit{A Few Queries for Thomas Moor the Elder, Thomas Moor the Younger, John Horn} (1660).
\textsuperscript{64} Horn defended Goodwin \textit{contra} Kendall in John Horn, \textit{Diatribe Peri Paedo-Baptismou} (1654) and \textit{contra} Owen in \textit{An Open Door} (1650); Goodwin defended Horn in \textit{Triumviri} (1658). Baxter wrote a defense of universal atonement in the late 1640s, which was finally published posthumously as Richard Baxter, \textit{Universal Redemption of Mankind} (1694).
\textsuperscript{65} See Horn’s letter, 13\textsuperscript{th} August 1655, in Keeble and Nuttall, \textit{Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter}, I. 188-9.
\textsuperscript{66} John Horn, \textit{Thyra Aneigmene. The Open Door} (1650), ‘Epistle Dedication’.
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to toe with John Owen's *Death of death* (1647).\(^{67}\) The main body of the work would therefore have been acceptable to hypothetical universalists and Amyraldians alike.\(^{68}\) However, in an extended section to the reader, Horn made clear that he intended 'Universalist' as a reference to the whole of God's salvific intentions, for the Scriptures 'saith not, God so loved his Elect that he gave his only begotten Son... Mr Owen confounds the Elect and the World together'.\(^{69}\) As Horn moved to defend Moore against Owen, he clarified the nature of their shared convictions: 'God will not be wanting in sufficiency of helpfulness to them... God in his workings with men, gives them liberty and power to make use of and listen to the means of light and life afforded them'.\(^{70}\) Consequently, Horn insisted on a form of universalism that was not hypothetical and partial but categorical and comprehensive: 'that which was not done at all for All, was not sufficiently done for All'.\(^{71}\) For Arminian universalists like Horn, the subjunctive mood of salvation should therefore be attributed to human response rather than divine intention: 'we put no If unto Gods purpose, which as secret concerns not our faith... But we put that If, into the way of mens participation of that salvation as God hath revealed it'.\(^{72}\) Despite his brazen rejection of even softened forms of Calvinism, Horn denied being an Arminian, and proceeded to juxtapose 'our universalitie' with a Pelagian straw man of meritorious salvation: 'What good God doth to any, it is of mercy not of merit'.\(^{73}\) The work concluded with patristic citations to demonstrate that the 'universalitie' of God's love chymed with antiquity.

---

\(^{67}\) Horn's work was reprinted in 1655 under the title *Universal Redemption*.
\(^{68}\) Indeed, Horn praised 'men of more moderate spirits and sounder learning... witnesse Mr. Baxter here, and Dr. Amiral in France and others'. See John Horn, *Brief Instructions for Children* (1656), Preface, sig. A3v. Hypothetical universalism and Amyraldanism will be considered further in Part II.
\(^{69}\) *The Open Door*, 79. No doubt Horn favoured the term 'Universalist' precisely because as a swing-door phrase, it could refer to softened forms of Calvinism or to a more comprehensive application by Arminians. This sleight of hand has fooled historians who have largely failed to differentiate the affirmation of universal atonement from Arminianism proper. See for example, Geoffrey Nuttall, 'John Horne of Lynn', in *Christian Spirituality: Essays in Honour of Gordon Rupp*, ed. by Peter Brooks (London: SCM Press, 1975), pp. 231-248.
\(^{70}\) *The Open Door*, 268, 301.
\(^{71}\) Ibid., 160.
\(^{72}\) Ibid., 282.
\(^{73}\) Ibid., 268.
Other publications by Horn also espoused Arminian tenets. *A Caveat to all true Christians* (1651) was styled as a piece of puritan piety. Horn railed against ‘prophane loose persons’ and examined the marks of a true saint, with exhortations to a ‘Holy walk toward God’. However, the final section criticised the ‘preposterous way’ of those who teach ‘that some few are and were Elected from Eternity, and others the most part of men... were from Eternity reprobated’. For Horn, the pastoral fall out from such error caused many to ‘advocate their own sanctification’ and ‘legal fruits’ as the ‘basis for assurance’ leading to ‘delusion and destruction’.\(^74\) Concerned for the legacy of Arminianism, Horn also published *Brief Instructions for Children* (1656) as the first English catechism to overtly refute Calvinism in a bid to raise future generations on ‘the Universality of the Grace & love of God’. An extended section explained the general nature of election ‘in Christ’ and refuted any notion of absolute or particular election of persons from eternity.\(^75\) In *Essays about General and Special Grace* (1659), Horn outlined a two-fold structure for his Arminian theology in order to reconcile the Augustinian doctrine of original sin with a universal and efficacious offer of salvation. Horn argued that the first work of grace, *gratia prima*, was universal and monergistic: ‘There are preventing, previous operations of the Spirit, upon men, while yet dead in sins’. This was sufficient to recover a basic receptivity to the Gospel that could then lead to a second work of regenerative grace. However, ‘Between these two... we do find that God requires something of men to be done by them, in the strength of his Spirit’.\(^76\) Convinced his arguments from Scripture refuted Calvinist alternatives, Horn concluded, ‘The Universalists are the only truly Orthodox by the verdict of the Apostles’.\(^77\) Though Horn’s works lacked substantial citations from continental Reformed divines, nevertheless Goodwin’s

---

\(^{74}\) John Horn, *A Caveat to all True Christians* (1651), 301, 306.  
\(^{75}\) John Horn, *Brief Instructions for Children*, 29-32. The work was later criticized for raising matters from the ‘Quinquarticular controversies: For think you these to be fit matter of instruction for children?’ Joseph Hacon, *A Review of Mr. Horn’s Catechisme* (1660), 4.  
\(^{77}\) Ibid., 31.
'Journey-man' modelled a similar puritan-style Arminianism characterized by practical divinity and experiential piety.\textsuperscript{78}

Thomas Moore

Thomas Moore (Senior) was a tradesman who in an era of increased social mobility became a minister in the parish of Whittlesey (Cambridgeshire). Though Baxter praised him as a 'Weaver... of excellent Parts', without a university education Moore struggled to shake off Thomas Edwards' accusation that he was a 'great Sectary' causing 'much hurt' in the puritan heartland of the fens. However, Edwards also had to admit that Moore was 'followed from place for place by many', and John Owen acknowledged that despite 'wildness, in such tattered rags' he was gaining quite a following.\textsuperscript{79} Moore came to notoriety in the 1640s when he published a series of tracts arguing for the universal scope of the atonement.\textsuperscript{80} These tracts earned him several published responses from high profile Reformed divines, including the infamous \textit{Salus electorum, sanguis Jesu, or, The Death of Death in the Death of Christ} (1648) by John Owen. However, Moore should be considered a puritan Arminian only after Goodwin and Horn, as his 1640s publications were initially restricted to hypothetical universalism. As late as 1647, Moore published \textit{A Briefe Declaration of Jesus Christ} in which he considered two forms of grace: 'Generall and common' that left men without excuse but short of salvation, and 'speciall, and peculiar' grace by which the elect are 'enabled to beleeve'.\textsuperscript{81} It therefore seems problematic to label Moore an Arminian before the 1650s.\textsuperscript{82} Rather, Moore illustrated the tension emerging

\textsuperscript{78} See for example, John Horn, \textit{The Divine Wooer, or, A Poem setting forth the Love and Loveliness of the Lord Jesus} (1673). Goodwin's 'Journey-man' was intended as a slur in George Kendall, \textit{Sancti Sancti}, 149.

\textsuperscript{79} For these citations and a helpful summary of Moore's early atonement controversies see Crawford Gribben, \textit{John Owen and English Puritanism}, 85-88.

\textsuperscript{80} His first and most significant publication in this series was Thomas Moore Senior, \textit{The Universallity of God's Free-grace in Christ to Mankind} (1646).

\textsuperscript{81} Thomas Moore Senior, \textit{A Brief Declaration of Jesus Christ} (1647), 28.

\textsuperscript{82} Wallace, Coffey and Gribben all label Moore 'Arminian' without sufficient sensitivity to his theological migration. During the 1640s, Moore deliberately distanced himself from Arminian tenets, considering the notion of equivalence between universal atonement and the scope of salvific grace to be 'so false and groundlesse a fancy, as needeth no Answer'. \textit{The Universality}, 128.
within the puritan milieu regarding the extent of the atonement, the universal sufficiency of grace and the fallibility of perseverance. Indeed, Moore attempted to perch on the proverbial fence by positing a two-tiered structure of ‘sons’ and ‘servants’: ‘God to this end Decreed, to use such meanes as hee pleased to some more, to some lesse, with some effectual Power therein, to call both Sonnes and Servants to the acknowledgement of this their Lord’. God elects and calls ‘Sons’ by monergistic grace, guranteeing their perseverance, for even if sons rebel God will ‘by his Spirit make them willing, and bring them into his Sonne’. However, servants receive only resistible grace and should they rebel they fall into a state of reprobation wherein God will ‘harden the residue and give them up for their contempt of the means’.83

However, by 1652 Moore had migrated beyond hypothetical universalism to embrace Arminianism proper. *A Treatise on the Liberty or Bondage of the Will* was a brief tract to refute what he deemed two equal and opposite errors – free will by nature and saving grace only for the elect. After a brief rebuttal of ‘any free will in man by nature’, Moore argued that ‘by virtue of the death, sacrifice and mediation of Jesus Christ’ a universal paradigm of salvation had been inaugurated.84 Thus the ‘impossibilitie of salvation’ was removed from all men and instead: ‘[God] giveth so much freedom to them that they might incline to attend those means and so look to him, and turn at his reproof; and that in so looking and turning he will give them supernatural and spiritual light, and save them’.85 This was no longer hypothetical but categorical universalism, which insisted that sufficient saving grace was available to all.

In 1656 Moore published his most sizeable work, amassing seven hundred pages: *An Explicite Declaration of the Testimony of Christ*. Moore had John Owen’s *The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance* (1654) in his sights and attempted to position himself as a *via media* between the high Calvinism of Owen and that ‘pretend

83 *The Universality*, 119-20.
84 Thomas Moore Senior, *A Treatise shewing the Liberty and Bondage of the Will of Man* (1652), 2.
85 Ibid., 31.
Spirit’ of the Quaker’s. In a rare autobiographical moment, Moore reflected on his former captivity to Owen’s strict Calvinism: ‘I was a long time snared with this old fable, till I experimented the evils mentioned, and was brought to confess God in his Sayings true’. Now with the benefit of hindsight, he considered Owen’s theology ‘a Wolf in a Sheep’s-skin’ that ‘barks and snaps against God’s gracious end in the Gospel’. However, Moore then revealed that ‘though the old fable be gone’, he had still clung to a form of hypothetical universalism, which purported to ‘set forth God’s mercy to all Mankinde’:

This last mentioned figment did a long time remain with me; yea I was not freed of it, when that first published Tract called the Universality of God’s Free-Grace to Mankinde, was put forth: some Expressions there of it I wish were amended… I own the blame of all the folly shown.

Moore now considered the pastoral face of Calvinism ‘a meer Artifice of remaining dregs of the former’. Having been rescued from the ‘snare’ of both strict and softened forms of Calvinism, he now celebrated full and free salvation and blessed God, ‘who delivered us’. Moore therefore set about to slay the ‘wolf’ of absolute decrees and elsewhere to advocate a thoroughly Arminian approach to predestination and grace. He was also insistent that ‘many others’ had been delivered in recent years. Indeed, closest to home, his own son Thomas Moore Junior published Mercies of Men in 1654. Originally a controversial sermon at Black Friars, this extended pamphlet called believers to pray for ‘ALL men’, on the ‘ground’ that Jesus Christ... hath given himself for all men' and that God had sent forth ‘His good Spirit in Supernatural light... to turn them to God'. Arminian convictions were therefore gaining ground across the puritan heartland of Norfolk. By 1669 when Archbishop Sheldon enforced a survey of nonconformity across the provinces, the parish of King’s Lynn is entered: ‘At the

---

86 Thomas Moore Senior, An Explicite Declaration of the Testimony of Christ (1656), 11.
87 Ibid., 407-10.
88 Ibid., 405. Like Goodwin, Moore’s use of conversion language heightened the sense of crisis.
89 Moore later published an essay on election, which was a catechetical presentation of his newfound Arminian doctrines. See A Treatise of the Person of Christ (1657), 226-50.
91 Thomas Moore Junior, Mercies for Man (1654), 53-4.
house of Mr John Horne... Universalists: 100’. As Nuttall concluded, ‘Puritan universalists in this sense were not in fact as rare as is supposed’.92

John Milton

During the 1650s, John Milton applied his creativity and verve to promulgate Arminian soteriology with puritan-style and poetic genius.93 A blind Milton began to dictate *Paradise Lost* in the late 1650s, though it was only made ready for publication in 1667. Recent scholarship also considers *De Doctrina* ‘a text of the late 1650s’.94 Written in the *lingua franca* of Latin, *De Doctrina Christiana* was Milton’s contribution to the genre of Reformed dogmatics, evidencing ‘close verbal affinities with the work of other systematic theologians of the Reformation period, preeminently William Ames and Johannes Wolleb’.95 Consequently, ‘for all its heterodoxies [it] remains an artefact of Reformed theological discourse’.96 Gathered around *loci communes*, Milton’s method was ‘that my page's space should overflow with scriptural authorities’.97 Indeed, it consisted of nine thousand biblical proof texts from the Junius-Tremellius Latin version. Milton’s Biblicist approach functioned as a rebuke to the speculative scholasticism of Reformed dogmatics, which he later depicted as fallen angels who ‘reasond high Of Providence, Foreknowledge, Will, and Fate’, but ‘found no...

---

95 Despite previous doubts over authorship, the scholarly consensus now affirms the ‘Miltonic provenance’ of *De Doctrina*. See Ibid., 3.
end, in wandering mazes lost’ (II. 558-61). Like Goodwin, De Doctrina appropriated the genre and vocabulary of Reformed Orthodoxy in order to bring a devastating critique from within.

Despite evidence of theological migration, Milton remained committed to the Augustinian assumption that fallen humanity was in ‘slavish subjection to sin’ including the ‘death of the will’. Consequently, nothing less than sola gratia was sufficient for salvation. However, the scope and style of grace Milton espoused represented a radical departure from Reformed Orthodoxy. In Paradise Lost, the promise is made to all: ‘I will renew His lapsed powers’ (III. 175-6) and the ensuing renovation elevates fallen humanity back to a position of neutrality and free will: ‘Upheld by me, yet once more he shall stand on even ground’ (III. 178-9). A Universal and prevenient grace, irresistibly given to all, therefore renders humanity once again predisposed to receive salvation. Consequently, divine decrees need only function in a conditional way: ‘We must therefore conclude that God did not decree anything absolutely which he left in the power of free agents’. The alternative would suggest God himself was ‘the cause and author of sin’, and would ‘jettison entirely all human freedom of action, all endeavour or desire to do right’. Instead, Milton considered divine decrees both conditional and corporate, encompassing everyone ‘in Christ’ according to divine foreknowledge. God has predestined ‘those who would believe and be constant in faith’ meaning that ‘Peter is not predestined or elected as Peter, or John as John’ but as believers in Christ. Milton’s God therefore desired ‘the Salvation of all and the death of none, and omitted nothing that might suffice for the salvation of all’. Thus for Milton, reprobation had no place in divine decrees, being instead a self-inflicted state of rebellion that can be ‘revoked by repentance’. Milton’s refutation of particular decrees in favour of a corporate approach to election
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98 All citations of Paradise Lost are from John Milton, Paradise Lost, ed. by Alastair Fowler (Harlow: Longman, 1968). The stanza and line reference are given in brackets following a citation.
99 Poole has argued persuasively that Milton’s conception of original sin ‘clearly follows a broadly Calvinist line, with Arminian qualifications’. William Poole, Milton and the Idea of the Fall, 145.
100 De Doctrina, 55.
101 De Doctrina, 71, 79.
102 De Doctrina, 101.
predicated on divine foreknowledge clearly aligned De Doctrina with the tenets of Arminianism.

One possible reading of Paradise Lost sees it building on De Doctrina as a form of poetic anti-Calvinism. Book I begins in hell where a parody of Calvinist theology comes from the mouth of Satan himself. The omnipotent god described from the depths of hell is not sumnum bonum but one who ‘holds the Tyranny of Heav’n’ by the imposition of arbitrary decrees and iron necessity (I. 124). With rich irony, the devil and his fallen angels present a god who appears to be their self-portrait. According to this reading, Milton portrayed the god of Calvinism as nothing but the devil ‘writ large’, in desperate need of vindication. Book III brings a form of theodicy through switching to the heavenly colloquy. Hellish decrees and fatal necessity are replaced by the unequivocal divine intention to provide universal salvation coupled with decrees that safeguard human free will:

for so
I formed them free, and free they must remain,
Till they enthrall themselves: I else must change
Their nature, and revoke the high Decree
Unchangeable, Eternal, which ordained
Thir freedom: they themselves ordained their fall. (III. 123-8)

For Milton, divine benevolence necessitates universal grace and negates any decree of reprobation. However, in a bid to preserve divine freedom and yet to ensure the universal offer of salvation, Milton’s God seems to champion a superior form of election for an elite few and conditional election for ‘the rest’:

Some I have chosen of peculiar grace
Elect above the rest; so is my will:
The rest shall hear me call, and oft be warnd
Thir sinful state, and to appease betimes
Th’incensed Deitie, while offerd Grace
Invites; for I will cleer thir senses dark,
What may suffice, and soft’n stonie hearts

103 This interpretation assumes Milton places in the mouth of Satan a deliberately false portrait of God and contrasts it with that of the narrator. For an extended discussion of this approach see Benjamin Myers, Milton’s Theology of Freedom.
To pray, repent, and bring obedience due.  
To prayer, repentance, and obedience due,  
Though but endevord with sincere intent,  
Mine eare shall not be slow, mine eye not shut.  
And I will place within them as a guide  
My umpire Conscience, whom if they hear,  
Light after light well us’d they shall ttain,  
And to the end persisting safe arrive. (III. 183-97)

Whether Milton understood ‘Elect above the rest’ to refer to temporal privileges or eternal predestination remains contested.\(^\text{104}\) Either way, the emphasis of the stanza falls on ‘The rest’ who are promised sufficient grace to ‘safe arrive’.

Milton’s puritan-style Arminianism was on display in both *De Doctrina* and *Paradise Lost*. In *De Doctrina* he referred positively to ‘Remonstrant Theologians’ who had ‘correctly advised’ him on the conditional nature of perseverance. He also referred to hostility from Calvinists who ‘fasten these charges on us’ because of rejecting unconditional decrees.\(^\text{105}\) Having been nurtured in the Reformed fold, Milton evidenced a distinct puritan-style, appealing to traditional Reformed authorities in order to defend Arminian tenets. As Stachniewski notes: ‘There is no doubting Milton’s Arminianism; but there remains good reason to suppose that the structure of perception fostered by Calvinism continued to play a role’.\(^\text{106}\) Thus as a voice sounding from inside the puritan camp, Milton’s attack was particularly disturbing, though its impact would only be felt after the Restoration. *De Doctrina* and *Paradise Lost* were further examples of puritan works written

---


\(^{105}\) *De Doctrina*, 669. Milton had already referred to Arminius himself as ‘acute and distinct’ in *Areopagitica*, 14.

during the 'Indian summer of English republicanism' when English Arminianism flourished under the umbrella of Cromwellian toleration.¹⁰⁷

**Distinctives of Puritan-style Arminianism**

Inspired by shared convictions, several puritan divines accompanied by a not insignificant lay following, migrated beyond softened forms of Calvinism to embrace the core tenets of Arminianism during the 1650s. Though they departed from Calvinist soteriology, they refused to surrender their Reformed heritage or puritan spirituality and self-consciously depicted themselves as reformers, furthering the cause of English Protestantism. They did not amount to a formal group but operated as a loose network with shared loyalties and doctrinal sensibilities. They continued to collude with Calvinists in rebutting common enemies, including episcopal Royalists on one side and antinomians, anti-Trinitarians and Quakers on the other. However, they also sparked a theological ‘civil war' as the 'Quinquarticular controversy' divided the godly brotherhood from within.

Their distinct style reflected particular motivations for turning against the hegemony of their former tutors and peers. First and foremost, they lost confidence that Calvinist doctrines could be reconciled with the Biblical doctrine of God. Arbitrary decrees of election and reprobation seemed to imply a partiality in God that rendered divine justice opaque. Additionally, irresistible grace combined with an iron blanket of meticulous providence appeared to compromise human culpability for sin. Despite Reformed qualifications that God was only the efficient not the material cause of evil or that grace was sufficient for all, if only efficient for the elect, it became harder to persuade those already disillusioned with scholasticism that such distinctions were not a semantic smokescreen. Consequently, Goodwin charged his fellow puritan divines: ‘you

---

Anti-Calvinize, as well as Anti-Arminianize, yea and that which is worse then both, you Anti-Christianize, blaspheming God by Attributing to him, [that] which is so inconsistent with his glory.' By the 1650s, cosmetic distinctions were not enough. Instead, Arminianism offered a comprehensive alternative with a hermeneutic that exalted Scripture’s universalist texts.

Pastoral motivations also gave puritan Arminianism its distinct approach. In addition to the problem of antinomianism, Calvinism posited hidden decrees, which undermined assurance and arguably left souls facing a spiritual lottery. Anfechtung therefore plagued many within the community of the godly, engendering a fear of ‘backsliding’ or being found to be only a ‘hypocrite’, masquerading among the elect. For some, ‘The persecutory imagination’ grew to suicidal proportions. Baxter reported that ‘when it cometh to extremity, they are weary of their Lives... as if something within them were either urging them to drown themselves, or cut their own Throats’, and he estimated that ‘some Two or Three in a Week, or a Day, come to me in the same case’. As Stachniewski concluded:

[T]he psychological difficulty of securing assurance in a milieu where damnation was statistically much more probable tended to plunge people into a more terrible despair than anything they had suffered when such confidence was not expected of them.

The alarming success of ‘manifestarians’, such as Quakers and Seekers, was in part attributable to their promise of an immanentist assurance through experience. Consequently, having witnessed pastoral crises and radical reactions under the Calvinist hegemony, some feared their own beloved doctrines were crippling the puritan project. As Goodwin argued, belief in unconditional decrees and irresistible grace was ‘extreamly Anti-Evangelical’ and ‘infuseth a

---

108 John Goodwin, Moses Made Angry, 9.
109 John Stachniewski, The Persecutory Imagination, 55-6. Though Stachniewski’s account has been challenged, the angst engendered by Calvinism was clearly a widespread pastoral issue. See Leif Dixon, Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590-1640 (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 26-33.
110 Ibid., 33.
proportionable malignity into the Will and affections, and occasioneth sinful distempter’, The attempt to divorce puritanism from Calvinism was therefore motivated by a shared millenarian vision to establish a godly commonwealth in England. Ironically, the likes of Goodwin, Horn and Milton became convinced that Calvinism was undermining puritanism and turned to Arminianism for a more robust pastoral theology.

Political concerns regarding independency, republicanism and toleration also informed puritan Arminianism. Independents like Goodwin and Milton had experienced rough treatment from Presbyterian heresiographers, which fuelled their fears that the harsh Calvinist god produced men in his own image and likeness. As committed regicides, they had succeeded in executing an earthly tyrant and were now determined to remove any theological equivalent from the throne. Arguably therefore, Goodwin’s AntiCavalierisme (1642) and his anti-Calvinism were inextricably linked. Consequently, his theopolitical analogies deliberately typecast the Calvinist god as a cruel and capricious king. In Redemption Redeemed, Goodwin argued that the true God was not a despotic monarch who only ‘loves two or three Favourites about his Court’ but a philanthropist, ‘a lover of his Subjects’ who provides sufficient saving grace for all. This style of Arminianism also depicted the divine modus operandi as one of persuasion rather than coercion, thereby fostering a linked commitment to tolerationism. Consequently, there was an important relationship between Milton’s Areopagitica and De Doctrina, between Tobias Conyers appealing for toleration and publishing Arminius’ Declaration of Sentiments, between Goodwin’s tolerationist tracts such as Hagiomastix and his Arminian commitments. Politics and theology were never divorced in early modern England.

---

111 RR, ’Preface’, sig. a2.
112 This was insinuated in Tobias Conyers open letter to Cromwell. Conyers feared that Cromwell cared only for the elect few in contrast to the ‘universalitie’ of God’s love. See D. F., A Letter of Addresse to the Protector (1657), 1-3.
113 RR, 408.
114 This is not to say that Arminianism necessarily leads to tolerationism as will be demonstrated in the next chapter.
Finally, the spread of Arminianism among the godly also requires certain historiographical revisions. Puritanism has often been considered inexorably tethered to the doctrinal commitments of Calvinism.\(^{115}\) Until the mid-1640s, this essentialist approach largely held firm. However, amid the maelstrom of the English Revolution, several puritan paradoxes emerged, including Amyraldian, antinomian and Arminian strains. To restrict definitions to the pre-war era, fails to appreciate diachronic diversity and tends to reify a monolithic puritanism.\(^{116}\) Equally, to confer the status ‘puritan’ only on those who conform to \textit{a priori} doctrinal criteria ignores the way Goodwin, Horn and Milton were embedded within networks of influence and patronage among the society of the godly.\(^{117}\) Instead, puritan Arminians demonstrated the evolving nature of English puritanism and should be considered part of the 'subterranean world of intrapuritan debate'.\(^{118}\) English puritanism was not a homogenous ideology, nor was Calvinist soteriology its essential or unifying core. Instead puritanism was ‘a fractured landscape, a community in which competing visions of right religion vied for attention’.\(^{119}\) Crucially, for high profile puritans such as Baxter, Goodwin and Milton it was precisely their concern for puritan piety and godly reform that motivated their doctrinal migrations. Considering puritanism a style of piety with an impulse for further reform can accommodate these dissident voices as variations on a theme rather than deviations from a confession.

\(^{115}\) The vexed issue of defining puritanism has received significant scholarly attention. For helpful summaries, see \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism}, ed. by John Coffey and Paul CH Lim (Cambridge: CUP, 2008). Randall Pederson has argued for a nuanced approach to the relationship between Reformed Orthodoxy and puritanism, which allows for both unifying themes and significant diversity. See \textit{Unity in Diversity: English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603-1689} (Boston: Brill, 2014); ‘Reformed Orthodoxy in Puritanism’, \textit{Perichoresis} 14.3 (2016), 45-59.

\(^{116}\) Spurr helpfully refers to ‘the "horizontal" picture of puritanism’ and the need to fully appreciate the dynamic ways in which puritanism changed ‘in response to the world around it’. John Spurr, \textit{English Puritanism, 1603-1689}, 4, 7. Equally, Collinson argued that the puritan cause for godly reform was the irreducible core of puritanism. This approach encompasses the likes of Goodwin and Milton, who were part of an English tradition of ‘discontents’ seeking to change a church 'but haftly reformed'. Patrick Collinson, \textit{The Elizabethan Puritan Movement}, 13-15.


\(^{118}\) David R. Como, \textit{Blown by the Spirit}, 28.

\(^{119}\) Ibid., 31.
CHAPTER THREE

Episcopal-Style Arminianism
There were at that time, two sorts of Episcopal Men who differed from each other... the old common moderate sort, who were commonly in Doctrine Calvinists... The other sort followed Dr. H. Hammond and (for ought we knew) were very new, and very few.¹

Richard Baxter's juxtaposition of the ‘old common moderate sort’ with those he elsewhere dubbed ‘New Prelatical Divines’ inevitably relied on a certain amount of caricature.² However, Baxter also highlighted an important trend during the interregnum, which has been largely overlooked. Revisionist historiography has concentrated its efforts on demonstrating the subversive and radical nature of early Stuart Laudianism in the build up to the civil war. As Anthony Milton has argued, this has resulted in the largely untested assumption that once Archbishop Laud was executed and his bishops sequestered, a post-Laudian ‘Anglicanism’ arose with an innocent commitment to prayer-book liturgy, the Thirty-Nine Articles and a moderate style that was “theologically prudent, socially deferential and liturgically restrained”.³ However, Baxter was alarmed by the rise of an even more vociferous episcopal-style anti-Calvinism, which insisted on *jure divino* ordination and instigated a wholesale attack on the Reformed heritage of the Church of England. In short, ‘These men in Doctrine were such as are called Arminians’.⁴

To date, the theological commitments of this new breed of episcopalian in the 1650s have received scant attention. As McElligott notes: ‘In the vast scholarly literature on the English Revolution, more has been written about the 1640s than about the 1650s, and more attention has been given to the Parliamentarians than to the Royalists’.⁵ The involvement of high profile episcopal Arminians in the *quinquarticular* war of the 1650s therefore remains an important but neglected facet of the overall contest for the Church of England.⁶ Highlighting this doctrinal
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³ Anthony Milton, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', 62.
⁶ A cursory note by Spurr indicates an area awaiting further research: ‘During the Interregnum the Episcopalians were also active in the promotion of Arminianism’. John
contest will further underscore the problematic nature of ‘Anglicanism’. Indeed, though Spurr may be right to conclude that the Restoration church ‘emerged from the 1640s and 1650s with a distinct doctrinal, ecclesiological and spiritual identity’, the more significant point would seem to be that this was not the ‘Restoration’ of a former status quo. This chapter will therefore chart the crucial role played by episcopal Arminians, who during the 1650s, secured a more radical departure from the English Reformed heritage with longer-term ramifications for the Church of England than anything achieved by the Laudians.

During the 1640s and early 1650s, ‘New Prelatical Divines’ were largely preoccupied with other pressing concerns. The concerted efforts of Presbyterians and Independents to establish new forms of church polity threatened the already tenuous English claim to historic episcopacy, and sent divines scurrying to their studies in order to construct a defense of episcopalian polity. As Quantin has cogently argued, ‘Beleaguered Episcopali ans’ attempted to shore up the authority of the Fathers generally and especially the letters of Ignatius in order to preserve a mandate for jure divino episcopacy. Hammond, Thorndike, Gunning, Heylyn and Sheldon all contributed to the assault on those they deemed ‘not a Church’, but ‘Conventicles of Hereticks and Schismaticks’. However, their arguments soon reverberated from Rome as Catholic polemicists,...

8 Fred Trott has argued for significant continuity between Laudians of the 1620s-30s and episcopal divines in the 1650s. His thesis reveals important aspects of intellectual affinity and patronage and helps to refute the assumption that after Laud, ‘Anglicans’ were moderate conformist types. However, Trott’s assumption that Laudianism continued into the 1650s and 1660s tends to reify ‘Laudianism’ as a static and unified entity. However, Anthony Milton has highlighted diversity and divergence within early Stuart Laudianism, making it more of a ‘moment’ than a ‘movement’. Trott’s approach also overlooks significant discontinuity between divines in the 1620s and 30s and those caught up in the heady atmosphere of the 1640s and 50s, when some episcopal Arminians formulated more radical approaches that early Stuart Laudians may not have tolerated (See Chapter Seven). F. J. Trott, ‘Prelude to Restoration: Laudians, Conformists and the Struggle for “Anglicanism” in the 1650s’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1992), 387. See also Anthony Milton, ‘The Creation of Laudianism’, 183.
most notably Edward Knott, gleefully cried “Tu quoque!” The Church of England was a deviant schism and the collapse of episcopal rule was the proof. More worryingly, as English divines sought repose abroad in Catholic regions, conversions to Rome reached a peak in the early 1650s as disillusioned divines swam the Tiber – including the son of John Cosin. Consequently, the defense of English episcopacy took centre stage and expressions of episcopal anti-Calvinism were limited to publishing strategies, which printed anti-Calvinist manuscripts from bygone eras. However, during the second half of the 1650s, episcopal Arminians instigated a more concerted attack on Calvinist soteriology.

Henry Hammond

At the centre of the hard fought custody battle for the Church of England was Henry Hammond. He was arguably the leading episcopal divine during the interregnum and would later be considered something of a patriarch for the Restoration church. Educated at Eton and Magdalene College (Oxford) where he remained a Fellow until 1634, Hammond was renowned for his comprehension of Greek and patristic writings. For a season, he straddled the growing divide between Royalists and Parliamentarians. A member of convocation and preferred to the archdeaconry of Chichester, he was nevertheless deemed sufficiently Reformed for nomination to the Westminster Assembly in 1642. However, Hammond refused to participate and soon published Practical Catechism (1644), demonstrating his growing incompatibility with the Westminster divines by formulating an ordo salutis, which reversed the Protestant order and posited a moral condition for justification. Thomas Barlow later claimed this was the first English attempt to introduce ‘obedience’ as a
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11 In response to a substantial Catholic work by John Austin entitled The Christian Moderator (1651-2), which referred to ‘the late Church of England’, Henry Hammond tabled his most substantial anti-Catholic writing: Of Schisme a Defence of the Church of England (1653) along with John Bramhall, A Just Vindication of the Church of England (1654). Meanwhile, Peter Gunning and John Pearson joined forces to publicly debate papists and Baptists.
12 Pocock referred to Hammond as ‘that refounder of Anglicanism’. See ‘Within the Margins’, 36.
13 John Fell, The Life of the Most Learned, Reverend and Pious Dr. H. Hammond (1662), xx.
condition of salvation, highlighting the novelty of Hammond’s approach. Indeed, given the Protestant shibboleth of sola fide, Hammond had to defend himself against charges of ‘abominable errours, damnable heresies, and horrid blasphemies’, though by the eighteenth-century this ‘neo-Arminian’ moral condition had gained the consensus in the ‘Anglican’ church. Michael McGiffert has demonstrated that Hammond himself migrated from moderate Calvinism on which he had been raised, to a ‘tacit Arminianism’ that matured through the 1650s. A Practical Catechism was therefore something of a mid-way point as Hammond insisted on ‘the principle of conditionality’ for salvation.

After serving as Chaplain to Charles I, Hammond spent the 1650s sequestered at the home of Sir John Packington in Worcestershire. From there he orchestrated a defense of the Church of England along with Gilbert Sheldon and other episcopalian. Hammond’s apologia was multi-faceted and prolific. He defended episcopacy against Presbyterians, Monarchy against Resistance theorists (including John Goodwin), English supremacy against Catholics and Grotian hermeneutics against Reformed divines. Indeed, Hammond’s Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament (1653), acknowledged a debt of gratitude to ‘the most judicious and learned Hugo Grotius’, whose anti-dogmatical approach subverted confessional methods of exegesis. Instead of mining the Biblical text for doctrinal truths, Grotius emphasized the use of philological methods in order to achieve a historical-grammatical description rather than a theologically driven interpretation. In keeping with the Grotian vogue, Hammond’s Annotations studiously avoided centuries of debate by abstaining from doctrinal discussion even when commenting on a locus classicus such as
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14 In Nicholas Tyacke, Aspects of English Protestantism, 284.
17 For biographical information on Hammond, see J. W. Packer, The Transformation of Anglicanism.
Romans chapter nine. Consequently, Reformed divines feared that Hammond’s introduction of the ‘Grotian way’ sheltered heterodox views, such as the Socinians, from the *regula fidei* of doctrinal orthodoxy. John Owen and Richard Baxter published lengthy ripostes, though both respected Hammond’s formidable stature as a ‘Clerical atlas’, bearing on his shoulders ‘the whole weight of the Episcopal cause’.

In 1654, Hammond published *Of Fundamentals* as something of an *Enchiridion* to inspire lay piety. Ostensibly, it outlined a minimal doctrinal foundation upon which to ‘erect a Church of pious livers, and to bring all rational men within the compasse of it’. However, lengthy digressions contained vociferous anti-Calvinism, denouncing ‘Solifidians’ who deny the necessity of good works, along with ‘fiduciaries’ who claim ‘full perswasion’ of salvation. He considered both a ‘great scandal’ and ‘block of offence’ to the cause of moral reformation. The paradigm within which Hammond’s critique functioned was ‘the reformation of morals’, which he considered ‘the superstructure of the Christian life’. *Of Fundamentals* outlined lengthy reasons why the twin Calvinist tenets of irrespective decrees and irresistible grace were ‘noxious’ and ‘evacuate all the force of these fundamentals, designed by God as motives of great energie to induce good life’. In place of these ‘artifices’, Hammond emphasized means of grace that ‘induce reformation’, especially the sacrament of baptism along with

19 For more on Hammond’s exegetical methods see Chapter Seven. For the influence of Hugo Grotius and the Great Tew Circle on Hammond, see Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, 119-146.
23 Ibid., 8, 120.
24 Ibid., 119.
25 Ibid., 156.
the eucharist, creeds, articles, liturgy and homilies belonging to the ‘Apostolicall Church’.26

Hammond’s use of ‘reformation’ was distinct and rooted in his commitment to a moral condition for justification. Instead of the noun ‘Reformed’, indicating a doctrinal tradition, Hammond gave preference to verbal forms that emphasized the process of moral transformation. Hammond rejected the solifidian emphasis on doctrinal credence, which he disparagingly referred to as a set of ‘orthodox opinions [that] are able to secure God’s favour’.27 Instead, he instigated a departure from the Reformed tradition, by advocating a religion founded on doctrines of conditional predestination and conditional justification, which provided motivation for moral ‘reformation’.28 Arguably, this was a more comprehensive departure than puritan Arminians, as Hammond stepped out of classic Protestantism and shifted the soteriological accent from doctrinal credence to moral obedience. As Allison has argued, Hammond and other ‘Holy living divines’ broke with the solifidian and imputationist traditions of English Protestantism and created a ‘watershed in the middle of the seventeenth century’.29 This ‘moralism’ began to distinguish episcopal Arminianism from the middle of seventeenth-century. By the eighteenth-century the ‘reformation of morals’ became a leitmotif in ‘Anglican’ theology and provoked the evangelical reaction of Methodism.30

26 Ibid., 217.
27 Ibid., 116.
28 It was the doctrinal combination that made Hammond’s theology unorthodox among English divines. Baxter was prepared to introduce a moral condition to justification, but insisted that predestination was unconditional. Goodwin taught conditional predestination but retained a solifidian commitment regarding justification.
29 Christopher Fitzsimons Allison, The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter (London: S.P.C.K, 1966), 112. However, Allison’s contrast of ‘classical Anglicans’ such as Hooker and Ussher with ‘holy living’ Caroline divines overstates the case and relies on a binary that arguably obscures more than it reveals.
30 Mark Smith charts the legacy of Hammond’s ‘new soteriology’ and argues that moral Arminianism came to dominate the Hanoverian church. However, Smith also refers to this as neo-Arminianism in recognition that it may have dominated later generations, but it was not the consensus view among other English Arminians during the 1650s. Mark Smith, ‘The Hanoverian Parish: Towards a New Agenda’, 85.
Hammond’s soteriological migration culminated in *Pacifick Discourse* (1660), which remained his only dedicated discussion of the nature of predestination and grace. It therefore revealed the more detailed contours of Henry Hammond’s Arminianism and will be analysed in Chapter Seven. In *Pacifick Discourse*, Hammond named his opponents as ‘Calvinists’ for the first time and considered the doctrines of ‘irrespective Decrees, and Grace irresistible’ to be ‘presumptions’. Hammond’s tactic was to assail his opponents by the testimony of an alleged Calvinist deserter, Robert Sanderson, who confessed to ‘quitting’ the Calvinist way in 1625. *Pacifick Discourse* therefore consisted of Hammond’s letters to Sanderson along with heavily edited extracts from Sanderson’s replies. Hammond sought to depict Sanderson and himself, along with the ‘Learned Bishop Overall’, as representatives of a moderate ‘Anglican’ *via media*, far removed from the extremes of Calvinism and maturely transcending the petty squabbles of Dort.

In a section entitled ‘Reflections on the Calvinists’, Hammond concluded that ‘predetermination’ and ‘irresistible grace’ contradict the ‘Catholick Doctrine of all ages’. Consequently, the tradition of the church ‘stands in opposition to the Calvinists’. Under ‘Reflections on the Arminians’, Hammond stated emphatically ‘I am no Arminian’, though he suggested Sanderson had been misled regarding the orthodoxy of Arminius and the Remonstrants. Indeed, it is ‘very strange that the Arminians are rejected by [the Calvinists] when in effect they do but repeat Christ’s own words’, for ‘all the Decrees whereof Scripture treateth, are conditionate’. Hammond subtly defended the Remonstrants throughout and portrayed their arguments as an echo of the Thirty-Nine Articles as interpreted by Andrewes and Overall. Indeed, in *Pacifick Discourse* Hammond worked as a
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skilled ventriloquist, communicating his Arminian theology through the mouthpiece of ‘our venerable Mother, the Church of England’. Though it claimed to represent a mature resolution to the quinquarticular debates, *Pacifick Discourse* was in fact an audacious attempt to confer the honourable status of ‘moderate’ on a heavily glossed Robert Sanderson and a decidedly Arminian Henry Hammond. Published on the eve of the Restoration, as Sanderson was made Bishop of Lincoln, it was a politically charged coup d’état, aimed at displacing Calvinism in the restored Church of England.

In 1653, Clement Barksdale an episcopal divine with Arminian sympathies, engaged in a heated public debate with other ministers at Winchcomb. When he referred to ‘the Learned and pious Doctor Hammond’, a heckler exclaimed ‘An Arminian, an Arminian!’ In response, Barksdale applied Hammond’s own tactic, declaring: ‘you are mistaken when you think the Doctrine of Universall Redemption Arminianism. It was the Doctrine of the Church of England before Arminius was born’. By depicting himself as a mere spokesperson for the historic Church of England and exuding an appearance of moderation, Hammond disguised his quite radical departure from the Reformed heritage of the English church.

Thomas Pierce

Thomas Pierce was undoubtedly the most aggressive anti-Calvinist in the 1650s. His frequent and ferocious attacks far exceeded anything by Montagu and the

35 *PD*, ‘Preface’, sig. a5v.
36 *PD* was also intended to counter the publication of fourteen of Sanderson’s sermons in 1657, which contained anti-Arminian statements. In response, Hammond argued they only contained ‘those Doctrines which he is now far from owning’. ‘Preface’, sig. a5v.
37 Clement Barksdale, *Nympha Libethris, or, The Cotswold Muse* (1651) included ‘Hammond’ and ‘Godwin’ as names worth of honour, along with praise for ‘learned Grotius’ (sig. A4v, 5, 85). Marco Barducci has argued that Barksdale’s work during the 1650s to translate and publish Grotius was intended to provide ‘the post-Laudian Anglican movement with a new foundational ideology which was Erastian, Arminian, moderate (tolerant), and irenicist’. Marco Barducci, ‘Clement Barksdale, Translator of Grotius: Erastianism and Episcopacy in the English Church, 1651–1658’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 25 (2010), pp. 265–280, 267.
38 Clement Barksdale, *The Disputation at Winchcomb* (1654), 44.
Laudians. Richard Baxter, was on the receiving end on one occasion and lamented his ‘venomous railing Pen and Tongue against the Puritans and Calvinists’. However, Pierce was also well educated and well connected. He matriculated from Magdalene College, trilingual in Hebrew, Greek and Latin and entered Holy orders through a clandestine ordination in 1646. During the 1650s he received patronage from the Countess of Sunderland and worked as tutor to her only son, Robert Spencer, the future secretary of State to James II. After the Restoration, he returned to Magdalene College as President and Chaplain-in-ordinary to the King. Samuel Pepys captured Pierce’s two sides: in his preaching he had ‘as much of natural eloquence as most men that I ever heard in my life, mixed with so much learning’, but ‘in his controversial writings there was more of the bitterness of gall than the smoothness of oil’.

* A Correct Copy (1655) was Pierce’s first anti-Calvinist salvo and it sparked an episode of *quinquarticular* controversy that ran right through to the Restoration. Pierce claimed that a manuscript from a ‘private conference’ was soon to be published by those intent on misconstruing his opinion. In a pre-emptive strike, he published his own summary. *A Correct Copy* targeted the twin doctrines of Calvinist soteriology, irrespective decrees and irresistible grace, labeling them ‘a cloud of blasphemies’, which ‘affirm that of [God], which [God] affirmed of the Devil’. Pierce even confessed that ‘the horrible decree’ of reprobation, ‘frightened me into my wits’. His Arminian commitments were clear throughout: ‘The whole Tenor of the Scriptures, in the Judgement of all the Fathers, who are best able to understand them, teacheth no other Praedestination, then in, and through Christ, which is respective and
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40 Pierce replacing Thomas Goodwin as president of Magdalene College in 1660 illustrated a momentous shift regarding the centre of gravity of English theology that was consolidated after the ‘Restoration’.
41 In Jon Parkin, ‘Pierce, Thomas (1621/2–1691)’, *ODNB*.
42 Thomas Pierce, *A Correct Copy of some Notes concerning Gods Decrees* (1655), 11, 24. *A Correct Copy* was quickly reprinted in 1657 and 1658, giving some indication of the scale of the controversy it sparked.
43 Ibid., 24. Pierce deliberately echoed Calvin’s famous phrase, regarding reprobation as ‘*Decretum quidem horrible*’. See *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III. 23. 7.
Pierce’s unprecedented antagonism sparked a concerted response from moderate Calvinists, including Henry Whitfield, William Barlee and Henry Hickman, with Edward Bagshaw and Richard Baxter also drawn into later rounds. An epistle by Reynolds, published by Barlee, bemoaned the fact that Pierce had brought the disputes of Dort to England: ‘I was sorry to see this controversy revived amongst us which caused antiently so much trouble to the Church of God, and in our memory so much danger and distemper to the Belgick Nation’.

Pierce rapidly published lengthy polemical responses, which contained little sustained doctrinal discussion due to the cut and thrust nature of close quarter combat. However, in these later works Pierce gave several autobiographical insights, which revealed another moderate Calvinist who migrated to full blown Arminianism. Pierce referred to ‘mistakes which once were mine own’, until during his time as a Fellow at Oxford, ‘by reading better books then I had formerly done, and by conversing with better company, and by non-resisting the grace of God, I look’d through the fallacies wherewith I had been blinded, and observed the ugliness of their looks’. His colleague, Henry Hammond, may have been the primary influence that saved him from the perceived epidemic of Calvinism: ‘I was gladder to be recovered from those diseases of the soul than from the painfulllest maladies’. Pierce boldly contended that his experience of theological migration from juvenile Calvinism to mature Arminianism was paradigmatic:

> For how many (besides my inconsiderable selfe) have been for absolute decrees in their dayes of Ignorance and Childehood, who growing to riper understandings, and reading better books, as well as conversing with
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48 Ibid., 7.
better company and obtaining some degree of manumission from passions and prejudices, have discerned those fallacies, wherewith (before) they have been blinded?  

In a bid to prove the point, Pierce adopted Hammond’s controversial strategy of acquisitions and mergers, purporting to show that several other prominent divines had migrated in their mature years, including ‘King James, and Bp. Andrewes, and good Melancthon, and the late Primate of Armagh, and learned Dr. Potter’. Each of these names was controversial, but none more so than the enigmatic Archbishop of Armagh, James Ussher. Pierce claimed that in private conversations with ‘Dr. Bernard and several others’, Ussher had disclosed a shift beyond hypothetical universalism to Arminianism: ‘he held the universality of Christ’s death; and not only in respect of sufficiency, but also in regard of efficacy, so that all men were thereby salvable… and that the grace of conversion was not irresistible’. When Ussher’s former chaplain, Nicholas Bernard, vehemently denied that Ussher had closed his life an Arminian, Pierce retreated to the more modest claim that Ussher adopted the position of John Overall. Pierce presented three ‘certificates’ as evidence – John Walton, Peter Gunning and Herbert Thorndike. In unison, they concurred that Ussher ‘did not approve the Doctrine of Geneva, but was wholly of Bishop Overalls opinion’ (Walton) and that Ussher had concluded his life with the simple testimony: ‘Bishop Overal was in the right, and I am of his mind’ (Gunning). Whether Ussher made this alleged move away from Calvinism is doubtful. It maybe better explained by the inherent ambiguity of Ussher’s hypothetical universalism, which left the door open for this ‘high-church kidnapping’. As Alan Ford concludes, Ussher’s alleged ‘conversion’ was

49 Ibid., 77. Pierce later summarized the point succinctly: ‘men follow Calvin in their younger, and Arminius in their riper years’. He claimed this was true for ‘almost All the great Scholars the world hath bred’. An Impartial Inquiry, ‘Preface’, sig. c3, b3.  
50 Ibid., 7.  
51 Thomas Pierce, Heautontimoroumenos, or, the Self-Revenger, 154.  
52 Ibid., 154, 156.  
53 Alan Ford, "Making Dead Men Speak", in Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History, 1600-1800, ed. by Mark Williams and Stephen Paul Forrest (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 49-70, 64.
little more than ‘Anglican, anti-Calvinist wish-fulfillment’. However, Pierce knew what was at stake: ‘if my L. Primate forsook those Doctrines which he and his party are wont to plead for, it is some discredit to their Cause, that so great a person thought fit to leave’.

In their appropriation of high profile episcopal divines, Hammond and Pierce illustrated the early modern ‘rule of moderation’, which disguised Machiavellian tactics as reason and restraint in the face of excess. As Ethan Shagan has demonstrated, ‘moderation was simultaneously peace and coercion, a state of equipoise and an act of control’. Episcopal Arminians therefore exuded a carefully stylized image of moderation and sought to construct a historic and pan-European coalition of anti-Calvinist divines, who could be depicted as the rightful occupants of the centre ground of Protestantism in general and the Church of England in particular. Pierce therefore elevated Melancthon to the status of the archetypal reformer who offered a mature and moderate approach. ‘This Melancthon was, and is still the Darling, (more than any one man) of the Reformed part of the Christian world: so much the rather, because besides his vast learning, unbyass’t judgement, and transcendent piety, he was almost proverbial for moderation’. As Wallace has noted, English anti-Calvinists as early as Peter Baro had appealed to Melancthon as a Protestant alternative, who unlike Erasmus, avoided the charge of Romanizing. Melancthon’s soteriological synergism combined with his commitment to episcopal polity made him a name to conjure with for English episcopal Arminians throughout the 1650s. Indeed,
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Pierce considered Melancthon and the Augsburg Confession, associated with Philippist Lutherans, to be the foremost summary of doctrine, in full harmony with the Thirty-Nine Articles. Within the English church Melancthon ‘was esteemed farre above Mr. Calvin’.\textsuperscript{59} Pierce therefore identified himself with Melancthon and his ‘worthy disciple, Hemmingius’: ‘If Mr. B. [Barlee] would needs call me by any new Name, it should have been Melancthonian, not a Pelagian, or an Arminian’.\textsuperscript{60}

Having defined Melancthon as the personification of Protestant moderation, Pierce attempted to align more controversial names with him. In particular, Arminius was ‘so much a follower of Melancthon, that we call him Melancthonian’.\textsuperscript{61} This rhetorical sleight of hand attempted to smuggle Arminianism onto the centre ground of Protestantism by considering it merely a subset of the more venerable species. In addition to Melancthonians and Arminians, Pierce venerated Lancelot Andrewes ‘the strings of whole sandals I am not worthy to untie’, ‘the incomparable Bishop’ Overall, the ‘Immortal Grotius’ and Henry Hammond worthy of ‘honour and veneration’.\textsuperscript{62} The clear intent was to define English orthodoxy according to an episcopal-style Arminianism and thereby to marginalize Calvinists.

By 1658, Pierce sensed the tide was turning against both the Republic and its incumbent Calvinism: ‘The Erroneous side of the controversies is grown feeble and dispirited’.\textsuperscript{63} He therefore intensified his attacks and attempted to shame Calvinists into submission through guilt by association. In particular, he highlighted the contest between the Irish Bishop, John Bramhall, and Thomas Hobbes, accusing Calvinists of spawning the ‘determination of Mr. Hobbs’. Equally, Pierce considered Calvinism guilty of causing the opposite threat of

\textsuperscript{59} Thomas Pierce, \textit{The Divine Purity Defended}, 14.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 14. Niels Hemmingius was a Danish Lutheran and protégé of Melancthon. He developed a Lutheran soteriology that resembled some aspects of Dutch Arminianism. See Chapter Five.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 14.
\textsuperscript{62} Thomas Pierce, \textit{A Correct Copy of some Notes}, 42.
‘English Libertines’ such as the ‘Ranters’. Pierce therefore appealed for a ‘return’ to the true religion of Protestants, which he claimed was both anti-Catholic and anti-Calvinist. By the end of the Interregnum, Pierce’s polemics had caused a ‘major debate’, which ‘drew in the some of the most important religious controversialists of the 1650s’. Even his Arminian mentor grew tired of Pierce’s penchant for controversy: ‘Mr. Pierce is still in the press. I know not how long it will be ere he get out of it’. In this battle of attrition, Pierce’s relentless attacks finally took their toll on Calvinist resistance.

Herbert Thorndike

Herbert Thorndike tabled the most scholarly and sophisticated Arminianism by an episcopal divine during the 1650s. It would also prove to be the closest formulation to Arminius himself, drawing on the scholastic concept of *scientia media* to preserve divine sovereignty and future contingency. Thorndike was trained in divinity at Cambridge and became a Patristic specialist. He later taught Ancient Near Eastern languages at Oxford and made a significant contribution to Brian Walton’s ground breaking *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (1657). After 1654, sequestered from his rectory at Barley and having had his Trinity College fellowship rescinded, Thorndike believed the pen to be mightier than the sword and set about writing complex tomes, which culminated in *An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England* (1659). This work comprised three books and nearly one thousand pages of densely written prose, published on the eve of the Restoration. Thorndike’s *magnum opus* attempted to harmonise a quasi-Catholic approach to ecclesiastical polity, a puritanesque commitment to covenant
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67 For a helpful analysis of Thorndike’s use of *scientia media*, see Michael McGiffert, ‘Herbert Thorndike and the Covenant of Grace’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 58 (2007), pp. 440-460. The use of middle knowledge will be considered in Part II.
theology and a decidedly Arminian formulation of the doctrines of grace. This enigmatic combination combined with Thorndike's rather tortuous style limited his prominence, until the nineteenth-century Oxford movement appropriated his writings. In short, Thorndike was 'an original, critical, and scholarly theologian and biblical commentator who began his career as a moderate Calvinist and ended it... as a forerunner of the Tractarians'.

Book II of *An Epilogue* was entitled *Of the Covenant of Grace* and contained Thorndike's most sustained piece of anti-Calvinism. Thorndike leveraged the inherently conditional nature of covenant theology to suit his Arminian agenda. He strenuously upheld Augustinian original sin (*contra* Jeremy Taylor) and yet posited sufficient regenerating grace through baptism to 'utterly deface' the effects of the fall. Through divine 'helps', the new covenant allowed human free will to play a determinative role: 'the condition of the covenant of grace implyeth a resolution generally to obay all that Christianity injoyneth... Christianity then supposeth free choice'. These divine 'helps' were providential moments of grace, including preaching and the sacraments, offering incentives for moral action, which in turn led to further 'helps'. Consequently, at the core of Thorndike's soteriology was the 'divine-human reciprocity of pledge and performance'. However, this was sacramental Arminianism as divine helps were mediated exclusively by the church: 'that grace which is immediately sufficient to save, he hath not immediately provided for all mankind, but hath trusted his Church to provide it for the rest of mankind, having left them meanes sufficient to do it'.

Thorndike considered Calvinist decrees to be 'monstrous' and puritans to be 'fanaticks' and 'schismaticks' but he was also conscious of opposite dangers. To
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navigate a mediating course, he appropriated *scientia media* as the latest and most sophisticated scholastic resource that promised to accommodate human agency without diminishing divine sovereignty:

> [T]hough God determine not by His immediate act the free will of man to do or not to do this or that, yet He hath determined from everlasting the events of all future contingencies, by determining the objects, whether inward or outward, which all men in all occasions that shall come to pass, shall meet with; knowing, that the consideration of them will move them effectually to resolve upon doing or not doing that which they shall do or not do.\(^{73}\)

Despite foregrounding divine ‘helps’ and human free will under the covenant of grace, Thorndike remained committed to an unseen divine orchestration such that finally, God ‘hath determined from everlasting, the events of all future contingencies’. Thorndike’s use of *scientia media* to reconcile human free will with meticulous providence borrowed heavily from Catholic Scholastics such as Luis de Molina along with Arminius and the early Remonstrants.\(^{74}\) However, by the 1650s most English Arminians could not tolerate even this level of divine control, migrating further from a Reformed approach to divine providence than Arminius and the early Remonstrants had done.\(^{75}\) Indeed, among interregnum episcopal Arminians, Thorndike appears to have been alone in his reliance on *scientia media*. He also demonstrated significant engagement with Catholic divines and regularly referenced the controversy *de Auxiliis* between the Jesuits and Dominicans. Thorndike was keen to note that the Catholic, Lutheran and English churches had all refused to sanction either side of the debate:

> I am much in feare that our Puritan Preachers when they swagger over the Arminians in their pulpits, do neither inform them, how great a part of

\(^{73}\) *An Epilogue*, II. 189.

\(^{74}\) The reception of *scientia media* within the English Arminian tradition will be considered in Part II.

\(^{75}\) This claim will be demonstrated in Part II. It calls into question the suggestion by Jae-Eun Park that *scientia media* was widely appropriated by English Arminians. Jae-Eun Park, ‘John Plaifere (D. 1632) on Conditional Predestination: A Well-Mixed Version of Scientia Media and Resistible Grace’, *Reformation & Renaissance Review*, 18 (2016), pp. 155-173.
the reformation as all the Lutherans make is on their side (neither the Church of England nor that of Rome having given sentence in the whole question) nor what difficulties their own opinion is liable to... the whole church before the reformation, and, since the Reformation, all that adhere to the confession of Ausburg, in this point, are in the balance against Calvine and his followers.\(^{76}\)

Despite his commitment to a theologically conservative form of Arminianism, Thorndike was united with Hammond and Pierce in assailing the Calvinist hegemony. Together they sought to construct a new English orthodoxy, which was prepared to embrace doctrines of Jesuits, Lutherans and Arminians whilst rejecting Calvinism \textit{in toto}.

Laurence Womock

The controversialist, Laurence Womock, also entered the fray and tabled three major anti-Calvinist works in the late 1650s. Womock’s preoccupation was to discredit the Synod of Dort. His first work, \textit{Tilenus against the Triers} (1657), took up the cause of Daniel Tilenus. This enigmatic Huguenot adopted Arminian sympathies, became an open critic of the Synod of Dort, taught at the \textit{Academie de Sedan} and clashed with the renowned Calvinist Pierre Du Moulin. Womock’s fictional dialogues imagined Tilenus before the Presbyterian Triers who were typecast as \textit{Dr. Absolute, Mr. Narrowgrace, Mr. Friable, Mr. Knowlittle} and \textit{Mr. Efficax}. Tilenus contended that Dort’s determinism implied for the reprobate: ‘the decree of God hath made [salvation] impossible. You may as well say, that a dogg can fly, and a horse become an excellent philosopher’.\(^{77}\) For Womock, Calvinism was guilty of predetermination, which undermined the ‘main end of the office ministerial... to comfort the afflicted and doubtful’.\(^{78}\) Womock’s Tilenus also conveyed a rather English episcopal concern that, ‘we shall find no more use or comfort in the sacraments’.\(^{79}\) The attraction of Melancthonian moderation was

\(^{76}\) An Epilogue, II. 165, 284.
\(^{77}\) Laurence Womock, The Examination of Tilenus Before the Triers (1657), ‘Praefatory Epistle’, sig. [A8v-r].
\(^{78}\) Ibid., 69.
\(^{79}\) Ibid., 83.
also on display. Doctrines ‘consonant... to the sacred Scriptures and right Reason, as to primitive Antiquity’ were ‘maintained by Melancthon and other Moderate Lutherans’ and later taken up by the ‘acute wit, and solid judgment and great learning of James Hermine’. According to Womock, these doctrines ‘quickly found a cheerful reception and great multitudes of followers in the Beligick Churches’. It was only a post-Dort slur campaign that had weakened this otherwise ancient consensus.

Richard Baxter was the primary reason for Womock’s follow up work, _Arcana Dogmatum_ (1659). In _The Grotian Religion Discovered_ (1658), Baxter attacked both Pierce’s defense of Grotius and Womock’s defense of Tilenus. Baxter sought to defend Dort by presenting its views as moderate and chastising Womock for his straw-man attacks that were guilty of ‘unworthy falsification’. In typical fashion, Baxter assumed a posture of neutrality and constructed an irenic version of Arminianism and Calvinism, which conveniently drew both into the centre: ‘I am grown to a very great confidence that most of our contentions about those points, are more about words then matter’. In a bold attempt to outflank Grotian ecumenism, Baxter had attempted to depict the Canons of Dort as an irenic mediating position: ‘the Synod gives as much as the Arminians or Jesuites to Universal Grace, both in Decree, Redemption, and Execution by Collation of Grace; but they give more to the Elect’.

However, episcopal Arminians were in no mood for making peace and refused to accept that Calvinism and Arminianism were different sides of the same coin. Instead, Womock accused Baxter of being riddled with contradictions: ‘Mr. B calls that a fiction and abusive language which is the clear doctrine of the Synod’. For Womock, Calvinism was not moderate or ‘Catholick’ but dangerous _Arcana_, for ‘they have wrapt up their decrees and Canons in so many clouds, and confounded

80 These were anglicized transliterations of Arminius’ Dutch names.
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84 Laurence Womock, _Arcana Dogmatum Anti-Remonstrantium. Or the Calvinists Cabinet unlock’d_ (1659), 370.
them with so many intricacies... that they are like to fall into a New Schisme’. Calvinism therefore ‘deflowers the beauty of [divine] Attributes, evacuates the merits of Christs Death, frustrates the use of Holy Ordinances, and enervates the power of Godliness’. For Womock, Baxter’s efforts to redeem Calvinism were fatally flawed by a central contradiction: ‘The Synod grants an Evangelicall command, without Evangelicall power to perform it’. For Womock, this flaw had been exposed by ‘the most Learned and judicious Heads’ and he cited Arminius, Tilenus, Amyraldus, Junius and even Piscator as those who have either renounced Calvinism or made some ‘retractions’. In short, ‘Truth abideth on the Remonstrants side’.

In the euphoric atmosphere of the Restoration, Womock published his most strident anti-Calvinism, *The Result of False Principles* (1661). From the first page, he charged Reformed soteriology with a threefold failure, deeming it:

I. Not practicable in the exercise of the Ministerial Function
II. Not serviceable to the interest of souls
III. And not according to Godliness.

Womock then formulated a practical syllogism to assess the veracity of doctrine:

[Major premise] ‘Those Articles of Religion, which are unprofitable for Doctrine... are not practicable in the exercise of the Ministerial Function’
[Minor premise] ‘The Articles of religion concerning Gods decrees... drest up by supralapsarians... or sublapsarians are unprofitable for Doctrine’
[Conclusion] ‘Therefore The Articles of Religion concerning Gods Decrees... are not practicable in the exercise of the Ministerial Function’.

This syllogism reflected the moral concern of Hammond and also charged Calvinism with undermining the sacraments and polity of the Church of England.
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Fictional dialogues followed, in which Reformed theology faced a pastoral onslaught from ‘Paganus’, ‘Animalis’, ‘Securus’, Praesumptuous’ and ‘Desolatus’. However, on each occasion the incumbent Calvinist divine, ‘Diotrephes’, failed to curb error or comfort despair. Only in the final dialogue is hope restored as ‘Desolatus’ finds deliverance through the introduction of a new counsellor, the good ‘Samaritus’ whose doctrine was, unsurprisingly, thoroughly Arminian.

Womock finished the work with *A Briefe Account of the Synod of Dort*, based on abridged sections of letters from two of the British delegation. John Hales and Walter Balcanquahall had allegedly recorded their disapproval regarding treatment of the Remonstrants, concluding that ‘this factious Provincial Party swayed matters in this Synod’. Womock argued that the British divines had rejected the Calvinism of Gomarus and ‘vindicated the Lutherans to be part of the Reformed Churches’. It was no coincidence that Hales’s *Golden Remains* appeared for the first time in 1659, followed in quick succession by Womock’s partisan commentary in *A Briefe Account*. They were part of a concerted strategy by episcopal anti-Calvinists to discredit the Synod of Dort and to persuade the Church of England to ‘bid goodnight to John Calvin’. To drive the wedge in further, Womock also included Thomas Goad’s *Disputation Concerning Contingency and Necessity*, as an appendix, which was first published by John Goodwin earlier in 1661. The publication of Goad’s *Disputation* by a regicidal puritan and a royalist episcopalian in the same year, illustrates the way anti-Calvinist sentiment had crossed party lines during the 1650s.
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92 Diotrephes was a Biblical character condemned for being disrespectful to authority, teaching distractions and preventing others coming to faith (3 John 9-11).
93 Ibid., 225.
94 Ibid., 231.
95 As Milton has noted, the Dutch Remonstrant Philip van Limborch quickly translated Womock’s *A Briefe Account* into Dutch having been alerted to the work by Thomas Pierce. See Anthony Milton, ‘A Distorting Mirror’, 141-2.
96 In the light of such partisan agendas, ‘all accounts of the Synod… need to carry a government health warning’. Ibid.127.
Peter Heylyn

Peter Heylyn offered one of the final anti-Calvinist salvos of the interregnum. As Milton has noted, Heylyn was another example of a divine who migrated from Calvinist sympathies toward full-blown Arminianism. However as early as the 1630s, Heylyn’s anti-Calvinism became evident and he gained favour with both Laud and later Charles I. His subsequent publications were in the style of ‘purposive history’, ranging from historical Geography (Cosmographie, 1652), a biography of Archbishop Laud (Cyripius Anglicus, 1668), plus attacks on puritan sabbatarianism (Respondet Petrus, 1658) and Presbyterian polity (Ecclesia vindicata, 1657; Aerius redivius, 1672). These writings were peppered with pejorative references to those dubbed ‘Calvinians’, with the oft repeated refrain that the English Reformation ‘no regard had to Luther or Calvin’. Given his penchant for constructing polemical histories, Heylyn was well placed to respond to Henry Hickman’s attacks on his comrades. In A Justification of the Fathers and Schoolmen (1659), Hickman had argued from history ‘that not the Remonstrant, but the Contra-remonstrant opinion hath been the Doctrine of the Reformed Church of England’. In Laudensium Apostasia (1660) he named Hammond, Pierce, Heylyn and Taylor as ‘Canterburians’, who were attempting a full-scale counter reformation. Having ‘removed the old landmarks placed by our Protestant Forefathers... They do pretend great Antiquity for their Opinions’. Heylyn soon tabled a three-part history as a new weapon in the quinquarticular war. Aptly named Historia Quin-quarticularis (1660), it was Heylyn’s ‘first and only extended engagement with predestinarian issues’. However, as part of a broader contest to define the heritage of ecclesia Anglicana, the work exuded a breadth of anti-Calvinism that was not restricted to soteriology. Indeed, outbursts of political anti-Calvinism surfaced as Heylyn accused ‘Calvinians’ of

98 Peter Heylyn, Cyripius Anglicus (1668), 3-4, 36.
99 Henry Hickman, Patro-Scholastiko-Dikaiosis, or, A justification of the Fathers and the Schoolmen (1659), 'Preface', sig. a3v.
100 Henry Hickman, Laudensium Apostasia: or A Dialogue (1660), 'Preface', sig. a3v.
101 Anthony Milton, Laudian and Royalist Polemic, 179.
causing not godly reformation but subversive revolutions: ‘Who seeth not the confusion of all common-wealths to depend hereupon? What Prince may sit safely in the seate of his Kingdome? What subject may live quietly?’

In *Historia*, Heylyn set out his conclusion from the start: ‘...I hope it will appear that Calvinism was not the native and original Doctrin of the Church of England, though in short time it over spread a great part thereof, as Arianism did the Eastern Churches’. Indeed, without precedent, John Calvin had begun to play deviant doctrinal notes and ‘all his followers since have danced to the tune thereof’. The polemical history that followed considered the Greek fathers normative and Augustine an aberration due to his over-reaction to Pelagius. *Historia* then homed in on the sixteenth-century to discredit the legacy of Wycliffe, Tyndale and Foxe, along with other ‘moderne Calvinists’ such as Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli, whose influence on English liturgy Heylyn deemed unfortunate. Most importantly, the early English Reformers ‘had no respect of Calvin’, Zwingli or the ‘strict Lutherans’. Instead, Heylyn argued that the English church had relied at times ‘word for word’ on the ‘Augsburg Confession’ and ‘ascribed much to the authority of Melancthon’. Heylyn’s Catholic sympathies also deferred to Tridentine Doctrine and the Erasmian tradition on occasion. After all, it was Melancthon not Calvin that was invited to England, and Erasmus’ *Paraphrases* that were placed in every Parish by royal authority, not Calvin’s *Institutes*. In short, the English Church had always drawn a clear doctrinal line and Calvinism was on the wrong side of it:

English Protestants, Belgic Remonstrants, Melancthonian Lutherans, together with Jesuits and Franciscans on the one side, and the English

---

103 Ibid., 'To Reader', sig. B2v.
104 Ibid., II. 64.
105 Ibid., II. 18.
106 Ibid., II. 19. As Dodds has argued, Erasmus, was the other significant non-Calvinist episcopalian appropriated by Hammond, Pierce, Heylyn and later Edward Stillingfleet. However, his Catholicism made him less convenient than Melancthon. Gregory Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2009).
Calvinists, the Contra-Remonstrants, the Rigid Lutherans and Dominican Friars on the other side.\textsuperscript{107}

Heylyn had to work history hard to generate this narrative, but he considered even this the fault of Calvinism: ‘observe how hard it is to recover an old doctrinal truth, when overborn and almost lost by the continual prevalency of a busie faction’.\textsuperscript{108}

Other episcopal divines also contributed to the Arminian cause during the interregnum, including Jeremy Taylor, Tristram Sugge and Richard Allestree.\textsuperscript{109} Their moral ‘style’ generated a devotional theology that offered pastoral assurance through moral obedience. In particular, Jeremy Taylor’s \textit{The Rule and exercise of Holy Living} (1650) \& \textit{Holy Dying} (1651) and Richard Allestree’s \textit{The Whole Duty of Man} (1658) became devotional classics. As Spurr notes: ‘\textit{The Whole Duty of Man} managed to be both singular and typical. It became the most successful book of the age, in the possession of perhaps one out of ten households’\textsuperscript{,110} Though their works avoided doctrinal discussions related to the Quinquarticular debates, their devotional style gave popular appeal to episcopal-style Arminianism by placing good works and ‘Holy Living’ centre stage.\textsuperscript{111}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Historia Quinqu-Articularis}, III. 109-10.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., III. 110.
\textsuperscript{110} John Spurr, \textit{The Restoration Church of England}, 282.
\textsuperscript{111} These episcopal Arminians formed a loosely co-coordinated network of anti-Calvinist resistance and Richard Royston was the printer for their circle in 1650s – including the works of Hammond, Taylor, Womock and Pierce. See \textit{Registers of the Stationers Company}, Vol. II 1655-1675.
\end{flushright}
Distinctives of Episcopal-Style Arminianism

Despite reaching similar conclusions regarding predestination, episcopal divines displayed an Arminian style quite distinct from their puritan counterparts. In 1662, Zachary Mayne highlighted one notable difference by constructing a spectrum of approaches to justification. Luther and antinomians formed one extreme under the motto ‘DO NOTHING’. However, episcopal divines, who ‘bend the stick too much the other way’, were the ‘other extrem’ due to their error in making morality the ‘chief condition’ of justification.\(^{112}\) Mayne considered Goodwin and Baxter midpoints, with Goodwin furthest away from the episcopal divines. Whereas the moralists taught that ‘the righteousness of Faith is... a Christ-like Nature in mans soul’, Goodwin held to a form of forensic justification, which never ‘allowes Evangelical Works’ as a condition for remission of sins.\(^{113}\)

Keen to underscore his distance from anti-solidifidian episcopalians, Goodwin wrote an Advertising for Mayne’s treatise in which he warned against those theologians ‘of a Legal spirit’ who were drifting back to Rome.\(^{114}\) Indeed, episcopal Arminians were characterised by an anti-solidifidian moral style combined with a sacramental emphasis, which markedly distinguished them from puritan Arminians.

Political anti-Calvinism was another distinct feature of the ‘Canterburian’ Arminians.\(^{115}\) As sequestered Royalists, they considered themselves in exile under Cromwellian rule. Thomas Pierce concluded the preface to his publication of lectures by Lancelot Andrewes with a reference to the Church of England ‘in

\(^{112}\) Zachary Mayne, *St. Paul’s Travailing Pangs, with his Legal-Galatians* (1662), ‘Preface’, sig. [A7v].

\(^{113}\) Ibid., ‘Preface’, sig. [A7-8].

\(^{114}\) Ibid., ‘Advertisement to the Reader’.

\(^{115}\) Milton has summarized anti-Calvinist attacks by earlier English divines on Calvin and Beza due to their Presbyterian polity, which threatened English episcopalianism. Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 448-61.
the dayes of her mourning and captivity'. Consequently, episcopal Arminians made every effort to associate Calvinism with both the embarrassment of regicide and the problems that plagued the republic thereafter, including the insurgence of sects and heresies. As Hammond argued: ‘the Writers of Politicks warn us of the noxiousness of this doctrine to all civil governments’. When ‘imbibed by Governours’, Calvinism is ‘very apt to instill into them principles of tyrannie, if it be but by imitating and transcribing from God the notions which they have received of him’. Equally, Heylyn argued that Calvinism was a form of determinism akin to the ‘stoicks… which opinion because it destroyed the state of a Commonwealth was banished out of Rome’. Episcopal Arminians therefore echoed Montagu’s headline, which associated Calvinism with ‘fanatick’ puritans who were socially and politically subversive and ‘most contrary to the outward peace of a Church or Nation’. From the vantage point of the Restoration, Thomas Pierce reflected on the ‘Defensive war’ that had been fought against the ‘enemies of God, and of his Anointed (both King, and Church)’. Episcopal Arminianism was therefore an intensely political enterprise during the contest for the Church of England.

However, the most notable distinctive of episcopal-style Arminians was the coordinated effort to construct an anti-Calvinist tradition for the Church of England. In contradistinction to puritan Arminians, ‘Canterburians’ sought to distance themselves from Calvin and other continental Reformed divines, who they dismissed as ‘moderne Calvinists’. The list of names to conjure with was therefore quite different for episcopal Arminians. They attempted to draw over to their side a venerable tradition of continental anti-Calvinists, including Catholics such as Erasmus, Melancthon and other Lutherans, as well as Arminius

---

116 Lancelot Andrewes, *Apospasmatica Sacra*, 7. This phrase alluded to the ‘Babylonian captivity of the Church’, a period in the fourteenth-century when the papal enclave was located in Avignon.

117 Thomas Pierce claimed that Calvinist ‘Blasphemie’ regarding the predetermination of sin had been ‘suck’d in greedily by the Ranters’ and other ‘Libertines’ during the interregnum. *An Impartial Inquiry*, ‘Preface’, sig. a4v.

118 *Of Fundamentals*, 173, 177-8.

119 *Historia Quinque-Articularis*, I. 79-80.

120 *PD*, 17.

However, the greatest energy was spent on accumulating a portfolio of English and Irish episcopalian. As well as infamous anti-Calvinists such as Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall, great efforts were made to display Robert Sanderson and James Ussher as mature converts from Calvinism. The controversy that ensued served to highlight the potency of reputational value and strategic association during this *quinquarticular* war.

In order to erase the Calvinist heritage from the English record, the early modern shibboleth of ‘moderation’ was frequently invoked. By fashioning bipolar binaries, Calvinism was set at one extreme with opposing errors such as Pelagianism and Socinianism at the other. Meanwhile, Arminianism was subtly brought in from the margins and considered part of the *via media* and in full accord with the Articles and liturgy of the Church of England. This polemical reconstruction of the English spectrum demonstrated that ‘orthodoxy’ and ‘heresy’ were not fixed entities but ‘sites of conflict and contest’. Indeed, as Peter Lake has argued, ‘moderate’ was an inherently relative and malleable term that could be tailored to suit various interests. By depicting Calvinists as Hobbesian ‘fanatics’ or ‘Stoick extrems’ and the Church of England as the mature golden mean, episcopal Arminians concealed an iron fist in the velvet glove of moderation. Beyond the Restoration, their tactics proved successful and Calvinism was widely discredited as a puritan aberration. MacCulloch therefore rightly concluded that ‘the Restoration Church had altered its latitude in both senses’. Not only did it shift the centre of gravity away from Reformed

---

122 Significantly, their unreserved appeal to Lutherans went beyond early Stuart Laudians. As Milton has observed, Laud, Plaifere and Potter criticized the ferocity of Lutheran attacks on continental Reformed divines. However, by the 1650s, episcopal Arminians exhibited an intensity of anti-Calvinism that matched their Lutheran counterparts and exceeded their Laudian forefathers. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 443-4.

123 Pierce insisted that there was ‘perfect Amitie, and Communion of Episcopal Divines, for all their difference in judgment as to some controverted matters’. *An Impartial Inquiri*, ‘Preface’, sig. c4v.

124 Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church*, xx.

125 Peter Lake, ‘Predestinarian Propositions’, 110.

Protestantism but also ‘destroyed the latitude’ of a church that had previously encompassed both Lancelot Andrewes and William Perkins.\textsuperscript{127}

As this chapter has demonstrated, changes to English theology associated with the Restoration church can be traced back to the 1650s, when episcopal Arminians staged a major overhaul of the Reformed heritage of the English church, all the while insisting that their Arminian convictions were both moderate and historic. Womock therefore flatly denied ‘M. Hickmans suggestion, that his \textit{Quinquarticular} opinions were the Doctrine of the Church of \textit{England}', leaving Hickman to lament: ‘But alas! It is too evident that some of our Canterburians... have removed the old landmarks placed by our Protestant Forefathers, and are gone over into the Tents and Camps of our adversaries’.\textsuperscript{128}

However, as Hickman also shrewdly observed, his opponents betrayed their own claims and bore witness to a quite radical theological departure within the English church. Despite attempts at concealment, their biographies testified against their fabricated histories: ‘How comes it to pass, that those who now follow \textit{Arminius}, did heretofore follow Mr. \textit{Calvin}? ...[D]id not the Parents, Masters, Tutors of these persons know what the Doctrine of the Church of \textit{Engl. was}?’\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Arcana Dogmatum}, 'Praefatory Epistle', sig. a2; Hickman, \textit{Laudensium Apostasia, or A Dialogue}, 'Preface', sig. a3v.
\textsuperscript{129} Hickman, \textit{Patro-Scholastiko-Dikaiösis}, 'Preface' sig. b3v-r.
CHAPTER FOUR

Sectarian-Style Arminianism
For the present state of the old World... is running up like parchment in the fire, and wearing away.¹

The insurgence of radical ideas, sects and publications throughout the 1640s and 50s brought a third ‘style’ of anti-Calvinism to the fore. A proliferation of fissiparous networks along with more formalized movements flourished under the relative amnesty of Cromwellian toleration – including ‘Anabaptists’, ‘Levellers’, ‘Diggers’, ‘Ranters’, ‘Muggletonians’, ‘Quakers’, ‘Fifth Monarchists’.² Much to the disgust of ordained divines, even ‘soap boilers’ and women morphed into ‘mechanicall’ preachers who turned tubs upside down as makeshift pulpits and turned the world upside down in the process.³ In particular, those committed to an immanentist and charismatic religion considered the strictures of Reformed Orthodoxy suffocating. However, as Paul Lim has demonstrated, Socinian ‘rationalists’ also undermined the Reformed tradition. Indeed, anti-Calvinism was one of three major areas of convergence between the proponents of “radical religion”, and “rational religion”...Calvinism was, unequivocally, the bête noire of both these groups’.⁴ Consequently, those committed to a rationalist hermeneutic that removed mystery from religion and those committed to the unio mystico that ‘godded’ the believer, both chipped away at the Calvinist hegemony throughout the 1650s. The millenarian hope that underpinned the English Revolution therefore struggled to survive the blizzard of heterodox ideas propagated by ‘Munster fanaticks’.⁵ Instead of a magisterial reformation, English

¹ Anonymous, *The True Levellers Standard Advanced* (1649), 7. This quote has been attributed to the Leveller, Gerrard Winstanley.
² These terms were originally pejorative and remain problematic. For a helpful summary of the historiographical debates regarding ‘radicals’ and ‘radicalism’ and a vindication of the continued use of these terms, see 'Introduction: Reappraising Early Modern Radicals and Radicalism' in Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan, eds., *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 1-29.
³ Daniel Featley’s *Dippers Dipt* (1645) attacked uneducated lay preachers whom he dubbed ‘Mechanick Enthusiasts’.
⁴ Lim, *Mystery Unveiled*, 72. Socinian anti-Calvinism will also be referenced in Chapter Seven.
⁵ See Thomas Edwards, *The Third Part of Gangraena* (1646). Munster was the scene of a violent rebellion by radical Anabaptists (1534-5).
divines increasingly feared a radical reformation: ‘Having set out to erect the new Jerusalem, conservative Puritans now found themselves looking at a new Babel’.6

Any attempt to summarize the doctrinal tenets of diverse and competing sectarian groups must proceed with caution. Puritan and episcopal Arminians amounted to loose networks of coordinated resistance to Calvinism, each displaying a distinct approach built around certain commonalities. Consequently, they can be appropriately assessed as collective styles, with John Goodwin and Henry Hammond as representative figures whose theologies will be more closely considered in Part II. However, sectarians represented divergent networks without a cohesive ideology or approach. Consequently, this chapter will be more cautious in drawing overall conclusions, and Part II will resist the temptation to complete the set by elevating one sectarian as representative of such a diverse and conflicting range of English Arminians.

The rationale for distinguishing sectarians from the puritan mainstream must also be carefully teased out. Recent historiography has drawn attention to the Reformed and puritan heritage of even the most radical sectarians. Political movements, such as the ‘Levellers’ and ‘Diggers’ were far more theologically informed than previous Marxist scholarship implied.7 Sectarian movements had their roots in puritanism, sharing its impulse for a religion of immediacy and interiority over and against the sacramentalism of Catholics and Laudians. As Geoffrey Nuttall noted, puritanism ‘evinced itself to be a movement towards immediacy in relation to God’ and sects like the ‘Quakers’ were a radical extension of core tendencies among the godly.8 Thus the relationship between sectarians and puritanism involved both continuity and change, with many high profile ‘radicals’ steeped in a thoroughly Reformed heritage before migrating

---

7 Ariel Hessayon has demonstrated that Gerard Winstanley’s heterodox religious views were the by-product of his journey from puritan roots and his creative application of General Baptist tenets. ‘Gerard Winstanley, Radical Reformer’ in Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context, ed. by Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 87-122.
‘leftward’. Additionally, McDowell has demonstrated the surprising number of Oxbridge educated sectarians (e.g. Richard Overton, Abiezer Coppe, Samuel Fisher, John Rogers, John Biddle) who used their access as literati to attack the cloisters of learning. Sectarian movements also comprised a significant proportion of the ‘middling sort’ whose lay religion was more informed and reformed than plebian parodies dared to admit. Consequently, ‘radical beliefs are better explained as a reaction to or a development of the ambiguities and contradictions of Calvinist theology rather than an expression of heretical ideas circulating in a timeless “radical underground”’. Along with occasional sui generis heterodoxies, this chapter will highlight surprising doctrinal affinity between ‘radicals’ and their puritan and episcopal counter-parts, as sectarian Arminians followed a similar migratory path away from the English Reformed tradition.

Nevertheless, despite noteworthy continuity with the puritan mainstream, sectarians still formed a distinct expression of religion in the 1650s due to their widespread dissent from the Cromwellian church settlement. Though the Long Parliament had abolished episcopal rule and Prayer Book liturgy, throughout the 1640s and 50s a national church remained intact, upheld by establishment pillars such as clerical ordination, the parochial system and the Oxbridge institutions. What distinguished sectarians was their readiness to reject these conventional religious traditions and authorities. Consequently, anti-clericalism and anti-intellectualism were common denominators among sectarians, with a few Baptists as noteworthy exceptions. The 1650s therefore witnessed the irony of Oxbridge educated sectarians turning on the establishments, which they now considered ‘means of preserving hierarchical and antichristian relations of

---

9 For example, Samuel Fisher was a Presbyterian minister before later resigning to join the General Baptists and subsequently the Quakers.
12 McDowell, The English Radical Imagination, 11.
power’.\textsuperscript{13} Some Sweet Sips, (1649) by the ‘Ranter’ Abiezer Coppe, depicted the universities as ‘Schools of the Anti-Christ’. He mocked his former Oxford tutors with the varsity term of ‘Cronies’ and taunted them with Latin tags that parodied their apparent learning as a folly.\textsuperscript{14} In contrast to clerical ordinations, sectarians insisted that their commission to preach was not \textit{jure humano}, conferred by a bishop’s hands, but \textit{jure divino} by an unmediated anointing of the Holy Spirit. This radical subversion of conventional religious authorities was conveyed through satirical pamphlets, noisy interruptions and even naked protests much to the disgust of Reformed divines. Sectarian Arminians therefore comprised a distinct religious style, which made an important contribution to the crisis of Calvinism in Cromwellian England.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Arminianism among the English Laity}

The earliest overtly Arminian publications during the English Revolution did not stem from episcopal or puritan divines but from laity, who represented the ‘spectacular proliferation of lay theology’ during the years of the revolution, when the \textit{vox populi} was heard like never before.\textsuperscript{16} Though not sectarian in their ecclesiastical or political commitments, several individuals of ‘the middling sort’ published significant lay Arminian works that evidenced a rejection of traditional religious authorities and a radical application of the Protestant principle, \textit{sola scriptura}.\textsuperscript{17} Their lay-style combined Biblical proof-texts with a simple application of common reason that often resulted in quite unconventional theologies.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 9.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 136.
\textsuperscript{15} The puritan roots of sectarian groups have led some to refer to ‘radical Puritanism’, while David Como prefers ‘Puritan underground’ for groups that emerged as part of ‘the left wing of English Protestantism’. David R. Como, \textit{Blown by the Spirit}, 21, 12.
\textsuperscript{17} McDowell argues that the ‘middling sort’ accounted for thirty percent of the population and an equivalent proportion of publications during the English Revolution. \textit{The English Radical Imagination}, 6-7.
\end{flushright}
Francis Duke published the first part of *The Fulnesse and Freeness of God's Grace* in 1642.\(^{18}\) The title page claimed to offer a ‘middle way betweene Calvin and Arminius’, reinforcing Shagan’s observation that during the interregnum, the claim of moderation ‘can be found in the writings of the most committed royalists, levelers, Presbyterians, independents, and more or less everyone else’.\(^{19}\) However, Duke’s enigmatic theology clearly defended the two core tenets of Arminian theology.\(^{20}\) Structured according to a modified covenant theology, *Fulnesse and Freenesse* insisted that though Adam’s original sin was imputed to all mankind, Christ as the ‘second Adam’ restored all humanity to a state of grace. Controversially, this ‘restauration’ consisted of both the ‘imputation’ of Christ’s righteousness and an ‘infusion’ of the Spirit to all humanity that recovered a capacity for salvation. For Duke, this was ‘universall Predestination’, which elected all humanity through Christ and imparted to all an ‘infused principle’, which enables ‘the Spirit of Faith, to receive his gift of righteounesse’.\(^{21}\) Underlying these arguments was a concern to democratize doctrines that were traditionally reserved either for the baptized (Augustine) or for the elect (Calvinism). Instead, Duke argued that through Christ and the ‘pow’ring out of the Spirit at Pentecost’, sufficient saving grace was available to all, ‘without respect of persons’.\(^{22}\)

---

\(^{18}\) Duke appears to have been part of the broader puritan milieu and may have been an MP in one of the interregnum parliaments. He publicly opposed sects such as the ‘Familialists’, wrote against ‘John Lilburn’ and defended clerical authority and university education against the Quakers. See *The Fulnesse and Freenesse*, Part III (1656), 94-114; *An Answer to some Principall Quakers* (1660). Though he is positioned in this chapter due to his lay-theology and primitive style, he could have been classified as a puritan Arminian in Chapter Two. He therefore illustrates the provisional nature of the distinction between puritan and sectarian.

\(^{19}\) Ethan Shagan, ‘Rethinking Moderation in the English Revolution’, 27.


\(^{21}\) Ibid., 63, 140. Duke claimed that he had shown the manuscript of part one to ‘Dr. Twist, Dr. Gouge, and Mr. Gataker and from their feedback, Duke concluded that they ‘say not enough to the depth of the fall of man in the first Adam, nor to the raising of the World, and all mankinde by the second Adam’. *Fulnesse and Freenesse*, (1655) II. ‘Epistle to Reader, sig. A3v-r.

Part one of *Fulnesse and Freenesse* (1642) contained convoluted sections of primitive reasoning, which Duke himself later described as ‘obscure’.23 However, parts two and three emerged over a decade later (1655, 1656) as Duke discerned a new moment of debate. In part two, he referred to the contemporary ‘Question and Controversie’ regarding predestination, demonstrating awareness that England was now embroiled in an episode of controversy that required a clearer statement to ‘help where most needs is’.24 Parts two and three more boldly refuted any notion of ‘personal election’, whether as ‘Reverend Calvin’ suggests, according to absolute divine decrees, or according to ‘that Reverend man Arminius’, by ‘foresight’ of faith.25 Instead, Duke developed his unconventional theology from part one and argued for a biological transference of sufficient grace. Referring to the immediate aftermath of the fall of Adam and the promise of Genesis 3:15 regarding the ‘seed of a woman’, Duke argued: ‘That immediately upon the said Election and Imputation by the Spirit of Christ, God put an internal disposedness into all man-kind to descend hereditarily in their natural generations, disposing them to operations according[ly]’.

According to Duke, this hereditary grace was a form of ‘Universal Election’, transferred through human reproduction, which offset original sin and enabled every person to ‘receive eternal life’.27 Despite unconventional arguments and a primitive style, Duke’s *Fulnesse and Freenesse* remained broadly Arminian throughout, rejecting absolute or personal predestination and affirming the salvific potency of universal grace.

Another work appeared under the initials LS with a similar title and style: *The Fulnesse of God’s love Manifested* (1643).28 Laurence Saunders’ extended pamphlet embodied a sectarian disregard for traditional authorities, relying

---

24 Ibid., II. ‘Epistle to Reader’, sig. A3v. The 1642 publication gave no indication that it was part of a multi-volume work. Indeed, the delay before parts two and three emerged (1655, 1656) suggests otherwise. Duke may have been emboldened to publish these further works due to a growing awareness of the quinquarticular controversy in the 1650s.
26 Ibid., II. 21. Duke therefore posited a radical reversal of Augustine’s notion of a biological transference of original sin through concupiscence.
27 *Fulnesse and Freenesse* (1656), III. 38, 50.
instead on common reason. Indeed, Saunders forthrightly condemned elitist ministers who ‘trample on reason as low carnall, and not to bee exercised in divine things, they speak in a dialect that none can understand’. Instead, he gloried in further reformation arguing it was ‘Christian-like for us to weigh, try and examine all things, all the reasons for and against, with freedome and ingenuity of spirit’. In the strongest terms, he bemoaned ‘what strange, dark and dismall doctrines are preached and published by those, which professe themselves Ministers of the gospel, and grace of God... as, that God did from eternity decree the ruine and damnation of the most part of men, without respect to any evil’. With egalitarian inflection he argued: ‘it is not suitable to God to pick and chuse amongst men in shewing mercy’. For Saunders, it was axiomatic that divine justice be commensurate with human reason, such that ‘we believe no word to be spoken nor action done by God, which we our selves see to bee unjust’. Consequently, this was an Arminianism burdened by the concern to demonstrate divine equity and impartiality: ‘should he save some in respect of Christ, and damne others in respect of Adam... there could be neither mercy in the one nor justice in the other, for both would be void of equity’. Saunders therefore apportioned two-thirds of the work to a sustained defense of the strength and ubiquity of divine grace, which ‘doth enlighten, invite, persuade and draw all men' toward salvation, ‘for God is no respecter of persons’. This style of Arminianism seemed determined to replace the perceived feudalism of Calvinism with the democracy of universal grace.

The rise of Arminianism among the laity in the 1640s was soon picked up on Reformed radars. After triumphant denouncements of the Laudians and their popish Arminianism, Reformed divines became aware of a new face of Arminianism, no longer dressed in clerical robes or wearing a bishop’s mitre. When London Presbyterians issued a catalogue of heterodox publications in

---

29 Ibid., 157.
30 Ibid., 5.
31 Ibid., 154.
32 Ibid., 2.
33 Ibid., 87.
34 Ibid., 78.
35 Ibid., 30, 37.
1648, Laurence Saunders’ work was the most frequently cited for ‘Errours, Heresies and Blasphemies’, even exceeding Socinian works by Biddle and Best.\footnote{Anonymous, \textit{A Testimony to the Trueth of Jesus Christ, and to our Solemn League and Covenant} (1648).} Along with Saunders nineteen citations, Goodwin’s \textit{Divine Authority of the Scriptures} was decried nine times, with only three references to Hammond’s \textit{Practical Catechism}. For Calvinists, this was quantitative proof that sectarian-style Arminianism was spreading through the alleys and taverns of London like the plague. The demise of the prelates had caused the godly to drop their guard. However, ‘While we have slept, the envious man hath bestirred himself to sow tares’. As a result of ‘universal toleration’, instead of ‘a Reformation, we may say with sighs... we have a Deformation in Religion’.\footnote{Ibid., 10.}

\section*{Radical Modifications to Calvinism}

During the 1650s, some sectarian groups retained the categories and structure of Reformed theology, whilst creatively modifying the dynamic of its administration. For example, the ‘Muggletonians’ forged an apocalyptic Calvinism by positing a ‘third age’ of the Spirit in which the two witnesses in Revelation chapter eleven had been sent to reveal the identities of the elect and reprobate.\footnote{The Muggletonians emerged from among ‘Seekers’ and ‘Ranters’, forming a distinct but short-lived sect from 1651. See William M. Lamont, \textit{Last Witnesses: The Muggletonian History, 1652-1979} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).} The title page of \textit{A Transcendent Spiritual Treatise} makes the stark claim: ‘John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton, the two last Witnesses and true Prophets of the man Jesus... sent by his Holy Spirit to seal the foreheads of the Elect, and the foreheads of the reprobate with the eternal seals of Life and Death’.\footnote{John Reeve, \textit{A Transcendent Spiritual Treatise} (1652).} The two prophets were available at ‘Great Trinity Lane’ to remove the angst of hidden decrees by revealing to individual inquirers whether they were among the elect or reprobate. Ironically, these Muggletonians adhered to absolute and particular predestination that decreed ‘two sorts’ of people ‘one elected unto glory, the
other rejected unto shame’. They also refuted ‘freewill redemptionists’, who ‘tend to nothing else but meritorious popery... and tyrannical Prelacy over one another’.

However, though they retained a strict predestinarian structure and opposed Arminianism, their creative and apocalyptic approach hardly helped the Calvinist cause.

The ‘Ranters’ also took a pair of scissors to the Calvinist script and radically reinterpreted predestination. ‘Ranters’ have been described as the ‘extreme left wing of the sects’, representing an ‘unsettling mixture of prophecy, sexuality, and social radicalism’. Though arguably they only existed in the nervous imaginations of Reformed divines, their fearsome reputation gained notoriety between 1649-51. According to a short play in 1651: ‘All the world now is in the Ranting humour’. Figures such as Abiezer Coppe, Richard Coppin, Joseph Salmon and later Lawrence Clarkson gave energy to a loose collective of disparate ideas. Theologically, Nigel Smith has noted their propensity to undermine the structural integrity of orthodox distinctions. Their immanentist paradigm insisted that ‘God is in man and in every creature, and there is one spirit in the world’. Richard Coppin’s *Divine Teachings* (1649) offered the clearest summary of ‘Ranter’ soteriology. Ironically, Coppin insisted on the necessity of divine agency for ‘Ranter’ enthusiasm, arguing that ‘none can come to God until he first comes to them; nor none can seek God, till he hath first found them’. However, his radical monism, which insisted on complete union with the divine, relocated the traditional categories of predestination within each individual: ‘Election and reprobation have no relation to any mans person, but to...

41 Attaching a label to the fissiparous firework of the ‘Ranter’ movement is open to critique. The term is therefore placed in inverted commas.
42 Nicholas McDowell, *The English Radical Imagination*, 89.
45 Richard Coppin, *Divine Teachings in Three Parts* (1653), I. 48. This quote was based on John 6:37, a Biblical text frequently cited by Reformed divines also.
the good and evill which grows up in the person’. Like Rachel carrying the twins, Jacob and Esau, ‘both these are in one person until one hath overcome the other’. For Coppin, Jesus Christ was the only fully ‘elected person’ in whom there was no reprobation. Union with him resulted in the ‘drosse’ being removed, for ‘Christ, and the Saints who are not twain but one, is the elect one, or elected’. This radical reworking left some eschatological ambiguities. Does Coppin’s phrase ‘until one hath overcome the other’ infer that unbelievers could still experience eternal reprobation? Nigel Smith concludes not, arguing that Coppin was a rare early modern exponent of Origenist Universalism. However, Coppin intentionally positioned himself between what he considered ‘two great mistakes’, one of which was ‘a generall Salvation, or that all men shall be saved... the other, that one man shall be saved, and the other damned... as if God were so unjust to make man, and after to damne him’. This apparent rejection of both Origenist universalism and Calvinism gave Coppin’s Ranter soteriology a novel shape. Indeed, both Muggletonians and ‘Ranters’ illustrated the remarkable intellectual fecundity characteristic of sectarians, who though steeped in the Reformed tradition, possessed a radical impulse for change.

Sectarian Arminianism in the 1650s

Early Quakers

Undoubtedly, Quakers became the most significant anti-Calvinist sectaries in the 1650s. By the Restoration, Quakers comprised one percent of the population and in strongholds like Westmorland as many as three percent. Their rapid growth swept down from the North to London, acquiring patrons such as Judge Fell on the way and making Quakerism a formidable force. Their prolific use of the printing press also enabled them to be ‘highly engaged with contemporary

46 Ibid., II. 4.
47 Ibid., II. 4.
48 Nigel Smith, ‘Coppin, Richard (c.1645–1659)’, ODNB.
49 Divine Teachings, II. 1-2.
political and religious affairs’. During the Nayler debate in parliament in 1656, Colonel Sydeham remarked ‘I cannot be in the world but I hear some of their opinions, both in print and otherwise’. They quickly became a major concern for Reformed divines, with John Owen debating and publishing against those he disparagingly referred to as ‘a deafening babble of confused sounds... contradicting and refuting each other’.

The ‘seed’ of Quaker theology was the inner light of Christ. This principle of interior divine illumination operated as a control on their soteriology and inevitably brought them into conflict with Calvinism. The inner light took precedence over externals, including the historic work of Christ, the creeds, the sacraments and the Biblical text itself. The early Quakers were more nuanced than simply to reject these religious authorities en masse. Rather, they considered external sources to be ‘hearsay’ compared to direct, interior revelation. Consequently, Reformed doctrines that did not compromise the axiomatic principle of universal inner light, were upheld with more continuity than much secondary literature has acknowledged. For example, human depravity and the necessity of divine grace were assumed by many of the early Quakers. Indeed, the natural human will was considered so listless as to require divine intervention by the direct and perfect agency of the Spirit. As Hinds argues, George Fox’s Journal depicts him and other Friends ‘as nothing more than passive conduits for the divine will... Human agency gives way to divine agency, human uncertainty to divine certainty’. The Quaker corollaries of quietism and perfectionism evidenced this strong emphasis on divine activity and human

50 Kate Peters, Print Culture and the Early Quakers (New York: CUP, 2005), 1. As Raymond notes, ‘Of all religious movements that sprang up in the revolutionary decades, none was more sensitive to the uses of the printed pamphlet than the Quakers.’ Joad Raymond, Pamphlets and Pamphleteering, 234.
51 Kate Peters, Print Culture and the Early Quakers, 254.
52 In Crawford Gribben, John Owen and English Puritanism, 193.
54 H. Hinds, "And the Lord's Power was Over all": Calvinist Anxiety, Sacred Confidence, and George Fox's Journal, ELH: A Journal of English Literary History, 75 (2008), pp. 841-870, 858, 862.
passivity. Ironically, the Quaker convert William Penn even accused Reformed divines of over-emphasizing human agency in their covenant theology.\textsuperscript{55}

Equally, whilst Quakers did object to the Reformed view of Scripture as a closed canon and \textit{regula fidei}, they nevertheless frequently cited Biblical proof-texts in their debates and publications, granting Scripture the status of ‘witness’ or ‘testimony’ to the light. In high-profile disputes between Samuel Fisher and John Owen, Edward Burroughs and John Bunyan, James Nayler and Thomas Collier, the Quakers consistently downgraded the status of Scripture, refuting any notion that it was a necessary intermediary between Christ and the believer.\textsuperscript{56} As Fisher stated: ‘we own not the said alterable and much altered outward Text and Letter, of Scripture, but the Holy Truth and inward Light and Spirit, which the Scripture it self testifies to’.\textsuperscript{57} Equally, Quakers rejected the methods of humanist exegesis and scholastic reason as ‘fleshly’ and ‘natural’, producing only ‘\textit{Academicall, Arteficiall Scrutinies} into the Scripture’.\textsuperscript{58} However, once Scripture was redefined as fallible \textit{witness} rather than the infallible \textit{Word}, early Quakers appropriated its authority in a manner at times barely distinguishable from their puritan counterparts. As George Fox noted in his Journal: ‘Yet I had no slight esteem of the Holy Scriptures, but they were very precious to me, for I was in that spirit by which they were given forth, and what the Lord opened in me I afterwards found was agreeable to them’.\textsuperscript{59} Quakers therefore offered lengthy Biblical citations to justify their arguments and frequently claimed their interpretation of Scripture


\textsuperscript{56} For an overview of the role of Scripture in Quaker debates see Underwood, \textit{Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb’s War}, ch. 1.

\textsuperscript{57} Samuel Fisher, \textit{Rusticus ad Academicos... The Rustick’s Alarm to the Rabbies, or, The Country correcting the University and Clergy} (1660), ‘To Reader’, B1v-r.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 59.

was more accurate. Though early Quakers questioned Reformed authorities, they did not embark on quite such a wholesale rejection of them.\textsuperscript{60}

Nevertheless, the Calvinist approach to predestination did come in for vehement attack by early Quakers because it violated their immanentist soteriology, which presupposed the ubiquity and efficacy of ‘inner light’. James Nayler rebuked the Particular Baptist Thomas Collier: ‘you have imagination that Christ is the light onely to inlighten you that call your selves believers; but who must inlighten the rest? Christ saith. I am the light of the world, he doth not say, I am the light of such a people, who are of a self-separation’.\textsuperscript{61} George Fox contended: ‘Doth not the Scripture say... “God would have all men to be saved?” Mark, all men.’\textsuperscript{62} Instead, as Hinds argues,

\begin{quote}
In [Fox’s] Journal, Calvinist predestinarian theology is countered by reversing the location of the powers that govern his life... No longer governed by a fully external and unknowable deity, instantiated in the fundamental uncertainty of the subject’s own soteriological destiny, Quaker theology offered a mechanism whereby the deity was partially internalized.\textsuperscript{63}
\end{quote}

The most sustained Quaker Arminianism during the 1650s came from Samuel Fisher. His trajectory was illustrative of the rapid migrations occurring during the turbulence of Cromwellian England. After seven years at Oxford gaining a reputation as a Hebraist, Fisher was awarded an MA and then ordained to the parish of Lydd in 1645. By 1649 he resigned from the parish to join the General

\textsuperscript{60} This point seems to be overlooked by McDowell who assumes that Samuel Fisher’s arguments against the infallibility of Scripture equate to a rejection of Scripture altogether. He notes the ‘unsurprising absence of Scriptural reference in Rusticus’. McDowell, The English Radical Imagination, 159. However, this only accounts for the early sections where Fisher is arguing directly against Owen’s notion of Scripture as an infallible \textit{regula fidei}. In the Fourth Exercitation, as Fisher turned to refute Calvinism, he relentlessly cited Scripture and used detailed exegetical arguments to refute Owen.

\textsuperscript{61} James Nayler, Deceit Brought to Day-light (1656), 11.

\textsuperscript{62} George Fox, The Journal of George Fox, 550. Peters has shown that the French version of Fox’s tract entitled To all that would know the way to the Kingdom, was overtly anti-Calvinist and criticized those ‘of the reformed religion, who follow the teachings of Calvin’. Kate Peters, Print Culture and the Early Quakers, 164.

\textsuperscript{63} Hinds, ‘Calvinist Anxiety, Sacred Confidence, and George Fox’s Journal’, 865.
Baptists. He publicly debated puritan divines such as John Simpson and Francis Cheynell in 1651 and was influential in converting William Allen from John Goodwin’s gathered church. In 1655, Fisher then converted to the Quakers and became their most prized theologian for the remainder of the interregnum.\textsuperscript{64} He travelled as a missionary to Rome and Turkey and may have influenced the young Benedict Spinoza en route. He certainly played a vital role in the conversion of the most influential of the early Quakers, William Penn, who founded Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{65}

Fisher wrote numerous polemical pamphlets but his most sustained anti-Calvinist work was \textit{Rusticus ad Academicos} (1660), subtitled ‘The Country correcting the University and Clergy’. The work consisted of four ‘Exercitations’, each one targeting ‘Misty Ministers’ who had published anti-Quaker works, including the Independent John Owen, Presbyterians Thomas Danson and Richard Baxter and the Particular Baptist John Tombes. A significant portion of the work engaged with the doctrine of Scripture. However, in the fourth Exercitation, Fisher turned his attention to Calvinist soteriology. He first bemoaned the misrepresentation of Quakers: ‘because we talk of an universal Redemption’ they ‘pittyfully propound us as denying Gods Eternall unchangeable Decree, and his Praedestination’. Instead, Fisher carefully defined universal redemption in order to positively exclude Origenist Universalism, concluding that ‘All are not, but few only actually saved’.\textsuperscript{66} Fisher also defended the Quakers against the charge of Pelagianism:

They make people believe as if we held that all men in the Fall had of themselves a Free Will, and a power of their own... to save themselves... Whereas we ascribe all the glory of our own and every mans Salvation to God alone and his meer mercy and free Grace.... The power for salvation is not in him that wills or that runs but in God only, that shewes the mercy.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{64} As a Quaker, Fisher became increasingly anti-intellectual and mocked the initials B.D as ‘Blinde Divine’. Whereas he signed \textit{Christianismus Redividius} (1655) ‘Samuel Fisher M.A’, by \textit{Rusticus} he had dropped the academic tag. However, Fisher still wrote a Latin defense of Quakers from jail, entitled \textit{Lux Christi emergens} (1661).

\textsuperscript{65} See Stefano Villani, ‘Fisher, Samuel (bap. 1604, d. 1665)’, \textit{ODNB}.

\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Rusticus Ad Academicos}, ‘Reader’, sig. b3v.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., ‘Reader’, sig. b3r-b4v.
To further avoid any hint of reliance on nature for salvation, Fisher emphasized that the inner light was a divine gift: ‘That light of conscience that some call naturall... we say is that speciall gift of Gods own grace... Not the naturall faculty of mans understanding’.\textsuperscript{68} In response to specific criticisms from Owen, Fisher therefore appealed to John 1:4, a popular proof-text for Quakers, Arminians and Cambridge Platonists alike: ‘In Him was life and that life was the light of men’.\textsuperscript{69} For Fisher, the light was Christ not nature and the mode of salvation was therefore grace not works. Arguably, this qualification kept the early Quakers within the bounds of the Protestant \textit{sola gratia} principle by rendering the ‘inner light’ equivalent to the conventional Arminian reliance on universal prevenient grace.

After careful qualification, Fisher then turned on hypothetical forms of universal redemption, which argue ‘that while God Tenders Salvation Openly and Universally to All Men, He secretly Intends it, but Particularly only, to a Few’. For Fisher, this compromised divine integrity and ‘personal Electionists’ who propagate such ideas create ‘Light-lesse Laborinths’ in which ‘you loose yourselves and Perish’.\textsuperscript{70} Indeed the notion that eternal decrees were ‘bolted out... by an absolute Decree’ and ‘without respect to... doing good or evil’ was considered by Fisher to be but a ‘Dream of a peremptory Election and Reprobation’.\textsuperscript{71} Echoing Goodwin, Fisher drew on the Arminian illustration of a Prince who called a prisoner in chains to come to him and receive pardon.\textsuperscript{72} The Calvinist god was an invention of ‘horrible cruelty, absurdity and non-sense’ and ‘utterly contrary to the Wisdome of God in Scripture’.\textsuperscript{73}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., ‘Reader’, sig. b4v.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., IV. 76.
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., ‘To Reader’, sig. g1v, d4v.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., IV. 95, ‘Preface’, sig. B4v.
\textsuperscript{72} Goodwin had also denounced any notion of ‘peremptory Election’ and drew on the analogy of a Prince to do so. See \textit{RR}, 298.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., IV. 88, 98. This was another telling statement regarding early Quaker use of Scripture.
\end{footnotesize}
By contrast, Fisher adopted the two core tenets of Arminianism. Regarding divine decrees, ‘Election and Reprobation of God [is] not absolute, but conditional only (as to persons)’. In addition, divine grace recovers free will for ‘every man without exception’ so all are ‘sufficiently empowered’ to respond to subsequent resistible grace. His Quakerism stressed the inner light as that which restored the ‘potentia ab actum’ so that humanity once again has ‘the power to choose life or death’. However, this initial and universal light must be ‘improved’ by repentance and obedience if it is to yield salvation. Reminiscent of Hammond and the episcopal Arminians, the condition of election turned more on obedience than faith. Fisher was also concerned to affirm divine impartiality, for unless Christ sufficiently enlightens all men ‘God’s ways were not equal and his words were not true’. Throughout Rusticus, Fisher was aggressively anti-Calvinist due to his concern that Reformed divines were ‘Failing Flocks’ and causing ‘Saints infirmities’. For, ‘being framed in John Calvin’s fancy’, Reformed doctrines were responsible for the grace of God being ‘niggarded up into a corner’, leaving the saints spinning in ‘Contradictions, Confusions & Rounds’.

General Baptists

Throughout the 1650s, Baptists fought a running battle with Quakers. Particular Baptists like Bunyan engaged in multiple disputes between 1656-7, including a notorious pamphlet war with Edward Burrough. While Bunyan defended absolute predestination and forensic justification, Burrough decried not only the Calvinism of particular Baptists but also the hypothetical universalism of General Baptists. For Burrough, though the General Baptists held that ‘Christ died for All’, they undermined this truth by their ‘carnall apprehensions’ of the Light. These disputes highlight the schismatic nature of sectarian Arminians who agreed on certain anti-Calvinist tenets but were fiercely divided on other matters. Tribalism also fuelled bitter disputes as Quaker proselytizing threatened Baptist churches.

---

74 Ibid., IV. 114, 104.
75 Ibid., IV. 92-3.
76 Ibid., IV. 152.
77 Ibid., IV. 128, Appendix. 12, 47.
In 1654 alone, the Broadmead Baptist congregation in Bristol lost a quarter of its members to the Quakers.79 However, Quaker heterodoxies gave General Baptists an opportunity to cultivate a more centrist aura, positioning themselves between high Calvinism and ‘extream Seekers’. Amidst the turbulence of the 1650s, General Baptists increasingly adopted Arminian theology and still gained considerable influence.

Throughout the 1640s, General Baptists largely adhered to the doctrinal combination of universal or ‘General’ atonement with unconditional election and irresistible grace. In The Fountaine of Free Grace (1645), a statement released to respond to charges of Arminianism, the General Baptists defended universal atonement and stated: ‘The Arminians... hold forth many noxious errours’.80 In response to the catechetical question ‘hath God elected some persons before the world began which only shall be saved?’ their answer was unequivocal: ‘Yes, certainly... God did appoynt the elect to faith... [And gave] the meanes of perseverence and encrease of Faith’.81 Thomas Lamb emerged as a figurehead for these ‘Universalist’ Baptists as publications such as Christ Crucified (1646) and Fountain of Free Grace Opened (1644, 1648) staunchly defended universal atonement. However, he also published A Treatise of Particular Predestination (1642), in which he insisted ‘there is no contradiction betwixt the two but a sweet concord’.82 Indeed, when John Goodwin published Redemption Redeemed, Lamb was one of his most vocal opponents in Absolute Freedom from Sin (1656).83

However, during the 1650s, General Baptists began to cross the doctrinal Rubicon, embracing Arminian doctrines of conditional decrees and resistible grace. Samuel Loveday, a member of the company of Merchant Taylors, issued

80 Fountain of Free Grace (1645), ‘To Impartial Reader’. This publication is wrongly attributed to John Saltmarsh by Early English Books Online.
81 Ibid., 20, 23.
83 The General Baptist Henry Denne reinforced Lamb’s approach. See Denne, Grace, Mercy and Peace (1645), 5. This did not stop Thomas Edwards calling Denne ‘a great Antinomian, a desperate Arminian’. See Gangraena, I. 76.
the first overtly Arminian work by a General Baptist during the English Revolution, *The hatred of Esau and the love of Jacob* (1650). This commentary on Romans chapter nine followed an Arminian typological interpretation of Jacob and Esau as tropes of justification by faith and works, rather than the Augustinian approach, which considered them types of absolute election and reprobation. Loveday’s concern was to place the interpretive emphasis on human agency in order to avoid depicting God as a ‘Tyrant that doth rule by his will’.84 The primitive style of *The hatred of Esau* reflected its status as one of the earliest forays by a General Baptist into the territory of classic Arminianism. His lay-theology was therefore devoid of any reference to the broader Western tradition, relying instead on strained etymology and proof-texting. However, when Loveday later extended and republished his work as *Personal Reprobation Reprobated* (1676), he was able to draw on several English Arminian commentaries on Romans chapter nine in order to offer a more sophisticated approach.85 The development of Loveday’s work therefore illustrates the maturing of English Arminianism in general.

John Griffith soon offered a Baptist defense of conditional perseverance in *A Treatise touching Falling from Grace* (1653). At a General Baptist conference in 1652, controversy had erupted when several ministers challenged thirteen arguments that were presented regarding the impossibility of a baptised believer falling away. Siding with the Arminian Baptists, Griffith’s work presented numerous arguments and proof-texts to show that ‘entrance into salvation is conditional’ and that ‘we are continued in union with Christ on condition of believing and persevering’.86 Griffiths overtly adopted the Arminian doctrine of conditional decrees based on divine foreknowledge: ‘God did foreknow some men in Christ, by or through faith, and obedience’ and decried ‘The absurdities

that do naturally flow from the doctrine of the impossibility of falling away’. Notably, Griffith’s Arminian-Baptist approach diverged from the Augustinian tradition, which considered justification to be conferred through paedobaptism but persevering grace to be a divine gift only given to the elect. Though Arminian-Baptists agreed that justification could be forfeited, they radically altered the condition upon which this possibility was predicated. Instead of perseverance being divinely determined, Arminian-Baptists emphasized the free-will nature of adult credobaptism. The act of baptism conferred salvation conditionally upon ‘those that keep the faith’. Thus having entered the company of the elect by human volition, the possibility remained of exiting through the same door.

James Browne contributed a more scholarly Baptist defense of Arminian tenets in *Scripture-Redemption freed from Men’s Restrictions* (1653). Browne graduated from Oriel College (Oxford) and was ordained vicar of Tenbury (Worcestershire) in 1638. By 1652 he was recorded as a Baptist minister who preached to the army and re-baptised several converts. Browne debated with Reformed divines in England, Wales and Scotland (including Vavasour Powell and Samuel Rutherford) regarding the doctrines of grace. In *Scripture-Redemption* he denounced both limited atonement and divine determinism: ‘Oh Horrid blasphemy and impudent impiety! ...This is fine doctrine for Ranters, Atheists and all ungodly men’. Instead, Browne posited two levels of predestination: ‘General election’ whereby ‘[God] set his heart upon lost man... through and in Christ’ and ‘special election... of such as believe’. Thus Browne referred to ‘the Elect elect’ as those who by faith inherit the general election available to all in

---

87 Ibid., 14, 33. Another General Baptist from Stafford, Henry Haggar, reinterpreted Scriptures that seemed to teach determinative decrees as God speaking from the vantage point of his foreknowledge: ‘and so [God] calleth Men that are not Elected, as though they were Elected’. His work outlined an Arminian *ordo decetorum*, which relied heavily on divine foreknowledge of faith. See Henry Haggar, *The Order of Causes. Of Gods Foreknowledge, Election, and Predestination* (1654), 3-4, 6
88 For more on the Augustinian tradition and its relationship to English Calvinism see Chapters Five and Six.
90 See John Spurr, ‘Brown, James (b. 1615/16)’ *ODNB*.
92 Ibid., 16-17.
Christ. By this twofold structure, Browne took the hypothetical/actual distinction that General Baptists had previously reserved for the atonement and reorganized predestination around it: ‘redemption... is also general and special: general of all lost mankind, by the pouring out of the blood of the Lamb slain from the beginning; special of such as believe on him who was slain’.93 When coupled with universal atonement, Browne argued his soteriology could meet the pastoral needs of the hour, keeping ‘the poor sin-sick sinner from despair, and the proud transgressor from presumption’.94

Richard Stooks published the largest and most vociferous anti-Calvinist work by a General Baptist during the 1650s: Truths Champion (1651). Stooks observed the high profile debates taking place regarding predestination and yet confidently asserted that a simple approach to Scripture ‘would end all the controversie’.95 Stooks categorized approaches to predestination into ‘two wayes, either in Christ, or out of Christ’. Those who hold to absolute predestination out of Christ make God a ‘respecter of persons’ who favours the elect but is ‘worse then the divell’ regarding the reprobate. He compared this to ‘Stoicks and Manichees’, claiming:

And this is all one in the substance with the Tenent of the Calvinists, who hold the same in substance, onely the difference lyes thus; that all evill cometh from an evil God, and therein I look upon [the Stoics and Manichees] to be better than the Calvinists Doctrine; for they charge the God of heaven with all wicked actions.96

Stooks was bemused that any sensible person would hold such a view: ‘What madness is it therefore to impute that to God, which cannot justly be fathered

93 Ibid., 31.
94 Ibid., 109.
95 Stooks sarcastically quipped that the notion of divine predetermination was falsified by any who oppose it. For ‘if it be Gods Predestination, that men should write against his Predestination as other have done, and I do, then ... it is a kingdom divided’. Truths Champion (1651), 16, 24.
96 Ibid., 187. Stooks may well have been influenced by Samuel Hoard’s God’s Love to Mankind (1633), which levelled similar accusations at those who held to a divine pre-determination of all things.
upon the devil?' Instead, he considered it obvious that election was ‘in Christ’ as a general offer: ‘It is granted of all that have common sense, that election and choice cannot be but in liberty, and that there is power given out to all, as the Scriptures hold forth’.98

In order to preserve sufficient human free will without recourse to baptismal regeneration, Stooks joined other Arminian-Baptists in refuting the Augustinian doctrine of original sin. Instead, he restricted the consequences of the fall to the introduction of physical mortality.99 For Stooks, the pre-lapsarian ‘gift of action’ was still latent, enabling human volition to act in a restorative way for ‘God doth not command men to do what they cannot’.100 This conviction gave Arminian-Baptists a distinct approach to the relationship between nature and grace in conversion. Arminius, the early Remonstrants and most English Arminians, upheld the Augustinian doctrine of original sin in its most basic form and relied instead on the universality and sufficiency of gratia praeveniens to circumvent it.101 However, Arminian-Baptists like Browne and Stooks curbed the doctrine of original sin itself, so that Adamic sin only introduced physical mortality. This allowed a sufficient remainder of spiritual responsiveness in order to freely choose faith and baptism without the infusion of a prior awakening grace.102 The General Baptist Brief Confession (1660) appeared to adopt this approach in Article X to safeguard the salvation of infants regardless of baptism: ‘Children dying in Infancy, having not actually transgressed against the Law of God in their own persons, are only subject to the first death... and not that any one of them

---

97 Ibid., 191.
98 Ibid., 10.
100 Richard Stooks, Truths Champion, 62.
101 The exception of Jeremy Taylor demonstrates the rule. As an episcopal divine, Taylor had controversially argued for only a partial deprivation of grace through the Adamic fall, incurring physical mortality. However, he denied the Augustinian notion of inherited depravation. Instead, Taylor claimed that human nature retained ‘powers and capacities to serve and glorify God’ making salvation ‘harder but not impossible’. Jeremy Taylor, Unum Necessarium, or, The Doctrine and Practice of Repentance (1655), 48, 82.
102 It is possible that their aversion to the Quaker notion of ‘the inner Light’ meant the Baptists steered well clear of anything that could sound like an equivalent.
shall suffer for Adams sin'.

The threefold rejection of infant baptism, original sin and absolute predestination by General Baptists was therefore thoroughly interconnected. As Clint Bass argued regarding Smyth and Helwys: 'it is not too surprising that the Separatists who first discarded infant baptism also challenged the predestinarian consensus of Puritanism'.

The emergence of overt Arminianism among General Baptists in the 1650s recovered the original emphasis of the early English Baptists such as Thomas Helwys who claimed that 'men may fall away from the grace of God'. Equally, his successor, John Murton had written unequivocally against absolute predestination. However, as some General Baptists returned to their early Arminian roots, a new fault line opened up. Whilst Lamb and Denne were adamant that the referent ‘General’ should be restricted to the extent of the atonement, other Baptists were moving beyond hypothetical universalism to posit ‘General’ decrees of election and sufficient saving grace for all. As Clint Bass concludes, General Baptist identity was 'hardly uniform beyond the doctrine of universal atonement'.

General Baptist confessions can help to plot the direction and pace of this migration. The Fountaine of Free Grace (1645) had no hesitation in declaring: ‘The Arminians... hold forth many noxious erroors’ and clearly articulated the causal priority of particular predestination: ‘God did appoynt the elect to faith’.

By 1651, an association of thirty General Baptist churches from the midlands

---

103 John Griffith, A Declaration of Some of Those People in or near London, called Anabaptists (1660), 6.
104 Clint Bass, 'Thomas Grantham (1633-1692) and General Baptist Theology', 137.
105 In William Latane Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith (Chicago: Judson Press, 1959), 118.
106 John Murton, A Discription of What God Hath Predestinated (1620). This work offered a baptistic defence of Arminian theology and sought to discredit the authority of the 'Counsell of Dort' ('To Reader', sig. a2).
107 Reformed divines soon detected this shift. For example, John Wetherall published a response to General Baptists in Lincoln in which he summarized and critiqued the five points of remonstrance by the Arminians at the Synod of Dort. John Wetherall, A Discovery, and Confutation of the Opinions, and Practises of some False Brethren (1652).
108 Clint Bass, 'Thomas Grantham (1633-1692) and General Baptist Theology', 27.
109 Ibid., 20, 23.
signed a confession that avoided the necessity of absolute decrees.\textsuperscript{110} Indeed, the deliberately ambiguous wording was sufficiently non-Calvinist to enable Samuel Loveday to sign it. By the Restoration, forty General Baptist elders signed \textit{A Brief confession or Declaration of Faith} (1660), which posited a ‘mildly Arminian’ soteriology.\textsuperscript{111} Article VI argued for general and sufficient saving grace: ‘all men at one time or other, are put into such a capacity, as that (through the grace of God) they may be eternally saved’. Article VIII taught election predicated on faith: ‘That God hath even before the foundation of the world chosen, (or elected) to eternal life, such as believe, and so are in Christ’. However in a bid to avoid further divisions, a qualifying sentence attributed all merit to the divine will: ‘yet confident we are, that the purpose of God according to election, was not in the least arising from fore-seen faith in, or works of righteousness done by the creature, but only from the mercy, goodness, and compassion dwelling in God’.\textsuperscript{112} These swing-door sentences offered a way in for the Calvinist Thomas Monck to sign the confession, despite holding to unconditional election, as well as Samuel Loveday and John Griffiths who were committed Arminians. These trends observed within General Baptist confessions during the middle of the seventeenth-century reflected the broader English migration beyond softened forms of Calvinism and toward overt Arminianism. Once again, the 1650s proved to be a hinge decade.

\textsuperscript{110} Anonymous, \textit{The Faith and Practise of Thirty Congregations} (1651). This represented a significant milestone as the first Baptist confession to be signed by a substantial number of congregations.

\textsuperscript{111} Clint Bass, ‘Thomas Grantham (1633-1692) and General Baptist Theology’, 145.

\textsuperscript{112} John Griffith, \textit{A Declaration of some of those People in Or Near London, Called Anabaptists}, 5. Though this sounded like a rebuttal to foreseen faith, in the context of the wider confession it represented an attempt to deny any meritorious cause of faith.
Distinctives of Sectarian-Style Arminianism

Despite considerable diversity, sectarian Arminians considered in this chapter displayed several commonalities. Firstly, they largely dispensed with Reformed conventions, including humanist exegesis, scholastic reasoning and citations from other English divines or the broader Western tradition, preferring instead a more rudimentary style of Biblical proof-texting and common reason.\(^\text{113}\) This cannot be attributed merely to differing capabilities between laypersons and ordained divines. Rather, Oxbridge educated sectarians also decried ‘our silly Sophisters’ with their ‘dark imagination’ and accused them of hiding doctrinal contradictions and blasphemies behind complex scholastic distinctions and pretentious Latin phrases.\(^\text{114}\) Indeed, Fisher considered Reformed methods an abuse of Scripture, treating it as ‘a piece of lead’ that can be manipulated to shape ‘their own lewd, lesbian, or petulant fancies’.\(^\text{115}\) As Saunders argued, the ‘glad tydings’ of God’s love were simple but the ‘teachers of the people cause them to erre’, leading them in ‘darke and sad waies’. For sectarians, the English Revolution afforded a vital opportunity for the lay masses to ‘awake out of sleep and to abandon these horrid opinions and not to suffer themselves to be deluded’.\(^\text{116}\) Just as the early Protestant Reformers exposed extra-Biblical heterodoxies sheltered within the Catholic Vulgate, sectarian Arminians pressed for further reformation to rid the church of erroneous Calvinist doctrines, which continued ‘that long train of Popish trash, and mans Tradition’ upheld by the

\(^{113}\) Sectarian anti-scholastic sentiment had been strongly expressed by Samuel How in *The Sufficiencie of the Spirits Teaching, without Humane-learning* (1640). John Webster’s later work, *Academiarum Examen* (1654), further denounced scholastic and humanist learning, arguing instead for Baconian science based on alchemical principles.

\(^{114}\) *Rusticus Ad Academicos*, IV. 99.

\(^{115}\) Ibid., IV. 125.

'Universities and Colleges'. Consequently, the anti-intellectualism and anti-Calvinism of Fisher and other sectarianarians were thoroughly integrated.

In addition, sectarian Arminians commonly associated Calvinism with an elitist social hierarchy. As Saunders argued, ‘[by] limiting the love of God to a few, the love of the most religious men of our times is also limited to a few’. The notion of divine decrees that unilaterally conferred the status of elect or reprobate conflicted with the sectarian impulse for equality. As Richard Overton the Leveller and General Baptist argued; ‘by natural birth all men are equally and alike born to like propriety, liberty and freedom... so are we to live, everyone equally and alike to enjoy his birthright and privilege; even all whereof God by nature has made him free’. Consequently, some sectarians found in Arminianism a more compatible political theology. The Arminian tendency toward soteriological parity could more readily underpin appeals for social equality. If England was to become a true commonwealth, her theology must be aligned accordingly: ‘Nothing can beget such a Spirit in us, but the spirit of this Doctrine, of the free and universall love of God’. For sectarian Arminians, anti-elitism and anti-Calvinism were therefore linked arenas of protest.

Finally, the proliferation of sects and heterodoxies that flourished in the 1650s were marked by an intellectual fecundity, which cultivated unique and

---

117 Fisher, Rusticus Ad Academicos, IV. 45-6.
118 They conveniently overlooked the fact that along with Arminius himself, other English Arminians were using humanist exegesis and scholastic reasoning to refute Calvinism and vindicate Arminianism.
119 Fulnesse of Gods Love, 163.
120 Richard Overton, An Arrow against all Tyrants and Tyrany (1646), 3.
121 William Walwyn's The Power of Love (1643) also appeared to argue for an egalitarian divine love. As the opening line stated: ‘there is no respect of persons with God, and whoever is possest with love, judgeth no longer as a man but god-like, as a true Christian’. He also berated the ‘universitie men’ who are ‘opposers of the welfare of the common-wealth’ and turn the translated scriptures back into ‘mysteries’ so that ‘you must have an University man to interpret the English’. William Walwyn, The Power of Love (1643), 1, 45-6.
122 Ibid., 164.
123 Of course Arminian soteriology was versatile and compatible with numerous traditions of political thought as evidenced by episcopal Arminians. However, arguably, the shape of Arminian soteriology was more suited to certain political interests, including tolerationism and egalitarianism.
idiosyncratic soteriologies. Having cast off the restraint of Reformed authorities and conventions, sectarians exuded theological creativity characteristic of those who had stepped out of the hegemony of traditional ‘orthodoxy’ and embraced a radical commitment to freethinking inquiry. The result was both playful reconfigurations of Calvinism (Muggletonians, Ranters) and quite original formulations of Arminianism (Quakers, Baptists), uniquely shaped by the particular commitments of each sect. Consequently, as Mark Goldie observed, ‘Calvinists who began the war against the Laudian Arminians now found themselves outflanked by a host of freethinking sectaries’. Amidst the maelstrom of sectarian, episcopal and puritan attacks, Calvinism experienced death by a thousand cuts.

124 Mark Goldie, Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs, 258.
PART I

Summary
A Motion Picture of Theological Migration

During the 1640s and 50s, the absence of a national confession, the suspension of press censorship and the insurgence of sectarian movements allowed the whole notion of ‘orthodoxy’ to be contested as never before. Within this environment, the impulse for further reform turned against Reformed theology itself. High-profile divines such as Davenant, Ussher and Preston had begun to modify Calvinism ‘as part of a general trend in early seventeenth-century England to reposition Reformed theology so that it could better resist the onslaught of an increasingly militant Arminianism’.\(^1\) However, under the accelerated conditions of the English Revolution, divines who had followed the path of their Reformed tutors now went beyond their hypothetical formulations. During the 1650s, some puritans, episcopalian sectarians crossed the Calvinist Rubicon and embraced Arminian formulations of predestination and grace. Consequently, the gradual evolution toward softened forms of Calvinism during the early Stuart period accelerated during the 1640s and 50s and resulted in Arminianism gaining the consensus after the Restoration.\(^2\) This pattern has been cross-referenced by charting the course of numerous individuals across diverse ecclesial styles who migrated from hypothetical to categorical universalism or from Amyraldianism to Arminianism during the 1650s. As Reformed divines counter-attacked, several publications referred to a doctrinal ‘civil war’ or quinquarticular controversy, demonstrating contemporary awareness that England was experiencing a seismic theological upheaval. The 1650s were therefore a hinge decade as a major episode of religious controversy resulted in a significant swing away from Calvinism and toward an Arminian hegemony that dominated the Church of England for the remainder of the seventeenth-century.

---

\(^1\) Jonathan Moore, 'The Extent of the Atonement', 160.
\(^2\) The dominance of Arminianism in the post-Restoration church was such that the seventeenth-century church historian Gilbert Burnett speculated whether Goodwin and Milton, as vocal defenders of regicide, only survived because they were 'Zealous' for Arminianism. In John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 270.
A Snapshot of Arminian Diversity

In addition to broader intellectual trends, Part I has highlighted diverse styles of Arminianism, which emerged during the 1650s. The persistent myth that English Arminianism was a pre-war Laudian phenomenon has obscured the breadth and diversity of post-war English engagement with Arminian theology. In fact, as Part I has demonstrated, more Arminian works were published by puritan and sectarian divines in the 1650s than by Laudians in the 1620s and 1630s. By considering expressions of anti-Calvinism across diverse styles, these chapters have highlighted surprising theological proximity between those otherwise radically divided by political and ecclesial matters. Consequently, a more variegated approach is required to accommodate surprising diversity within English Arminianism.

Fig. 1 Quadrants of theological identity c. 1650s
As fig. 1 illustrates, a snapshot from the 1650s should take into consideration both soteriological and ecclesiological spectrums in order to capture different styles of English Arminianism. The lower left and right hand quadrants include divines who were keen to avoid any association with each other. However, their horizontal equivalence indicates surprisingly similar doctrinal commitments. This observation was not lost on Reformed divines, who were keen to shame those among the godly, toying with Arminianism. George Kendall’s Act Theses referred to Henry Hammond and John Goodwin in the same breath as the two leading ‘neo-Pelagians’. John Owen’s *Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance* (1654) also attacked both Goodwin and Hammond as though a common enemy. Thomas Pierce awkwardly deflected accusations: ‘That J, Good.W. is a very brother of mine’. Indeed, Goodwin sought to defend himself against the accusation that as a deviant puritan, his theology of grace resembled that of the prelates. In *Redemption Redeemed*, he went out of his way to differentiate himself from ‘our late Bishops, such as Romanized, and Tyrannized’. He accused the Laudians of ulterior motives, claiming that they ‘politiquely fell to professe and teach Remonstrantisme’ simply as a means to discredite ‘the Puritan Doctrine before the People’. Goodwin therefore denied any guilt by association: ‘it is no disparagement to the Sheep that the Wolf sometimes puts on and weares her cloathing’. Goodwin’s arguments are less revealing than the fact that he felt obliged to offer an explanation in the first place.

The plot thickens when sectarian are brought into play. The notorious controversialist, Clement Writer, in *Fides Divina* (1657) cited long sections from

---

3 The diagram is limited by its two-dimensional approach and cannot portray the comet-like migration of many during the English Revolution. It is therefore not intended to be exhaustive or precise but simply to illustrate surprising affinities along longitudinal and latitudinal lines.
5 *Divine Philanthropie*, 40. Indeed, when the Dutch Remonstrant historian, Gerard Brandt, listed influential English Arminians, he inserted ‘Goodwin’ amongst episcopalian names such as Hammond, Pierce, Heylyn and Womock, in a manner that completely overlooked their political differences. See the dedicatory epistle dated 1674 in Brandt, *The History of the Reformation and Other Ecclesiastical Transactions in and about the Low Countries*, 4 vols (1720-23), II. xi.
6 *RR*, 170-1.
both the ‘great Schollar’, Jeremy Taylor as well as ‘John Goodwin, a man of both
great learning and deep judgment’ to bolster his radical views on Scripture,
tradition and toleration. Equally, the Presbyterian Nathaniel Stephens
highlighted the apparent influence of Jeremy Taylor on the unorthodox
formulation of original sin by the Leveller and General Baptist, Robert Everard.
For both Taylor and Goodwin, this was unwanted attention that could get a
divine in trouble. However, it also revealed a surprising triangulation as
sectarians borrowed ammunition from episcopal and puritan divines in order to
lay siege to the bulwarks of Reformed Orthodoxy. As Poole has noted: ‘When the
flat map of politics was pasted onto a globe, the extremes, from a theological
point of view, met’.

However, fig. 1 also highlights vertical lines of relationship, leading to surprising
collaborations, which spanned the Calvinist/Arminian divide. For example, the
high Calvinist John Owen and the Arminian John Goodwin were co-signatories of
the Humble Proposals, as shared doctrinal commitments and political interests
transcended deep soteriological divisions. Equally, the ‘improbable friendship’
between the episcopal Arminian Peter Heylyn and the episcopal Calvinist
Thomas Barlow, along with the longstanding relationship between Robert
Sanderson and Henry Hammond, illustrated the way ecclesial concerns
sometimes took centre stage and obscured significant soteriological
differences. Given the multi-faceted and provisional nature of these religious
identities and networks, more nuanced taxonomical instruments are required to
convey complex interrelationships between social, ecclesial and doctrinal
loyalties. For during the 1650s, whole new categories arose (e.g. Quakers),
paradoxical combinations emerged (e.g. puritan Arminians), and surprising
collaborations developed. In this context, English Arminianism experienced a

---

7 Clement Writer, Fides Divina: the Ground of True Faith Asserted (1657), 9, 14.
8 Nathaniel Stephens, Vindiciae Fundamenti: or A Threefold Defence of the Doctrine of
Original Sin (1658). Book I examined ‘Mr Everards ‘Method’ and Book III ‘Dr Taylor’.
9 William Poole, Milton and the Idea of the Fall, 41. This further explains the strong
resistance from Hammond and Thorndike toward Taylor, as his radical views
undermined the claim of moderation by episcopal Arminians.
10 Anthony Milton, Laudian and Royalist Polemic, 150. See Heylyn’s ‘Postscript’ to
Historia Quin-Quarticularis, where he defends ‘that learned Prelate… Dr. Barlow’.
‘golden age’ that spawned numerous diverse and sophisticated publications. Commenting on ‘Arminianism and the Restoration church’, Nicholas Tyacke referred to the emergence of a ‘new Arminianism’ late in the seventeenth-century that ‘was a much sturdier and more intellectually developed growth, which proved capable of combinations scarcely dreamt of earlier’. However, Part I has demonstrated that the rise of new styles of English Arminianism did not wait for the Restoration church, but were in fact a consequence of the paradoxical crisis of Calvinism during the decade of puritan rule. Part II will now trace the detailed theological contours of the two leading English Arminians in the 1650s, John Goodwin and Henry Hammond.

11 Aspects of English Protestantism, 336. The claim that this ‘new Arminianism’ included the convergence of Dutch and English movements will be considered in Part II.
PART II

‘Quinqu-Articularis’

Tracing the Contours of English Arminian Theology
CHAPTER FIVE

*Ordo Decretorum*

Confessional Traditions and Doctrinal Disputes
Others apart sat on a Hill retir’d,
In thoughts more elevate, and reason’d high
Of providence, Foreknowledge, Will, and Fate,
Fixt Fate, Free will, Foreknowledge absolute,
And found no end in wand’ring mazes lost

John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, II. 557-563

The Reformation and post-Reformation eras were marked by major episodes of theological controversy. Registering high on the Richter scale were debates regarding predestination and the doctrines of grace, which troubled every major Christian tradition. The Eastern Orthodox Church faced the apparent conversion of a former Patriarch of Constantinople to Calvinism as witnessed in *The Confession of Cyril Lukaris* (1631). The controversy culminated in the Synod of Jerusalem (1672), whose *Confession of Dositheos* condemned Calvinist doctrines as ‘abominable, impious, and blasphemous’.¹ In 1581, debate flared within the Roman Catholic communion as a Dominican friar, Domingo Báñez, accused Jesuit priests of reducing grace to synergistic aid (*auxilia*) rather than efficacious infusion. The publication in 1588 of *Concordia Liberi Arbitrii* by the Spanish Jesuit Luis de Molina added fuel to the fire. By 1602 Pope Clement VIII presided over a series of formal conferences in a bid to resolve what became known as the controversy *de Auxiliis*.² After eighty-five conferences, the verdict was inconclusive and a papal decree in 1607 permitted both Dominican and Jesuit doctrines of grace. A later decree in 1611 forbade further publications regarding efficacious grace in a bid to dampen the flames of controversy that still raged.³ However, the writings of Cornelius Jansen reignited the controversy in 1640 when his three-volume work was posthumously published, in which Jesuits were

---

³ The decree also forbade pejorative references to Dominicans as ‘Calvinists’ or Jesuits as ‘Pelagians’.
denounced as *Pelagiani moderni*. Finally, in 1653 Pope Innocent X condemned the five cardinal doctrines of Jansenism as heresy, though the dispute continued to simmer under the surface into the eighteenth-century.

Within Lutheranism, a synergisitic controversy also erupted and deepened divisions between the self-styled ‘Gnesio’ or ‘genuine’ Lutherans and the Philippists who followed Melancthon. Johann Pfeffinger and other Melancthonians contended for human co-operation in conversion, insisting that sufficient *modus agendi* (mode of action) was available to fallen humanity to respond to divine grace, *contra* Luther’s *De Servo Arbitrio*. However, Nikolaus Gallus and Andreas Musculus accused them of reintroducing the late medieval *via moderna* maxim associated with Ockham and Biel; God will not deny grace to those who do ‘what lies within’ (*quod in se est*). In the heat of battle, Melancthon was charged with being a crypto-Calvinist for his reduced sacramentalism and a crypto-Catholic for his view of good works and free will in the Majorist and Synergist controversies respectively. However, it was predominantly his version of Lutheranism that gained confessional status in the *Formula of Concord* (1577). Meanwhile, in Strasbourg, the Lutheran Johann Marbach clashed with the Reformed divine Jerome Zanchi over predestination and the possibility of apostasy among the elect. This fundamental division pushed Zanchi out of Strasbourg and further sealed the rift within Protestantism.

This brief synopsis of soteriological controversy spanning major Christian traditions provides an important backdrop for debates within Reformed

---


Protestantism. Capturing the breadth of debate in early modern Europe refutes any notion that predestination was a peculiarly Calvinist doctrine which other traditions avoided. Election and reprobation were considered important biblical categories by all major Christian traditions. Arminius himself described predestination as: ‘The First and most important article of religion’. Predestination therefore featured prominently in early modern confessions and catechisms – whether Catholic, Lutheran or Reformed. The longevity of predestinarian debates also demonstrates that Calvinism/Arminianism was not a new fault line. The heated exchanges at Congregatio de Auxiliis and the Synod of Dort were an echo of ancient discussions that reverberated down through the centuries. Ever since monks in Hadrumetum questioned the anti-Pelagian writings of the Bishop of Hippo, episodes of controversy regarding these matters punctuated the Western theological tradition. Though a version of Augustine’s mature thinking was given formal approval by the Second Council of Orange (529), unlike christological or trinitarian controversies, no ecumenical council or creed managed to achieve a ‘reigning orthodoxy on predestination’.

Indeed, development within Augustine’s theology, from predestination post praevisa to ante praevisa, allowed both sides to find suitable proof-texts from his immense corpus. Arminians could appeal to the ‘early Augustine’, arguing that in the heat of the Pelagian controversy Augustine subsequently lost his balance. Whereas Calvinists insisted that his subsequent retractions meant only the ‘late Augustine’ was truly Augustinian. Consequently, as Visser has demonstrated,

---

8 Jacobus Arminius, *Arminius and His Declaration of Sentiments*, ed. by Stephen Gunter, trans. by Stephen Gunter (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2012), 103. Subsequent references are from this edition unless otherwise stated. References to ‘anti-predestinarian’ theology are therefore problematic. See for example, Wallace who stated that ‘Hammond’s standpoint was clearly antipredestinarian’. In Puritans and Predestination, 125.

9 See for example the Council of Trent’s ‘Canons concerning Justification’, or Article XI of the Lutheran *Formula of Concord*. For the place of predestination in catechisms see I. M. Green, *The Christian’s ABC: Catechism and Catechizing in England c.1530-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). However, Green does note a decline in the prominence of predestination in catechisms over the course of the seventeenth-century (see p. 384).

'Augustinianism' was 'far from a coherent, unequivocal conception'. Instead, seventeenth-century divines representing both sides of the Dortian line appealed to the 'protean quality of Augustine’s authority' in order to demonstrate their alignment with ancient orthodoxy. Early modern divines also referenced subsequent episodes of debate such as Johannes Scotus Eriugena’s ninth-century clash with Gottschalk of Orbais or the polemical attacks by Gregory of Rimini and Thomas Bradwardine against the alleged Pelagiani moderni in the fourteenth-century. High-profile histories published in the seventeenth century attempted to tailor ancient controversies to suit their agendas. The Dutch scholar Gerardus Vossius published Historiae de controversiis quas Pelagius (1618), on the eve of the Synod of Dort, as an Arminian retelling of ancient controversies regarding predestination. The clear intent was to distance Remonstrant teaching from heresy and to align it instead with the mainstream Western tradition. Archbishop James Ussher’s riposte, Gotteschalci, et Praedestinatianae Controversiae (1631), attempted to turn the tables amidst growing concerns that Laudianism was a trojan horse for Arminianism. The French Jesuit, Louis Cellot, later published an alternative Historia Gotteschalci Praedestinatiani (1655), which took aim at Jansenists who adhered to Gottschalk’s notion of double predestination. Despite conflicting doctrinal agendas, Vossius, Ussher and Cellot shared the same concern to appropriate ancient authorities in the early modern struggle to define soteriological orthodoxy. As Stanglin therefore concludes,
‘From the letters of Paul, through Augustine to the Canons of Dort, soteriology has played a constitutive and ongoing role in the character of the Western church’.16 Consequently, ecumenical breadth and historical depth form an essential backdrop to seventeenth-century religious controversy. As Muller argues: ‘Seventeenth-century Reformed Protestants consciously formulated their theology with reference to the broader Christian tradition, basing formulations on Scripture, the Fathers, various medieval thinkers deemed useful, the works of the Reformers, and a host of contextual issues’.17 Therefore, narrow anglicized approaches that are limited to the confines of the Calvinist/Arminian debate only perpetuate the ‘lingering insularity of British Reformation studies’.18 Before considering the Arminian contours of John Goodwin (Chapter Six) and Henry Hammond (Chapter Seven), this bridge chapter will therefore provide a necessary introduction to the variegated and highly sophisticated theological resources available to English Arminian divines by the middle of the seventeenth-century. This will include a wide-angle perspective to capture their breadth of vision, including the Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed and Remonstrant traditions. It will also take the long-view to consider how English Arminians situated themselves in relation to centuries of debate and formulation. This backdrop will serve to highlight the bespoke and idiosyncratic soteriologies developed by English Arminians, who drew from an eclectic and often conflicting range of sources. Part II will therefore delve beneath the summative term ‘Arminian’ in order to reveal a spectrum of theologies and methodologies within this theological tradition. Not only did English Arminians emerge from within a variety of styles and sects during the 1650s (Part I), they also developed an eclectic range of theologies (Part II).

16 Keith D. Stanglin, Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation, 73.

John Plaifere’s Contemporary Taxonomy

In order to capture diversity and catholicity, Part II will draw on John Plaifere’s *Appello Evangelium* (1651), which offered a helpful synopsis of seventeenth-century soteriologies on their own terms.\(^{19}\) In addition to outlining Plaifere’s taxonomy, this chapter will contribute the first analysis of two extant manuscript copies of *Appello Evangelium*, highlighting important editorial changes made to the printed work.\(^{20}\) John Plaifere was Fellow of Sidney-Sussex College (Cambridge) and Rector of Debden (Suffolk). *Appello Evangelium* was likely a response to the controversy sparked by Montagu’s *Appello Caesarem* (1625). It was penned sometime between the publication of Samuel Ward’s sermon *Gratia Discriminans* (1626), which is cited, and Plaifere’s death in 1632. From the first page, Plaifere demonstrated his awareness of the issues at stake by noting that ‘the great Question of this Age’ is ‘*De ordine & modo praedestinationis*’.\(^{21}\) Plaifere’s work reflected these dual concerns and offered a five-fold taxonomy of ‘the several opinions of note and estimation’ regarding the order of divine decrees. The fifth opinion was favoured by Plaifere and so included an extended ‘exegesis’.

---

\(^{19}\) *AE* was printed in 1651, 1652 and 1653 as well as a later version entitled ‘An Appeal to the Gospel’, which was published in an anonymous work: *A Collection of Tracts Concerning Predestination and Providence* (1719). John Wesley published extracts of this edition in the *Arminian Magazine*, Vol. I. (1778).

\(^{20}\) To date, Seán Hughes and Jae-Eun Park have published scholarly articles on *AE*. Hughes highlighted the diversity within Calvinism, whereas this chapter will highlight the diversity within English Arminianism. Hughes relied on a later version (1718) and made considerable revisions of his own by rearranging Plaifere’s order and conflating two of the positions as ‘generally’ infralapsarian. Seán F. Hughes, ‘The Problem of Calvinism’. Park’s helpful article focuses on Plaifere’s arguments for combining *scientia media* and resistible grace in what Park terms ‘conditional predestination’. Jae-Eun Park, ‘John Plaifere (D. 1632) on Conditional Predestination’, 155. However, neither Hughes nor Park have engaged with the two extant manuscript copies of *AE*. In this chapter, the 1651 edition will be cited unless specific reference is made to these manuscripts: BL, ADD MS, 11040; Bodl., Rawlinson MS, C.167, fols. 212-18. The Bodleian Manuscript would seem to be the earliest as the preface is considerably shorter, it lacks a contents page and the lengthy discussion regarding free will is not included. The British Library manuscript appears to have been prepared for publication and bears much closer overall resemblance to the 1651 edition, though with several significant editorial changes which will be highlighted.

\(^{21}\) This echoed the title of a tract by William Perkins (1598), which received a notorious reply from Jacobus Arminius, *Examen Modestum Libelli Perkinsi* (1612, Leiden).
A subsequent section, consisting of nearly two hundred pages considered the mode of divine grace and its relationship to free will.

Though Plaifere clearly aligned himself with the opinion of ‘Arminius’, he displayed remarkable fairness in representing alternative views. He largely eschewed pejorative labels, opting instead to present each position in its strongest form, including lengthy citations from the Lambeth Articles, The Collegiate Suffrage by the British Delegation to Dort and John Overall’s Latin tract *Quinque sunt Articuli.* Plaifere’s magnanimity is further evident in the BL manuscript, which included a contents page that allocated the following federal heads to each position: ‘Opinion Perkinsi… Augustini… Overaldi… Hemingsi… Chrisostomi’. By aligning himself with the fifth position, Plaifere surrendered the immense authority of ‘Augustini’. However, by the time the manuscript was brought to print, the labels had been altered in a tactical manoeuver. The second ‘Opinion’ became ‘Synod of Dort’ and Plaifere’s fifth position simply ‘The Fathers’. The published edition in the 1650s therefore marginalized infralapsarianism to a modern synod and conferred the full weight of ancient authority on the position of Arminius.

Plaifere introduced each position with a formal *ordo decretorum,* which was a conventional method for outlining the procession of divine decrees. Such formulations were not intended to represent chronological sequence but rather structural and logical priorities within the divine will. As a scholastic approach to divine causation, it enabled both precision and comparison with alternative

---

22 The Bodleian manuscript opens with Plaifere’s reluctance to cite specific divines as the reader may be too easily ‘drawn to an opinion, by the Authority of great mens names rather than by their owne judgement’ (fol. 212).
24 BL, fol. 4.
25 *AE* [contents page]. However, the detailed commentary under ‘Synod of Dort’ did retain a qualifying note: ‘many doe say that Saint Austine was the first Author’ (*AE*, 16). In the Bodleian manuscript, Plaifere specifically identified ‘the Lutherans’ as those who attribute this position to ‘St Austin’ (Fol. 214).
26 An anti-Calvinist motive seems to have informed several other editorial amendments made by whoever brought the manuscript to print (see below).
approaches. Plaifere therefore reassured those who might demur at this more speculative approach, noting that his concern was to be ‘cleared of such crimes as Heresie, or Semi-heresie or novelty’. 27

*Supra-lapsum*: ‘opinion Perkinsi’

This first ‘Calvinist’ position began with a collegial list, which included ‘Beza, Piscator, Whitaker, Perkins, and other holy and learned men’. Plaifere proceeded to summarize the logic of their *ordo decretorum* as follows:

(i) ‘Create a certain number of Men’
(ii) ‘Predestinated some to everlasting life’ others ‘Reprobated’, according to ‘the pleasure of his own will’
(iii) ‘Permit Sin... that the Reprobate might be condemned’ and ‘decreed to send his Sonne to recover out of sin his Elect’

Distinct from the more extreme creabilitarianism, this formulation inserted decrees of election after creation but prior to any consideration of the fall (*supra lapsum*). The striking feature was therefore the symmetrical nature of divine causation. Both election and reprobation were considered *ante praevision* (prior to foresight) and thus not as a response to human sinfulness but *sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei*. As William Perkins stated, ‘God before all worlds did purpose to hate some creatures: and that justly so farre forth as his hating of them will serve for the manifestation of his justice’. 28 A singular divine purpose therefore positively and irrespectively willed election and reprobation in what has been termed ‘double predestination’ (*gemina praedestinatio*). However, Plaifere’s generous spirit carefully inserted the term ‘permit’ regarding the fall. Though Calvin largely renounced this term as insufficient to convey the intentionality of divine causation, Perkins affirmed the notion of divine permission in a bid to

---

27 *AE*, 7.
quiet the accusation that Calvinism made ‘God the author of sin’. By the late Elizabethan period, supralapsarianism was gaining ground in England and the Lambeth Articles were tabled in a bid to achieve confessional status. However, the 1590s witnessed a growing resistance to such strict formulations in the Dutch republic and in Cambridge. Plaifere therefore noted that supralapsarianism was in fact ‘rejected... by the reverend Divines of our Church that were at the Synod of Dort’. Indeed, supralapsarianism failed to achieve confessional status even among the continental Reformed churches.

Infra-lapsus: ‘opinion Augustini’

Plaifere associated the other major Calvinist formulation with ‘Abbot, B. of Salisbury, Doctor Carleton... many Papists, Bellarmine, Cajetan, and the Dominicans’. The logic of the divine will was as follows:

(i) ‘[T]o create mankind’
(ii) Foresee the fall but ‘not to hinder’ it
(iii) Out of fallen mankind, ‘he chose a certaine number... the rest leaving them in their sinnes’
(iv) ‘[F]or these his chosen, hee decreed to send his Son to redeeme them, and HIS SPIRIT TO CALL THEM... the rest he decreed to forsake... and to punish them for their sins’

Crucially, the decree now operated infra or sub lapsum as humanity was considered creatus et lapsus at the moment of predestination. Election was still ante praevisa and unconditional. However, reprobation was post praevisa as...
divine foreknowledge perceived humanity as massa corrupta due to original sin. Divine causation was therefore asymmetrical. Election was a gratuitous and irrespective gift of grace but reprobation was an act of retributive justice. As the BL manuscript suggested, this approach arguably traced back to 396 AD and St Augustine. In his Retractationes, Augustine recalled writing to his former pastor Simplicianus, regarding Romans 9:11 and the differentiation between Jacob and Esau. He had been committed to election post prævisa merita and so ‘laboured in defense of free choice’ as its necessary corollary. However, ‘the grace of God conquered’ and Augustine pioneered a theological paradigm underpinned by three axiomatic principles: original sin, which he first mentions in his letter to Simplicianus; gratia operans as the essential prerequisite for any human responsiveness; unconditional election as an unmerited and gratuitous gift: ‘for what have you that you did not receive?’ (1 Cor. 4:7). Augustine therefore concluded that the grace to finally persevere was causally derived from absolute predestination:

Between grace and predestination there is only this difference, namely that predestination is the preparation for grace, while grace actually bestows it... grace is the result of predestination.35

---

34 These citations are taken from an overview of Augustine's Retractiones in Gerald Bonner, Freedom and Necessity: St. Augustine's Teaching on Divine Power and Human Freedom (Washington: CUA Press, 2007), 2-4. John Barclay has also given a helpful analysis of the development of Augustine’s soteriology, by framing it within a broader taxonomy of six ‘perfections’ of grace that characterise the history of interpretation regarding Paul and the Gift. Barclay considers Augustine’s uniqueness to consist in a definition of grace that for the first time drew into one-approach three attributes or ‘perfections’. Firstly, the ‘priority’ of grace as ‘gift’ that always precedes human agency. Secondly, the ‘incongruity’ of the ‘gift,’ without consideration of the recipient's merit or worth. Thirdly, the intrinsic ‘efficacy’ of the ‘gift’, which ensures that it always accomplishes its goal. John Barclay, Paul and the Gift (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 70-75, 85-97.

35 ‘On the Gift of Perseverance’, in Saint Augustine, On the Free Choice of the Will, on Grace and Free Choice, and Other Writings of Augustine, trans. by Peter King (Cambridge: CUP, 2010), 234-5. Augustine remained broadly committed to what could be termed an infralapsarian approach, interpreting the potter’s clay in Romans 9:21 as massa damnata.
Though some Reformed divines did combine infralapsarianism with double predestination, by the early seventeenth-century the English tendency was to downgrade reprobation from an active decree to a passive negation that passed over the majority of humanity in a state of damnation. The Collegiate Suffrage of the British delegation therefore argued that reprobation was ‘non-electing’.\(^{36}\) Equally, infralapsarianism accommodated certain expressions of hypothetical universalism, including those of Davenant, Preston and Ussher, who revised the doctrine of the atonement but retained the structural integrity of this \textit{ordo decretorum}. However, despite softer tones, Plaifere insisted infralapsarianism was still plagued by divine arbitrariness, leaving the reprobate ‘but more oppressed, being call’d to embrace salvation offered, which they cannot do’.\(^{37}\)

\textit{Universalismus hypotheticus: ‘opinion Overaldi’}

Plaifere next considered creative attempts to convert the ‘two extremes’ of ‘Remonstrants’ and ‘Contra-Remonstrants’ into a ‘third’ way.\(^{38}\) Attributed to ‘Doctor Overald’ and his ‘diligent Auditor’, Richard Thomson, Plaifere outlined the following order:

(i) ‘Decreed to create’
(ii) ‘[F]oresaw the fall’
(iii) ‘[D]ecreed to send his Sonne to dye for the World… and to offer salvation unto all men, with a common and sufficient grace’
(iv) ‘Out of God’s foreknowledge that none would believe by this common grace, he decreed to adde a special, more-effectuall grace to whomsoever he pleased… by which they shall not onely bee able to believe, but also actually believe’

\(^{37}\) \textit{AE}, 18.
\(^{38}\) \textit{AE}, 33.
In a crucial revision, the decree of particular election was relocated after the provision of universal atonement and sufficient grace. Through Christ, humanity was now considered *creatus et lapsus et redemit* and an initial decree of general election extended a universal offer of salvation. As Plaifere noted, this position: ‘cannot admit a decree of predestination... antecedent to the Gospell’. However, given that none would actually ‘believe by this common grace’, a subsequent and absolute decree follows, accompanied by effectual grace. These structural modifications enabled a more thoroughgoing universalism consisting of both ‘common’ and ‘special’ grace derived from dual intentions in the divine will, ‘conditional’ then ‘absolute’. This reworking of Reformed Orthodoxy implied that the divine will was not only frustratable but also responsive to foreseen creaturely actions. Nevertheless, despite radical alterations, the approach still arrived at the same conclusion as supra- and infralapsarianism: salvation is only effectual by absolute election and irresistible grace.

Though John Overall insisted that the Church of England held this middle way, Plaifere noted its ambiguity and rarity: ‘The Opinion, if I understand it aright, I have not found expressly or strictly examined by any Divine’. However, the Amyraldian School soon emerged as a continental equivalent and provoked heated debates. John Cameron, a Scottish theologian who taught at the Academy of Saumur (1618-21), pioneered an approach that Moses Amyraut refined in several high profile publications including *Traitté de la Prédestination et de ses Principales dépendances* (1634). Richard Baxter formulated the best-known

---

39 This accounts for the crucial differences between the hypothetical universalism of Davenant *et al*, which remained infralapsarian, and the more thoroughgoing universalism of Amyraldianism.

40 *AE*, 34.

41 For this reason, the Amyraldian formulation of the decrees remained broadly within the Reformed tradition despite internecine controversy. See Richard Muller, ‘Diversity in the Reformed Tradition’, 18-19.

42 *AE*, 23. The defining characteristic of Overall’s approach was the notion of a *via media* that joined together what others rent asunder: ‘*conjungit particulare decreatum absolutum... cum generali et conditionata voluntate*. See *Quinque sunt Articuli* in Anthony Milton, *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort*, 67.

43 Amyraut attended three separate synods charged with heresy (Alencon in 1637, Charenton in 1644, Loudun in 1659) but each time was acquitted. For more on Amyraldianism and its distinction from hypothetical universalism see Richard A. Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 107-25.
English version of Amyraldianism and praised ‘Camero’s moderation and great clearness’.\(^{44}\)

*Appello Evangelium* portrayed the Overallian position as still broadly committed to a Reformed denial that conditional decrees resourced by common grace could ever be actually salvific for fallen humanity.\(^{45}\) However, John Overall was master of ambiguity and left several tantalizing allusions to other possibilities. In a crucial sentence, Overall affirmed the elect were given ‘more [magis] efficacious and abundant grace’ but in one manuscript variation qualified this to be ‘sine ullo praejudicio [reliquorum]’.\(^{46}\) If ‘reliquorum’ was original to Overall, not only did he consider special grace merely a difference of degree but also implied this did not prejudice the possibility of salvation for the ‘remainder’. Overall’s approach was further complicated by his commitment to English Prayer Book theology, which implied that justification was conferred on all those baptized. Though Overall acknowledged only the elect were certain to persevere, he left a pregnant silence regarding the rest: ‘The Church of England maintains with Augustine that believers *may* recede from grace and faith through temptations’ whereas the elect ‘cannot either totally or finally fall’.\(^{47}\) This Augustinian approach therefore posited justifying grace among the reprobate, which at the very least severed the ‘Golden Chaine’ of the Reformed *ordo salutis*.\(^{48}\) It could also imply an alternative sacramental route of grace for those not among the ‘elect’.

One plausible interpretation therefore assumes that Overall’s ambiguities deliberately allowed for two paths of salvation. Special grace by an absolute

\(^{44}\) Baxter, *Catholick Theologie*, ‘Preface’, sig. a3. As noted in Part I, Amyraldianism also gained popularity among General Baptists such as Thomas Lamb and Henry Denne.

\(^{45}\) The 1651 edition added a concluding paragraph to this third position, which fiercely critiqued any notion of election prior to divine ‘contemplation’ of the gospel actually ‘preached to the World’. In short, ‘The Gospel, I say cannot admit a decree of predestination to life or death’ apart from ‘Divine foreknowledge’. See the section between: ‘for since’ and ‘the Divine foreknowledge’ (*AE*, 33-34). This paragraph was absent from both manuscripts suggesting it was not original to Plaifere. This later editorial work therefore conveyed a growing intolerance for any notion of irrespective decrees by the 1650s.


\(^{47}\) Ibid., 66. Emphasis added.

\(^{48}\) For more on the golden chain and Arminian rebuttals, see Chapter Six.
decree was reserved for the elect but common and sacramental grace remained available to the rest, according to a conditional decree, and could actually save those who persisted in faith and perseverance. Thus considered, Overall offered an English and Protestant strain of the variegated paths of grace found in Patristic and medieval theologies and defended by the Roman Catholic church. In particular, the assumption of Mary and the conversion of Saint Paul became oft-cited examples of those more 'highly favoured' (Luke 1:28). Whether he intended it or not, by the 1650s Overall’s convenient ambiguities provided a halfway house for those migrating from a Reformed heritage, who wished nevertheless to keep a foot in both camps.

Post praevisa: 'opinion Hemingsi’

If Overall was ambiguous, the fourth opinion unashamedly crossed the Rubicon. Plaifere attributed this position to ‘Melancthon, Hemingius and the Lutherans that follow the Augustan Confession, and formulam concordie; The Remonstrants, or Arminians and many Papists'.

(i) ‘To create man, to permit him to fall, and to send Christ’

(ii) ‘[God] made a generall conditionall decree of Predestination, under the condition of Faith, and Persverance; And a speciall absolute decree of electing those to life, whom he foreknew would believe and persevere under the meanes and aides of Grace’

This formulation assumed the same starting point as Overall and the Amyraldians. However, two crucial revisions extended the possibility of salvation

---

50 For example, Ockham argued some would be saved by congruous merit under a general pactum, while others were saved apart from merit by divine fiat. Biel posited a dual structure of direct predestination for the elect (ex gratia speciali) and indirect predestination for the rest (cum praevisis meritis). See Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 128-145.
51 The notable exception was Arminius, whose absence from this ‘Arminian’ fourth category indicated Plaifere's awareness of significant diversity within the Remonstrant tradition.
from hypothetical to categorical universalism.\(^{52}\) Firstly, predestination was considered a ‘generall and conditionall decree’, which established terms of salvation for all humanity. Consequently, with the benefit of foresight, God predestines those who actually fulfill the conditions of faith and perseverance. Election was therefore \textit{post praevisa} in a move to ‘enlarge the objects of Gods foreknowledge’.\(^{53}\) This appeared to resolve residual justice issues, as the divine will was purged of partiality. However, as Plaifere demurred, it risked conflating election with salvation and ‘seemeth to make Men choose God first, rather than God them’.\(^{54}\) Secondly, \textit{gratia universalis} is both universal in scope \textit{and} effectual for salvation. Plaifere carefully noted that, unlike Pelagianism, human agency still operated ‘under the meanes and aides of Grace’ and never solely \textit{ex natura}.\(^{55}\) Melanchthonian Lutherans, the early Remonstrants, and Tridentine Catholics largely retained the Augustinian premise of original sin, which rendered humanity incapable of faith and obedience apart from \textit{gratia praeveniens}.\(^{56}\) Crucially therefore, the point of departure with the Reformed tradition was not the \textit{necessity} but \textit{resistibility} of grace. Arminius insisted that: ‘The entire controversy can be reduced to answering this question, “Is the grace of God an irresistible force?”’\(^{57}\) The Arminian tradition distinguished itself by the crucial

\(^{52}\) For a discussion of these terms, see Richard Muller, \textit{Calvin and the Reformed Tradition}, 127, n.3.
\(^{53}\) \textit{AE}, 36.
\(^{54}\) \textit{AE}, 25. Reformed Orthodoxy insisted on an important distinction between election/reprobation, which were caused by the will of God and salvation/damnation, which were caused by the grace of Christ and human sin respectively.
\(^{55}\) See Plaifere’s later taxonomy, which distinguished views of free will according to Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, Augustinians and Manichaeism. \textit{AE}, 238-52.
\(^{56}\) However, within the Catholic, Reformed and Arminian traditions considerable debate continued regarding both the nature of original sin and its mode of transference. Some adhered to Augustine and Lombard’s reliance on concupiscence resulting in depravation and disordered desires. Others preferred deprivation of original righteousness resulting in the loss of the efficacious work of the Spirit to impart knowledge of God and moral virtue (Anselm, Scotus). Others such as Arminius considered original sin to consist only of the punishment (\textit{poena}) and not the guilt (\textit{reatus}) of Adam. See Stanglin and McCall, \textit{Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace}, 149-50.
\(^{57}\) \textit{Declaration of Sentiments}, 129, 141. Barclay’s disaggregation of the six ‘perfections of grace’ provides a helpful framework to move beyond the necessity of grace, to consider more nuanced differences regarding the nature of divine grace. As will be demonstrated, Calvin placed the stress on the \textit{priority} of God’s grace and the Calvinist tradition emphasized the ‘sovereignty’ of grace. However, the Arminian tradition formulated doctrines that emphasized alternative perfections, most notably ‘superabundance’ (the universal scope of saving grace) and ‘singularity’ (the unequivocal and singular intention
affirmation that grace was actually resistible and that election and reprobation were derived from free choice of the will rather than the cause of it. Consequently, the principle of predilection was not the secret operation of the divine will but the simple response of the human will. As Plaifere concluded: ‘The Elect obey their Calling’, the reprobate do not.

Regarding the source of this position, Plaifere insisted: ‘These things I was warned of long agoe by Melancthon, before the name of Arminius was heard of here’. Appeal to the Lutheran tradition was no doubt partly tactical, due to the tarnished reputation of the Remonstrants post-Dort. However, it also highlighted the genuine influence of Melancthonian Lutherans on English anti-Calvinists. Indeed, Niels Hemmingius (c.1513-1600) was an astute choice to represent this ‘fourth opinion’. The Danish Lutheran was a faithful disciple of Melancthon, who regularly cited and defended ‘Philippus’ in his writings. Arminius owned copies of his works and cited him in his high profile appearance before the States of Holland at the Hague (1608): ‘Hemmingius in his treatise on universal grace considers the controversy to hang on two fundamental points, “Do the elect believe?” or, “Are believers the true elect?”’ Hemmingius’s writings were also influential among English divines. A letter from William Barlow to John Overall referred to ‘one whom you love well, Hemmingius’ and proceeded to cite him to refute perfectionism. Six of his works were translated into English between 1569 and 1581, and his Latin tract on predestination became well known.

of God to provide sufficient saving grace for all). These Arminian concerns inevitably dashed with the Augustinian commitment to ‘complete efficacy’ and the Calvinist corollary of irresistibility. See Barclay, Paul and the Gift, 70-71, 128-9.

As Calvin noted: ‘Thus by interposing foreknowledge as a veil, they not only obscure election, but pretend to give it a different origin’. Institutes, 3.22.1. Citations from Calvin’s Institutes are taken from John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. by Henry Beveridge (London: James Clarke, 1957).

AE, 263-4.

AE, 271.


CUL, MS Gg, 1.29, II, fol. 42. The letter was dated 14th Feb. 1598.

See Niels Hemmingius, Tractatus De Gratia Universalis Seu Salutaris Omnibus Homnibus (Copenhagen: 1591). Hemmingius was attacked by Twisse who considered him, along with the Dutchman Gellius Snecanus and the Lutheran Nicholaus Hunnius, to be the primary inspiration for recent attacks on Perkins by Arminius and Baro.
Hemmingius’s soteriology, as outlined in Tractatus, was consistent with Melanchton, who united Protestant fiduciary commitments with a carefully qualified synergism. For Hemmingius, predestination was both conditional according to foreseen faith and corporate as a status conferred on those ‘in Christ’, who enter the company of the elect. In Tractatus, Hemmingius criticised ‘D. Ioannis Calvini’ for making God a respecter of persons through particular election. Hemmingius proceeded to outline ten points of divergence in the form of an anti-Calvinist manifesto. The third and fifth points stated:

III. To them God’s foreknowledge is the cause of election; to us it is not the cause, but the rule.

V. We teach that the manner of predestination and election according to Paul is in Christ and through Christ; they do not acknowledge Christ as the cause of predestination.

Hemmingius also insisted that the mode of grace and the Spirit’s work in conversion were ‘not violent but voluntary’ [non sunt violenta, sed voluntaria] as faith is both ‘the gift of God and the work of man’ [donum Dei, & opus hominis]. This careful phraseology was a creative interpretation of the Formula of Concord, which had insisted that in the moment of conversion, the human will was passive. Hemmingius therefore blended the Formula with Melancthonian synergism and concluded that ‘faith is a passive work’ [fides passiuum est opus].

Hemmingius’s Tractatus and Plaifere’s summary of this fourth position represented harmonious accounts of the two defining doctrines of Arminianism:

---


64 See Gregory Graybill, Evangelical Free Will: Philipp Melanchthon’s Doctrinal Journey.
65 Tractatus De Gratia Universalis, 76-8. Translated from the Latin text with reference to Henrik Frandsen, Hemmingius in the Same World as Perkinsius and Arminius (Copenhagen: Velux Foundation, 2013), 37.

III. Illis praescentia Dei est causa electionis: nobis non est causa, sed regula.

V. Nos modu praedestinationis & electionis ex Paulo in Christo & per Christum docemus: illi Christu causam esse praedestinationis non agnoscent.

66 Tractatus De Gratia Universalis, 56.
conditional election by foreknowledge and resistible grace in accordance with free will. Though this was a far cry from Pelagianism it was also a considerable distance from Reformed Orthodoxy, rendering Arminianism a distinct Protestant tradition in its own right.

*Scientia media:* 'opinion Chrysostomi'

If the fourth opinion demonstrated Lutheran influence on English divines, the fifth highlighted that of Catholic scholastics. Plaifere introduced this final position as his own along with 'Arminius... Vorstius' and the 'Jesuits' most notably 'Molina' and 'Suarez'. Conscious of the charge of novelty, Plaifere also appealed to 'the Fathers Greeke and Latine before St Augustine', with 'Chrysostomi' rather generously appointed federal head despite a lack of supporting evidence. This final position drew on the notion of middle knowledge or *scientia media* as follows:

(i) ‘God by his infinite understanding... knew all things possible'  
(ii) From infinite possibilities, 'he conceived all this one frame of the World that now is'  
(iii) ‘Hee knows how to vary or alter’ this world ‘if hee would otherwise order them’  
(iv) ‘But considering this frame of the world, and order of mankinde (as now it is...) he judged it was exceeding good for the manifestation of [his divine attributes]’  
(v) 'God infallibly foreknew that if hee should decree to put it into execution... these particular persons would certainly... [be] brought to eternal life; and those other particular persons... would goe into perdition'  
(vi) ‘Though hee knew what these would be, yet he determined and decreed out of his owne absolute will and pleasure to say, Fiat... and in so doing he predestinat[ed] all men either to life or death Eternal'.

---

67 *AE*, 38.
Origen had framed the ancient debate over divine foreknowledge with his pithy summary: ‘a thing does not come to pass (non sit) because it is foreknown or foretold; but it is foreknown or foretold because it is yet to be’. Calvin and the Reformed tradition insisted otherwise. God foreknows only what his will determines. However, out of the Thomist tradition, the Jesuit teacher Fonseca and his brilliant pupil, Luis de Molina, pioneered an innovative middle-way, which attempted to harmonise divine and human causation. Recent scholarship has vindicated Plaifere’s assumption that these Catholic formulations were ‘foundational to [Arminius’] revision of the doctrine of predestination’. Early Remonstrants such as Conrad Vorstius and Simon Episcopius also appeared to rely heavily on Molina’s four volume classic: De liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, praedestinatione et reprobatione concordia (Lisbon, 1588).

In Concordia, Molina posited a ‘third type’ of knowledge within the intellectus Dei, which mediated between the traditional bipartite approach of scientia simplicis intelligentiae (what could be) and scientia visionis (what will be). For Molina, scientia media was that ‘by which... [God] saw in His own essence what each such will would do with its innate freedom were it to be placed in this or that... order of things’. Consequently, for Molina, divine foreknowledge was not derived from either foreordination as in the Reformed tradition, or foreknowledge of the future as in Plaifere’s ‘fourth opinion’. Instead, middle knowledge sees beyond what Judas could do, yet before what he will do, to infallibly know what Judas

---

70 Muller, God, Creation, and Providence, 154. See also Stanglin and McCall, Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace, 62–69.
72 Concordia, 4.52.9.
would do within any *ex hypothesi* circumstance. Crucially, the free decisions of secondary causes therefore populate the content of divine *scientia media* prior to any determination by the divine will. Consequently, pre-volitional knowledge of counterfactuals enables certain but hypothetical knowledge that, for example, Judas *would* betray Jesus if placed in a given set of circumstances. *Should* the divine will then sovereignly chose to instantiate those circumstances, Judas *will* freely betray Jesus.

This innovative model inspired an alternative approach to predestination, which was quite distinct from reliance on simple foreknowledge. Consistent with the Thomist tradition, Molina considered predestination a ‘speciall and principall part of [divine] Providence’, which orders every aspect of any given world. However, through *scientia media* God foreknows the *ex hypothesi* free response of individuals to grace in any given set of circumstances. Predestination is therefore the combined result of the free response of humans to grace within the particular set of circumstances that the divine will chooses to instantiate. For Plaifere, this was the profitable genius of *scientia media*. Predestination remained a non-meritorious and gratuitous act ‘out of [God’s] owne absolute will and pleasure’, to decree a certain world in which only the elect will believe. Yet within this world, human free will contributes a decisive response to grace without intrinsic determination. The theory of *scientia media* therefore attempted to resolve the ancient conundrum by demonstrating *concordia* between human free will and divine sovereignty. However, Plaifere concluded his summary by placing the accent firmly on divine mystery, for ‘who can tell why

---

73 *Concordia*, 4.50.15.

74 Of the numerous Reformed critiques of *scientia media*, some accused it of being an even stronger form of determinism than that which it sought to avoid. Others argued it made the divine will hostage to fortune, while still others focused on more technical arguments tracing back to Aristotle regarding the determinate truth-value of counterfactuals. See Muller, *PRRD*, III. 417-32.

75 *AE*, 71.

76 By contrast, Francisco Suarez also used *scientia media* but still posited *a priori* particular and absolute election. For a helpful overview of the differences between Molina and Suarez, see William Lane Craig, *The Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents from Aristotle to Suarez* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 169-233.
God by his Decree settled upon Peter, rather than upon Judas?’ Or indeed ‘why he distributeth the gifts of Nature, and of Grace so diversly?’

Through the modal logic of scientia media, Jesuit scholastics formulated innovative and sophisticated resources, which Dutch and English Arminians modified to suit their Protestant convictions. Some English divines such as Plaifere and Herbert Thorndike overtly appropriated scientia media. Others appear to have borrowed elements of Molina’s approach without wholesale adoption. This represented a new threat to Calvinist divines, who appropriated the tools and methods of scholasticism to defend Reformed theology against an increasingly sophisticated and well-resourced enemy.

English Arminianism: Diversity and Catholicity

In the early Stuart period, Appello Evangelium captured growing levels of diversity and complexity within seventeenth-century formulations of the order of divine decrees and the mode of saving grace. Plaifere’s work highlights the catholicity of sources and influences that informed English Arminians in their quest to develop an intellectually and pastorally robust alternative to Calvinism. Consequently, beneath generic terms such as ‘English Arminianism’ lay a rich and variegated tradition of bespoke theologies, which remain largely unexplored. Set against the backdrop of the Western theological tradition and taking into consideration the influence of Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed and Remonstrant sources, the following chapters will analyse the soteriological writings of John

---

77 AE, 51. The BL manuscript further emphasized divine sovereignty by noting that the free decision of God resulted in a world which would be ‘happie for some; unhappie for others’. This emphasis seemed to offend the sensibilities of whoever brought it to print and was removed. Cf. BL, fol.17; AE, 40.

78 Richard Hooker and Thomas Goad may have been influenced by Molinism without fully endorsing it. See Barry Bryant, ‘Molina, Arminius, Plaifere, Goad, and Wesley on Human Free-Will, Divine Omniscience, and Middle Knowledge’, Wesleyan Theological Journal, 27 (1992), pp. 93-103; Nigel Voak, ‘English Molinism in the Late 1590s: Richard Hooker on Free Will, Predestination, and Divine Foreknowledge’, The Journal of Theological Studies, 60 (2009), pp. 130-177.
Goodwin and Henry Hammond as the two leading English Arminians during the 1650s. The contours of their argumentation regarding predestination and grace will be carefully examined to reveal points of surprising similarity and striking juxtaposition.
CHAPTER SIX

Tracing the Contours of John Goodwin’s
Arminian Theology
'At our backs'

In 1638, the Scottish Presbyterian Robert Baillie gave a speech at the General Assembly of the Kirk, warning against Laudians such as Richard Montagu and Francis White, spreading 'Arminian Errour'. In 1652, following the publication of *Redemption Redeemed*, Baillie published an identical speech under the title *A Scotch Antidote to English Arminianism*. In the preface, Baillie warned that 'long hot skirmishes' in the 1640s regarding 'Bishops' and 'ceremonies' had allowed John Goodwin to 'cast open at our backs the gates of our great Towers... to undermine the very foundation of our Church'.\(^1\) It was the 'at our backs' threat that was so disconcerting. John Goodwin therefore became known as 'the Great spreader of Arminianism' from within the puritan fold.\(^2\)

Ironically, Goodwin's Reformed education strengthened his critique of Calvinism. After seven years at Queens' College, Cambridge, he completed his MA degree in 1619. Through rigorous training he had mastered Hebrew, Greek and Latin, attaining the humanist ideal of *trium linguarum gnarus*. He was also tutored in scholastic methods and fully conversant with the logic of Aristotelian causality. Goodwin's publications included extended exegetical arguments, which displayed the more general Protestant trait of ‘...a profound recourse to the biblical text in its original languages’.\(^3\) Equally, Goodwin applied syllogistic argumentation based on what he referred to as the 'rules' and 'axiomes' of the 'schoolmen'.\(^4\) In short, Goodwin illustrated the reasonably happy marriage between humanist *and* scholastic methodologies among Reformed divines.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Robert Baillie, *A Scotch Antidote against the English Infection of Arminianism* (1652), 18, 'To the Reader'.

\(^2\) In John Toland, *The life of John Milton* (1699), 125. Goodwin's Arminian publications were prolific. *Redemption Redeemed* (1651) totalled nearly six hundred pages in folio. His other Arminian publications amassed well over one thousand pages in quarto.


\(^4\) See for example, *Imputatio Fidei*, Part II.

\(^5\) Indeed, Goodwin was perfectly prepared to use scholastic methods to make the case for Arminianism. This further refutes the assumption prevalent in older historiography that scholasticism resulted in metaphysical and deterministic theologies that made predestination a central dogma. Rather, scholasticism was 'a scientific method of...
Consequently, Goodwin’s Arminianism was radical precisely because of its conservative appropriation of the methods and authorities familiar to Reformed Orthodoxy. In defending *Redemption Redeemed*, Goodwin insisted: ‘A considerable part of my works consist of Scripture stabiliments’ along with lengthy citations from ‘Calvin, Musculus, Melancthon, Bucer, Peter Martyr... besides what I alledge from the ancient Fathers’. He therefore claimed ‘patronage and countenance’ from Reformed luminaries throughout his Arminian publications.⁶ Despite Thomas Edwards labelling him ‘hereticum ingenium’, Goodwin’s Reformed style was unnervingly conventional.⁷

Goodwin’s Primary Sources

Goodwin’s theological publications reflected his context as a religious controversialist and puritan pastor. *Redemption Redeemed* (1651), the most systematic of Goodwin’s works, was intended as a two-part project. Starting with atonement and perseverance, it would then ‘launch forth into the deep of the Great Question concerning Personal Election and Reprobation’.⁸ However, part one provoked such a reaction that Goodwin quickly became embroiled in controversy and wrote a series of *ad hoc* responses to *ad hominem* attacks. Consequently, part two failed to emerge and Goodwin’s Arminian theology must now be pieced together from *Redemption Redeemed* and other sections of theological argumentation strewn across the *quinquarticular* battlefield.⁹ As vicar of St Stephen’s and pastor of a gathered congregation, Goodwin’s publications also evidenced a serious concern to educate his flock. He dedicated *Redemption* research and teaching’ that did not ‘have a doctrinal content’ intrinsic to it. Willem Van Asselt and Pieter Rouwendal, ‘What is Reformed Scholasticism?’ in *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise, Texts and Studies in Reformation & Post-Reformation Thought*, ed. by W. J. Van Asselt and E. Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2001), pp. 1-9, 8.

⁷ *Gangraena* (1646), III, 114.
⁸ *RR*, 569.
⁹ In addition to *Redemption Redeemed*, the following publications, with shortened titles, will be important to this chapter: *Pagans Debt and Dowry* (1651); Εἰρηνομαχία. The Agreement and Distance of Brethren (1652) [Εἰρηνομαχία]; An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (1653) [Exposition]; *Triumviri* (1658); Πληρωμα το πνευματικον, or A Being Filled with the Spirit (1670) [Being Filled].
Redeemed to the ‘Heads of Colledges’ at Cambridge, yet signed the preface simply ‘Thy Brother in Christ, greatly devoted to the Peace of thy soul’. Though his scholarly works contained considerable *marginalia* from Greek and Latin sources, they were written in the vernacular for a lay readership of the ‘middling sort’. Indeed, Goodwin’s writings blended exegetical commentary, syllogistic reasoning, and scholarly citations with flourishes of sermonic rhetoric designed to move the heart. His Arminianism was never a mere abstraction but theology with persuasive intent. As scholar, pastor and controversialist, Goodwin's context and audience therefore shaped the way his theology was articulated - sometimes to reveal, other times to conceal; sometimes exuding irenic generosity, other times with provocative edge. This chapter will be sensitive not only to the content but also the form and purpose of Goodwin’s texts, fashioned in the cut and thrust of polemical debates and pastoral ministry.

Secondary Literature on Goodwin

Older historiography struggled to comprehend Goodwin’s unusual conjoining of Arminianism, congregationalism and tolerationism. The whiggish approach of William Haller and the political interests of Perez Zagorin reduced Goodwin’s complexities to one rather exaggerated feature. Goodwin’s tolerationism was interpreted as a *prolepsis* of ‘Enlightenment’ rationalism, individualism and liberalism. Ellen More therefore concluded that Goodwin ‘was a harbinger of the Lockean age’. In fact, Goodwin demonstrated little engagement with the ‘new philosophie’ and his tempered use of reason was a far cry from ‘Enlightenment’ rationalism. John Coffey’s intellectual biography has debunked whiggish approaches through a contextually sensitive reading of Goodwin’s life.

---

and thought, concluding that Goodwin ‘remained to the end a self-consciously godly, biblical, Reformed theologian’.13

As an intellectual historian, Coffey adopted a biographical approach, which included important summaries of Goodwin’s theological publications. In addition, David Parnham’s Heretics Within has attempted a comparison of Anthony Wotton and John Goodwin, focusing on their anti-imputationist approaches to justification.14 Consequently, a more analytical engagement with Goodwin’s Arminianism is now warranted. This chapter will appropriate the scholarship of historical theologians such as Richard Muller, to offer a synchronic analysis of John Goodwin’s Arminianism. Following Plaifere’s approach, the first half will consider the order of divine decrees and the second half the mode of saving grace in Goodwin’s Arminian theology. This will enable several contributions to scholarship. Firstly, Goodwin’s soteriology offers a point of reference for the reception of the Arminian tradition in England. Secondly, as the unique features of Goodwin’s Arminianism are teased out, it will enable comparison with Henry Hammond and other English Arminians. Thirdly, analysis of Goodwin’s migration could, as David Como hinted, offer ‘clues to a more general trajectory’ in mid-seventeenth-century England.15

A final word on approach is in order. The concern of this chapter will not be whether Goodwin was a ‘real Arminian’ by a flat comparison with Arminius. Goodwin himself bemoaned the polemical strategy of his opponents, who hunted for any commonality with Arminius and declared him ‘a meer Translator’.16 Modern historiography must avoid inadvertently repeating this genealogical fallacy out of concern to trace intellectual lineage back to Arminius or other

13 John Coffey, John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution, 9.
14 David Parnham, Heretics Within: Anthony Wotton, John Goodwin. Parnham also considers Goodwin’s Arminian works in later chapters. However, his descriptive approach does not analyze Goodwin’s Arminianism as a whole or consider it within a broader intellectual context. An article by Pederson also briefly touches on Goodwin’s doctrine of justification. An unpublished thesis also offered a more general overview of Goodwin’s theology and its relationship to his politics: W. J. Hinson, ‘The Theological Thought of John Goodwin’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1953).
15 David Como, ‘Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy’, 86.
16 Goodwin, Triumviri, 32.
Remonstrants. As Muller has shown, comparison paradigms such as ‘Calvin and the Calvinists’ reduce intellectual traditions to one federal head and flatten idiosyncrasies in a quest to demonstrate continuity or prove deviance. In order to trace the unique contours of Goodwin’s soteriology, this chapter will therefore consider a wide range of influences including Biblical texts, patristic writings, medieval theologies and early modern Reformed, Catholic, Lutheran and Remonstrant traditions. It will highlight eclectic sources, complex arguments and bespoke strategies, which Goodwin deployed in order to bring down ‘that grand confederacie’ of Calvinism.

**The Order of Divine Decrees**

For it is a general and true rule in Philosophy, that *modus operandi consequitur modum essendi*.

Goodwin’s soteriology was the outworking of prior commitments regarding his doctrine of God. The *modus operandi* of salvation was necessarily derived from the *modum essendi*. Unlike the Socinians, Goodwin adhered to the conventional paradigm of classical theism and accommodated his Arminian convictions within the intellectual framework shared by Catholic and Reformed divines. Though Aquinas had set the terms of reference, late medieval thinkers such as Duns Scotus (c.1266-1308), William of Ockham (c.1287-1347) and Gabriel Biel

---

17 Some Arminian studies motivated by confessional agendas have attempted to construct a ‘Reformed Arminian’ trajectory from Arminius to Wesley. This is considered to be orthodox Arminianism with other Remonstrants such as Corvinus or Van Limborch deemed heterodox. See Roger Olson, *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities* (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2009); J. Matthew Pinson, *Arminian and Baptist: Explorations in a Theological Tradition* (Nashville: Randall House, 2015).


19 *Exposition*, 291.

20 Classical theism refers to a metaphysical approach to the divine being associated with medieval scholasticism. It assumed an Aristotelian hierarchy of being, with God as first cause followed by a descending order of finite beings. The emphasis fell on the transcendence of God through his incommunicable attributes (e.g. simplicity, immutability, impassibility) as well as communicable divine attributes (e.g. wisdom, goodness, justice). For Socinian attacks on classical theism (esp. divine simplicity and infallible foreknowledge), see Stephen Hampton, *Anti-Arminians*, 195-203.
(c.1420-1496) offered seventeenth-century divines a variety of approaches to the divine nature and faculties.\textsuperscript{21} In a bid to find the most appropriate tools to ply his Arminian trade, Goodwin displayed a highly selective approach. For example, though he generally preferred the intellectualist tradition associated with Aquinas, he argued for the non-necessity of atonement on voluntarist grounds.\textsuperscript{22} However, Goodwin was not unusual: ‘Protestant theologians were highly eclectic, particularly inasmuch as they had no commitment to any single school’.\textsuperscript{23}

In \textit{Redemption Redeemed}, Goodwin deliberately set about to cross-reference divine decrees with the divine nature as part of a broader strategy to attack his opponents from the ground up. His concern was to demonstrate a fundamental contradiction between the orthodox approach to divine attributes and Calvinist soteriology. Goodwin spied within classical theism itself angles of approach that could give sufficient leverage to dislodge Reformed Orthodoxy from underneath. Driving a wedge between standard metaphysical approaches to the divine \textit{modus essendi} and Calvinist doctrines regarding the \textit{modus operandi} of salvation proved to be an effective Arminian strategy.\textsuperscript{24}

Decrees and Incommunicable Divine Attributes

Goodwin began \textit{Redemption Redeemed} by venerating the ‘sovereign and super-transcendent perfection’ of God’s being, which consisted of ‘the most absolute

\textsuperscript{21} For a helpful overview see Heiko Oberman, \textit{The Harvest of Medieval Theology. Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism} (Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963).

\textsuperscript{22} Goodwin asserted that atonement stemmed from the sheer mercy of God not anything external to the divine will. See \textit{RR}, 15-22. John Owen held a similar position but later switched due to the threat of the Socinians who denied the Anselmian approach to atonement altogether. As Gribben concludes, ‘Owen’s thinking was never static’. Crawford Gribben, \textit{John Owen and English Puritanism}, 10.

\textsuperscript{23} Muller, \textit{PRRD}, III. 108. Fixing divines to certain schools of medieval thought is therefore unwise, as their theology was mobile and selective.

\textsuperscript{24} Goodwin was not the first English divine to turn the tables on Calvinism in this way. Thomas Jackson had appealed to the metaphysical principles of the ‘logitians’ (esp. divine simplicity, immensity, eternity) in order to refute Calvinism. Though careful examination reveals that Goodwin’s arguments were markedly different, he may well have been inspired by Jackson’s strategy of using classical theism to refute Calvinism. See Jackson, \textit{Divine Nature and Essence} (1629), I. 45-128.
simplicity of Essence, without any Plurality, Multiplication, or Composition'. Having established divine simplicity and the perfection of non-compositional being, Goodwin turned the notion against eternal decrees predicated on individual persons. Based on the scholastic maxim ‘Quidquid est in Deo, Deus est’, Goodwin argued that no persons were present in eternity ‘other then the Divine Being itself... unmultiplied’. Having challenged the quidditative status of personal subjects, Goodwin accused his opponents of unwittingly teaching divine self-reprobation: ‘if God justified any from eternity, it must be himself: if he condemned or reprobated any from eternity, it must be himself likewise’. Goodwin conceded that persons were present in ‘seminall’ form. However, as an extension of divine simplicity, even this was without differentiation of any kind. ‘For as God himself, the common roote, or produent cause of all men, was one, singly, simply and most undividedly... so were all men’. Consequently, according to Goodwin, personal and particular election from eternity contradicts divine simplicity.

In conjunction with simplicity, Goodwin appealed to a Boethian notion of eternity in order to redefine the relationship between eternal decrees and temporal execution. Boethius (c. 480-525) famously considered eternity ‘the unending and perfect possession all at once of interminable life’. He therefore compared divine perception of time to a hilltop vantage point, which ‘embraces all the infinite recesses of past and future and views them in the immediacy of its knowing as though they are happening in the present’. Consequently, the

---

25 **RR**, 40-41. The medieval notion of divine simplicity insisted that God is not made up of parts nor composed of any underlying substance or properties.
26 **RR**, 45.
27 **RR**, 46.
28 Richard Baxter also argued that ‘there was no object really existent from eternity but God himself’. *Catholick Theologie* (1675), II. 6. However, whereas Baxter used this principle to undermine double predestination i.e. the notion that God could positively will a negative (preterition), Goodwin pressed further, denying also the positive willing of particular election. See Simon Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic*, 293-5.
language and limits of time are only predicated of God as an act of divine accommodation to finite beings. Formally there is no sequence in divine comprehension, or as Goodwin noted, ‘nothing sooner, nothing later’.31 This eternalist paradigm was widely assumed in the Western tradition, from Augustine through Anselm and Aquinas to Calvin himself. However, Goodwin radically extended the principle to insist that divine decrees were therefore not ‘precedaneous in time’ but contemporaneous to human action. Consequently, ‘though God willed that will from eternity, which was efficacious to make Peter a Believer’, yet it was not formally prior to Peter actually willing to believe ‘in time’. Instead, according to the simultaneity of eternity, the two wills act in a ‘mutuall co-incidency, or joynt concurrence’.32

To reinforce the argument, Goodwin appealed to the Thomist concept of divine actuality. As actus purus, God is fully actualized, containing no potential for further accretion or adaptation. Goodwin therefore insisted that all decrees, whether of creation or salvation, were not ‘by any new Influx, Operation, or exertion of himself’ but by ‘one great Creative Act, wherein he gave out himself from eternity’.33 Consequently, God ‘elected them; not because he had formerly passed any act of Election concerning them, which is now at an end, and ceaseth’. Rather, divine decrees are present-continuous realities, ‘giving life and salvation unto all those who believe’.34 Equally, reprobation is not from the ‘past’, but is a present ‘estate’ of refusing grace. Election and Reprobation are thus ‘Acts of God’ that are ‘eternally permanent’, derived from the ‘standing counsel and good pleasure, which is eternall in him’.35 Goodwin therefore considered Scriptures, which refer to election in the past tense as acts of divine accomodation. In truth, ‘Phrases importing time’ actually ‘signifie that kinde of Permanency, or presence which is proper to eternity’.36 Goodwin’s use of Boethian eternity resembled a

31 RR, 51.
32 RR, 51.
33 RR, 57.
34 RR, 62.
35 RR, 62.
36 RR, 63. On this basis, Goodwin argued that the notion of divine foreknowledge was inaccurate, being only ‘anthropo-pathetically ascribed unto God’. For God is not situated before time, apprehending the future through telescopic vision. Again, Goodwin’s motive
modified form of Platonic eternalism, with decrees of election and reprobation as continuous emanations. This undermined the Reformed sequential approach predicated on Aristotelian entelechy. Instead, for Goodwin, eternal decrees of election were immediate to human action, operating in a ‘joynt concurrence’.37

Goodwin’s concomitance theory echoed the approach taken by the early Stuart Arminian and Platonist, Thomas Jackson. In A Treatise of the Divine Essence and Attributes (1628/9) Jackson had argued that ‘as [God] ceaseth not to worke, so doth he never cease to decree’. One should therefore ‘looke on Gods Decree concerning, himselfe, as present or coexistent to his whole course of life’.38 Citing Plotinus, Jackson argued that eternity is ‘a Centre in a circle; and time to the points of extremities of the lines in the Circumference, alwayes so moving about the Centre, that were it an eye, it might view them all at once’.39 An unpublished manuscript by the Laudian anti-Calvinist and master of Trinity College (Cambridge), Samuel Brooke, attempted to draw this ‘eye’ in diagrammatic form, depicting eternity as a centre around which temporal events orbit with an overall heading: ‘Deus est Circulus’.40 Jackson, Brooke and Goodwin demonstrated the appeal of the Christian Platonist tradition for constructing a more concurrent and contingent approach to divine decrees.41 By conceiving time and eternity in a

---

37 RR, 51. Freddoso refers to this as the ‘concomitance theory’ because according to a more radical application of Boethian eternity, God’s knowing and willing are deemed to be concomitant to actions in time. In Luis De Molina, On Divine Foreknowledge: Part IV of the Concordia, 42-46.

38 Divine Essence, I. 121-2.

39 Divine Essence, I. 121-2, 70. Twisse argued, contra Jackson that ‘durations doe flowe rather from Gods will, then from his eternitie’. William Twisse, A Discovery of D. Jacksons Vanitie (1631), 231.

40 Wren Library, MS, B.15.13, fol. 52-3. Brooke had delivered an early anti-Calvinist dissertation, De auxilio divinae gratia, in June 1616. As Master of Trinity, he then worked on a four-part tract regarding predestination. He confidently notified Laud that he had ‘found an issue out of that wood and wilderness’ which had been unresolved in his previous work. However, Laud was reluctant to license any further works on the controverted matter of predestination. Consequently, Brooke’s manuscript was never published and only three parts were completed. See C. S. Knighton, ‘Brooke, Samuel (c.1575-1631)’, ODNB.

41 This Arminian interest was part of a wider renaissance of Christian Platonism during the seventeenth-century, which reached its most sophisticated expression among the
circular and concomitant fashion, divine decrees and human agency operated in a reciprocal manner through ‘mutuall co-incidency’.42

As a final scholastic battering ram, Goodwin appealed to the principle of divine immutability. Given that God is not subject to fluctuating affections, his infinite love cannot increase or diminish without violating divine immutability. However, if God elects specific persons from eternity with foresight of their sins (infralapsarianism), at the point of their conversion divine affection would alter from ‘hatred to love’.43 Equally, if out of supralapsarian humanity specific persons created good were subsequently reprobated, this would also require ‘a change in his affection’.44 Consequently, ‘an election of men in a mere personall consideration, must needs be inconsistent with the perfect actuality of God’.45 Instead, divine election should only be predicated upon ‘individuum, or Persons of such and such a Species’.46 By faith a person may be transferred from a state of reprobation to election without any divine alteration, for love or hate was never directed to the person but to the species. Goodwin compared these general states to the weather. Without ‘change or alteration... in the Climates’ a man may leave a cold region and enter warmer climes. This ‘only argues a change in the Man in respect of his Residence’.47

Cambridge Platonists. For an example of their approach to the divine being, see Leslie Armour, ‘Trinity, Community and Love: Cudworth’s Platonism and the Idea of God’, in Platonism at the Origins of Modernity: Studies on Platonism and Early Modern Philosophy, ed. by Douglas Hedley and Sarah Hutton (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), pp. 113-129. 42 RR, 51. John Owen had accused English Arminians of ‘Platonicall abstraction’, which undermined particular election. For Owen this resulted in ‘a predestination and none predestinated, an election and none elected... now such an election, such a predestination have the Arminians substituted, in the place of Gods everlasting decree’. John Owen, Theomachia Autexousiastike: or, A Display of Arminianisme (1643), 55. However, despite the claim of Twisse and Owen that Platonism inexorably led to Arminianism, several Reformed divines such as Theophilus Gale and Peter Sterry embraced forms of Platonism without renouncing their Calvinism. See Dewey Wallace, Shapers of English Calvinism, chs. 2 & 3.
43 RR, 63.
44 RR, 65.
45 RR, 63.
46 RR, 63.
47 RR, 64. This situated Goodwin within a longstanding tradition of those who considered divine decrees general not particular and conditional not absolute. John Scottus Eriugena depicted decrees as divine laws, which established general terms of salvation. Eriugena also argued that according to a Boethian approach to divine eternity, nothing is
In summary, *Redemption Redeemed* turned incommunicable divine attributes against Calvinist formulations of predestination. For Goodwin, divine simplicity negated the existence of persons to elect in the first place; divine eternity and actuality rejected 'past' election in favour of 'eternally permanent' decrees; divine immutability refuted particular predestination in favour of general categories or climates. Nevertheless, Goodwin insisted divine decrees were still 'absolute, unchangeable, irreversible upon any terms, suppositions or conditions whatsoever'. There may be 'conditions essentially included', but 'Evangelical' decrees of election and reprobation remain 'absolute'. For, 'if men believe, they shall be saved'. Goodwin was therefore adamant that despite his Arminian approach, the efficient cause of election remained *sola gratia*.

Decrees and Communicable Divine Attributes

The sheer diversity of medieval scholastic traditions offered numerous possibilities regarding the hotly contested matter of how to relate the divine faculties of intellect and will. In general, Reformed Orthodoxy prioritized the will as the first faculty of the divine life, unconditioned by the intellect. This safeguarded divine sovereignty and preserved a compatibilist form of human freedom through the Scotist theory of synchronic contingency. Of course, for known or predestined in any formal sense. Rather, ‘the one eternal predestination of God is God, and exists only in those things that are, but has no bearing... on those things that are not’. Johannes Scotus Eriugena, *Treatise on Divine Predestination*, trans. by Mary Brennan (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998), 'Epilogue'. *De divina Praedestinatione* was published in Paris in 1650. In the thirteenth-century, Petrus Aureolus radically applied Boethian eternity to deny foreknowledge, arguing instead that God was ‘indistant’ from the actuality of past, present and future so that future contingents were entirely undetermined. See Chris Shabel, ‘Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freedom’ in Russell Friedman and Lauge Nielsen, eds., *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400–1700* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2003), 167. In the sixteenth-century, Albertus Pighius and Jerome Bolsec used Boethian eternity to refute Calvin’s notion of *ante-praevisa* election. Indeed, Bolsec argued for ‘simultaneity of election and faith, given the non-temporal character of eternity’. Cited in Muller, ‘The Use and Abuse of a Document’, 44.

48 *RR*, 64.
49 *RR*, 65.
50 This approach has been examined and defended in Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as Against Sudrez, Episcopius, Descartes, and*
Reformed divines were also reliant upon the Thomist intellectual tradition but in matters related to salvation the accent fell on the divine will. As Muller notes, ‘the Reformed... following Calvin, were typically philosophical intellectualists and soteriological voluntarists’. By contrast, Arminians tended to prioritise the intellect and considered the divine life to be regulated according to a prevolitional self-understanding. The divine will was therefore not a free execution of unbridled power but the outworking of God’s essential nature as *summum bonum*. Divine goodness became a governing category in Arminius’ theology and resulted in a certain hierarchy:

> [T]he *potentia Dei* stands below the *voluntas Dei*; and the will of God, in turn, answers to the *sapientia, scientia, and intellectus Dei* and is, in all its movements or extensions, ultimately grounded in the *bonitas Dei* as that goodness is known and desired inwardly or intrinsically by God.\(^52\)

The Arminian tradition also presupposed a Thomist correspondence theory regarding God and creation. Unlike Scotist voluntarism or Occamist nominalism, the Thomist tradition adopted a realist approach, arguing for intellectual correspondence regarding communicable attributes such as goodness, wisdom and justice. This analogical premise combined with an intellectualist hierarchy caused Arminian soteriology to diverge from Reformed Orthodoxy from the ground up.

Goodwin himself asserted the priority of the divine intellect and appealed to analogical arguments rooted in the communicable attributes of God. For Goodwin, divine actions *ad extra* could never diverge from the divine essence *ad intra*:

---


\(^{52}\) Muller, *God, Creation, Providence*, 145.

The will of God, being nothing else but God himself, and so essentially good, and essentially wise... the acts or productions of it... must of necessity answer the nature and essence of it, as far as they are capable of such a correspondency, i.e. must needs be actings and productions of the best, as full of goodness as full of wisdom, as is possible for such things to be.\footnote{Exposition, 291.}

This quotation highlighted two communicable divine attributes, which became axiomatic to Goodwin’s Arminianism.

\textit{Bonitas}

Divine goodness held pride of place in Goodwin’s understanding of the \textit{modus essendi} and structured the divine relationship to the world. According to Goodwin, God assumes paternal responsibilities toward creation and as a ‘Parent, Father or Mother’, discharges a duty of care to all humanity in an ‘equitable and rationall way’.\footnote{RR, 236-7.} Crucially, divine benevolence includes ‘vouchsafeing unto all a liberall and bountifull sufficiency of means’ to secure the ‘well-being’ of every creature. For God is ‘φιλανθρωπΣ, a lover of men’ and the Scriptures record ‘...those most pathetical, affectionate, and bowel-breathing wishes, or desires of God for the peace and prosperity even of the vilest and worst-deserving men’.\footnote{RR, 408; Eirenomachia, 7.}

Having established the principle, Goodwin argued that divine benevolence would be ‘utterly inconsistent with such bowel les and merciless Reprobation of far the greatest part of Mankinde’.\footnote{Eirenomachia, 7.} Indeed, given the ‘Nature of God [to] be infinitely Perfect... there can be no such purpose, no such Decree in him as men commonly call, Reprobation’.\footnote{RR, 66.} Goodwin specifically targeted softened forms of Calvinism. Recalling the wording of the Collegiate Suffrage, Goodwin argued that the ‘softnesse’ of terms such as ‘preterition’ or ‘meere Negation’ only masks the
‘harshnesse of the matter’. Equally, the hypothetical universalism of his former tutors, which would ‘leave men’ without sufficient grace, ‘tendeth every whit as infallibly, as unavoidably to everlasting destruction... as Positive Reprobation’. If reprobation were inevitable for any creature, it would amount to a ‘constructive denial’ of God’s essential goodness. Consequently, for Goodwin, God’s ‘Prerogative-Will’ was not absolutely free, but conditioned by his character ad intra and his covenantal obligations ad extra: ‘God himself doth acknowledge a gracious tie and ingagement upon him as a Creator, to love, respect and take care of his Creatures, until they voluntarily renounce and disclaime their relation unto him’.

Of course, Reformed divines also affirmed divine benevolence and providential care. However, careful distinctions moderated the extent of God’s duty toward fallen humanity – most notably gratia communis for all and gratia specialis for the elect. Goodwin trampled over these distinctions in a bid to affirm the equity of God’s dealings with humanity: ‘The Relation of a Creator in God is uniform, one and the same, towards the Elect (Believers) and towards Reprobates, or Unbelievers; the one being the workmanship of his hands, as well as the other’. Goodwin therefore underscored the unity of humanity and insisted that God’s ways in creation and redemption were ‘equitable’. Muller’s observations regarding Arminius are therefore pertinent to Goodwin: ‘If the Reformed systems can be called... a theology of grace, the Arminian system may, perhaps, be called a theology of creation’.

*Sapientia*

---

59 RR, 66.
60 RR, 68.
61 RR, 72. Goodwin insisted on correspondence between divine and human standards. If Scripture rebukes the Ostrich for treating her young ‘harshly, as if they were not hers’ (Job 39:16), preterition would render God guilty of breaking his own principles. Instead, God is a mother ‘Hen’, who in ‘tendernesse’ calls her chicks back under her wings. RR, 70, 72.
63 RR, 71.
64 God, *Creation and Providence*, 268.
If the divine will is conditioned by goodness, Goodwin argued that the exercise of divine power is carefully calibrated according to wisdom. Reacting to the Reformed emphasis on inscrutable divine sovereignty, which could irresistibly save Jacob and irrefutably harden Pharaoh, Goodwin retorted that unrestrained power and brutish force were signs of immaturity and wholly unworthy of God. Instead, as the highest being, God operates according to the ‘most exquisite wisdom...which frames and fashions both the consents and dissents of his Will’. The power that executes the divine will is therefore regulated by wisdom: ‘for he that is Omnipotent must needs be Omniprudent also’.

This principle of power regulated by wisdom permeated Goodwin’s writings. In Eirenomachia, divine prudence was summoned to refute arbitrary and absolute predestination, which elects ‘only one or two’ from thousands. For Goodwin, this ‘presents the Gospel to men like a lottery, wherein there are many blanks but few prizes’. Aware of the puritan disdain for lotteries as ‘unworthy devices contrived gin-wise’, Goodwin concluded: ‘such an election is inconsistent with wisdom’. In Redemption Redeemed he argued against hypothetical universalism on the basis that ‘waste’ is ‘repugnant to the principles of sound Wisdom’. Consequently, for God to provide atonement for all, but to limit ‘the consignment of those means’ to only a few is ‘utterly inconsistent with the Wisdom of God’.

In An Exposition, Goodwin made extensive use of wisdom as a hermeneutical control on Romans chapter nine. A locus classicus for Calvinist arguments, the text ostensibly asserts the absolute and arbitrary execution of the divine will:

---

65 RR, 427, 229.
66 RR, 426. Goodwin’s emphasis on divine wisdom also resonated with the wider Platonic tradition. The Cambridge Platonist Ralph Cudworth (1617-88), argued that the Calvinist notion of ‘arbitrary’ divine will was ‘carried on much too far by those who extend it to... the reprobating of the far greater part of mankind, by absolute decrees from eternity’. Instead, in true Platonic fashion, Cudworth insisted: ‘There is a nature of goodness, and a nature of wisdom antecedent to the will of God, which is the rule and measure of it’. Ralph Cudworth, A Treatise of Freewill and an Introduction to Cudworth’s Treatise, ed. by W. R. Scott (London: Routledge, 1992), 17, 50. This work may have been written in the 1650s but was not published until 1838.
67 Eirenomachia, 9.
68 RR, 412; Eirenomachia, 5.
69 RR, 487.
‘Therefore, God has mercy on whom he wills, and he hardens whom he wills’ (Rom. 9:18). The unconditional hardening of Pharaoh’s heart only illustrated the freedom of divine power. However, for Goodwin, the hermeneutic of wisdom invalidated any suggestion that God would irresistibly harden or convert Pharaoh’s heart. For, divine power is ‘regulated, managed, or acted by the infinite wisdome and understanding of God’.70 Instead, Goodwin offered an alternative interpretation, which could be summarized by the following syllogism:

Major: Those who resist grace will inevitably become hardened
Minor: Pharaoh resisted grace (in the Exodus narrative)
Conclusion: Pharaoh’s heart became hardened.

With his argument under exegetical strain, Goodwin looked for support from Ephesians 1:11. God works not ‘according to his meer will or pleasure (which are some mens unhappy expressions), but ‘according to the COUNSEL of his will’.71 Capital letters highlighted a Biblical principle, which exemplified the priority of divine intellect over will, wisdom over power: ‘it clearly follows that the Omnipotency of God is continually, in all the movings and workings of it, steered and directed, enlarged and contracted, led this way, or that way, by the influence or superintendency of his infinite wisdome and understanding’.72 Goodwin applied this hierarchical relationship as a hermeneutical control: ‘wheresoever elsewhere any thing is ascribed unto the will of God’, it should be ‘regulated by... the COUNSEL of his will’.73 The development of a supporting hermeneutic, including control-texts and doctrinal principles of exegesis, was a noteworthy feature of Goodwin’s puritan-style Arminianism.74

The priority of divine wisdom resulted in significant limitations being placed on divine freedom: ‘God, being infinitely more wise... must needs in a way of Reason

70 Exposition, 226.
71 Ibid., 232. This text in Ephesians along with Titus 1:1 functioned as hermeneutical controls throughout Goodwin’s exegetical work.
72 Ibid., 232.
73 Ibid., 232.
74 See Appendix 1.
be conceived to be more bound up in Himself, to have less liberty or Power to do any thing contrary to any Rule, Dictate, or Principle of the most exquisite Wisdom’. To offset cries of heresy, Goodwin appealed to the late medieval distinction of potentia absoluta/ordinata. God’s absolute power referred to his unrestrained omnipotence, encompassing all possibilities that do not violate the Aristotelian law of non-contradiction. God’s ordained power was his normal modus operandi within the created sphere, constrained by the laws and principles he had freely established. However, Goodwin had to be careful, as the dialectic of two powers also dovetailed neatly with the more sinister distinction between voluntas beneplaciti/signi. Reformed Orthodoxy considered the revealed will of God (voluntas signi) to be executed by potentia ordinata, ensuring the stability of the created order. However, the will of God’s good pleasure (voluntas beneplaciti) was inscrutable and retained a transcendent freedom to execute hidden decrees by potentia absoluta. Therefore, voluntas beneplaciti could decree absolute election and reprobation, whilst under the dome or sphere of voluntas signi salvation was revealed to be according to evangelical conditions. Unsurprisingly, Goodwin discarded the ‘over-worn, thread-bare distinction, of voluntas signi and beneplaciti’, which opened up a haunting void between that which is hidden and revealed and implied contradictory wills in God that ‘digladate’ and ‘fight against each other’. Though Goodwin still hypothetically retained the distinction of potentia absoluta/ordinata, he resisted the possibility of actual divergence thus rendering it benign. For Goodwin, any hint of a hidden will operating behind revealed promises, was a frontline of attack in ‘this Quinquarticular war’.

In a controversial section, Goodwin further traced the limitations of divine freedom to their logical conclusion. Since perfect wisdom is essential not
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75 RR, 427.
76 See Muller, PRRD, III. 65.
77 Equivalent distinctions within the divine will, such as voluntas arcane and voluntas revelata, were also widely used by Reformed divines. For a helpful discussion of the nuanced uses of these distinctions, see Muller, PRRD, III. 456-75.
78 RR, 106.
79 See Exposition, 233, 292. Arminius also configured the absolute/ordained distinction so that ‘potentia absoluta no longer hovers behind the will of God’. Muller, God, Creation, Providence, 238.
accidental to the divine being, actions derived from it are necessary. Divine wisdom *ad intra*, generates a perfect ‘modell’ for divine operations *ad extra* such that God acts in time ‘by the efficacy and vertue of, that modell or determination of his will, which was in him from eternity’. Consequently, God’s provision of universal sufficient grace was strictly speaking not voluntary: ‘And thus you see how, and in what sense, it never was in the power of God to deny means of salvation’. Equally, if perfect wisdom informs every divine action, then ‘he could not have made this world... otherwise then now he hath made it, nor govern it otherwise’. Since nothing occurs ‘accidentally, but necessarily, uniformly, and constantly, according to the most exquisite, and absolute, wisdom, or counsel’, God is ‘in no capacity of working any thing otherwise or better’. Indeed, ‘there could be no Modell of any other world better then this in his eye’.

Did this Leibniz-*avant-la-lettre* preserve any semblance of divine freedom? Goodwin reserved for God only the liberty of spontaneity, not that of indifference. Though God could not have done otherwise, nevertheless he was free from external necessity: ‘what he now doth necessarily, in respect of his essential and native goodness, and wisdom, he doth also most voluntarily and freely’. Ironically, Goodwin posited a level of freedom for God that Arminians generally considered inadequate for humanity. Thus, in his efforts to vindicate the goodness and wisdom of God, Goodwin traded divine freedom to ensure greater levels of contingency for humans. However, in the process he risked losing both by elevating ‘wisdom’ to an almost fatalistic concept. Struggling to
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80 *Exposition*, 290.
81 Ibid., 290.
82 Ibid., 292.
83 Ibid., 293-5.
84 Ibid., 296.
85 The intellectualist tradition had a recognized propensity toward determinism. If freedom is rooted in the intellect rather than the will, once the good is known it must be desired. As Dekker notes, ‘it is possible to infer determinism from an intellectualist position’ and William Ames accused Robert Bellarmine of this very thing. See *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise, Texts and Studies in Reformation & Post-Reformation Thought*, ed. by W. J. Van Asselt and E. Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2001), 149. Equally, Platonism tended toward an *a priori* and essentialist approach to wisdom. Consequently, the theology of Cambridge Platonists such as Ralph Cudworth reached similar conclusions to Goodwin: ‘a perfect being is
find support from the Christian tradition, Goodwin fittingly concluded by offering the divine being advice from Seneca: ‘Be willing with that, which necessity commandeth; and by this means you shall elude the whole force... of necessity’.86

In order to reveal the dark side of Calvinism, Goodwin promoted goodness and wisdom to governing principles. Both were assumed to be analogues of human conception and axiomatic for the divine modus operandi. Consequently, bonitas Dei ensures divine benevolence toward all creatures with equity; sapientia Dei regulates the exercise of divine power, necessitating the provision of sufficient grace for all.

Divine Decrees and Desires

In order to further pull the rug from under Reformed feet, Goodwin introduced distinctions in the divine will that preserved space for divine intentions to be frustrated by human agency. Crucially, Goodwin distinguished between ‘Gods decreeing WILL’ and his ‘purposing or desiring WILL’.87 Decrees are according to God’s absolute will ‘without any Exceptions or Proviso’s’. He therefore knows the outcome according to ‘the Operativeness’ of his will alone. However divine desires or intentions, established under ‘condition and limitation’, are determined by human contingency.88 They are therefore foreknown by the divine intellect but not foreordained by the divine will. Goodwin’s categories of decrees and desires mapped neatly onto the ancient distinction between voluntas antecedens/consequens. Originating with John of Damascus and used by Aquinas, the distinction had become controversial by the seventeenth-century. Whereas Reformed references to the antecedent will were circumspect, Arminius

______________________________
86 Exposition, 298. Seneca was renowned for teaching a form of fatalism himself.
87 RR, 39.
88 RR, 39.
exploited the versatility of the distinction and inserted a measure of contingency between the two wills, with human resistance conditioning the consequent will.\footnote{For Arminius’ use of the distinction see Stanglin and McCall, \textit{Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace}, 69-75. See also Carl R. Trueman, ‘Puritan Theology as Historical Event’.
}

Goodwin adopted this distinction, rendering the \textit{antecedent} will equivalent to God’s conditional \textit{desire} for the salvation of all (1 Tim. 2:4). Whereas, the \textit{consequent} will established absolute \textit{decrees} in the light of human rebellion, such that ‘men dying... in the Faith of Jesus Christ, shall be everlastingly blessed; men dying... in unbelief, shall be eternally accursed’.\footnote{RR, 38.}

Once again, decrees were not predicated upon particular individuals. Rather, the consequent will is a ‘power of decreeing, appointing, and determining by a Law, who or what kind of sinners... shall at last be eternally destroyed’.\footnote{Exposition, 277.}

By distinguishing antecedent desires from consequent decrees, Goodwin attempted to sever any causal relationship between what God \textit{knows} and what he \textit{wills}. Unlike absolute decrees, divine desires are ‘not categoricall’ but ‘Provisionall’, ‘suspended on the condition included’.\footnote{RR, 22. Muller has noted that whereas the Reformed tradition insisted on the divine will being simple and linear: ‘Arminian doctrine tends to emphasize the distinctions for the sake of arguing interaction between God and genuinely free or contingent events in the created order’. \textit{God, Creation, and Providence}, 189.}

Though divine knowledge comprehends all things, the divine will does not predetermine everything. Goodwin’s distinction between desires and decrees was intended to safeguard contingency and relationship, as divine self-limitation carved out a conditional space in which genuine reciprocity could occur between God and humanity.

\textit{Goodwin’s Ordo Decretorum?}

Overall, Goodwin appeared reluctant to outline a formal \textit{ordo decretorum}. He eschewed speculative formulations given his concern to define election and reprobation according to revealed and evangelical decrees. Indeed, Goodwin lamented that ‘...the Decrees of this denomination levied by our Brethren’ result in ‘endless digladations and irreconcilable divisions’. Listing ten competing
formulations, he concluded that speculation caused ‘uncouth distractions and interferings’. Goodwin left sufficient evidence to enable a tentative reconstruction of his Arminian *ordo decrætorum*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modum essendi</th>
<th>Divine nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bonitas &amp; sapientia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modus operandi</td>
<td>Decree of creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divine Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The fall of Adam</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antecedent Desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>For universal salvation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Provision of universal atonement and grace</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequent Decrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Election: ‘whosoever believeth’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Reprobation: ‘whosoever believeth not’</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crucial to Goodwin’s schema was the interplay between God’s desire for all to be saved and provision of sufficient means. Reacting to the hypothetical universalism of his former tutors, Goodwin was adamant that any suggestion of a divergence between divine intention and provision was ‘to speak contradictions’. If the fall was universal, ‘Grace must have a proportionable reigne unto life’. Rooted in the divine nature as *summum bonum*, sufficient grace was an extension of the ‘diffusive Principle of the love of God’. Equally, the consequent decrees of election and reprobation preserved a decisive role for faith. God’s purpose was ‘to separate, elect and chuse those, who should beleve
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93 *Eirenomachia*, 14. Davenant may have shaped Goodwin’s aversion to speculative decrees. As Burton has noted, in a series of lectures given in Cambridge in the wake of the Synod of Dort, Davenant objected to Scotist instants of priority and posteriority that appeared to posit formal sequence in God and undermine divine simplicity. Though Davenant reserved a place for unknowable decrees, he argued that human understanding must only be derived from revealed decrees. See Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic*, 279-323.

94 *RR*, 94. Goodwin specifically noted that God’s antecedent intentionality was not merely *ex Dei intentione* but *cum Dei intentione*. *RR*, 116.

95 *RR*, 110.

96 *RR*, 83.
in Christ’. Consequently, ‘There is no election or reprobation from eternity; but decrees of Election and Reprobation only’. Election is not conferred unconditionally, but ‘...only upon their believing and not before, are they numbered amongst the elect of God’. However, Goodwin again insisted that faith is non-meritorious as it is only rendered salvific according to ‘the meer grace or good pleasure of God’.

Goodwin’s *ordo decretorum* would have contained no final decree to transition from corporate to personal election. Whereas Plaifere’s ‘fourth opinion’ used simple foreknowledge and the ‘fifth opinion’ *scientia media* to achieve this personal turn, Goodwin was determined to avoid predicking any divine decrees on particular persons. Goodwin’s aversion to personal subjects reflected a genuine concern to safeguard divine attributes of simplicity, actuality, eternity and immutability. However, it was also part of a polemical strategy to set classical theism against Calvinism, and to offer his own approach as a more coherent alternative.

**The Mode of Saving Grace**

Reformed divines valued a measure of symmetry between the speculative *ordo decretorum* and the executive *ordo salutis*. The Augustinian commitment to absolute predestination was mirrored by the gift of perseverance for the elect. However, whereas Augustine and the Roman Catholic tradition considered justifying and sanctifying graces to be conferred on elect and non-elect alike, the Reformed tradition thought otherwise. From the towering text of Romans 8:30, Calvinists celebrated a ‘Golden Chaine’ of unbreakable links from election,
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98 *Truths Conflict with Error*, 107.
99 *Eirenomachia*, 12.
100 *Exposition*, 113, 115.
101 For early modern approaches to the *ordo salutis* see Richard A. Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 166.
102 Augustine’s two treatises reinforced this point: *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum* and *De Dono Perseverantiae*.
through calling and justification to final glorification. William Perkins solidified this conviction with diagrammatic clarity. In *A Golden Chaine... containing the order of the causes of Salvation and Damnation* (1591), Perkins explicitly stated the causal link between ‘election’ and ‘execution’: ‘for they whome God elected to this end... were also elected to those subordinate means, whereby as steppes, they might attaine this ende’.

Having modified the *ordo decretorum* away from ‘the Doctrine of absolute Personall Election’, Goodwin faced the challenge of formulating a consistent *ordo salutis*. Commenting on Romans 8:30, Goodwin argued that within the ‘concatenation of Divine acts’ there is not the ‘same fixedness, or certainty of coherence’ between each chain. Some links may indeed be connected ‘necessarily’ but others ‘contingently’. For example, the call of the gospel is universal but those who receive it are by no means ‘irresistibly necessitated savingly to believe’. Goodwin therefore factored conditional links into the chain in order to allow for alternative eventualities. The divine purpose may ‘admit of many suspensions and interruptions’ as the *viator* navigated the uncertain path toward the celestial city. Therefore, Goodwin’s approach to the mode of grace required some rather unconventional contingency planning.

Prevenient Grace and Universal Recovery

Given rising levels of heterodoxy regarding the doctrine of the fall during mid-seventeenth-century England, Goodwin was surprisingly conservative. Though he objected to the federal imputation of the guilt of Adam’s sin, he acknowledged the punishment was transferred from ‘the fountain and spring-head’ to all his
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103 *The Collegiate Suffrage* stated: ‘only the elect are justified, it is plaine by that golden chaine of the Apostle, Rom. 8. 30’. However, it allowed for non-elect persons to experience a ‘certain supernaturall enlightening’ leading to a ‘change of their affections’. In Milton, *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort*, 266, 270.


105 *RR*, 281. This phrase is a helpful summary of the dual aspects of Calvinist formulations of divine decrees, which Goodwin rejected – ‘absolute’ and ‘Personall’.

106 *RR*, 212.

107 *RR*, 211, 213.

108 See William Poole, *Milton and the Idea of the Fall*.
'posteritie'. Consequently, Goodwin adopted an anti-Pelagian stance and affirmed 'original sin', insisting that 'all those dispositions and inclinations unto good, which were vested in the nature of man in his creation, were forfeited, lost, and ruin’d by [Adam’s] fall'. Therefore, no one can believe without the 'gracious assistance of the Spirit of God'. However, Goodwin also insisted that humanity should be considered not only post lapsum but also post Christum. As the first Adam took all humanity down, so the last Adam brought about a 'recovery' and 'put the World into a capacity of Salvation'. By employing the governmental theory of the atonement, Goodwin argued that divine justice was placated and a 'white flag' from heaven signified 'a new Covenant... of Grace and favour' on earth. The death of Christ purchased not only sufficient atonement for all but a restorative grace that is 'diffusive... through the generality of mankind'. Due to the extent of the Adamic fall, initial grace must be administered 'irresistibly' and 'cannot be withstood or rejected'. Goodwin therefore argued for a universal and monergistic infusion of restorative grace that offset original sin and put humanity back 'into an estate of justification by [Christ]'. Whereas Reformed discussions assumed three states of man (ante-lapsum, post-lapsum, sub gratia), Goodwin inserted a new universal state - post-Christum. Whereas the Augustinian tradition, expressed in English Prayer Book liturgy, assumed justification was conferred through baptism, Goodwin suggested an equivalent gift was bestowed apart from any sacrament or duty.

The 'restauration' of humanity to a state of original righteousness had dramatic implications for the scope and structure of Goodwin’s soteriology. Regarding the scope, Goodwin affirmed that 'Grace is in no ways confined within the narrow compass of a handful of men... but like the sun in the firmament of the Heaven, it
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compasseth the whole Earth'.

Drawing on the parable of the Talents, he argued that 'heavenly endowments of reason' were 're-invested' into humanity enabling all men to seek God. Goodwin’s expansive vision was not restricted to the elect or even to those ‘under the preaching of the Gospel’. Appealing to divine benevolence, Goodwin pressed for greater equality: ‘the Scriptures in several places... plainly insinuate a capacity in the Heathen, yea in all men by the light of Nature’.

For Goodwin, unlike Calvin and many Reformed divines, Sensus divinitatis held not only a condemnatory function ('Debt') but also salvific possibility ('Dowry'). Those who made positive use of the first talent received further revelation. Consequently, those far off may still attain the ‘Evangelical conclusion’ that atonement has been made and repentance is sufficient. Indeed, those who believe in Christ by ‘mediate’ means (nature and reason) are ‘equivalently’ the same as those who believe by ‘immediate means’ (Scripture and preaching).

Goodwin’s insistence on the salvific potency of grace for pagans was perhaps his most controversial move. In a sharp riposte, George Kendall and Obadiah Howe accused Goodwin of ‘licensing the Sun, Moon, and Stars to Preach the Doctrine of the Gospel’ and warned that even the ‘Papists’ would condemn such teachings.

Regarding the structure of Goodwin’s ordo salutis, prevenient grace gave humanity a freed will with which to make the next move. Humanity was no
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117 Remedie of Unreasonableness, 7.
119 Pagan’s Debt & Dowry, 10. Once again the divine attributes of classical theism supplied the logic for his argument, for is not ‘modus operandi consequitur ad modum essendia? Triumviri, ‘Preface’, sig. q1v.
120 The Canons of Dort had argued that ‘glimmerings of natural light’ were not ‘sufficient’ to bring fallen man to a saving knowledge of God’. In Dennison, Reformed Confessions, IV. 135. See also Calvin, Institutes, I. 4-5. For Arminian approaches to natural theology see John Platt, 'The Denial of the Innate Idea of God: Episcopius to Van Limborch’, in Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment, ed. by Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), pp. 213-226.
121 Pagan’s Debt & Dowry, 30-31; Triumviri, ‘Preface’, sig. q2v.
122 Obadiah Howe, The Pagan Preacher Silenced, 2. Though Zwingli envisaged the salvation of certain ancient heroes and philosophers, he was an anomaly within the early Protestant tradition. As Marenbon has argued, ‘Among the Protestants, the Augustinian position was all but universal’. John Marenbon, Pagans and Philosophers: The Problem of Paganism from Augustine to Leibniz (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2015), 294.
longer formally dead in sin but ‘inabled so to awake and recollect themselves’. For Goodwin, this inspired a bold ministry characterized by evangelistic zeal, which appealed to the ‘spark or principle of life’ in every man. Restorative grace transfigured the Adamic state of spiritual death into a mere sleep, which could be woken, by the gospel call: ‘Wake up O sleeper, rise from the dead!’ (Ephesians 5:14). Through creative exegesis, Goodwin therefore considered Scriptural references to spiritual death and blindness to indicate a subsequent condition for those who incur a second fall by rejecting prevenient grace. He flatly denied that Scripture ‘any where termeth the natural men darkness’ and instead drew on a phrase from Proverbs 20:27 that became associated with the Cambridge Platonists: ‘the candle of the Lord’ is through Christ ‘lighted up in every mans soul’. Goodwin had relational links with this circle of scholars and was keen to associate his Arminian theology with their sophisticated and decidedly anti-Calvinist scholarship. In particular, Goodwin appreciated their insistence on the divine origin and spiritual nature of human reason. The Cambridge Platonists, following Augustine’s inward turn, considered the light of reason in the soul not merely a natural capacity of intelligence, but a spiritual faculty or ‘Divine sagacity’, which enabled the soul to experience intellectual vision and spiritual union with the divine. By positing a divine gift of light in the human soul, the Cambridge Platonists formulated an approach that broadly retained the Protestant commitment to sola gratia. Echoing this emphasis, Goodwin insisted:

Therefore, certainly those noble faculties and endowments of Reason and Understanding in Men, as they are sustained, supported and assisted, by the Spirit of God in the generality of Men, are in a capacity of
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Augustine’s Confessions, provided a seminal account of how God’s light allowed the eye of the soul to discern truth and goodness. Augustine affirmed not only the mind’s sensory capacity for perceiving God but also its absolute dependence on divine illumination. Augustine, Confessions, esp. Book VII. For a helpful introduction to Augustine’s Platonic approach to inner illumination, see Phillip Cary, Augustine’s Invention of the Inner Self: The Legacy of a Christian Platonist (Oxford: OUP, 2000).
apprehending, discerning, understanding the things of God in the Gospel.\textsuperscript{128}

However, ‘when men shall turn their backs upon that candle’ God justly ‘curseth that tree of light within them’. This second fall put men into a ‘hardened, or further blinded condition’, and the talent they had was taken away.\textsuperscript{129}

Goodwin’s \textit{ordo salutis} breached the banks of Reformed soteriology, declaring a universal flood of saving grace: ‘Our brethren... straighten and confine the Grace of God... we contrarily judg it to be diffusive... throughout all mankind’.\textsuperscript{130} However, Goodwin was determined to remain within the Protestant tradition shaped by the Augustinian doctrine of original sin and a commitment to \textit{sola gratia}. His Arminian solution was not to increase the capacity of nature but to load extra weight on the universal operations of grace. Goodwin was no optimist regarding post-lapsarian humanity. However, his sanguine anthropology considered humanity suspended between Adam and Christ with a pivotal opportunity to exercise freed will and thereby to receive a ‘second relief from the free Grace of God’.\textsuperscript{131} Consequently, Goodwin did not have ‘a greater trust in nature and in the natural powers of man’.\textsuperscript{132} Nor was his soteriology characterized by Pelagian optimism but an Arminian reworking of the Augustinian notion of \textit{gratia praeveniens}: ‘no man ever believeth, without a present and actual assistance from the free grace of God’.\textsuperscript{133} For in the act of

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{RR}, ‘Preface’ sig. b2.
\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Divine Authority}, ‘To Reader’, sig. a2.
\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Eirenomachia}, 31.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{RR}, ‘Preface’, sig. c3v.
\textsuperscript{132} Richard Muller made this statement regarding Arminius’ anthropology in \textit{God, Creation and Providence}, 233. However, it is indicative of other accounts that do not give sufficient consideration to Arminian formulations of prevenient grace, which were specifically designed to safeguard the necessity and priority of grace over nature. Goodwin’s soteriology broadly adhered to the Augustinian paradigm of \textit{gratia praevenit} as articulated by the Second Council of Orange (529): ‘grace is not preceded by merit... grace precedes good works, to enable them to be done’. Cited in Rebecca Weaver, \textit{Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy} (Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1996), 237-8. For a helpful discussion of the differences between Arminianism, Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, see Stanglin and McCall, \textit{Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace}, 157-164.
\textsuperscript{133} \textit{RR}, ‘Preface’, sig. c3v.
conversion nature must be transfigured by grace. From the first ‘rising up of the will’ towards God ‘men cease to be any longer naturall men’.\(^{134}\)

Saving Grace and Freed Will

Prevenient grace shifted the terms of debate from the \textit{necessity} to the \textit{resistibility} of grace. Reformed Orthodoxy reserved \textit{gratia specialis} for the elect, considering it to be both monergisitic and efficacious without the need for human cooperation. As the Canons of Dort insisted, conversion ‘must be wholly ascribed to God’ who ‘opens the closed and softens the hardened’. Indeed, any synergistic notion ‘That grace and free will are partial causes which together work’ is a dangerous denial of ‘all the efficiency of God’s grace in our conversion’.\(^{135}\)

However, in true Arminian fashion, Goodwin insisted that man is ‘\textit{συνεργων a joynt-worker}’ with God.\(^{136}\) Having created humans ‘rationall and voluntary’, divine concurrence with human action would never violate free will.\(^{137}\) Instead, grace draws alongside to enable liberty of \textit{spontaneity} (freedom to act according to desire) whilst preserving liberty of \textit{indifference} (power to act in a contrary manner).\(^{138}\) According to Goodwin, the force of divine assistance is always carefully calibrated to safeguard ‘a Power at least, or Possibility of rejecting the Grace offered’.\(^{139}\) Divine grace gives ‘the power to convert’ but not ‘the very act of conversion itself’.\(^{140}\) As ‘principal actor’ God ‘putteth forth his omnipotency, only in putting men into a capacity’.\(^{141}\) Thus God’s Spirit causes ‘a kind of enterview’ as the human soul considers the truth of the gospel.\(^{142}\) Crucially, though the

\(^{134}\) Goodwin, \textit{Νεοφυτοπρεσβυτερος, or the Yongling Elder, or, Novice-Presbyter (1648)} 47.

\(^{135}\) James Dennison, \textit{Reformed Confessions}, IV. 137, 143.

\(^{136}\) \textit{A Door Opening}, 132. This was the Greek term from which ‘synergism’ is derived, meaning to work or act with.

\(^{137}\) \textit{RR}, 13.

\(^{138}\) This conviction mirrored Goodwin’s approach to toleration, which argued for persuasion rather than coercion as a reflection of the divine \textit{modus operandi}.

\(^{139}\) \textit{RR}, 427.

\(^{140}\) \textit{Triumvirin}, 19.

\(^{141}\) \textit{Being Filled}, 256-7. The force of divine grace is necessarily limited such that: ‘In respect of that regulated power of God... it is more then probable, that [God] doth whatsoever he is able to do for the bringing of all men to repentance’. \textit{Exposition}, 234-5.

\(^{142}\) \textit{Being Filled}, 58.
intellect is enlightened, the will retains the power of veto. Goodwin rigorously applied this principle, denying any exceptions. Even Judas and Pilate were not under ‘any determination’ but retained the freedom of counter-factual possibilities. For ‘God did not ‘decree, that such and such men by Name, should crucifie’ Christ, but ‘it was sufficient for God to determine or decree, that in case any man... should attempt his death’ he would permit it. Though Goodwin acknowledged the variegated nature of converting grace such that God could save ‘either by the right hand or the left’, he insisted that the most ‘signal or miraculous’ conversion retained the ‘native and essential freedom and liberty of the Will’. Even the Apostle Paul could ‘have not onely resisted but even frustrated... his Conversion’. Despite differences between the strength of operations between God’s ‘right’ and ‘left’ hands, ‘conversion is never wrought irresistibly’. For Goodwin, divine wisdom ensured a ubiquity of supply and a calibration of strength so that the weakest supply of grace is always sufficient and the strongest form of grace is always resistible.

Perseverance and Assurance

The ‘Golden Chaine’ approach of Reformed Orthodoxy insisted that gratia specialis enabled justification, regeneration and sanctification exclusively for the elect. Therefore, to be truly justified, guaranteed perseverance de facto. However, a new category was therefore required for temporary communicants who would inevitably fall away. Calvin referred to temporalis fidei, considering those who displayed external signs without inner election to be ‘hypocrites’. Perkins warned of a ‘great likeness and affinity’ with the elect and offered thirty-six points of subtle distinction. However, this made any quest for assurance problematic and led to what R.T Kendall dubbed ‘experimental’ as opposed to
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‘creedal’ predestination.\textsuperscript{149} Various *testimonium* were considered signs of true election – including the internal witness of the Spirit and an external inventory of good works. A practical syllogism was formulated in a bid to offer assurance of election rooted in lived experience:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Major: Every true believer does good works \\
Minor: I do good works \\
Conclusion: I am a true believer
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The pursuit of subjective assurance by *a posteriori* ‘signs’ represented a departure from the Western theological tradition as a whole. Augustine remained ambivalent regarding the possibility of assurance and argued that a healthy amount of uncertainty could motivate immature believers. Indeed, the whole medieval period was characterized by ‘oscillation between the fear and love of God in the heart of the sinner’.\textsuperscript{150} The *viator* lived in the tension between a ‘moral’ sense of assurance and the uncertainty of final judgment. The resulting dialectic of faith and fear spurred them on. Consequently, *securitas* in this life was both impossible and undesirable.

Goodwin was keen to drive a wedge between his Reformed opponents and the Western tradition regarding perseverance and assurance. In an extended section, which included numerous citations from Augustine’s *De Dono Perseverantiae*, Goodwin concluded that the ‘great party of the Reformers of Religion’ had deviated from orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{151} Indeed, as ‘often happeneth in sweeping of Houses’, treasures are ‘swept up among the soyl and cast together with it upon the dunghill’.\textsuperscript{152} For Goodwin, the discarding of ‘Conditionall Perseverance’ had incurred equal and opposite pastoral dangers. Weaker souls were plagued by the

\textsuperscript{149} See R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 79-80. Leif Dixon has critiqued this distinction, preferring instead ‘practical predestinarians’. Dixon also helpfully notes that given the unpredictable nature of life in early modern England, the doctrines of absolute predestination and perseverance were intended to provide comfort through certainty. See Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 11-15.

\textsuperscript{150} Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, 224.

\textsuperscript{151} *RR*, 380-1.

\textsuperscript{152} *RR*, 383-4.
possibility of being a hypocrite, causing ‘gripings of conscience, wherewith peace is interrupted’. Arrogant souls assumed ‘insurance... against all sin’ resulting in antinomianism and ‘sad apostasies’. Consequently, Goodwin sought to recover the dialectic of faith and fear. Warnings in Scripture regarding the possibility of apostasy were authentic and should instill a ‘feare and dread’ that is the ‘strongest and sharpest bridle’ for unruly men. Accused of engendering a ‘servile spirit’, Goodwin distinguished between the ‘danger’ and ‘possibility’ of falling away. Whilst imminent threats cause unbearable angst, humans can live with the possibility of danger and still enjoy peace. Goodwin therefore compared apostasy to suicide. The danger is only imminent for those with self-destructive tendencies. Persons ‘need not apostatize or perish, except themselves please’.

Goodwin’s Arminian ordo salutis was therefore designed to incorporate the possibility of apostasy. Reformed doctrines that operated in a fixed and linear fashion now required a measure of reversibility. Firstly, Goodwin bifurcated justification into two stages. Initial justification ‘standeth in Remission of sins’ whereas final justification was an eschatological ‘approbation, commendation, or vindication’ at the end. The initial stage was solifidian, according to the ‘constant assertion of the scripture, and the Architectonical Doctrine of the Gospel’. Indeed, Goodwin vehemently opposed any who held that ‘strein of teaching... that men are not justified by Faith’. However, the final verdict would be a judgment of works, for ‘no person whatsoever... shall receive the great benefit and blessing of justification’ without ‘fruitfulness in well doing’.

---

153 *RR*, 166, 114.
154 *RR*, 166.
155 *RR*, 115.
156 *Banner of Justification*, 47.
157 Ibid., 32. This was likely an allusion to Henry Hammond’s moral condition for justification.
158 Ibid., 51. Other Reformed divines, most notably Martin Bucer, also formulated a notion of double justification, whereby an initial justification was imputed and forensic but a ‘second justification’ was inherent and moral. However, Reformed formulations considered the two forms of justification roughly contemporaneous, whereas Goodwin’s notion of final justification radically separated them into two stages and reserved the possibility of apostasy. See Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 220-22. Goodwin’s controversial approach would surface again in the Wesleyan ‘Minutes Controversy’. See Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 287.
In addition to guarding against the twin dangers of antinomianism and moralism, Goodwin’s doctrine of justification accommodated the possibility of a reversal. By reducing the efficient cause of justification to remission of sins, Goodwin rejected the imputation of the active or passive righteousness of Christ. To be justified does not consist in the *addition* of Christ’s righteousness but merely the *subtraction* of sins. Conveniently, this status of remission was easily reversible: ‘God justifieth a Man this day, upon his believing: to morrow, upon a returne to His vomit of unbelief; He divests him of His justification, and requires his sins at hand’.\(^\text{159}\)

However, Goodwin’s *ordo salutis* not only ensured that justification could be reversed but also that apostasy could be restored. Should initial justification be lost, sincere repentance would ‘recover and re-instate’ salvation by the ‘Reiteration of Regeneration’. Men who had fallen twice (in Adam and through apostasy) may yet ‘live twice, or twice receive the life of grace opposite hereunto’.\(^\text{160}\) Goodwin therefore fronted his soteriology with a rotating door that held the possibility of both apostasy and recovery. Consequently, any status conferred in this life was provisional. The uncertainty of final justification positioned the *viator* within the dialectic of faith and fear: ‘for men are not meet... for a translation into coelestial glory immediately upon the first of their repenting, or believing... but there are yet many things to be done... before God looketh upon them as meet for an actuall investiture with glory’.\(^\text{161}\)

\(^{159}\) *RR*, 278.

\(^{160}\) *RR*, 329, 332.

\(^{161}\) *Exposition*, 308.
Goodwin’s *ordo salutis* closely reflected his *ordo decrertorum*. General decrees of predestination were mirrored by a doctrine of perseverance contingent upon faith and works. Goodwin therefore deliberately weakened the links in the ‘Golden Chaine’. Instead, of ‘Divine acts... un-interruptedly succeeding’ the process of salvation may experience ‘suspensions and interruptions’ as divine decrees intersect with human resistance.\(^{162}\) Consequently, the links are ‘dissolveable’ and the whole chain may be ‘severed, or broken by the miscarriages... of the saints’.\(^{163}\) Goodwin’s radical rejection of the ‘Golden Chaine’ revealed the extent of his departure from Reformed theology. Indeed, John Owen was aghast that Goodwin should ‘propose an intercision’ and ‘fancy a suspension of these Acts of Grace... upon conditionalls’. In his massive refutation of *Redemption Redeemed*, Owen accused Goodwin of building his soteriology around ‘the slipperinesse, and uncertainty, and lubricity of the Will of Man’.\(^{164}\)

---

\(^{162}\) *RR*, 208.

\(^{163}\) *RR*, 213, 217.

\(^{164}\) John Owen, *The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance*, 55, 100.
Conclusion: Arminianism as a Hermeneutic

John Goodwin’s approach to the order of decrees and the mode of grace amounted to a creative and comprehensive reworking of Reformed soteriology. His fertile mind generated bespoke strategies and original arguments that should be classified ‘Arminian’ only in the broadest sense. Goodwin’s reliance on Boethian eternalism and the axiomatic principle of divine sapientia, combined with theories of a double fall and second regeneration led to complex contours and unique features not easily pigeonholed. These complexities were conditioned in part by his context. Unlike Arminius, Goodwin’s primary concern was not the supralapsarianism of Perkins but the hypothetical universalism of Preston. Consequently, Goodwin’s approach was designed to expose inconsistencies in the more subtle and pastoral versions of Calvinism prevalent in his day. Additionally, as a puritan pastor, Goodwin worked hard to retain his status among the godly, insisting that he continued to ‘fight on their side’ in ‘this Quinquarticular war’. He therefore downplayed his departure from Calvinism, arguing that any detour he had taken from the ‘common Road’ was simply to ‘carry some stumbling stone out of it... to make it more smooth and pleasant’.

However, Goodwin’s puritan piety and learned style could not conceal the radical nature of his departure from Reformed Orthodoxy. His ‘Arminianism’ did not comprise minor editorial revisions to hermetically sealed doctrines. Rather, Goodwin’s Arminianism was systemic and comprehensive, impinging on the doctrine of God, creation, anthropology and the nature of grace. From the ground up, Goodwin turned classical theism against Calvinism convinced that cracks in the superstructure traced back to errors in the very foundation. Differences regarding predestination and grace were a synecdoche for theology as a whole. At stake in ‘this Quinquarticular war’ was nothing less than the very nature of God: ‘there is a very vast difference between the one Opinion and the other, in their respective representations of God unto his Creature, in point of Grace,

Goodness and Loveliness on the one hand, as of Rigor, Hardness, and Unloveliness on the other hand’.\textsuperscript{167}

Given the pervasive and programmatic nature of Goodwin’s revisions, his Arminianism may best be considered not as a doctrinal position but a holistic hermeneutic, an interpretative lens that altered Goodwin’s entire intellectual vision.\textsuperscript{168} Though he shared the same conceptual framework of classical theism with his Reformed interlocutors, he reinterpreted its tenets according to alternative \textit{a priori} commitments regarding the divine \textit{modus essendi} and the corresponding \textit{modus operandi} of salvation. Equally, Goodwin’s exegetical work resulted in quite different conclusions due to his Arminian principles of interpretation (Appendix 1). Goodwin himself referred to a ‘golden’ and ‘unerring Touchstone’ consisting of dual concerns, which adjudicated in matters of doctrinal controversy:\textsuperscript{169}

\begin{quote}
[T]here are two main considerations and grounds which… have commanded our judgments and Consciences, not to one or some but to all the points, or particulars, relating to all the five heads of Doctrine specified

1. [O]ur Brethrens Doctrine... hath in it a black thread of a manifest inconsistence with the nature and attributes of God... his immutability, simplicity, wisdom, grace, goodness, justice, and love to mankind.
2. ...[T]he advancement of true godliness in the world\textsuperscript{170}
\end{quote}

These convictions regarding the nature of God and the necessity of doctrines that cultivate godliness formed an Arminian hermeneutic that motivated Goodwin’s comprehensive reappraisal of Biblical texts and doctrinal \textit{loci}. This chapter has traced the resulting arguments and strategies, which Goodwin deployed in order to bring down ‘that grand confederacie’ of Calvinism from within.

\textsuperscript{167} \textit{RR}, 479.
\textsuperscript{168} This concurs with the ‘new perspective’ on Arminius, which argues that his theology was a ‘systematic alternative’ to Reformed Orthodoxy. See Keith Stanglin, ‘Arminius and Arminianism’, in \textit{Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559-1609)}, ed. by Theodoor Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin and Marijke Tolsma (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 1-24, 8.
\textsuperscript{169} \textit{RR}, 269.
\textsuperscript{170} \textit{Eirenomachia}, 81.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Tracing the Contours of Henry Hammond's Arminian Theology
In the grip of Restoration euphoria, Thomas Pierce declared Henry Hammond victorious over Catholic and Calvinist enemies who had threatened the Church of England. Eulogies often include a measure of mythology, and Pierce’s poetic stanza was no exception. It serves to highlight the intensely political nature of theological debate during the English Revolution as well as the significant role played by Henry Hammond in shaping the doctrinal consensus of the Restoration church. Along with other relevant publications, this chapter will offer the first indepth analysis of Hammond’s only major contribution to the quinquarticular war. Published just after his death, *Pacifick Discourse* (1660) included sustained discussions of the order of decrees and the mode of grace, resulting in the clearest summary of Hammond’s mature Arminian theology. The publication was the culmination of an arduous process, spearheaded by Thomas Pierce, who persuaded Robert Sanderson to publicly confess to ‘quitting the sublapsarian way’. Though an initial statement was deemed inadequate, under duress Sanderson sent further correspondence. *Pacifick Discourse* contained two letters of reply by Hammond, including carefully selected extracts from Sanderson’s correspondence. *Pacific Discourse* was therefore both a sophisticated theological

---

1 Having surpassed all other claimants,  
He overcame the Romans, overthrew the Genevans,  
Over both were triumphant  
TRUTH & HAMMOND.

This extract was taken from Thomas Pierce’s eulogy printed in the Second Edition of John Fell, *The Life of the most Learned. Reverend and Pious Dr H. Hammond* (1662), 251. The translation follows J. W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism*, 209.

2 The limited scholarship on Hammond’s soteriology has tended to focus on his earlier writings, especially *Practical Catechism*. See Lettinga, ‘Covenant Theology Turned Upside Down’; McGiffert, ‘Henry Hammond and Covenant Theology’. Consequently, *Pacifick Discourse* itself has not received the scholarly attention it deserves.

3 Izaak Walton recounted his version of these events in his *Life of Robert Sanderson*, which included a letter Pierce had sent to him giving alleged further extracts from Sanderson’s correspondence that were ‘nowhere else extant’. In *The Works of Robert Sanderson*, ed. by William Jacobson, 6 vols (Oxford: OUP, 1854), VI, 315-17, 351-55.

4 Hammond also included an appendix, entitled *Of Praescience*. See below.
treatise and a politically charged publication, carefully crafted and timed to consolidate an episcopal anti-Calvinist Church settlement.  

**A Pacifick Discourse?**

Throughout the 1650s, Hammond worked hard to leverage the reputational value of English episcopalian who could be construed as anti-Calvinists. Underpinning these efforts was a concern to avoid the appearance of isolation. In a letter to Sheldon, Hammond bemoaned John Owen’s backhanded compliment, which ‘tells me that the whole weight of the Episcopal caus seems especially to be divolved upon me’. He therefore urged a show of support: ‘I should be glad Dr Sanderson, or you, or some others would confute [him], for the truth is my appearing thus alone will go for little’. Hammond’s other letters contained numerous tactical instructions regarding the activities and publications of episcopal divines, including ‘Dr. Sanderson’ and ‘Dr. Jackson’ whose public personas were valuable assets requiring careful management. For example, a letter to Sheldon voiced concern that Sanderson was considering attending Presbyterian lectures in Grantham. Hammond cautioned: ‘Instead of serving Dr. Sanderson, they desire to serve themselves of him... To have him thought such as they’. *Pacifick Discourse* therefore attempted to seize upon the apparent coup of Sanderson’s anti-Calvinist confession in order to demonstrate that, despite ‘light differences’, Sanderson and Hammond were on the same page.

The strategic significance of the publication was captured in private correspondence between Hammond and Gilbert Sheldon. On May 10th, Hammond

---

5 *Pacifick Discourse* was registered on 9th May 1660, though the reference entitled it ‘The Last words of the pious, reverend and very learned Dr Hammond’. It was therefore published shortly after Hammond died and just before Charles II landed at Dover. See *Registers of the Stationers Company*, Vol. II 1655-1675, 263.

6 BL, Harleian, MS 6942, fol. 38. Hammond was also aware of attempts by Baxter to place him in a separate category from the likes of Ussher and Sanderson. Ibid., fol. 77.

7 Ibid., fol. 77.

8 *PD*, 8.
wrote: ‘If that discours of Dr. S: come to Mr P: I shall hope to be by that time there to receive it’. By August 30th, Hammond had seen Sanderson’s initial letter and bemoaned his ‘cautions & unwillingness to be engaged’. In a bid to secure a clearer statement, Hammond urged Sheldon to ‘detain Dr S’ in order to ascertain his response but to ‘conceale’ the matter from any wider audience. Finally, on Dec. 18th Hammond wrote: ‘On your & some others encouragement, those papers to Dr S. are gone to press’.9 In Pacifick Discourse itself, Hammond noted with some relish that ‘the accordance betwixt you and me... is put into a very grave attire, and revered as a great difficulty’.10 Clearly, the motive for publishing these private letters was anything but Pacifick. Sensitivity to Hammond’s political intentions is therefore an essential prerequisite for tracing the contours of his doctrinal argumentation. As Brian Cummings notes, ‘Doctrine exists as a single stratum of dogmatic propositions only in the artificial world of intellectual history; within its historical formation it is a complex series of intersecting speech acts’.11 Pacifick Discourse offers a clear example of the politics of writing that blends doctrine with propaganda.

The immediate reception of Pacifick Discourse indicated a measure of success. Sanderson’s biographer, Izaak Walton, made the rather exaggerated claim that ‘the debates in these Letters’ have ‘been the occasion of giving an end to the Quinquarticular Controversy’.12 Certainly, the carefully staged consensus between Sanderson and Hammond gave Pacifick Discourse wide appeal. The conformist divine Thomas Traherne made considerable use of it in his recently discovered A Sober View of Dr Twisse.13 Equally, the nonconformist Presbyterian

---

9 BL. Harleian MS 6942, fols. 11, 45, 60, 108. Hammond’s letters do not give the year but this correspondence would seem to date from 1657 onwards.

10 PD, 5. As a high-profile divine, Sanderson’s renouncing of infralapsarianism significantly strengthened the episcopal anti-Calvinist cause.

11 Brian Cummings, The Literary Culture of the Reformation, 285.

12 Works of Sanderson, VI. 317.

13 Traherne did qualify his positive reception of PD by observing that Sanderson ‘had the Advantage on Dr. Hammond in that he perfectly conformeth to the Ch. of England’. However, he considered the work overall to ‘fitteth in the Golden Mean’. In Happiness and Holiness: Thomas Traherne and His Writings, ed. by Denise Inge (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008), 31-2. The nonconformist John Humfrey also considered Hammond far from Pelagianism and within the ‘Latitude’ of the English church, for ‘...even in those curious Points... Men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church
John Howe borrowed heavily from Hammond’s arguments in his *Reconcileableness of God’s Prescience of the Sins of Men, with the Wisdom and Sincerity of his Counsels* (1677).\(^{14}\) Equally, John Locke took notes from *Pacifick Discourse* and recommended it to his students.\(^{15}\) More recent scholarship has therefore assumed that *Pacifick Discourse* successfully charted a middle course between the Scylla of Calvinism and the Charybdis of Arminianism. Henry McAdoo concluded that the ‘rational quality’ of *Pacifick Discourse* was ‘not so much Arminianism proper as that liberality of outlook of which Arminianism was a particular manifestation’.\(^{16}\) Regarding Sanderson and *Pacifick Discourse*, Gerald Cragg considered it an ‘intermediary position, which was neither Calvinist not Arminian’ and Herbert McGonigle concluded it was ‘an example of that moderate, Arminian Anglicanism’.\(^{17}\)

However, though Hammond’s carefully choreographed image may have fooled subsequent historians, many of his contemporaries saw through the rhetoric.\(^{18}\) Richard Baxter later bemoaned the way ‘The Prelatical divines, instead of drawing nearer those they differed from for peace, had gone farther from them by Dr. Hammond’s new way... the very cause they contended for being not concord... but domination’.\(^{19}\) Considered this way, *Pacifick Discourse* was arguably Hammond’s most controversial and heavily disguised work.\(^{20}\) It proved of England to be for them. The Arminians with Doctor Hammond, and the Calvinists with Bishop Usher do Subscribe them, and find out their own different Sense in them’. John Humfrey, *The Healing Paper, or, A Catholick Receipt for Union* (1678), 28.

\(^{14}\) This was written as a letter to Robert Boyle, who commissioned the work in order to further his previous attempt in *Seraphic Love* (1659) to harmonize Calvinism and Arminianism by minimizing the differences between them. The tone and style of Howe’s work reflected *Pacifick Discourse*, including the genre of private correspondence being published to demonstrate a broad consensus. See Wojcik, *Robert Boyle and the Limits of Reason*, ch. 3.


\(^{18}\) Henry Hickman repeatedly challenged the claims of episcopal Arminians to speak for the Church of England: ‘the plants they so greedily feed upon, are exotick, not planted by our first Reformers’. *Laudensium Apostasia* (1660), ‘Preface’, sig. a2.

\(^{19}\) Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), i. 68.

\(^{20}\) Despite the politics surrounding PD, this chapter will operate on the assumption that Hammond accurately cited extracts from Sanderson’s original letters, which are no
to be his final salvo in the contest for the Church of England and found favour in the Restoration church, which was dominated by his disciples. However, its origins reflect a unique episode in English history, when orthodoxy was suspended and episcopal divines engaged in quite ‘daring theological radicalism’. Indeed, this chapter will demonstrate that despite the rhetoric of moderation, Hammond’s Arminianism was a more radical breed than anything conceived by early Dutch Arminians or early Stuart Laudians. Beneath the veneer of concord and coalition, Hammond’s arguments left him isolated even from those anti-Calvinist divines whose patronage he so coveted.

Robert Sanderson and the Church of England

Addressed to ‘All our Brethren of the Church of England’, *Pacifick Discourse* faced head on the challenge of interpreting the English Articles of religion in a robustly anti-Calvinist manner. As a well-timed exercise in the construction of orthodoxy, Hammond presented his conversation with Sanderson as a ‘Lamb, or Turt’l’ peace offering, ‘exemplifying the charity’ so lacking among those whose ‘singular Doctrines’ cause ‘divisions and fractions’. By contrast, *Pacifick Discourse* was a model of mature theological discussion and a balanced summary of the longer extant. Equally, to avoid unnecessary conjecture, Sanderson’s theology will be considered as it is presented in *Pacifick Discourse* where it forms a direct point of comparison with Hammond’s approach.

---

22 As Collinson noted, the Thirty-Nine articles ‘had never been so complete as to exclude other theological tendencies which found space to live within the latitude of the Articles of Religion, and which were nourished by elements of a more catholic tradition’. ‘England and International Calvinism’, 218. Indeed, at the close of the seventeenth-century Gilbert Burnet argued that the English Articles could comfortably accommodate Calvinists and Arminians. Regarding Article Seventeen, Burnet noted that the ‘knot of the whole Difficulty’ was whether God elected persons without foresight. He insisted that the phrase ‘decreed by his Counsel, secret to us’ had sufficient latitude to accommodate both alternatives. However, he also admitted it was ‘very probable’ that those who ‘penned’ the Article intended ‘that the Decree was absolute’. Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England* (1699), 168.
mediating position of the Church of England, which should bring ‘a conclusion to
debates’.23

However, despite the generous façade, *Pacific Discourse* quickly set about
excluding unwanted visitors. The first section contained several quotations from
the ‘judicious Dr. Sanderson’, affirming that ‘all agree’ on the necessity of divine
and human freedom but the real debate was about ‘πως’, or how to reconcile
these two non-negotiables.24 Hammond began by outlining a threefold
agreement with Sanderson in order to establish a minimal creed. Firstly, ‘God’s
prescience layeth no necessity at all’ as it is ‘but the seeing every thing that ever
exists’. Secondly, ‘God worketh not by his grace irresistibly’. Rather, he effectually
orders the means of grace ‘with such congruity’ that they are salvific if not
resisted. Thirdly, God extends to all sufficient grace for conversion so that
culpability for ‘miscarriages’ lies with humanity, though salvation is *sola gratia*.
Divines may differ on *adiaphora*, but Hammond concluded these three were ‘a
standard, and umpire’. By implication therefore even moderate Calvinists were
declared out.25

To reinforce the point, Hammond cited Sanderson’s autobiographical statement
at length to show that the only ‘necessity’ placed on would-be communicants in
the Church of England was ‘quitting the sublapsarian way’.26 The crucial factor in
Sanderson’s alleged conversion in ‘the year 1625’, was the synoptic revelation he
received when he ‘reduced into fives schemes’ common soteriological
formulations.27 It immediately became apparent that for divine judgement to be
justifiable, ‘the decree of sending Christ must be praecedaneous to that of
Election’. Sanderson therefore rejected the ‘grand praetensions’ that belong to

---

24 *PD*, 3.
25 *PD*, 4, 5, 7.
26 *PD*, 11, 16.
27 Sanderson claimed his taxonomy was shown to several others and that further copies
of it were made. It is therefore likely that this informed Plaifere’s equivalent. However,
Sanderson’s schema appears to have differentiated more *within* Calvinism, as the first
three positions appear to have been creabilitarianism, supralapsarianism and
sublapsarianism. Presumably this left ‘Bishop Overals way’ as fourth and the Arminian
formulation as one final position. See *PD*, 11-14.
Calvinism, and by implication, so would any ‘dispassionate seeker of truth’. Indeed, for Hammond, excluding these extreme errors was the original motivation for ‘our Churches Moderation in framing the Article of Predestination, and of our late Kings Declaration, in silencing the debate’. This audacious reinterpretation of early Stuart policy implied that the prohibition was not because these matters were too mysterious but because they were so obvious, requiring no further discussion. Despite the rhetoric of ‘Catholic harmonious charity’, Hammonds clear agenda was to redraw the boundaries of the Church of England in order to exclude even a moderately Calvinist interpretation of Article Seventeen.

Henry Hammond and the Order of the Decrees

With Sanderson safely inside and Calvinists shut out in the cold, discussion moved on from non-negotiable ‘opinions’, about which all ‘true sons’ of the church should agree, to Sanderson’s ‘conjectures’ that ostensibly represented more permissible points of divergence. Here the challenge of interpreting Sanderson in an anti-Calvinist manner began in earnest. Firstly, Hammond outlined an ordo decretorum in Sanderson’s own words, which appeared to further consolidate their agreement:

(i) ‘[M]an being made upright… did by his own voluntary disobedience… fall away’

(ii) ‘God out of his infinite compassion to his creature… decreed to send his only begotten son’ that ‘the whole mass of mankind lost by the fall in Adam, might be restored to a capability of salvation’

---

28 PD, 6, 15. In particular, Twisse was singled out for criticism throughout Pacifick Discourse. As well as holding to supralapsarianism, as prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, Twisse represented efforts to reconstitute the Church of England according to emphatically Calvinist soteriology.

29 PD, 17. The declaration prefixed to the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1628 clearly appealed to the mysterious nature of divine decrees, insisting that ‘these disputes be shut up in God’s promises’. Hammond’s intolerance of divine mystery will be considered below.

(iii) ‘God was graciously pleased to enter into a new Covenant with mankind... consisting of Evangelical but conditional promises... upon the condition of faith in Christ, repentance from dead works, and new obedience’\textsuperscript{31}

However, due to potential ambiguities, lengthy annotations accompanied each section in order to rein in Sanderson’s elastic phraseology. Regarding the atonement, Hammond insisted that Sanderson’s words were ‘not (to my apprehension) capable of any of those evasions, that others are willing to reserve themselves in this business, as of his dying sufficiently, but not intentionally for all’\textsuperscript{32}. Hammond therefore moved to ensure Sanderson’s conversion was not merely hypothetical by insisting that God’s ‘unfeigned intention’ was for humanity to be ‘restored to a real capability of salvation’ with none ‘absolutely passed by... or excluded’.\textsuperscript{33} Hammond insisted this categorical universalism was Sanderson’s true meaning: ‘in this full latitude I am obliged to understand you, for with not any more pregnant words to expresse it, then those which you have chosen’.\textsuperscript{34}

Sanderson’s association with ‘Bishop Overals way’ also required further qualification as Overall’s penchant for ambiguity ensured points of agreement with those on both sides of the Dortian line.\textsuperscript{35} Indeed, arguably, Overall’s ‘myddle way’ was the most successful English attempt to accommodate respective and irrespective decrees, resistible and irresistible grace. As a result he became a name to conjure with for Reformed episcopalians such as Joseph Hall as well as anti-Calvinists like Richard Montagu and Thomas Jackson.\textsuperscript{36} In \textit{Pacifick Discourse}, Hammond therefore oscillated between Overall, the authoritative episcopal anti-Calvinist; and Overall, the ambivalent compromise that provided Sanderson with

\begin{itemize}
\item[31] PD, 19-21.
\item[32] PD, 20.
\item[33] PD, 20.
\item[34] PD, 21.
\item[35] PD, 41. Anthony Milton has demonstrated that Overall’s Latin tracts circulated widely amongst English divines and may have had a moderating influence on the British Delegation to Dort. Milton, ‘Anglicanism by Stealth’, 160.
\item[36] Hall quoted extensively from Overall’s tracts to garner support for a middle way between the Contra-Remonstrants and Remonstrants. See Joseph Hall, \textit{The Shaking of the Olive-tree} (1660), 355-65.
\end{itemize}
a fence to perch on. Hammond therefore spent the majority of his first letter in *Pacifick Discourse* addressing Sanderson’s three ‘conjectures’ in order to persuade the reader that Overall and Sanderson were in fact on his side of the divide.

‘Conditionate decrees’

The first ‘conjecture’ pertained to the object and order of divine decrees. Citing Sanderson, Hammond insisted on a non-speculative approach, which posited ‘man preached unto’ as the object, with election and reprobation as consequences of human response. Despite protesting ‘I am no Arminian’, Hammond’s approach exhibited several defining qualities of Plaifere’s fourth position, though he was careful throughout to cross-reference these with the *Articles of the Church of England* not the *Five Articles of Remonstrance.*

Hammond insisted that decrees of election and reprobation were essentially conditional and inherently non-determinative. Far from a ‘chain of fatal decrees’, perfect symmetry existed between divine decrees and the ‘new covenant… consisting of Evangelical but conditional promises’. Divine decrees were therefore an echo of the gospel, pledging ‘rewards of blisse or woe’ in respect of ‘our obedience or disobedience’. Indeed, the antecedent will of God to provide universal and sufficient saving grace should not be considered so much ‘decreeing’ as a divine ‘desire’. To bolster this controversial reduction of the strength of the divine will, Hammond appealed to ‘our Article’, which considers ‘the promises of God as they are in Scriptures… *Universal and conditionate*, not *absolute* and *particular*’.41

---

37 PD, 57.
38 PD, 21.
39 Of Fundamentals, 151.
40 This echoed Goodwin’s Arminian distinction between antecedent desire and consequent decrees.
41 PD, 111, 17. Article Seventeen, did refer to ‘God’s promises’ as they are ‘generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture’. However, Hammond passed over other phrases in Article Seventeen, which were not convenient to his purposes.
As regards the general and conditional nature of divine decrees, there was significant proximity between Goodwin and Hammond. However, there was also considerable divergence regarding the nature of the condition itself. In his letter, Sanderson had referenced ‘faith’, ‘repentance’ and ‘obedience’ as new covenant conditions, though he likely intended these as a more extended *ordo salutis*. However, by reversing the order, Hammond predicated the ‘Evangelical covenant’ upon the condition of ‘repentance and new obedience, together with faith in Christ’.  

This subtle amendment contained seismic ramifications regarding the nature of justification and isolated Hammond’s Arminianism from the Protestant mainstream as a whole, whether Lutheran, Reformed or Remonstrant.

‘Evangelical decrees’

Hammond’s creative hermeneutic applied itself to another ambiguous phrase in Article Seventeen: ‘that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God’. As a conclusion to the Article, this phrase qualified an earlier reference to God’s ‘counsel secret’ and sought to ensure that a doctrine intended to bring ‘sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort’ was not abused by the speculation of ‘curious and carnal persons’. For conformist divines, this was a vital warning against working backwards from *voluntas revelata* to *voluntas arcana*. As Sanderson himself had cautioned, ‘the counsels and purposes of God are secret and thou art not to enquire with scrupulous curiosity into the dispensation and courses of his providence further than it hath pleased him either to reveal it in his word or by his manifest works to discover it unto thee’. Indeed, according to conformist divines, the warning appeared tailor-made for puritans who ‘pried into God’s privy counsel’.

However, the basic assumption remained that a real distinction existed between hidden and

---

42 *PD*, 21-22.
45 As John Donne cautioned: ‘let no man be too curiously busie, to search what God does in his bedchamber; we have all enough to answer, for that, which we have done in our bedchamber. For Gods *eternal decree*, himselfe is master of those Rolls’. In John Donne, *Fifty Sermons* (1649), 55.
revealed decrees. Indeed, it was axiomatic to Reformed soteriology that election and reprobation belonged to a hidden and inscrutable realm, for ‘who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counsellor?’ (Romans 11:34).

Given this context, Hammond applied pragmatism and creativity to the notion of hidden decrees. He initially echoed conformist critiques by accusing Calvinists of speculative formulations that substitute the ‘meer invention and fabrick of mens brains’ for ‘the oracles of God’ through ‘the sin of dogmatizing’. However, Hammond was wary of tolerating any hidden realm, in which absolute decrees could operate. In Of Fundamentals he had insisted ‘that which is contrary to his will, is not his will’ and referred to ‘the impiety of opposing God’s words to his thoughts, his revealed commands to his secret decrees’. Therefore formulated a simple ordo decretorum based on dual decrees of ‘scripture-election’ and ‘scripture-reprobation’. For Hammond, the hyphen was a grammatical representation of the tethered relationship between the divine will and the revealed word. Scripture alone was to be the ‘express transcript of Gods eternal destinations or decrees’. By positing a ‘strict analogy’ between ‘Evangelical promises’ and eternal decrees, Hammond sought to remove any possibility of divergence. For ‘if he gave command to publish the Gospel to all, then must the publishing of the Gospel be a matter of a general decree, there being no other so sure a way of discerning what was ab aterno predestined by God in his secret counsel’. Hammond therefore moved beyond the caution of Article Seventeen to an Arminian denial of any real distinction between voluntas revelata and voluntas arcana.

---

46 Even Montagu did not refute the notion of hidden decrees but attacked those who ‘insolently press into GOD’S Secrets’. Appello Caesarem, 53.
47 PD, 25.
48 Of Fundamentals, 168.
49 PD, 23-25. Juxtaposing Scriptural or ‘Evangelical’ decrees with speculative decrees was a clever tactic that challenged Calvinist opponents on their own terms.
50 PD, 24.
51 PD, 22.
52 As Muller has noted, this was a major point of contention between the Remonstrants and contra-Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort: ‘In controversy with the Arminians, the Reformed insisted that... these cannot be identical in content’. PRRD, IV. 462.
Relocating the Realm of Mystery

The inevitable corollary was a diminishing scope for divine mystery. This caused underlying tension between Hammond and Sanderson throughout *Pacifick Discourse*. As Hammond had noted in a letter to Sheldon, Sanderson’s original reticence to make a public statement was due to his conviction that one could never ‘understand things of this nature’. Regarding the ‘Consistence of Grace and free will’, Sanderson therefore considered it ‘a Mystery so transcending our weak understandings’, whereas Hammond pressed for further clarity considering it ‘no such transcending Mystery’. Sanderson’s second letter reiterated that the congruence of divine grace with free will was indeed ‘Abyssus multa, deep and unfathomable’. However, Hammond again insisted that his approach would bring resolution to ‘your whole difficulty’. Hammond’s confident assertion of rational comprehension therefore contrasted with the Reformed etiquette of Sanderson, who preferred apophatic silence before the mystery of divine sovereignty. Despite finishing with a dose of humility - ‘God can reconcile his own contradictions’ - *Pacifick Discourse* displayed uncharacteristic boldness for a seventeenth-century publication on predestination. As Cummings noted, until the mid-seventeenth-century, ‘the history of predestination is a history not only of complex acts of language: it is a history of silence, of totem and taboo... The lex abominabilis, the unpronounceable word of theology, was prone to material forms of prohibition’. Hammond’s outspoken confidence therefore heralded the arrival of a new age in which reason would boldly enter the divine chamber and hold divine mysteries to account.

---

53 BL, Harleian MS 6942, fol. 45.
54 *PD*, 63.
55 *PD*, 77, 81.
56 Calvin himself described predestination as an ‘inextricable labyrinth’ and warned against ‘human curiosity’ that ‘wanders into forbidden paths... determined that none of the secret things of God shall remain unexplored’. *Institutes*, III. 31. 1.
57 *PD*, 160. Hammond’s claim of comprehensibility and resolution almost matched that of Thomas Hobbes whose treatise, *Of Libertie and Necessitie* (1654) claimed in the title that the ‘controversie’ regarding such matters as ‘predestination, election, free-will, grace, merits, reprobation &c’ should now be considered ‘fully decided and cleared’.
59 As Lim has noted, the Grotian historical method combined with Socinian anti-Trinitarianism introduced a new intolerance for mystery from the middle of the
The Problem of the Pagans

Having emptied *voluntas arcana/revelata* of its traditional content, Hammond devised an alternative use for the distinction by re-orientating it toward the problem of ‘heathen nations’. In his first letter, Sanderson had highlighted the apparent conundrum faced by ‘Remonstrants’ who assert sufficient ‘Universal Grace’ despite discovered nations that ‘never had the Gospel preached unto them’. After pleading ignorance regarding the Remonstrant position, Hammond formulated a radical distinction between ‘Evangelicall grace’ and the ‘Evangelicall Covenant’. Evangelical grace was the gift bestowed on those within auricular range of ‘the Gospel’ and the auspices of the church. Consistent with his earlier argument, in this domain of revealed religion there were no hidden decrees, or mystery regarding the cause of salvation or damnation. Instead, Hammond insisted that pagan nations were the realm where hidden decrees operated and mystery remained, ‘since he hath not thought fit to reveal to us any certainty concerning their condition, but reserved it to himself, amongst his other secret counsels’.61

Feigning to draw back, Hammond actually pressed on toward a quite daring conclusion. Since ‘all men were dead in Adam’ universal atonement must be sufficient to save pagans. Therefore, though non-Christian nations were not within the realm of ‘Evangelical grace’, they nevertheless fell within the bounds of ‘the Evangelicall Covenant’.62 Having already jettisoned any solifidian condition requiring intellective assent, the way was clear for Hammond to posit ‘sincere obedience’ rather than faith as the terms of the ‘Covenant’ outside the realm of revealed religion.63 Drawing on his favourite Biblical proof-text, Hammond argued that a single ‘talent’ of understanding warranted ‘a smaller

seventeenth-century. After the Restoration, Latitudinarians such as William Sherlock accused Calvinist divines of ‘Enthusiasm’ for holding traditional Reformed doctrines that were underpinned by an assumption of divine mystery. Paul Lim, *Mystery Unveiled*, ch. 4.

60 *PD*, 26.
63 *PD*, 29.
degree of obedience’. This principle was ‘applicable to the heathens, who have certainly the talent of naturall knowledge’.64 Despite tentative phraseology, Hammond clearly implied that pagans, though deprived of ‘Scripture decrees’ and ‘Evangelical grace’, could nevertheless be saved according to the proportionate conditions of the ‘Evangelicall Covenant’.

Hammond’s overall conclusion was surprisingly concordant with that of John Goodwin. Together, they indicated a growing concern among English Arminians to underpin categorical universalism with sufficient means beyond the scope of revealed religion. However, Hammond’s rejection of solifidianism and the necessity of any ‘intellective faculty’, enabled him to posit a moral condition for pagans, which was simply a ‘smaller degree’ of the required condition for those in the realm of revealed religion.65 Pagans may only have one talent, but for Hammond, it was the same currency as those with five. As Marenbon has demonstrated, early modern Catholic divines had pioneered similar responses to ‘the new theological challenge’ provoked by the discovery of America in the decades following 1492.66 For instance, Suarez drew on the Thomist notion of implicit faith for Old Testament believers and extended its application to pagans desirous of salvation in voto, even though not actually baptised. Thus explicit faith and obedience in Christ could be replaced by an implicit ‘wishing to fulfil all that is necessary’.67 Hammond therefore appeared to have more in common with Catholic Jesuits in his reliance on a reduced moral condition for pagans. However, he may not have been alone in early modern England. John Milton’s enigmatic stanza in Paradise Lost appeared to rely upon a similar moral condition in order to extend the hope of salvation to ‘the rest’. One plausible interpretation, in line with Hammond, would consider the ‘Elect’ to be those privileged to live within

64 PD, 31.
65 PD, 30, 31. Hammond’s account of the phenomenology of pagan conversion was therefore different from Goodwin, who argued that a sense of guilt and intellective faith in a minimal gospel were still necessary prerequisites for pagans.
67 Suarez in Ibid., 292. This conflicted with the revival of strict Augustinianism among the Dominicans and the Jansenists. They took a more uncompromising position based on Cyprian’s maxim, extra Ecclesiam nulla salus and denied that pagan virtue, however genuine, could ever be salvific. See Francis A. Sullivan, Salvation Outside the Church? Tracing the History of the Catholic Response (London: Wipf and Stock, 2002), 88-102.
the realm of Christendom, where ‘Evangelical grace’ was readily available. ‘The rest’ referred to pagans, who under the ‘Evangelicall Covenant’, were still within the scope of saving grace. Interpreted this way, Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and Hammond’s *Pacifick Discourse* both formulated reduced terms and conditions for ‘the rest’: ‘To pray, repent, and bring obedience due’.68

Hammond and the Mode of Grace

If Sanderson’s first conjecture addressed the *ordo decretorum*, the next considered the mode of divine grace and its relationship to prescience, providence and perseverance. Consequently, *Pacifick Discourse* turned a corner to address arguably the most contested theological question in seventeenth-century Europe: How does divine grace concur with human free will? Hammond appended three letters to *Pacifick Discourse* entitled ‘Of Praescience’ in order to answer an underlying modal conundrum: How can divine foreknowledge be reconciled with future contingency?69 The next section will consider this appendix before returning to Sanderson’s second and third conjectures.

Of Praescience

As for Socinus’s resolution that he foresees only what are foreseeable, and that contingents are not such, but only those that come to pass by his

---

68 PL, 3: 189–93. Deborah Shuger has also argued that this stanza addressed the problem of pagans, and helpfully noted the profile given to other nations throughout the poem. However, she contends that Milton adopted one possible reading of John Overall, whereby the ‘Elect’ are saved by an absolute decree but ‘the rest’ conditionally. Debora Shuger, ‘Milton Über Alles: The School Divinity of Paradise Lost’. However, as will be demonstrated, this reading of Overall was not deemed plausible even by those such as Hammond who would have preferred it. Equally, given Milton’s insistence on conditional decrees throughout *De Doctrina Christiana*, it seems unlikely that he would introduce absolute election for some in *Paradise Lost*.

69 Muller concurs, noting that ‘The chief issue of debate in the seventeenth century was the location of divine knowledge of the conditional or *ex hypothesi* events’. *PRRD*, III. 414.
decree, I conceive that it is as dangerous as M. Calvins, that he predetermines all things.\textsuperscript{70}

Hammond deliberately juxtaposed Calvin and Socinus out of several early modern solutions to the problem of divine foreknowledge and future contingency. Reformed divines generally relied on the notion of synchronic contingency associated with Scotus.\textsuperscript{71} This voluntarist approach defined contingency according to the principle of alternativity. The absolute freedom of the divine will preserved the contingency of all things, as divine action always possessed alternative possibilities. Equally, the divine will was executed in such a way that the innate nature of secondary causes was preserved, whether natural or voluntary. This safeguarded a limited form of contingency among secondary causes whilst ensuring divine foreknowledge was ultimately derived from the exercise of divine will, whether by decreeing good (\textit{providentia approbationis}) or permitting evil (\textit{providentia concessionis}). Hammond summarised this position neatly: ‘by his decree... he predetermines all things’.\textsuperscript{72} The Thomist tradition took a quite different approach, refusing to tether foreknowledge to the divine will. Instead, Aquinas adopted the Boethian approach to divine eternity, arguing that future contingents were present to God even before they existed in time: ‘God knows contingent things not successively, as they are in their own being, but as we do simultaneously... Hence all things that are in time are present to God from eternity’.\textsuperscript{73} However, Aquinas coupled this benign perceptual model of foreknowledge with a strong providentialism, which ensured that all things finally resulted from divine causation. From within the Thomist tradition,

\textsuperscript{70} PD, 98-9. This cleverly implied a moral equivalence between Calvin and Socinus as extremes and set up Hammond’s approach as the \textit{via media}.

\textsuperscript{71} For a defense of this claim and a summary of alternative approaches to modal logic, see Martin Bac, \textit{Perfect Will Theology}, 12-37.

\textsuperscript{72} PD, 99.

\textsuperscript{73} Aquinas, \textit{Summa Theologica}, I. Q.14, Art.13 [accessed online (Nov. 13\textsuperscript{th} 2015) http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa.FP_Q14_A13.html]. This assertion was controversial. Whilst it was conventional to argue that things, which exist in time, exist in eternity, the idea that things that do not yet exist in time (future contingents) exist in eternity was deemed by some to be a modal contradiction. In addition, Molina highlighted Biblical texts that presupposed divine knowledge of counter-factuals of freedom, which were never actualised and could not therefore be known by direct perception. See \textit{On Divine Foreknowledge: Part IV of the Concordia}, 30-36.
Molinism emerged as a significant departure that affirmed infallible foreknowledge but denied that divine providence intrinsically determined secondary causes. Arminius and the early Remonstrants relied on this creative alternative, which was in the final analysis ‘a synergistic soteriology’.74

Despite considerable disagreements regarding foreknowledge and the exact mode of divine ratiocination, Catholic, Reformed and Remonstrant divines unanimously affirmed the comprehensive and infallible nature of divine prescience. However, Socinians began to exploit tensions between these competing traditions in order to undermine confidence in the certainty of divine foreknowledge of future contingents. They accused Reformed divines of compromising divine justice, for if God knows all things according to his sovereign will, then he is unavoidably the determinative cause of evil.75 Equally, they challenged the Arminian reliance on non-determinative foreknowledge, arguing that God could not have certain knowledge of that which is by definition uncertain. The notorious English Socinian John Biddle therefore insisted, ‘As for our free actions, which... may afterwards either be or not be... God knoweth not such actions, till they come to pass’.76

Hammond’s Of Praescience was the result of correspondence with an anonymous Reformed divine.77 United by the Socinian threat, both Hammond and his interlocutor defended the premise of comprehensive and infallible

74 Muller, PRRD, III. 420. Among the many facets of appeal was the claim that scientia media could support divine foreknowledge of all futurity, including counter-factuals of freedom, without requiring Aquinas’ perceptualist model. Instead, Molina argued that scientia media enabled definite comprehension of future contingency by a conceptualist model. Foreknowledge was derived from an infallible yet hypothetical comprehension of counter-factuals coupled with a sovereign exercise of divine providence that actualised a chosen world. Consequently, Molina insisted that: ‘In God there is providence and predestination with regard to future contingents’. Concordia, IV.49.13.
75 For the impact of the Socinians on Reformed discussions of divine foreknowledge, see Muller, PRRD, III. 424-30.
76 John Biddle, A Twofold Catechism (1654), 14. The Racovian Catechism had referred to God’s complete knowledge of all matters relating to wisdom but made no reference to divine foreknowledge of the future. Anonymous, The Racovian Catechisme (1652), 16.
77 It could have been John Owen, as in correspondence with Sheldon; Hammond noted an exchange of letters with Owen on a doctrinal matter. Bl. MS 6942, Fol. 34, 39. In addition, Owen was most concerned about the threat of Socinianism as evidenced by his mammoth Vindicae Evangelicae (1655).
foreknowledge. However, Hammond’s letters pulsed with anti-Calvinism and leveraged the threat of the Socinians, depicting Reformed Orthodoxy as the original error, which caused this reactive heterodoxy. The letters themselves orbited around two main questions.

Firstly, how can definite foreknowledge be reconciled with real contingency? In response, Hammond largely adopted the perceptualist model premised upon simple and benign foreknowledge. Consequently, God’s praescience derives from direct observation: ‘God sees it, as it is, therefore he sees it as done, and so certain, yet as done contingently, and so as that which might not have been, the being, certain, the manner of its coming to act, uncertain.’ This crucial distinction between ‘being’ and the ‘manner’ of causation protected both infallible foreknowledge (contra Socinians) and indeterminate contingency (contra Calvinists). Along with simple foreknowledge of actualities, divine praescience could comprehend future contingents as ‘possibles’ according to their causes. Given that some are ‘meerly possible’ and do not eventuate, Hammond acknowledged a limited role for ex hypothesi knowledge of counterfactuals ‘per scientiam mediam’. However, for Hammond, the predominant mode of prescience was that ‘whereby God sees what man will freely do, and not only conditionally what he might or would do’. Consequently, scientia media was a minor subset of divine knowledge, related to things ‘meerly possible’.

---

78 As Hammond noted, Socinus argued that God could only foresee what he foreordains. Given that the Socinians allowed only partial predetermination, God’s foreknowledge must likewise be partial. Hammond therefore argued that the Socinian error traced back to the Calvinist premise that divine foreknowledge is derived entirely from the divine will. See Of Fundamentals, 163.

79 PD, 106.

80 PD, 125.

81 PD, 125. Hammond showed full awareness of middle knowledge, citing the Scriptural locus classicus, which described what the men of Keilah would do to David (1 Samuel 23:12). However, Hammond was clearly reluctant to allow middle knowledge anything but a minor role, given his concern that the Socinians would exploit over reliance on ex hypothesi suppositional knowledge to support their claim that divine foreknowledge was uncertain. For Hammond, divine perception of actual future events gave a more reliable basis for infallible foreknowledge. Consequently, the totality of divine knowledge of futurity is ‘far from a knowledge meerly hypothetical… which being uncertain, whether it will be or not, there can be no determinate knowledge’. To posit scientia media as the primary mode of ratiocination would be ‘favourable to the Socinian’s opinion’. PD, 146.
*Scientia visionis* comprehended all other future actualities whilst preserving their causal nature: ‘contingently future, future when it might be otherwise’.82

Hammond’s commitment to non-determinative prescience rendered the relationship of foreknowledge to future contingents as that of a shadow of an object. Though chronologically, it may appear ahead of the entity, causally it was wholly derived from the object’s form. In order to reinforce this, Hammond drew on several scholastic distinctions.83 In particular, when future contingents are considered *sensu composito*, they are indeed necessary. However, considered *sensu diviso*, genuine contingency is not undermined as ‘it’s being or not being such, is in order of nature antecedent to Gods seeing it’.84 If Judas did not betray Christ, divine foreknowledge would reflect this, as the event was logically antecedent to the divine perception of it. Scripture can foretell the event only because God foresaw it not because he foreordained it. Consequently, according to Hammond’s perceptualist model, the divine intellect and will are significantly conditioned by the free actions of secondary causes. However, Hammond’s approach appeared to render God a mere spectator. Indeed, Molina had dubbed reliance on perceptual foreknowledge ‘the height of absurdity and impiety’ as it undermined the divine intellect as *causa sui* and the divine will as *prima causa*.85

In a rather self-conscious moment, Hammond qualified that God is not ‘an idle helpless spectator’. Though his foreknowledge may be passive, ‘his providence, and assistance, and efficacy belong to other things... giving Grace sufficient, preventing, restraining, exciting &. ordering’.86 Nevertheless, *Of Praescience* jettisoned divine causation to such an extent that even those considered heterodox by Dominicans and Calvinists would have deemed Hammond’s position unorthodox.

---

82 *PD*, 125.
83 Hammond’s willingness to embrace scholastic distinctions throughout *Of Praescience* demonstrated that he had not rejected scholasticism *per se* but preferred Grotian methods for his exegetical work. Scholasticism still offered a useful resource for disputes regarding modal logic.
84 *PD*, 105.
85 *Concordia*, IV.49.13. Instead, Molina insisted that God does not need to be acted on by secondary causes or to perceive anything external to himself in order to achieve full comprehension.
86 *PD*, 110.
The second question addressed how the divine intellect could possess definite knowledge of future contingents, which were by nature indefinite. In response, Hammond appealed to the attribute of divine immensity. According to the notion of omnipresence, divine immensity fills every created space, transcending finite limitations. However, Hammond posited a similar notion with regards the temporal dimension such that divine immensity enables God to be present to all future moments. This was a subtle but intentional departure from the more conventional appeal to divine eternity. Instead of the Boethian theory of a tenseless eternity in which all eventualities were in some sense present to God, Hammond reversed the relationship and considered God present to all things:

[Although it be granted of any finite thing, that it cannot be both present and future, yet God being immense, may and must be present to that which is future, or else he is bounded and limited. Yet this doth not infer God to see what is future as present (which you say is to be deceived) but to see what is future as future, which though indeed it be future, yet he by his immensity may be present to it.]

Hammond thus argued that divine immensity could comprehend future contingents by immediacy to their sequence of causation; ‘those things that are not certain until they are done, may by an immense Deity be ab aterno seen to come to pass in time’. Divine immensity enabled perceptual observation which nevertheless preserved both infallibility and contingency: ‘the being, certain, the manner of its coming to act, uncertain’. However, as well as a heuristic tool, Hammond utilised divine immensity as an anti-Calvinist weapon, reflecting the strategy of other English Arminians. In the face of his Reformed interlocutor, Hammond insisted that to deny foreknowledge of future contingents was ‘derogating from Gods Immensity and Infinity’. Detecting a measure of success, he later taunted his opponent: ‘you are very solicitous that your opinion should be freed from the imputation of derogating from the Divine immensity, and

---

87 PD, 115.
88 PD, 114.
89 PD, 106.
90 PD, 106.
Omniscience, so at this time it concerns you to be as carefull, lest you offend God's purity, and other attributes'.

Of Praescience secured a philosophical foundation upon which to build a synergistic soteriology. Hammond could therefore insist that benign prescience in no way undermined the authentic offer of the gospel. On the contrary, it was 'very reconcilable with the seriousness of his call', given that prescience was 'posterious and subsequent' to the decreeing of sufficient grace for all. God's promises and warnings were therefore authentic, being 'subdecreto, decreed by him' without foresight of resistance or acceptance. Equally, immensity, being present to the sequence of contingent causes, allowed for a form of divine double vision, observing both process and outcome. God foresees the pilgrim as 'salvable' whilst 'in Via', yet simultaneously as elect or reprobate according to his eschatological vision: 'These two things then by force of praescience are equally cleer, that he is one while salvable, another while damned'. Hammond’s appeal to divine immensity was therefore a thoroughgoing rebuttal to 'any necessary chain of causes'. Instead, contingent actions were both observed and preserved by divine prescience:

The short is, that which is future onely contingently, it is certain that it is foreseen by God, yet till it is, it may be otherwise, and if it be otherwise, God sees it to be otherwise... therefore his damnation is not certain before he is born.

Of Providence

Hammond’s discussion of Sanderson’s second and third conjectures centred on the relationship 'betwixt the worke of Grace and of Providence'. Their dialogue presupposed awareness of longstanding debates, which rumbled on into the seventeenth-century. Within a pre-Newtonian paradigm of Aristotelian causality,
Catholic and Reformed divines widely assumed the necessity of divine concurrence. This principle affirmed a necessary divine causal contribution that enabled creaturely actions. Within the soteriological realm, this was subdivided into general and special concurrence. General concurrence was available through auxiliary grace, annexed to the outward ministry of the church and sacraments. Special concurrence was an additional supernatural donum of grace, deemed necessary for salvation due to the incapacity of fallen nature. However, the nature of this special grace and its mode of impartation became a matter of fierce controversy. Aquinas and the Dominicans argued that divine concurrence involved an immediate influx, which amounted to physical pre-motion of the secondary cause to act in a predetermined manner. In short, divine motion took precedence, causally if not chronologically, over human motion. Thomism therefore hinged on the notion of an intrinsic gratia efficax, imparted by the operation of special divine concurrence. Divine concurrence also implied a comprehensive or meticulous approach to providence. Indeed, Aquinas’s teleological system gave providence the dominant role and considered predestination pars providentiae, as divine concurrence drew all things, including the elect and reprobate, to their ordained end.

Jesuit scholastics reacted against the Thomist notion of physical pre-motion, which seemed to depict God as a cosmic puppeteer and reduced humans to natural rather than voluntary causes. Whilst retaining a doctrine of meticulous providence, Molina argued that divine concurrence operated at a ‘remote’ level. Thus for any voluntary action, ‘the proximate and immediate source is the free choice of human beings and angels’. Divine concurrence does not act ‘upon’ or ‘in’ but ‘with’ secondary causes to effect their free actions. Arminius later

---


97 The Reformed tradition largely rejected this Thomist approach to divine concurrence and placed the emphasis instead on the work of the Spirit to convert the elect without the need for physical pre-motion. See Van Asselt, Bac and Velde, Reformed Thought on Freedom.


99 Concordia, IV.47.10.
summarized this alternative approach succinctly: ‘The Concurrence of God is not his immediate influx into a second or inferior cause, but it is an action of God immediately flowing into the effect of the creature, so that the same effect in one and the same entire action may be produced simultaneously by God and the creature’.100 Thus Jesuits like Molina and Suarez formulated co-operational models whereby divine concurrence was extrinsic as an auxilium gratiae.

Though Molina and Suarez both affirmed the necessity of human consent, they differed regarding the principle of predilection. For Molina, differentiation between persons who experienced equivalent means of grace derived from the human wills. However, Suarez argued that the same grace could result in differing responses due to the nature of its application. Consequently, those God has antecedently predestined, received the same grace as the rest but in a congruous manner that ensured non-resistance. Thus for Suarez, ‘no grace is intrinsically efficacious; but congruent grace is always in fact efficacious because it is so perfectly suited to the creature’s temperament, circumstances, desires, and so forth, as to win his free and affirmative response’.101 Soteriological efficacy resides not in grace per se but in the bespoke manner by which it is providentially administered to the elect. Consequently, as regards the relationship between providence and predestination, Jesuit scholastics such as Molina and Suarez, along with Robert Bellarmine and Gabriel Vasquez, formulated a spectrum of approaches, which encompassed absolute and conditional forms of election.

100 In Stanglin and McCall, Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace, 96-7. Modern philosophy would distinguish between these two categories of causation by reference to either event-event causation or agent causation. J. P. Moreland considers event-event causation to be a form of determinism whereby ‘all causes and effects are events that constitute causal chains construed either deterministically... or probabilistically’. Libertarians posit agent causation as a second form of causation to explain human action. Agent causation denotes the unique ability of human persons to be the originators or first movers of their actions and so to instantiate events by their own free will. See James Porter Moreland and Scott B. Rae, Body & Soul: Human Nature & the Crisis in Ethics (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 123.

101 In William Lane Craig, The Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents, 227.
Henry Hammond was attuned to these subtleties and concerned to ensure that Sanderson was drawn over to the right side of the line. Sanderson’s second conjecture had affirmed the principle of divine concurrence whereby ‘auxilium Gratiae generale’ is ‘annexed’ to the visible means of grace and ‘sufficient in itself to convert the soul of the hearer’. Hammond also eagerly affirmed the necessity of a general concurrence of divine grace given the fallen nature of humanity. Indeed, Hammond affirmed that ‘our nature being universally corrupted by Adam’s fall’ was recoverable only by several stages of grace, ‘the first by his preventing, the second by his assisting Grace’. Hammond condemned as ‘Pelagianisme’ any presumption that one’s ‘owne power’ would be sufficient ‘to repent without grace’ and objected to Jeremy Taylor’s denial of original sin in *Unum Necessarium* (1655).

However, Sanderson’ third conjecture had queried the actual sufficiency of general concurrence. Given the ‘strength of naturall corruption’, Sanderson intimated that ‘General Grace’ alone ‘might happen to prove uneffectuall to all persons’. In harmony with Plaifere’s third position, Sanderson argued that ‘a more speciall measure of Grace’ was necessary as a ‘supereffluence’ of divine favour bestowed upon the elect, leaving the rest in a state of ‘dereliction or preterition’. Sensing a crucial divergence, which threatened Sanderson’s anti-Calvinist persona, Hammond instigated a triple-lock response. An initial volley of arguments from Scripture, reason and tradition brought the first and most basic objection – Sanderson’s principle of ‘supereffluence’ necessitated a separate

---

102 PD, 33.
103 PD, 7.
104 Of Sinnes and Weaknesse and Wilfulnesse (1646), 58. Hammond wrote to Sheldon; ‘Dr Taylors book is matter of much discours, & in tht point of Origl Sinn disliked by everyone’. BL MS Harleian 6942 fol. 124. Hammond’s objections became more widely known. In a letter dated 25th Jan. 1659, ’Th. Saintserf, Bpl. Of Orkney’ commended his judgment ‘concerning Dr. Taylour on the point of original sin’. Bodl., Rawlinson, MS D.317, fol. 238. Thomas Pierce also distanced himself from Taylor’s heterodoxy. He referred to: ‘The dissatisfaction of Episcopal Divines’ regarding ’Dr. Taylors error on the right hand’ but insisted it was still ’extreamly better then the heresie of Presbyterians on the left’. *An Impartial Inquiry*, ’Preface’, sig. c3v.
105 PD, 34.
species of grace, which excluded those ‘who are not of the number of the Scripture-Elect’.\textsuperscript{106}

Hammond’s next response was to craft an interpretation of Sanderson that achieved the ‘\textit{utmost} latitude’ and drew him back into line with the venerable ‘Bp. Overall’. Initially Hammond entertained the principle of super-effluence, ‘for certainly God being granted to give sufficient Grace to all, there is no objection imaginable against this \textit{Superabounding to some ex mero beneplacito’}.\textsuperscript{107} However, Hammond subtly revised the cause of super-effluent grace by drawing once again on the parable of the talents, ‘where the rule is generall, that \textit{to him that hath shall be given’}. For Hammond, the reason for an increased measure of grace must be meritorious not gratuitous, for ‘the supereffluence of Grace is ordinarily proportioned to the faithful discharge of former trusts, making use of the foregoing \textit{sufficient Grace’}.\textsuperscript{108}

Having redefined super-effluence according to a dipleuric rather than monopleuric covenant, Hammond addressed the mode of application. Concerned to obviate any distinct species of grace for the elect, Hammond aligned Sanderson with the notion of Suarezian congruism: ‘the extraordinary favour of God, which some men receive… may not rather be imputed to Gods special providence, then his special Grace?’ However, in order to represent the Church of England rather than foreign ideas, Hammond attributed this approach to ‘Bishop Overals way’:

\begin{quote}
[F]or in his scheme the effectualness seems to be attributed to the giving what is given, \textit{tempore congruo}, at a time when, whether by sickness or by any other circumstance of their state) they are foreseen by God to be so
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{106}\textit{PD}, 35-9. Thomas Pierce's \textit{An Initial Inquiry} included an appendix, which defended Sanderson’s doctrine of concurrence against claims by Hickman that Sanderson’s recently published sermons taught an irresistible concurrence for the elect. Pierce insisted that Sanderson only held to ‘\textit{generalis concursus causae universalis’} and referred to \textit{Pacifick Discourse} claiming it was of ‘common fame’ that Hammond and Sanderson were in ‘Full Accordance’ and had ‘fully satisfied’ the matter (pp. 197-204). Published in May 1660, \textit{An Initial Inquiry} provided reinforcement for Hammond’s interpretation of Sanderson.

\textsuperscript{107}\textit{PD}, 39.

\textsuperscript{108}\textit{PD}, 41.
qualified and disposed, that they shall infallibly accept Christ offered... when the same man out of those circumstances, would not have been wrought on by the same means.\cite{109}

The absence of overt references to congruous grace in the extant writings of John Overall suggests this was a strategic manoeuvre by Hammond to disguise a Catholic Jesuit as an English divine. By attributing congruism to Overall, and insisting that Sanderson ‘perfectly agree’ with him, Hammond showed a clear preference for Catholic rather than Calvinist formulations of divine grace.

Having appeared to embrace congruism, Hammond then placed certain restrictions on its usage. Firstly, though ‘God in his wise disposals’ may indeed give ‘a greater degree of preventing Grace’ by ‘congruous timing’ yet it remained ‘resistible still’.\cite{110} Even the most ‘pregnant example of supereffluence’, the conversion of the Apostle Paul, preserved the possibility of becoming a ‘castaway’.\cite{111} Secondly, lower degrees of grace or incongruous timing remained salvific. Aware of Sanderson’s proclivity toward hypothetical formulations of sufficient grace, Hammond carefully calibrated the strength and congruity so that grace always operated within the crucial range of ‘sufficient but resistible’.\cite{112} Thus no one need ‘despair’ nor become ‘slothfull’, waiting for ‘the congruous time of God’s choice’ only to ‘perish by that presumption’.\cite{113}

The final qualification placed on super-effluent grace was the principle of predilection. In his letter, Sanderson had parodied ‘Calvinists’ in Thomist terms, adhering to ‘physical predetermination’ and ‘the Irresistibility of the work of Grace’. Hammond happily agreed and concluded that such doctrines contradict ‘common notions of Morality and Christianity’ along with the ‘Cathlick Doctrine

\begin{footnotes}
  \item[109] PD, 41-2.
  \item[110] PD, 47.
  \item[111] PD, 41.
  \item[112] PD, 64. Once again there is a clear echo of Goodwin’s approach.
  \item[113] PD, 49. In a sermon on Ezekiel 18:31 Hammond warned: ‘There is no such encumbrance to trash us in our Christian Progress, as a phansie that some men get professed with; that if they are elected, they shall be called and saved in spight of their teeth; every man expecting an extraordinary call, because Saul met with one’. In Henry Hammond, *Sermons Preached by Henry Hammond* (1675), 83.
\end{footnotes}
of all ages'.\textsuperscript{114} However, Sanderson’s letter then argued that the elect receive not a physical but a ‘moral suasion’ of such ‘sweetly order and attemper’ and applied in such a ‘congruous manner’ as to be ‘\textit{de facto}’ irresistible.\textsuperscript{115} Despite apparent anti-Calvinism, Sanderson’s approach still threatened to compromise human culpability and divine justice by asserting super-effluent grace and congruous timing as \textit{de causa discriminans}. In addition, Hammond was aware of attempts by other English divines to posit what he termed a ‘milder way’ than strict Calvinism. ‘Some few’ substitute ‘efficacy’ for ‘irresistibility’, others suggest the ‘Phansie’ that sufficient grace was for all but only the elect receive ‘\textit{ipsam non resistam}, the very not resisting’\textsuperscript{116} Hammond was alluding to an influential sermon by Samuel Ward entitled \textit{Gratia Discriminans} (1626). Ward had insisted that ‘irresistible grace’ was indeed a misnomer as Reformed theology preserved the capacity of \textit{resistibilitas} as integral to human nature. However, at the point of conversion the will of the elect hypothetically retained the capacity for resistance but ‘grace efficaciously establishes a non-resistance in the will, and thus eliminates actual resistance’.\textsuperscript{117}

Hammond opposed any such formulation that considered divine action, whether by super-effluent congruity or the impulse of non-resistance, to be ‘the signal discriminating grace’ between elect and reprobate.\textsuperscript{118} Indeed, he considered the principle of predilection the very touchstone of orthodoxy, which Sanderson and Ward compromised by their search for a ‘milder way’. Hammond therefore insisted that the principle of discrimination must reside in the ‘temper and disposition of the heart’.\textsuperscript{119} Though salvation was only possible due to ‘preventing Grace’ and ‘the operation of his holy spirit’, nevertheless \textit{de causa discriminans} was finally attributable not to the divine will but to the human

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{114}{PD, 55.}
\footnotetext{115}{PD, 59.}
\footnotetext{116}{PD, 64, 85.}
\footnotetext{117}{'\textit{hanc gratiam efficaciter ponere in voluntate non-resistentiam, atque ita tollere eo tempore actualm resistentiam}'. Samuel Ward, \textit{Gratia Discriminans} (1626), 28. I am grateful to Rev’d Dr Stephen Hampton for assistance with the translation of this text.}
\footnotetext{118}{PD, 85.}
\footnotetext{119}{PD, 44.}
\end{footnotes}
will.\textsuperscript{120} The crux of Hammond’s most significant divergence from Sanderson therefore centred on this: ‘the Discrimination comes immediately from one mans resisting sufficient Grace, which the other doth not resist’.\textsuperscript{121}

As a result of these concerns, Hammond’s first letter was dominated by intellectual and pastoral ‘Animadversions’ regarding Sanderson’s position. This clearly disturbed the peace and resulted in a reply from Sanderson, challenging Hammond’s representation of his views. In particular, he objected to Hammond’s emphasis on ‘my distinction betwixt the worke of Grace and of Providence’.\textsuperscript{122} Sensing Sanderson’s discontent, Hammond insisted that he had only emphasised this distinction ‘as a prejudice to Bishop Overall’s way’.\textsuperscript{123} The attempt to draw Sanderson away from Calvinism and toward congruism had backfired. Hammond therefore dropped his guard and acknowledged the less generous but more obvious reading of Overall: ‘the whole weight of that Learned Bishops scheme’ falls ‘on the foreseen universall inefficaciousness of the barely sufficient Grace’. Consequently, for Overall, the final cause of predilection results from ‘the work of Gods Election, to make the discrimination’.\textsuperscript{124} In a surprisingly stark conclusion Hammond insisted ‘nothing like this could be found’ in Scripture or tradition and therefore ‘nothing is gained’ from reliance on Overall’s approach.\textsuperscript{125} Consequently, Hammond’s extended discussion of the mode of grace concluded with him seemingly at odds with the very episcopal anti-Calvinists, whose patronage he so jealously courted. The radical nature of Hammonds’ Arminian soteriology was hard to conceal given his divergence from even the ‘milder way’ of Overall, Ward and Sanderson.

Of Perseverance

A closing section in \textit{Pacifick Discourse} afforded Hammond opportunity to restore his affinity with Sanderson. Despite their differences over the sufficiency and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{120} PD, 45.
\item \textsuperscript{121} PD, 58.
\item \textsuperscript{122} PD, 77.
\item \textsuperscript{123} PD, 78.
\item \textsuperscript{124} PD, 83.
\item \textsuperscript{125} PD, 83–4.
\end{itemize}
congruity of grace, both affirmed the Augustinian premise that the state of justification could be lost. Indeed, if Augustine was ‘the onley fautor’ of Calvinist absolute decrees, nevertheless he ‘granteth the possibility of falling, both totally and finally’. Sanderson therefore rejected the doctrine of absolute perseverance asserted by ‘the Contra-remonstrants’ in favour of Article Sixteen of the Church of England, which affirmed that those truly regenerate may indeed ‘fall away’. Hammond also cited Article Sixteen and affirmed Sanderson’s conclusion, supplying citations from Scripture and tradition regarding the possibility of apostasy for truly regenerate saints.

However, the doctrine of perseverance still required one final display of dexterity by Hammond in order to secure an anti-Calvinist reading of Sanderson. Though the non-elect may indeed fall from grace, Sanderson argued that ‘finall perseverance’ belonged to the elect despite ‘great (perhaps totall) interruptions’ along the way. Therefore, perseverance of the saints was indeed a certainty, if only in the mind of God (‘certitudo objecti’) rather than the saints (‘certitudo subjecti’). Hammond claimed ‘concurrence’ with this approach, but only if ‘I may be allowed to express what I mean by it’. His subsequent interpretation employed arguments resembling the pactum theology of the medieval via moderna. Whereas the Augustinian via antiqua assumed that the status of election was conferred on individuals ante praevisa merita, Ockham and Biel represented a counter-tradition, which reversed the direction of causation. As McGrath has demonstrated, this radically altered the tense attributed to predestination and gave it an eschatological orientation: ‘For Ockham, prae destinare, in its active mood, refers to the future bestowal of eternal life’. Consequently, the statement ‘Paul is predestined’ is not a verifiable truth-claim until the beatific vision has been finally bestowed. This inversion of the relationship between election and salvation was illustrated by Ockham’s truncated syllogism:

---

126 PD, 68. ‘Fautor’ was equivalent to patron.
127 PD, 66.
128 See PD, 65-68, 70.
129 PD, 69.
This man will finally persevere.
Therefore he will be predestined.\textsuperscript{131}

Consequently, no temporal evidence, including assurance of faith or good works, could provide \textit{certitudo subjecti} as this would be to view causation the wrong way round. According to Biel’s \textit{via moderna}, predestination is back to front and awaits final perseverance. Indeed, God himself only knows the final company of the elect by foresight of their perseverance, \textit{post praevisa merita}.

In order to accommodate Sanderson’s approach, Hammond appropriated this versatile tradition, insisting that ‘Gods Election of any person to the reward of the covenant’ was ‘founded in the perseverance of that person in the faith’.\textsuperscript{132} Consequently, those who fall from grace may indeed be ‘elected to salvation’ on account of ‘Gods foresight of their returne, and persevering constancy at length’.\textsuperscript{133} However, from the perspective of the \textit{viator}, predestination was a future goal for which they must strive, not a past decree upon which they may presume: ‘the inheritance of sons, being inseperably relative and annexet to the constant filial obedience, which he indispensably requires of us, under the Gospel of conditionall promises’.\textsuperscript{134} The absence of any divine safety net therefore rendered those who fall away in a ‘desperately dangerous state’, worse than ‘the unregenerate’, from which there is no absolute promise of recovery.\textsuperscript{135} Consequently, the direction of vision assumed by the \textit{viator} was crucial. Looking back ‘to the cabinet of Gods secret counsels’ would result in ossified presumption akin to Lot’s wife. Instead, the ‘method of resolution’ should be an eschatological

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 137.
\textsuperscript{132} \textit{PD}, 69.
\textsuperscript{133} \textit{PD}, 70.
\textsuperscript{134} \textit{PD}, 75. William Barlee therefore accused episcopal Arminians of teaching ‘Post-destination’ in \textit{Praedestination, as before Privately, so Now at Last Openly Defended Against Post-Destinaion}, (1656).
\textsuperscript{135} In his reply, Sanderson objected to Hammond’s suggestion that the apostate may have sufficient grace entirely withdrawn in this life. Despite reassurances, Hammond insisted that Pharaoh illustrated the total withdrawal of grace ‘as if he were already in hell’. \textit{PD}, 94. Hammond like Goodwin, drew on the fear engendered by the threat of apostasy and used it as a goad for moral reformation. Sanderson’s reaction against this fearsome approach is a reminder that cartoon caricatures depicting Calvinism as harsh and Arminianism as soft, fail to comprehend the ramifications of either position.
vision that strives to make ones calling and election sure, for only they ‘that persevere unto the end shall be saved’.136

In order to safeguard vital motivation derived from incertitude, Hammond also purged other more subtle forms of deviance.137 In a letter interleaved with Peter Gunning’s theological notebooks, Hammond discussed Thomas Jackson’s view of perseverance.138 In 1651, Gilbert Sheldon, acting as Jackson’s literary executor, had arranged for Hammond to view unpublished manuscripts, which included volume ten of Jackson’s commentary on the Creed.139 It had remained unpublished in Jackson’s lifetime as Archbishop Laud considered it too Arminian to license in early Stuart England.140 In volume ten, Jackson had argued that mortification was an alternative criterion for assurance. He claimed it offered ‘more certain Experiments of our Progress’ than puritan forms of experimental predestination.141 Adopting the Augustinian concept of donum perseverantiae, Jackson argued controversially, that the ‘Gift’ was not conferred according to a priori decrees of election, but according to a posteriori progress in mortification: ‘the Gift of Final Perseverance in this Duty, is not immutably established, until we attain unto a certain Measure of Mortification’.142 More daringly, Jackson implied that by sufficient mortification, such a status could be ‘Infallibly collated... before he come neer to the End of his mortal life’.143 This assertion of infallible and experimental certitudo subjecti by meritorious means disturbed the sensibilities of Reformed divines and Henry Hammond but for contrasting reasons.144

136 PD, 74–5. Hammond’s approach appeared to echo the notorious late medieval maxim of Ockham and Biel, ‘God will deny his grace to no one who does what is in him’. This accusation was also levelled at the early Remonstrants. See Stanglin & McCall, Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace, 162.
137 PD, 70.
138 Bodl., Rawl. Collection, MS C.616, fol. 65.
139 See Thomas Jackson, Maran Atha, or, Dominus Veniet (1657), ‘Epistle Dedicatory’, sig. A2v.
140 The work was finally published in 1654 as another example of an early Stuart Arminian work that was printed in the 1650s. See Thomas Jackson, An Exact Collection of the Works of Doctor Jackson... such as were Not Published Before (1654).
141 An Exact Collection, 3148.
142 Ibid., 3152.
143 Ibid., 3148.
144 Other episcopal Arminians had favourably adopted elements of Jackson’s work. Henry Hickman accused Pierce and Heylyn of ideas ‘almost Verbatim, transcribed out of Dr. Thom. Jackson’. Laudensium Apostasia (1660), ‘Preface’, sig. a1v.
In typical fashion, Hammond’s letter initially concurred with the hypothetical possibility that 'such a degree of mortification' could be 'endowed with the gift of perseverance'. However, after doffing his cap to divine sovereignty, Hammond turned on the idea that such certitude was ever promised by God: the 'may' should not be 'turned into a must' as regards both 'certitudo obi' & subter. Given Hammond’s conviction that predestination was contingent upon perseverance, it followed that no man could actually obtain certitude of 'that which is not certain'. However, for Hammond, such heterodox views should be silenced, not simply because they lack Scriptural support, but also because they risk guilt by association:

And let me add, that if there be any notable inconvenience or danger of spirituall pride or presumption incident to the Calvinist doctrine of that no falling away from grace... the same are in some degree incident to this doctrine if the promise of perseverance is to some degree of mortification.

Despite contrasting models of causation, Jackson’s meritorious mortification and Calvinist experimental predestination reached a similar conclusion regarding the possibility of absolute assurance. Hammond therefore communicated to the recipient of the letter, his ‘just prejudice agt the publishing any such unprooved doctrine’ and wrote to Sheldon, who was Thomas Jackson’s literary executor, urging caution: ‘I am fully of your mind that no mansc... of Dr. Jackson's should be published’.145

145 Bl. Harleian MS 6942, fol. 73. Hammond’s concern to control the posthumous publication of Jackson’s work reflected his concern that discordant voices may discredit the episcopal Arminian cause.
Conclusion: Redefining the ‘myddle way’

Throughout *Pacifick Discourse* and behind the scenes a valuable portfolio of English episcopal anti-Calvinists required careful management by Henry Hammond. This included silencing Jeremy Taylor’s heterodoxies, censoring Thomas Jackson’s manuscripts, soliciting correspondence from the reluctant Sanderson and publishing carefully crafted letters in *Pacifick Discourse*. In each instance, Hammond’s concern was to cultivate an image of moderation, whilst subtly relocating the English *via media* further from Calvinism than John Overall or Robert Sanderson would ever have countenanced. However, his Arminian agenda did not go unchallenged. An intriguing postscript to the aforementioned letter, noted that Hammond’s objections to Thomas Jackson were not representative: ‘Sir. Mr. Allen told me, you have declared your self in this opinion to be of Dr. Jackson’s judgement… Is not, Thomson Diatriba to the same effect? & Dr. Overall’s myddle way?’

This comment indicated a contemporary awareness that, despite studious attempts to appear otherwise, Hammond’s interpretation of the English Articles had departed the ‘myddle way’ and was surprisingly isolated, even among episcopal anti-Calvinists.

As this chapter has shown, despite exuding ‘Catholick harmonious charity’, the radical edges of Hammond’s Arminianism protruded in several places. His loathing of hidden decrees and intolerance regarding appeals to mystery differed from Laudians, who seemed quite content like Sanderson to appeal to apophatic awe. The notion of a ‘Covenant’ extended to pagan nations, with a reduced moral condition, overturned the patristic maxim, *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* and the Protestant shibboleth, *sola fide*. Hammond’s reliance on simple, perceptual foreknowledge implied a measure of autonomy to human action that would have offended even controversial Jesuits like Molina. Most crucially of all, the principle

---

146 Bodl., Rawl. MS C. 616, fol. 65.
147 Hammond’s concern expressed in an earlier letter to Sheldon, continued to haunt him: ‘the truth is my appearing thus alone will go for little’. BL Harleian MS 6942, fol. 38.
of predilection was a major fork in the road, separating Hammond from other high-profile English episcopalian. Samuel Ward took the path of moderate Calvinism, Sanderson sought the ‘myddle way’ of John Overall but Hammond unequivocally chose an Arminian route, insisting that ‘Discrimination’ was a result of the human will. Finally, Hammond’s commitment to preserving a state of incertitude in order to motivate the viator, clashed with the ‘the premier English Arminian theologian of the 1630s’. Though addressed to ‘All our Brethren in the Church of England’, *Pacifick Discourse* represented a quite narrow interpretation of the English Articles, without precedent even among Laudian anti-Calvinists. Though Sanderson may have ‘quit the sublapsarian way’, he was by no means prepared to embrace Hammond’s Arminian way. Despite the rhetoric of *A Pacifick Discourse*, Hammond and Sanderson appeared to be conversing from opposite sides of the soteriological fence.

In order to mask his theological radicalism, Hammond subtly reconfigured the spectrum of English orthodoxy by summoning the threat of the Socinians. Previously, the ‘Church of England’ had been depicted as a via media between ‘Contra-Remonstrants’/’Remonstrants’ or ‘Papists’/’Puritans’. However, Hammond now positioned *ecclesia Anglicana* between the alternative reference points of the Reformed and Racovian catechisms. This elongated spectrum allowed *Pacifick Discourse* to present itself as a moderating theology, strategically positioned as the revised centre ground and able to speak for the Church of England on the eve of the Restoration. Hammond thus appropriated the via media method exemplified by John Overall and continued the project of constructing ‘Anglicanism by stealth’. However, by revising the parameters, Hammond de-centered even Overall’s ‘myddle way’. As Peter Lake has cogently argued, ‘the substantive content of any middle way depended entirely on the way in which the two extremes were construed or constructed... Here, one enters the
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148 Tyacke used this phrase to describe Thomas Jackson, in *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 22.
149 For an example of the former, see Overall’s *Quinque sunt Articuli in Belgio controversi*. For the latter see Montagu’s *Appello Caesarem*.
realm of polemic'. The ‘Anglican’ *via media* was a sliding scale in the hands of Henry Hammond, who radically revised the centre of English orthodoxy, all the while exuding irenic moderation.

---

151 Peter Lake, 'Predestinarian Propositions', 111-2.
PART II

Summary
The puritan John Goodwin and episcopalian Henry Hammond displayed remarkable fecundity and sophistication in their diverse formulations of Arminian soteriology. Considered as representatives of broader intellectual trends, these divines provide some final reflections regarding the shape of English Arminianism by the 1650s.

Doctrinal Commitments

According to Plaifere’s taxonomy, Goodwin and Hammond broadly adopted the ‘fourth opinion’, which formulated an ordo decretorum predicated upon conditional decrees and the universal provision of resistible grace. However, both divines also appealed to elements of classical theism, including Boethian eternalism and divine immensity, in order to undermine the linear causation of Calvinism. This complicates Plaifere’s assumption that Arminianism was predicated either on simple foreknowledge or middle knowledge (‘fifth opinion’). Indeed, though both divines were clearly aware of scientia media, neither appropriated it.¹ Both Goodwin and Hammond seemed nervous of any theology that undermined human culpability by positing an absolute and arbitrary voluntas Dei. Though middle knowledge guarded contingency against determinism, it did so only within the world that the divine will sovereignly instantiated. Indeed, for Plaifere, it was crucial to affirm that these determinative circumstances were solely a consequence of ‘[God’s] owne absolute will and pleasure’.² Scientia media could therefore appear to be little more than ‘absolute predestination in a mask’.³ As a consequence, Goodwin and Hammond kept their

¹ In RR, Goodwin also referred to the locus classicus of 1 Samuel 23:11-12, referencing David and the hypothetical actions of the men of Keilah. He affirmed that God not only knows ‘what they will be’ (actuals) but also ‘what they would have been’ if he had caused things to be ‘otherwise’ (counter-factuals). RR, 23. However, he did not draw middle knowledge into his Arminian system and made no further reference to it.
² Plaifere, AE, 51. As Hicks has argued, Arminius and the early Remonstrants combined a libertarian approach to free will with a strong and meticulous divine providence precisely because of their reliance on scientia media. John Hicks, ‘Was Arminius an Open Theist?’, in Reconsidering Arminius: Beyond the Reformed and Wesleyan Divide, ed. by Keith Stanglin, Mark Bilby and Mark Mann (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 2014), pp. 137-60.
distance and formulated alternative approaches, predicated on divine-human reciprocity and concomitancy. This more thoroughgoing libertarianism appears to have been representative of English Arminian theology by the 1650s, with Herbert Thorndike as a notable exception.

Regarding the mode of grace, Goodwin and Hammond formulated quite diverse approaches to the condition of justification, the nature of prevenient grace and the possibility of apostasy. However, both divines dug their heels in regarding the principle of predilection. Indeed, this was arguably the clearest boundary that distinguished Calvinist and Arminian soteriology in the seventeenth-century. Though Goodwin and Hammond retained the Augustinian framework of original sin and the necessity of grace, they echoed each other’s insistence that de causa discriminans must finally be attributed to human not divine causation. This axiomatic principle required certain corollaries of thought, each related to the context of mid-seventeenth-century England. Firstly, both Goodwin and Hammond spent considerable energies warding off hypothetical formulations based on Lombard’s ancient distinction between efficienter pro electic and sufficienter pro omnibus. This distinction offended Arminian sensibilities, as the point of predilection remained a result of divine preterition. Goodwin therefore worked hard to refute the pastoral Calvinism of his former tutors, while Hammond displayed remarkable dexterity to interpret the English Articles away from these subtle ambiguities. By 1660, the hypothetical universalism of Davenant and Preston, along with the ‘myddle way’ of John Overall, were increasingly out of fashion as a more emphatic Arminian universalism took their place.

In addition, English Arminians pioneered creative and at times conflicting responses to the problem of pagans and the scope of saving grace. The Arminian insistence regarding the principle of predilection incurred a specific intellectual challenge that both Goodwin and Hammond tried to resolve – how could

---

4 For an overview of the origins of this distinction and its appropriation by Amyraut and Davenant, see Richard A. Muller, Calvin and the Reformed Tradition, chs. 4 & 5.
sufficient saving grace be posited beyond the realm of revealed religion?\textsuperscript{5} This question was heightened by increased awareness in early modern Europe of ‘so many ten thousands, in so many Countreys and Kingdoms’ as compared with ‘we only, who live but in a corner of the Earth’.\textsuperscript{6} In response English Arminians, along with Cambridge Platonists and Socinians contributed alternative theologies that deviated from the Reformed tradition and radically revised both the salvific scope of reason and the terms and conditions for salvation. In particular, Goodwin’s fiduciary approach with its reduced intellective content and Hammond’s moral covenant with its reduced penitential requirement, provided two divergent English Arminian responses to the problem of the pagans and the principle of predilection.\textsuperscript{7}

Theological Motivations

Despite an apparently anthropocentric focus, the underlying concern that pulsed through English Arminianism in the 1650s remained surprisingly theocentric. Goodwin and Hammond were not burdened by modern liberal values but a preoccupation to vindicate the character of God and a concern to safeguard morality, against the perceived threat of Calvinist doctrines. Equally, diminishing scope for hidden decrees and divine mystery was not inspired by a proto-Kantian rationalism. Though Goodwin and Hammond extended the scope and salvific potency of reason and human free will, their concern was to vindicate the benevolence and wisdom of God rather than to promote anthropocentric optimism.\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{5} The Reformed tradition could defer the matter to the sovereignty of God and the mystery of divine decrees. However, the Arminian tradition required more radical alterations in order to include pagans within the scope of universal saving grace.
\textsuperscript{6} John Bunyan, \textit{Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners} (1666), 26.
\textsuperscript{7} Further research could consider the impact of global exploration and trade on early modern theology more generally.
\textsuperscript{8} The crucial difference between the Reformed and Arminian traditions was not their use of reason but their expectation regarding its efficacy. For Calvin, the Anselmian tradition of evidentialist apologetics was legitimate but would only be persuasive for the elect. Whereas, Goodwin’s \textit{Divine Authority of Scripture} (1648) argued that universal prevenient grace enlightened all with sufficient reason. For an analysis of these differences, see Muller, \textit{PRRD}, II. 255-293. See also Aza Goudriaan, ‘The Synod and
Stephen Gunter’s claim that the English reception of Arminian theology resulted in a ‘tolerant, non-judging’ doctrine of God and ‘optimistic anthropology’ therefore requires some revision.⁹ In fact, of the various theologies designed to purge antinomianism during the 1640s and 50s, Goodwin and Hammond arguably formulated some of the most fearsome responses. Their Arminianism deliberately unsettled certitude and accentuated final judgment as a goad to drive moral reform. Reflecting on the Arminian moralism of Jeremy Taylor, the poet, philosopher and leading figure in British Romanticism, Samuel Coleridge, provocatively concluded that Calvinism was ‘the lamb in the wolf’s skin’ and Arminianism ‘the wolf in the lamb’s skin’, for ‘the one is cruel in the phrases, the other in the doctrine’.¹⁰ Though Arminianism offered a generous front door of universal salvation, the level of security once inside was deliberately reduced.

Intellectual Sources

As English Protestants, Goodwin and Hammond embodied the early modern synthesis of patristic, medieval and reformation influences, combined with the methodologies of scholasticism and Renaissance humanism. Their works cited a wide-range of divergent sources, which as Van Asselt notes, did not equate to being ‘eclectic’ but was an intentional display of catholicity and orthodoxy.¹¹ Regarding post-Reformation sources, for tactical reasons Goodwin largely appealed to luminaries from the Reformed tradition, whereas Hammond sought the patronage of anti-Calvinist episcopalians. However, as an English puritan, Goodwin also borrowed openly from Catholic sources, including Iberian neo-Scholastics. In Redemption Redeemed, Goodwin drew on the ‘acute’ insights of the Franciscan Bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo, Francisco D’Arriba, and liberally cited his

---


Operis Conciliatorii, Gratiae et Liberi Arbitrii (1622). In Triumviri, Goodwin defended himself against the attacks of Henry Jeanes by citing several ‘Schoolmen and Papists’, including D’Arriba, Aquinas and the Jesuit Francisco Suarez. Ironically, Goodwin assumed Suarez to be a credible reference in his debate with a fellow puritan and concluded, ‘if Mr. Jeanes be of Suarez minde... he is of mine also’. This open recourse to post-Reformation Catholic scholastics serves as a corrective to common assumptions that English puritans, unlike ‘Anglicans’, only appropriated Protestant sources. In fact, whilst Goodwin openly cited Suarez, it was Hammond who appeared to disguise him as John Overall. Consequently, ‘the dividing line is not to be drawn between Reformed or Protestant and Catholic, but between different positions, which can be found in both Protestant and Catholic theologians’. Situated at the confluence of several intellectual streams, English Arminianism was characterized by surprising levels of diversity and catholicity that warrant further exploration.
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12 RR, 52. Operis Conciliatorii was dedicated to Pope Gregory XV and offered one of the most sophisticated responses to the controversy de Auxiliis. In a letter to Izaak Walton, Thomas Pierce also referred to the influence of D’Arriba’s Operis Conciliatorii on Sanderson’s decision to quit the sublapsarian way. See Izaak Walton, The Life of Dr. Sanderson (1678), ‘Dr Pierce’s Letter’.


14 See for example Hampton’s claim that a willingness to openly cite post-Reformation Catholic scholastics distinguished ‘Anglican Reformed’ divines. Anti-Arminians, 264-5.

15 W. J. Van Asselt and E. Dekker, eds., Reformation and Scholasticism, 152.
CONCLUSION
During the seventeenth-century the theological tide was turning in England. A cursory glance at bestseller lists highlights the scale of the changes that occurred. In the Jacobean period, the puritan bishop of Bangor published a Reformed handbook to cultivate godly spirituality. Lewis Bayly's *The Practice of Piety* (c.1612) became a publishing sensation, reprinted over thirty times in England before the Restoration.\(^1\) The notoriety of other publications, such as *A Golden Chaine* (1591) by William Perkins or the *Marrow of Sacred Divinity (Medulla Theologiae, 1623)* by William Ames, reflected the voracious English appetite for Reformed theology and piety. However, in the second half of the century, trends and titles changed as Calvinism's popularity waned and the English consensus shifted its centre of gravity.\(^2\) In 1658 an anonymous publication surfaced entitled *The Whole Duty of Man.* In a commendatory letter Henry Hammond offered up intercessions that ‘the benefit of this Work’ should fill the ‘Hearts of the whole Nation’. His prayers were soon answered as Richard Allestrée’s work experienced a meteoric rise, eclipsing Reformed rivals. Stripped of doctrinal discussions, *The Whole Duty* exemplified the moral style associated with episcopal Arminians.\(^3\) Along with Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living* (1650) and *Holy Dying* (1651) Allestrée's moral handbook captured the English imagination after the Restoration.\(^4\) These publishing histories bear witness to the widespread English migration away from Calvinism during the seventeenth-century.\(^5\)

---

1. Lewis Bayly, *The Practise of Piete Directing a Christian how to walke that he may please God* (1613). It was also translated into Welsh, Dutch, French and German. Approximately 100,000 copies may have been sold across Europe. See Stanford E. Lehmb erg, *Cathedrals Under Siege: Cathedrals in English Society, 1600-1700* (Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 1996), 114.

2. For example, Bayly’s *Practice of Piete* went through less than half as many reprints in the second half of the seventeenth-century.

3. In the preface, Allestrée, who was almost certainly the author, urged souls ‘to behave themselves so in this world, that they may be happy for ever in the next’ and gave stark warning of eternal torment for those who do not ‘faithfully obey’ the terms of the new covenant. Richard Allestrée, *The Whole Duty of Man* (1658), ‘Preface’, sig. a1, a3.


5. In response to claims by Pierce *et al* that the Church of England had never been Calvinist, Hickman appealed to publishing records: ‘Why hath the Practice of Piete... with divers others been so often printed?’ *Patro-Scholastiko-Dikaiosis*, ‘Preface’, sig. b4v.
This observation in itself is not new. Modern historians have variously referred to ‘the eclipse of Calvinism’, ‘the defeat of Calvinism’ or the ‘retreat from Calvinism’. However, this research has demonstrated that the decisive moment for this intellectual shift was not during the early Stuart era, nor was it delayed until after the Restoration. Paradoxically, ‘the golden age of theological debate on Arminianism was in the England of the 1650s’. Previous scholarship has suffered from an over-reliance on ecclesiastical and political approaches, which associated English Arminianism with the interests of Laudian or Latitudinarian parties, either side of the English Revolution. Based on the assumption that ‘Arminianism was politically defeated in the early 1640s’ and that puritans were Calvinist agitators to a man, it became a historiographical fait accompli that godly rule in the 1650s could mean only one thing: ‘Calvinism returned to its former prominence’. Scholars have therefore largely presupposed that Arminianism was marginalized in Cromwellian England, forced to sit it out like an impotent opportunist waiting for the next political coup. The Restoration provided just such a moment as the ‘return of the Laudians’ instigated another political overthrow of Calvinism. English Arminianism has therefore been reduced to a Laudian phenomena and its post-Restoration dominance explained by political rather than intellectual changes. Commenting on the ‘sudden’ and ‘suprising’ dominance of Arminianism after the Restoration, Mark Goldie articulates a common assumption by neatly joining the 1630s to the 1660s and concluding: ‘It was an astonishing transformation, and in this respect at least Archbishop Laud had triumphed’.  

---

9 Mark Goldie, *Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs*, 257. McGonigle expressed a similar assumption: ‘Beginning with the Restoration in 1660, English Calvinism suffered an increasing eclipse during the remainder of the seventeenth century’. *Sufficient Saving Grace*, 69 [emphasis added]. An online database for the British Civil Wars Project offers a popular version of the same basic narrative. Its page entry for ‘Arminianism’ simply states that after Laud, ‘Arminian influence was driven out during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth era, but re-emerged after the Restoration amongst Anglo-Catholics’. See
By decoupling English Arminianism from ecclesiastical or political commitments and considering it a theological tradition in its own right, this research has highlighted the rise of Arminianism during the decade of puritan rule. The resulting quinquarticular war evaded conventional boundaries, as puritans, episcopalian and sectarian displayed surprising points of affinity in their critiques of Calvinism (Part I). Cromwellian toleration combined with suspension of press licensing also facilitated unprecedented engagement with sophisticated resources from Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed and Remonstrant traditions that enabled English Arminians to construct intellectually cogent and pastorally rigorous alternatives to Calvinism (Part II).

Consequently, unlike Laudian anti-Calvinism, ‘the golden age’ of English Arminianism was not restricted to one ecclesiastical style. Instead, the multifaceted nature of English Arminianism during the 1650s displayed the hallmarks of long-term intellectual change, as Calvinism experienced a widespread plausibility crisis. Under the rarefied conditions of Cromwellian toleration, this escalated into a major episode of religious controversy and proved to be an epoch-shaping moment for English intellectual history. The paradoxical rise of Arminianism during the decade of puritan rule therefore serves as a reminder that, ‘not all early modern intellectual history has to be reduced either to politics or to a set of philosophical presuppositions’. Arminianism established itself in England before the Restoration and against the prevailing hegemony of the 1650s. This thesis has therefore highlighted the virulence, potency and diversity of English Arminianism, as an intellectual tradition in its own right.

---


10 As Patrick Collinson noted, ‘Laud’s triumph’ was ‘transitory’ and political in nature, leaving the ‘climax of Calvinism’ still to come in the Westminster Assembly. However, ‘Thereafter, [Calvinism] would fall victim not to sudden assassination but to its own contradictions, and to the morbid processes which eventually overtake all systematic achievements of the human mind and spirit’. ‘England and International Calvinism’, 222.

11 Dmitri Levitin, Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science, 22.
Having charted the variety of Arminian styles and theologies that emerged during the English Revolution, further research should now consider the post-Restoration reception and maturation of English Arminianism. The complex ecclesiastical arrangements following the Clarendon code combined with the new intellectual horizons that emerged during the early English Enlightenment, necessitate a more dexterous analysis than has been achieved to date. While scholars agree on the broad conclusion that ‘Arminianism swept the board’,\(^\text{12}\) this research provides taxonomical resources that can help to capture more subtle trends of continuity and change, influence and originality. In particular, the ‘quiet Arminianism’ of the Cambridge Platonists warrants further research, which could in turn provide a better understanding of the relationship between Arminianism and Latitudinarianism.\(^\text{13}\) Equally, puritans such as John Goodwin likely influenced the maturation of Arminianism among post-Restoration Cambridge divines such as William Sancroft and John Tillotson, Quakers such as Robert Barclay and William Penn and Baptists such as Thomas Grantham who went on to develop systematic Arminian theologies.\(^\text{14}\) However, increased influence from later Dutch Remonstrants, including Étienne de Courcelles and Philip Van Limborch, along with the infiltration of Lockean philosophy, would suggest considerable discontinuity from Arminians like Goodwin who remained wedded to scholastic methods, classical theism and the Augustinian doctrine of original sin.\(^\text{15}\)

---

\(^\text{12}\) Tyacke made this observation regarding Cambridge. See ‘Laudians to Latitudinarians’, in *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 48. Hampton has chastened such conclusions by noting the presence of twelve Reformed bishops and six Reformed deans within the Restoration church. *Anti-Arminians*, 22. Nevertheless, other commentators have argued that toward the end of the seventeenth century, ‘Arminianism became commonplace in England’ and ‘Calvinism was all but dead’. Goldie, *Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs*, 257.

\(^\text{13}\) See Goldie, ‘Cambridge Platonists’, *ODNB*. See also Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I. Ch. 2.


\(^\text{15}\) Hampton has suggested that: ‘After the Restoration there was a much more explicit alliance between English and continental European Arminianism’. *Anti-Arminians*, 271. Further research is needed to examine these claims.
Further analysis of the detailed contours of English Arminian theologies could also confront unfounded presumptions that Arminianism was either a staging post toward ‘Enlightenment’ rationalism or a slippery slope into theological liberalism.16 The common assumption that Taylor’s Arminianism, Tillotson’s Latitudinarianism and Toland’s Deism formed an inevitable theological genealogy, not only remains unexamined but also fails to appreciate other English Arminian theologies from the mid-seventeenth-century that were more resilient.17 Further research could also trace the reception of English Arminianisms into the eighteenth-century when the Hanoverian church was confronted by the ‘ghost of John Goodwin’, as Wesleyan Arminianism clashed with moralism and Calvinism alike.18

Scholarship related to the early Enlightenment period in England would therefore benefit from a closer consideration of the role the 1640s and 50s played in shaping long-term intellectual trends.19 The crisis of Calvinism sheds light on powerful forces of radical Reformation unleashed during the English Revolution.20 As Lamont has argued, issues birthed in the 1650s ‘lived on into the

16 For example, Coleridge insisted that ‘Socinianism is as inevitable a deduction from Taylor’s [Arminian] scheme as Deism or Atheism is from Socinianism’. Henry Coleridge, The Literary Remains of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, III. 331-2. For a contemporary comment, see Pocock, ‘Within the Margins’, 36.
17 Mark Goldie and David Steers have charted the theological migration of Presbyterian dissenters from the Baxterian middle way toward a full-blown Arminianism by the 1690s. This Arminian tradition differed considerably from the ‘Anglican’ Arminianism associated with Taylor. See Goldie, Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs, ch. 6; David Steers, ‘Arminianism Amongst Protestant Dissenters in England and Ireland in the Eighteenth Century’, in Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60-1609), ed. by Theodoor Marius van Leeuwen, Keith Stanglin and Marijke Tolsma (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 159-200.
18 Augustus Toplady claimed that John Wesley had ‘raised the ghosts of John Goodwin, the Arminian regicide; and of Thomas Grantham, the Arminian baptist’. In The Works of Augustus M. Toplady, in 6 vols (London: 1794), V. 348. As noted, Wesley published extracts of Goodwin’s writings, including a paraphrase of his commentary on Romans chapter nine. See The Arminian Magazine, vol. 3 (1780), 9-19, 177-94.
20 The notion of the English Revolution as a period of ‘radical imagination’ has been briefly explored in Jonathan Scott, England’s Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), part II.
1670s in England in ways which we do not yet fully understand’. For the interregnum was no mere interlude nor was the Restoration a return to business as usual. With *de facto* suspension of the Articles of Religion and press licensing, the *quinquarticular* war during the 1650s was part of a broader contest to (re)define English orthodoxy and lay claim to the Church of England. The result was unprecedented levels of intellectual fecundity and theological radicalism, which contributed to a quite daring re-imagination of English theology.

At the end of *Pacifick Discourse*, the final words of Henry Hammond were recorded in a prayer: ‘Restore this Church to her pristine state, renew her dayes as of old’. Shortly afterwards, Edward Hyde, the Earl of Clarendon, gave a speech to parliament, in which he concluded that Hammond’s prayer had been answered. Though the Church of England ‘had been buried so many years, by the boisterous hands of profane and sacrilegious persons’, God had now ‘miraculously... raised it from the grave’. The myth of a stable and continuous ‘Anglicanism’ - rudely interrupted by puritan revolution then safely restored - proved a potent narrative that ‘Canterburian’ Arminians leveraged to the full. However, the English church was not laid to rest but witnessed a tumultuous contest, culminating in a significant relocation of the centre ground of English theology. In particular, Calvinism faced an intellectual crisis that undermined the Reformed heritage of the Church of England and paved the way for Arminianism to become the new English orthodoxy.

---

22 In *PD*, ‘The Last Words’ (3).
24 As Judith Maltby has noted, the narrative was ‘greatly aided by the retrospective spin-doctors of the Restoration Church of England’ such as Izaak Walton. In ‘Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of "Anglicanism", 1642-60’, in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, ed. by Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), pp. 122-143, 143.
Throughout his *Exposition of the Nineth Chapter of Romans*, Goodwin relied on certain principles in order to overturn the hegemonic interpretation of this Calvinist *locus classicus*. For example, he insisted on the conditionality of all divine promises: ‘There is nothing more frequent and usuall in the Scriptures, then for the Holy Ghost to express such purposes and intentions of God simply, absolutely and without any specification or mention of a condition, which are yet conditionally to be understood’ [178]. Goodwin also disputed the KJV translation if he deemed it to violate such principles. Regarding the translation of Titus 2:11, which he considered evidence of universal prevenient grace, he argued that ‘when the Original Text bears hard upon any beloved notion or opinion of theirs’, they ‘decline the work of Translators, and turn Interpreters’ [260].

Goodwin was aware of his reliance on certain unconventional principles and so declared them in ‘A Table of some general Rules for Interpretation of Scripture’. Of the forty-two principles, the majority were innocuous. Below are listed several that more overtly underpinned Goodwin’s Arminian hermeneutic:

11. There is nothing more usual in the Scriptures, then for the Holy Ghost to express such purposes of God, simply, absolutely and without any mention of a condition, which yet are conditionally to be understood, as he even in many cases hath made manifest.

14. Some things there are so expressed and represented in the Scriptures, as if they were simply and absolutely the Intentions of God, (and may upon this account be called, his Intentions) when as they are but parts only of these Intentions, the other parts of them (respectively) being to be supplied and made out from other Scriptures.

17. The Scriptures often speak of the power of God as regulated.

22. The Scriptures are very frequent and pregnant in asserting this, that men must more then simply beleive, to becom meet for Glory, or such on whom God is pleased to confer eternal life.

38. Verbs of the passive form, are oft used in a reciprocal sense, and import, the effect specified to be done, by the persons themselves, who are spoken of, or to, in such verbs.¹
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