Hartford Puritanism

*Thomas Hooker, Samuel Stone,
and Their Terrifying God*

BAIRD TIPSON

Hartford Puritanism

OXFORD STUDIES IN HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

THE PASSIONS OF CHRIST IN
HIGH-MEDIEVAL THOUGHT
An Essay on Christological Development
Kevin Madigan

GOD'S IRISHMEN
Theological Debates in Cromwellian Ireland
Crawford Gribben

REFORMING SAINTS
Saint's Lives and Their Authors in Germany, 1470-1530
David J. Collins

GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS ON THE TRINITY
AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD
In Your Light We Shall See Light
Christopher A. Beeley

THE JUDAIZING CALVIN
Sixteenth-Century Debates over the Messianic Psalms
G. Sujin Pak

THE DEATH OF SCRIPTURE AND THE RISE OF
BIBLICAL STUDIES
Michael C. Legaspi

THE FILIOQUE
History of a Doctrinal Controversy
A. Edward Siecienski

ARE YOU ALONE WISE?
Debates about Certainty in the Early Modern Church
Susan E. Schreiner

EMPIRE OF SOULS
Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth
Stefania Tutino

MARTIN BUCER'S DOCTRINE OF
JUSTIFICATION
Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism
Brian Lugioyo

CHRISTIAN GRACE AND PAGAN VIRTUE
The Theological Foundation of Ambrose's Ethics
J. Warren Smith

KARLSTADT AND THE ORIGINS OF THE
EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY
A Study in the Circulation of Ideas
Amy Nelson Burnett

READING AUGUSTINE IN THE REFORMATION
*The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe,
1500–1620*
Arnoud S. Q. Visser

SHAPERS OF ENGLISH CALVINISM, 1660–1714
Variety, Persistence, and Transformation
Dewey D. Wallace, Jr.

THE BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION OF WILLIAM
OF ALTON
Timothy Bellamah, OP

MIRACLES AND THE PROTESTANT
IMAGINATION
*The Evangelical Wonder Book in
Reformation Germany*
Philip M. Soergel

THE REFORMATION OF SUFFERING
*Pastoral Theology and Lay Piety in Late Medieval and
Early Modern Germany*
Ronald K. Rittgers

CHRIST MEETS ME EVERYWHERE
Augustine's Early Figurative Exegesis
Michael Cameron

MYSTERY UNVEILED
The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England
Paul C. H. Lim

GOING DUTCH IN THE MODERN AGE
*Abraham Kuyper's Struggle for a Free
Church in the Netherlands*
John Halsey Wood, Jr.

CALVIN'S COMPANY OF PASTORS
*Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church,
1536–1609*
Scott M. Manetsch

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF JAMES USSHER
The Act and Object of Saving Faith
Richard Snoddy

HARTFORD PURITANISM
*Thomas Hooker, Samuel Stone, and Their Terrifying
God*
Baird Tipson

HARTFORD PURITANISM

Thomas Hooker, Samuel Stone,
and Their Terrifying God

BAIRD TIPSON

To Sarah, David, and Elizabeth.

Contents

Preface

THIS BOOK UNDERTAKES to investigate in considerable detail the preaching and writing of the two founding ministers of the First Church in Hartford, Connecticut: Thomas Hooker and Samuel Stone. Both men had developed distinctive theological positions before they immigrated to New England in 1633, first during their tenure at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and then as part of an extensive network of "godly" clergy and laity. The reader will discover the English origins of those positions and come to understand their New England expressions largely as the natural outcome of what the ministers had learned before coming to the New World.

The argument proceeds through twelve discrete chapters, each of which contributes to the overall argument of the book. Not every chapter will be of equal interest to every reader. Those familiar with the history of Christian thought may decide to move rapidly through the extensive discussion of extreme Augustinianism in chapter 4 as well as through the overview in chapter 5 of attempts over the next thousand years to evade or reinforce that Augustinianism. Since Augustinianism is the theological stream in which Hooker and Stone swam, these chapters help familiarize the reader with the major currents of that stream. (A reluctance to recognize the importance of that stream accounts, in my judgment, for much of the misrepresentation of Hooker in recent historiography.) Those who wish to skip over those chapters and jump directly from chapters 3 to 6 will not lose track of the book's overall argument, but they may find themselves having to take subsequent assertions about the nature of extreme Augustinianism on faith.

Readers may also wonder why Martin Luther appears so frequently in a book about early seventeenth-century England and New England. Luther enters the argument for two reasons. First, I present him as the archetypical Protestant, the standard by which any individual's commitment to "Protestantism" can be judged. In using Luther as a standard, I do not mean to make his theology somehow normative. I want simply to drive a stake somewhere in the ground

so that distance from that stake can be measured. Second, I want to argue that Luther's theological positions drove him to experience God in a fashion similar to—but by no means identical to—the way God was experienced by Thomas Hooker. The fact that Hooker seems to have known little or nothing about Luther's experience makes the similarity all the more striking. Hooker's extreme Augustinian way of imagining God drove him, I am arguing, to experience God in a fashion startlingly similar to the way Luther described the experiences of biblical figures in his sermons.

Enough said. Here is what readers can expect to encounter in each of the following chapters:

Chapter 1 argues that Hooker's significance has been obscured by the agendas of those who have studied him. In particular, the enormously influential work of Perry Miller, who saw Hooker leading his colleagues away from Calvinist determinism, continues to shape the historiography of early New England. Hooker is best seen, on the contrary, as an especially vivid proponent of what Jean Delumeau terms *surculpabilisation*, the clergy's creation of extraordinary anxiety and guilt in lay audiences.

Chapter 2 offers brief biographies of Hooker and his younger colleague Samuel Stone. Hooker's early experience led him to define himself as a "godly minister" whose preaching was marked by a particular style and content. Shaped during almost a half-century in England and Holland, his religious "program" needed only minor adjustments after his arrival in the New World. Despite modern Connecticut's continuing tendency to portray him as a liberal precursor to the Enlightenment, this Hooker often behaved more like a stereotypical nineteenth-century bluestocking. He was a "busy controller," committed to the "ways of exactness" and eager to regulate the lives of godly and ungodly alike. Rather than being consumed with local New England issues, he was wrestling with fundamental Protestant challenges as he worked out the implications of Augustinian theology, the dominant theology of western Christendom. Rather than retreating from "Calvinism," he and his colleague Samuel Stone embraced and extended the extreme Augustinian positions that the *Institutes* had laid out.

Hooker's English activity reveals him as a godly preacher presiding over a godly community in the town of Chelmsford. Although the imagery of saints and angels, which provided visual support for pre-Reformation worship, had been largely stripped away, Hooker assumed that his hearers came in constant contact with neighbors who were living models of saintly behavior. Like the later Pietist *ecclesiolae in ecclesia*, communities of the godly in English towns functioned as organizations of the committed within the larger parish church structure. For godly ministers, in particular, they conferred an alternative status

within the pervasive class structure of early seventeenth-century England. In addition to trying to add to its numbers, preachers like Hooker saw it as their mission to sustain the godly community and those within it (chapter 3).

As a hearer came to recognize the demands that godly communities made on their adherents, she might understandably ask why anyone would want to take on religious obligations so clearly at odds with what most townspeople considered appropriate (not to mention at odds with the assumptions about human nature made by most twenty-first-century intellectuals). What, in the final analysis, could account for human choices? Hooker (and Stone) stood in a tradition, originating with Augustine of Hippo, which argued that individual choices stemmed from a fundamental orientation of the will. Their extreme form of Augustinianism decisively shaped Hartford theology (chapter 4).

By the late middle ages, extreme Augustinianism had undergone considerable modification. Luther and Calvin attacked late medieval modifications as unacceptable compromises with God's sovereignty. To combat Protestant heresy, the Society of Jesus developed an elegant method of combining human free will with divine predestination (chapter 5).

In attacking Jesuit theology, William Perkins, Hooker's widely influential theological mentor, systematically eliminated any unaided human initiative toward salvation. Jacobus Arminius found Perkins's positions abhorrent and repudiated them, proposing instead a Protestant version of Jesuit positions. Hooker followed Perkins by explicitly exposing Arminian positions as crypto-Jesuit. Samuel Stone's *Whole Body of Divinity* laid out a ferocious doctrine of predestination, more extreme than that in Calvin's *Institutes* (chapter 6).

Hooker and Stone imbibed a Ramist philosophy filtered through the thought of Alexander Richardson, another widely influential thinker whose positions shaped the education of Harvard College students for almost a century. Richardsonian Ramism offered a method whereby students could not only dissect reality into its component parts but also recover God's intentions in creating it. It encouraged ministers to fit biblical narrative into logical boxes, which would then govern the interpretation of that narrative. As it dichotomized all reality, Richardsonian Ramism reinforced the black/white distinctions of extreme Augustinianism, most notably the belief that God had from all eternity divided the human race into elect and reprobate. Ramist presuppositions turned the Bible into a set of data about nature, moral precepts and exemplars, fostering a theology based on proof texts (chapter 7; an earlier form of this chapter appeared in *The Seventeenth Century* [28 (2103): 275–292]).

Consciously modeling his preaching on that of John Rogers of Dedham, Hooker developed a dramatic style that drew large audiences and quickly made

him a celebrity. "Civil" believers, confident that faithful attendance at the worship services of their parish church would earn them God's favor, found the ground cut out from under their false security. Hooker deliberately polarized his hearers; if they did not place God at the center of their lives by following the exact ways of the godly, they were no better than thieves and prostitutes. His chief rhetorical weapon was terror; God would punish sinners with hellfire and damnation in the next life as well as plague and Roman Catholic invasion in this one (chapter 8).

Hooker imagined "conversion" not as a once-in-a-lifetime opening of one's heart to Jesus but as the lifelong acquisition of a habitual inclination to obey God's commandments. Perkins's theology provided the framework, but Hooker added a distinctive emphasis, almost certainly gained from John Rogers, on "saving preparation." Hooker's personal experience of God's wrath, eerily similar to that of Martin Luther, reinforced his tendency to "save with fear" and made him skeptical of those who experienced God primarily as comforting and nurturing (chapter 9).

Despite a long interpretive tradition that sees Hooker as encouraging human initiative in conversion, close attention to his preaching discovers the opposite: humans were "passive" in the initial stages of conversion. "Preparation" was a divine initiative, mediated through sermons that functioned like sacraments, sermons that broke the resisting will. Sorrow and shame—"contrition" and "humiliation"—were its components, and Hooker demanded a degree of humiliation that shocked contemporaries even as it remained consistent with the terrifying God he preached. He saw it as his task to terrify hearers out of their security and was skeptical of those who depicted God as nurturing and loving to his human creatures. Recognizing one's depravity—and one's helplessness to change it—led to the sort of humble submission to God's exacting demands that marked one as part of the "godly" fellowship (chapter 10).

Hooker followed Perkins in insisting that a Christian not only could but must achieve assurance that she was among God's chosen. But his method—constant struggle and recognition that failure rather than success led one to rely entirely on God's grace—seemed appropriate only for spiritual athletes. Too much introspection could lead to despair and even thoughts of suicide; membership in the godly community, while comforting, could be feigned by hypocrites. Both Hooker and Stone relied heavily on participation in the Lord's Supper, but only when that participation could be carefully controlled (chapter 11).

In Hartford, the godly community could restrict church membership to itself. The *ecclesiola* could become the *ecclesia*. How was this achieved

in practice? Hooker adapted his English and Dutch experience to create church membership standards remarkably similar to those in Augustine's Hippo Regius. Both Hooker and Stone remained skeptical of "liminal" conversion experiences and consciously rejected requiring prospective members to "relate" them. Godly behavior over a period of time, rather than extraordinary experiences of God's favor, qualified the prospective member for participation in the Lord's Supper. One participated in the Lord's Supper because one belonged to a carefully selected group of those deemed worthy to receive Christ's body and blood in the bread and wine by faith; group acceptance reinforced the conviction that a member was one of God's chosen (chapter 12).

Acknowledgments

Hartford Puritanism

I

Creating the Thomas Hooker Brand

A R O U N D 1617, T O W A R D the end of his nine-year tenure as Fellow at Cambridge, a terrified Thomas Hooker awoke in his Emmanuel College lodgings. His God, the God in whom he had always put his trust, had turned against him. An overwhelming sense of "the Just *Wrath* of Heaven … fill'd him with most unusual Degrees of Horror and Anguish."[1] Alone in the night, Hooker faced the anger of a terrifying God.

Two decades later, thousands of miles from Cambridge on the Connecticut frontier, Hooker was still haunted by the memory of that experience. Describing the feeling of dread that plagued a sinner terrified of his own damnation, Hooker told his congregation that "the sinner conceives himself in the possession of the Devil really, and irrecoverably in Hell." "If he do but close his eyes together to sleep," he went on to say, "his dreams terrifie him, his thoughts perplex him, and he awakens gastered and distracted, as though he were posting down to the pit." Rising from his bed, the sinner "raves" that "I must go to Hell, Satan is sent from God to fetch me."[2]

A twenty-first-century reader might imagine Hooker's experience of divine anger as a simple nightmare, but the feelings of horror and anguish persisted into his waking hours and days. For some time—"a considerable while" as

---

1. "Horror and anguish" were what godly people like Hooker were expected to feel in the face of God's anger. His theological mentor William Perkins said of the damned in hell that "their bodies and soules are tormented with infinite horror and anguish arising of the feeling of the whole wrath of God." *A Treatise Tending unto a declaration* in *The Workes of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Vniuersitie of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins*, 3 vols. (London: John Legatt, 1616–18), 1:379.

2. AR 8:371. To "gaster" was to frighten or terrify; the term will reappear in chapters 8 and 10. See the Appendix for a guide to the abbreviations of works by Hooker and Samuel Stone.

his Emmanuel colleague John Eliot remembered it—Hooker "had a Soul Harassed with such Distresses." Hooker's College Sizar, Simeon Ashe, offered to help, and it was Ashe who brought Hooker through the torment. Only after much struggle did he finally convince himself that his God had not abandoned him to the devil.

For the rest of his life Hooker took careful steps to prevent a recurrence. As he lay down to sleep, he would "Single out some certain *Promise* of God, which he would Repeat, and Ponder, and Keep his Heart close unto it, until he found that satisfaction of Soul wherewith he could say, *I will Lay me down in Peace, and Sleep; for thou, O Lord, makest me Dwell in Assurance*."[3]

What might have occasioned such a prolonged experience of divine anger? What notion of God resided in Hooker's sleeping brain that could have aroused such dread? And how did the experience, and the understanding of divine activity that lay behind it, shape both his ministry in England and the ministry he shared with his colleague Samuel Stone in Connecticut? This book will address these questions. It will argue that Hooker's experience, while extreme, was not anomalous. His dreadful, terrifying God lurked in a great many minds in early seventeenth-century England and New England.[4] Skeptics would call this God cruel, tyrannical, arbitrary, untrustworthy, and willing to consign people to an eternal punishment they had no power to avert. Hooker would have to defend him.

That God might be angry at sinful humans was conventional wisdom in early seventeenth-century Christian Europe.[5] From childhood, Christians were taught that God had good cause to direct his wrath at the misdeeds of his human creatures. Complicit in the sin of Adam and Eve and habitually putting their own needs ahead of God's will, they knew only too well that they

---

3. Our knowledge of Hooker's wrath experience comes from Cotton Mather, who (erroneously, I will argue in chapter 9) thought of it as a conversion experience; Mather was relying on a manuscript he had obtained from Eliot. *Piscator Evangelicus, or, The Life of Mr. Thomas Hooker,* in *Johannes in Eremo* (London, 1695), *Wing* M1117, separate pagination, 5–6, republished in *Magnalia Christi Americana* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967 [reprint of 1852 ed.]), 1:333. It almost surely occurred in 1617 while Hooker was in his early thirties, for Samuel Stone's 1647 funeral poem speaks of "*the peace he had full thirty years agoe.*" SSCD sig. C3ᵛ.

4. Drawing especially on literary sources, John Stachniewski explores "godly" conceptions of divine anger in *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

5. In *La Peur en Occident (XIVe–XVIIIe sicles): Une cité assiégée* (Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1978) and *Le Péché et la peur: La Culpabilisation en Occident, XIIIe–XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Librarie Arthème Fayard, 1983), English translation *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture 13th–18th Centuries,* trans. Eric Nicholson (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), Jean Delumeau argues that such fear was pervasive in both Catholic and Protestant Europe.

had failed to live up to God's lofty standards for their behavior. Although much of its imagery had been defaced or whitewashed over during the early years of the Reformation, the Last Judgment was never far from consciousness. In that judgment all God's enemies, including anyone whose name was not "written in the book of life," would be "cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. 20:15). At the very heart of Christian faith was a God whose anger at sin was so great that it demanded human blood-sacrifice, Jesus's "propitiation" (Rom. 3:25) or "ransom" (Mark 10:45) on the cross.[6]

Even so, Hooker's sense of a divine anger directed personally at him went well beyond convention. It dominated his preaching and writing to a degree that startled his godly colleagues in the ministry.[7] To understand Thomas Hooker, one must explore the source of that sense of anger.

But why need to understand Hooker at all? Three reasons stand out. First, citizens of Hartford, and indeed all Connecticut, look to Hooker as the secular equivalent of their patron saint. His statue stands prominently before the Connecticut State House.[8] A giant mural behind the bench in the courtroom of the Connecticut State Supreme Court building depicts Hooker presiding over the formation of the colony's 1639 *Fundamental Orders*.[9] A few hundred yards away, on the walls of the state capitol, his bust takes its place alongside more recent Connecticut worthies. Ordinary citizens celebrate "Hooker Day" in late October, an occasion for "individuals, organizations and the fun-loving among us [to] dress up in their outrageous best and march through downtown Hartford, in celebration of Thomas Hooker, Hartford's founding father."[10] Probably most telling, his image reaches even into the place he most despised: the alehouse! The Thomas Hooker Brewing Company produces a full line of Hooker beer, including "Hooker Blond Ale," "Hooker Hop Meadow IPA," and "Hooker Imperial Porter."[11]

Second, Hooker's importance in the settlement of New England extends well beyond Connecticut. The enormously influential intellectual historian Perry

---

6. By no means all twenty-first-century Christians accept the notion of a substitutionary atonement, but it was taken for granted in early seventeenth-century England.

7. Cotton Mather felt obliged to include an explanation for what was apparently Hooker's well-remembered anger in *Piscator Evangelicus*, 30 {*Magnalia* I:345}. For another approach to Hooker's anger, see the next chapter.

8. http://www.foundersofhartford.org/index.htm.

9. In recognition of a May 1638 sermon that is believed to have influenced their composition.

10. "Festivals and Traditions: Hooker Day," http://hartford.omaxfield.com/hooker.html.

11. http://www.hookerbeer.com/.

Miller called him "the mighty Thomas Hooker" and judged him "the greatest of New England preachers."[12] He served as a moderator at the "Antinomian Synod" that condemned Anne Hutchinson and wrote *A Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline*, an influential early defense of congregational polity.

Third, Hooker's preaching documents a vital stage in the development of Protestantism from the Reformation to the great Evangelical Revivals of the eighteenth and early nineteenth-centuries. In some accounts of American history, the "evangelicalism" that continues to dominate much contemporary religious life seems to arise almost miraculously from the corpse of colonial churches. Lifeless moralism is said to have replaced once-fervent piety, and the great ship launched by the magisterial reformers of the sixteenth century is thought to have run aground. Only the spiritual uplift provided by George Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, and their colleagues succeeded in refloating the foundering vessel and propelling it forward once again.[13]

But since miraculous resuscitations are not the ordinary stuff of history, imagining the American evangelical tradition as arising Phoenix-like from a once vibrant but now exhausted piety cannot satisfy serious historians. Thomas Hooker—and his lesser known colleague Samuel Stone—can offer a valuable seventeenth-century steppingstone on the way from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century. It is true that Hooker's theology differed in vital areas from that of the later evangelicals, but as he attempted in his preaching to put core Reformation teachings into practice, he startlingly anticipated much of what was to come.

It has not been customary to imagine Thomas Hooker in the hands of an angry God. In part this results from ancestor worship. Glenn Weaver's assertion in his history of Hartford that Hooker was "less given to hellfire-and-damnation sermons than were the other ministers in the river towns" probably represents a fair summary of conventional Hartford wisdom, not fond of hellfire and damnation preaching.[14] Hooker's modern descendants continue to join The Society of the Descendants of the Founders of Hartford

---

12. *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), 16–47, at 16; *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939), 349.

13. "Magisterial" because they relied on the magistrate to support their churches.

14. Glenn Weaver, *Hartford: An Illustrated History of Connecticut's Capital* (Woodside, CA: Windsor Publications, 1982), 22, reflects a long tradition of interpreting Hooker's positions as more "liberal" than those of his fellows. William Perkins had taught that since "the soule being spiritual cannot burn … hell fire is not a material fire, but a grievous torment fit resembled thereby." *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:266. Hooker's graphic descriptions seem to imagine something material.

and to celebrate Hooker's accomplishments proudly at regular meetings and in a newsletter.

But ancestor worship alone cannot explain how Hooker's memory has been co-opted for often contradictory purposes. In his entry for the encyclopedia *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and North America*, Stephen Foster comes to the conclusion that "Hooker's historical reputation has suffered to an unusual degree from one form or another of tendentious misrepresentation."[15] Since that misrepresentation has resulted from an almost 200-year struggle to exploit what twenty-first-century people would call the Hooker "brand," it will be helpful at the outset to take a careful look at the way Hooker has been marketed.

An important effort to brand Thomas Hooker reached the public eye in the Spring of 1846, when the painter Frederic Church, later to become famous as a prominent member of the Hudson River School, exhibited his first large work at the National Academy of Design. Three-and-a-half-feet high and five-feet wide, *Hooker and Company Journeying through the Wilderness in 1636 from Plymouth to Hartford* attracted many viewers. Although not yet 20, Church had already completed two years of apprenticeship with Thomas Cole in the Catskills, and he was ready to show the artistic world what he had learned. Church knew that his father, a successful businessman, had a Yale college education in mind for his son; the father would need to be persuaded that the son might forego Yale on his way to an artistic career. Church's impressive canvas depicted what Hartford's leading citizens imagined as the city's founding moment: the trek of the Reverend Thomas Hooker and many of his English followers west through the New England forests from Massachusetts Bay (not Plymouth!) into a promised land along the Connecticut River. Both the senior and junior Church could take special pride as they viewed the painting with friends and relatives, for an ancestor, Daniel Church, had been among Hooker's company on this journey.

Hooker and Company launched Church on a long career as one of the new nation's most revered painters. Quickly sold to Hartford's Wadsworth Atheneum, the painting seemed a perfect embodiment of the way the city's leading citizens liked to imagine its founding.[16] In the words of the art historian

15. "Hooker, Thomas (1586–1647)," *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO, 2006), 1:132.

16. John Howat, *Frederic Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 14–16, shows how *Hooker and Company* "in composition and effects of space and light … is an almost direct appropriation from Cole's *The Pic-Nic*." The Atheneum paid $130 for the painting. Church continued to celebrate Hartford's early years by producing two separate large oil paintings of its "Charter Oak." (The State of Connecticut chose the Charter Oak for the obverse of its quarter).

Simon Schama, Church portrayed Hooker as an "American Moses" who led his flock "westward, away from the heavy hand of Old World authority represented by the Bay Colony government." The foliage of the Promised Land "trickles with sunlight; its waters run sweet and clear. It is the tabernacle of liberty, ventilated by the breeze of holy freedom and suffused with the golden radiance of providential benediction."[17] Church's Hooker sheds outworn custom for a new beginning in the unsullied Connecticut forest.

Conveniently ignored in Church's myth was Hooker's younger clerical colleague, Samuel Stone. Stone had made the trek the previous Fall and along with William Goodwin had negotiated purchase of the land from the resident native Americans. It was the name of Stone's English birthplace, Hertford, that was to become the name of the new settlement. Had Church been more concerned for historical accuracy, the painting's title would then have had Hooker and his company: *Journeying through the Wilderness from Newtown* (soon to be renamed Cambridge) *to Suckiaug* (soon to be renamed Hartford).

Overshadowing such minor inaccuracies, though, is the portrayal of Hooker as an "American Moses," leading his people from out of slavery to European institutions. Precious as that portrayal may have been to mid-nineteenth-century Hartforders, it resulted in a Hooker shaped more by what they thought their city needed from its past than from what he actually said and did.

Church's portrayal was eventually destined to clash jarringly with the picture of Hooker contained in seventeenth-century documents. Unfriendly contemporaries, both at Emmanuel College and later at the towns where he preached, described him not as a protector of individual rights but as a "busy controller" who would not hesitate to curtail personal freedoms whenever they were at odds with his sure sense of God's will. The nightmarish descriptions of hellfire and damnation in his published sermons would hardly have felt to his contemporaries as "the breeze of holy freedom."

But the clash was yet to occur in the mid-nineteenth century. On the contrary, the Hooker "brand" depicted in Church's painting gained still more credibility in 1860 when the distinguished antiquarian J. Hammond Trumbull drew the attention of the world to a hitherto-unknown sermon that Hooker had preached before the Connecticut General Court on May 31, 1638. Members of the Court were just beginning to draw up what became the *Fundamental Orders*, a frame of government for the colony, and Hooker drew their attention to three "doctrines" which he supported with "reasons":

---

17. Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995), 200.

   I. The choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people by God's own allowance.

  II. The privileges of election, which belongs to the people, therefore must not be exercised according to their humours, but according to the blessed will and law of God.

 III. They who have power to appoint officers and magistrates, it is in their power, also, to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place unto which they call them.

Reasons. I. Because the foundation of authority is laid, firstly, in the free consent of the people.

  2. Because, by a free choice the hearts of the people will be more inclined to the love of the persons [chosen], and more ready to yield [obedience].

  3. Because of that duty and engagement of the people.[18]

To historians enraptured by the promise of America's future, the discovery of such a statement in its earliest past was electrifying. The core principles of American liberal democracy—that "the people" owned the right to choose their magistrates "by God's own allowance" and that they could "set the bounds and limitations of the power and place unto which they call them"—had roots in seventeenth-century Connecticut! Eager to give credit to these roots, and delighted to put "theocratic" Massachusetts in its place, historians like George Bancroft "saw in Hooker's pronouncements the 'seed' whence flowered the 'first of the series of written American constitutions.'" In *The Beginnings of New England*, John Fiske went still further. When one looks for the birth of American democratic institutions, wrote Fiske, Thomas Hooker "deserves more than any other man to be called the father."[19]

Surely Hartford had a founder to admire! One could imagine a trajectory that led from the Protestant rediscovery of the Bible straight through Hooker to the liberal democracy of the Enlightenment. When George Leon Walker, who held

18. Trumbull had discovered the sermon notes in Matthew Grant's manuscript diary. The notes Trumbull published are reprinted in George L. Walker, *History of the First Church in Hartford, 1633–1883* (Boston: Brown & Gross, 1884), 105–6.

19. Bancroft, *History of the United States*, rev. ed. (Boston: D. Appleton & Co., 1876), 1:291, 318; Fiske, *Beginnings of New England* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1889), 127, cited in Sydney E. Ahlstrom, "Thomas Hooker, Puritanism, and Democratic Citizenship: A Preliminary Inquiry into Some Relationship of Religion and American Civic Responsibility," The Third Hooker Lecture, First Church of Christ, May 16, 1962, 1, later published in *Church History* 32 (1963): 415–31. It was in this hagiographic spirit that the Hooker statue before the State House was erected in 1950; a quote from the sermon notes appears prominently at its base. Connecticut still proudly identifies itself as the "Constitution State."

the same position as Minister of Hartford's First Church that Hooker had held so many years before, sat down to write a serious biography in 1891, he would imagine Hooker as a proto-democrat.[20]

Fiske's version of the Hooker brand would reign nearly fifty more years before the Harvard historian Perry Miller drove a stake through its heart. Provoked by what he considered the mistreatment of Hooker in Vernon Parrington's standard *Main Currents in American Thought*, Miller set out to demolish the characterization of Hooker as a "Puritan Liberal."[21] Reading Parrington today, most readers will quickly recognize what aroused Miller's ire.

For Parrington pronounced the ideals of the leaders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony "feculent." Very much as had Frederic Church, he imagined Hooker as leading a secession from the outworn institutions of the Bay to found "a free church in a free state." "A better democrat than his fellow ministers" and the true "father of New England Congregationalism," Hooker had the vision to reject "the reactionary theocracy" of John Cotton and John Winthrop.[22]

Miller firmly insisted that Parrington and his predecessors had missed the point of Hooker's sermon. Hooker's critical "doctrine" was not the first but the second: that the people must exercise their privileges not "according to their humours, but according to the blessed will and law of God." The "irrepressibly democratic dynamic" that Parrington had found in Hooker was in fact common to all Protestant theology, "though all good Protestants strove to stifle it," as Hooker had in his second doctrine. In every important respect, Miller concluded, Hooker's positions were almost identical to those of Massachusetts Bay.[23]

Miller's 1931 article effectively silenced those historians who imagined that a liberal Connecticut had seceded from a conservative Massachusetts Bay. In a series of subsequent articles, Miller proposed a new school of Hooker

---

20. *Thomas Hooker: Preacher, Founder Democrat* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1891). Walker's biography appeared in the "Makers of America" series. His earlier *History of the First Church in Hartford* treats Hooker's theology more systematically.

21. *Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920*, vol. 1, *The Colonial Mind 1620–1800* (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1927), 53–62.

22. *Main Currents*, 51, 53. Parrington relied heavily on Walker's *Thomas Hooker*.

23. Miller, "Thomas Hooker and the Democracy of Early Connecticut," *New England Quarterly* 4 (1931): 663–712, reprinted in *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), 16–47. By far the most insightful discussion of the relationship of political thought in early New England to later democratic institutions is now David D. Hall, *A Reforming People: Puritanism and the Transformation of Public Life in New England* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011).

interpretation. Miller saw the New England Puritans—and the Harvard College they founded—as the wellspring of a distinguished American intellectual history. While they may not have been social democrats, Miller was determined that the Puritans not be dismissed as dogmatic Biblicists whose "ideal" was "simply an impassioned harangue, the sort of emotional evangelicalism familiar to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century revivals." In his pathbreaking *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, he contended that "in Puritan thought the intellectual heritage was finally more decisive than the piety." He proceeded at painstaking length to uncover the intellectual roots of their "cosmology," "anthropology," and "sociology," to demonstrate their awareness of the writings of a broad range of contemporary European intellectuals, and to draw particular attention to their indebtedness to the logic and rhetoric of Peter Ramus.

Miller's brilliant opening chapter, "The Augustinian Strain of Piety," recognized that the New Englanders' thinking arose from 1,200 years of western Christian tradition that stemmed largely from the writings of St. Augustine. It also prepared the way for one of his major theses: that Puritans were trying to escape from the dark shadow of John Calvin. Although he could not deny that their theology was in some sense "Calvinist," he was certain that they were struggling to get out from under the harshest implications of Calvin's positions. Deliberately or unconsciously, they were devising schemes that would undermine the notorious doctrine of double predestination. "The stark predestination of early Calvinism was too often driving the devout to distraction … it needed somehow to be softened."[24]

Miller believed that he had identified two schemes in particular—"covenant theology" and "preparation for salvation"—that would support this thesis. Calvin and his most faithful followers had insisted that God determined any

---

24. Miller's most important publications on these topics were "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 32 (1937): 247–300, reprinted in *Errand*, 48–98, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, and " 'Preparation for Salvation' in Seventeenth-Century New England," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 4 (1943): 253–86. The above citations are from *The New England Mind*, 301, 330, and 386. Miller's thinking was influenced by that of his colleague, Samuel Eliot Morison, who wrote in 1935 that "after reading some hundreds of puritan sermons, English and New English, I feel qualified to deny that the New England puritans were predestinarian Calvinists." *The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1960); originally published as *The Puritan Pronaos* (New York: New York University Press, 1935), 11. Miller's influence has endured far longer than that of most historians. John Micklethwait, the Editor-in-Chief of *The Economist*, writing with Adrian Wooldridge as his co-author, recently termed him "the premier historian of the [American] Puritans." *God Is Back: How the Global Revival of Faith is Changing the World* (New York: Penguin, 2009), 57. E. Brooks Holifield provides the most persuasive corrective to Miller's thesis in his *Theology in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), especially 31–44.

individual person's final destination—heaven or hell—unconditionally. Before a person was born, before the creation of the world, in fact, God elected or reprobated each person without any consideration of what that person might or might not do during her lifetime. There was no way any person could influence God's choice; the decision had been made from eternity. Unwilling to imagine that his intellectual forebears could actually have believed in a creed that seemed to reject any meaningful human agency, Miller was convinced that the New England Puritans had found mechanisms to reintroduce conditions into God's decisions. In practice, there were actions human beings could take to influence God's choice. In practice, one's ultimate fate was conditional; it depended on how a person chose to respond to the preacher's call to repentance.

Everyone knew, he argued, that God had made a covenant with Abraham and his descendants. In the book of Genesis, God promised to "establish my couenant betweene me and thee, and thy seede after thee, in their generations for an euerlasting couenant." In return, God required of Abraham, "Thou shalt keepe my couenant therefore, thou, and thy seede after thee, in their generations."[25] Miller believed that this covenant was in practice understood, and preached, as if it were a contract whose fulfillment was contingent upon each party's performing agreed-upon conditions. If Abraham and his seed kept the terms of the covenant, God would keep his promise to multiply their number and would grant them the land of Canaan. If he or she kept the appropriate covenant terms, each individual descendant of Abraham could also be a recipient of God's promise and gain eternal salvation. Keeping the terms of the covenant meant repenting of misdeeds and obeying God's commandments as laid out both in the Old Testament (testament and covenant being virtually synonymous terms) and as expanded and amended in the New Testament.

Miller argued that by stressing God's covenant promises and by preaching the covenant as a "voluntary contract," ministers "sundered the outward manifestation [how salvation was preached] from the inner principle [the doctrine of predestination]." In other words, while paying lip-service to God's absolute sovereignty, New England sermons in practice subverted it. Preachers encouraged their congregations to exert themselves to good deeds, because by those good deeds they could claim to have met God's conditions and so provoke God's favor. Covenant theology was "an extremely subtle … device within the framework of predestination for arousing human activity," and the ministers'

---

25. Gen. 12:1–3, 17:1–22; the citations are from Gen. 17:7 and 9. These and all subsequent biblical citations are from the Authorized Version of 1611 (KJV).

"imposition of the covenant doctrine upon the system of Calvin produced at last in the New England theology an altogether different philosophy from any propounded in Geneva."[26]

The concept of "preparation for salvation," in Miller's judgment, was just the tactic to implement the covenant strategy. By preaching the need for preparation, ministers could encourage their hearers "to seek holiness in the midst of a determined world." Admitting that no one's deeds could merit salvation, they could nevertheless exhort their congregations to "prepare" for it, to "make themselves ready to entertain" the gift of faith should God choose to implant it in their hearts. By living an upright life and attending to the words of the preachers, by cultivating "a mere inclination to accept faith, should faith ever come," every human being could "prepare" for God's converting activity.

Such preparation did not require any special divine assistance; it was within the power of every human being. While the preachers stressed that preparation could put no claim on God, "it was noted that normally those who most strove to prepare themselves turned out to be those whom He shortly took into the Covenant of Grace." Furthermore, argued Miller, preaching preparation allowed the preachers to call upon all their hearers, not just the regenerate among them, to be good, "to exert themselves in precisely such a course of moral conduct as was required of all the society." Preparation offered "a fulcrum for the lever of human responsibility, even in a determined world." And the main proponent, "the most explicit exponent" of preparation was Thomas Hooker, who by developing and advocating this doctrine "did more than any other to mold the New England mind."[27] Hooker was now rebranded as the one who saw most clearly, and preached most persuasively, New England's departure from orthodox "Calvinism."

Miller left his readers in no doubt of his admiration for "the mighty Thomas Hooker." Although John Cotton was "the better Calvinist" (not a mark of praise for Miller), Hooker was the more "exquisite diagnostician of the phases of regeneration." It was Hooker whose preaching anticipated "the direction in which Puritanism was travelling."[28]

For the next several decades, Miller's characterization dominated the study of early New England. No historian of its intellectual life could avoid grappling with his positions, and most built their arguments upon the foundation

---

26. *New England Mind*, 379, 394, 367; "Preparation for Salvation," 259.

27. "Preparation for Salvation," 261–63, 278, 265.

28. *Errand into the Wilderness*, 16, *New England Mind*, 349, 335; "Preparation for Salvation," 261, 267, 263, 286. Parrington also saw Hooker as "the most stimulating preacher of early New England," *Main Currents*, 55.

he had laid. Cracks began to appear by the 1960s. Students of Christian theology found his descriptions of Calvin's positions (most notoriously regeneration as "a forcible seizure, a holy rape of the surprised will") little better than caricatures. Others pointed out that the biblical covenant—and the New Englanders use of it—was more nuanced than Miller had allowed. One can find plenty of examples (e.g., Psalm 25:9: "All the paths of the LORD are love and faithfulness to those who keep his covenant and his testimonies") where God's willingness to keep his covenant in force seems to depend on the willingness of Israel to observe its conditions. In the seminal texts, however, those where God establishes the covenant with Abraham and his seed, the covenant is a promise rather than a contract, a promise that remains in force despite Israel's unfaithfulness.[29] The closing verses of the Magnificat, Mary's prayer in Luke's Gospel, celebrate this everlasting promise: "He has come to the help of his servant Israel, for he has remembered his promise of mercy, the promise he made to our fathers, to Abraham and his children forever" (Luke 1:54–55).[30]

Intellectual historians and students of literature began to take issue with Miller's willingness to assume that New England "Puritanism" was a single entity, that (with the notable exceptions of Cotton, John Wheelwright, and Anne Hutchinson) the preachers all agreed with one another and that the laypeople

---

29. In particular Gen. 15:1–21; cf. Jer. 31:31–34. Thomas Hooker did not see the covenant as a contract, e.g., "in the Covenant of Grace, all is firstly, freely, wholly, and only in the hand of the Lord to dispose, to whom he wil, what, when, and after what manner he wil." AR 10:301–302. This is entirely consistent with what Richard A. Muller takes to be the conventional Reformed position: the covenant of grace "stands as a gracious promise of salvation given to fallen man apart from any consideration of man's ability to respond to it or to fulfill it and apart from any human initiative." See "*foedus gratiae*" in Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1985), 120–21. The Hebrew word *chesed*, often translated as "loving-kindness" but more accurately as "covenant-faithfulness," poignantly expresses the belief that God remains committed to Israel despite her frequent transgressions.

30. "Preparation for Salvation," 261. Among the most perceptive early critics were Gerald J. Goodwin, "The Myth of 'Arminian-Calvinism' in Eighteenth-Century New England," *New England Quarterly* 41 (1968): 213–37; and George Marsden, "Perry Miller's Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique," *Church History* 39 (1970): 91–105. Charles Cohen, *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 75–84, provides a thorough refutation of Miller's position on preparation. Amy-Jill Levine, Professor of New Testament and Jewish Studies at Vanderbilt University, offers an apt summary of how covenant is understood in the Hebrew Bible (and by Jews today): "the election of Israel is based on grace, not merit or works. Jews do not follow Torah in order to "earn" divine love or salvation … it is part of the covenant. Divine love is already present; it is not earned." "Bearing False Witness: Common Errors Made about Early Judaism," in Amy-Jill Levine and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Annotated New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 501–4, at 502.

passively accepted the pronouncements of their preachers.[31] Social historians identified ways of thinking that long pre-existed English Puritanism or were in obvious disagreement with ministerial dogma. Almost everyone came to the recognition that Miller's positions made his intellectual ancestors either muddle-headed or dishonest.[32] They seemed unable to see that while professing a deterministic "Calvinism," they were in practice telling people that their behavior could provoke God to grant them grace.

Miller advanced his characteristic positions at the time of World War II; generations of graduate students first cut their teeth on them and then made their reputations by attacking them. By the second decade of the twenty-first century, one might be forgiven for assuming that Miller's work had long been consigned to the academic trash heap.

But it is a mark of Miller's brilliance that even those who believe that they are repudiating him often remain under his influence. To single out two important monographs among many, Janice Knight's *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts* appears to take a position against Miller when she argues that there were two schools of Puritan thought in New England, not one. But her descriptions of Hooker and his "preparationist" colleagues could have come straight from *The New England Mind*. "The modification of high Calvinism inherent in their assertion of conditional promises and the doctrine of preparation," she explains, "were adaptations made within the boundaries of traditionally defined Reformation 'orthodoxy.'" "Faced with the terrifying abyss of irrational power and immeasurable sin, these preachers invented a doctrine to limit and contain both. They moved with agility from this initial terror to the comforting rationality of the covenant bond."[33]

Darren Staloff, while arguing that the important disputes in early New England were actually about clerical authority, simply takes for granted the validity of Miller's analysis of theology: "The very 'marrow of Puritan divinity,' according to the venerable Perry Miller, was a 'federal' or covenant theology. This theology, which found expression in the 'preparationist' preaching of the orthodox majority, stipulated that if unregenerate man would but engage in a sincere and solemn quest for the 'habit of faith,' God

---

31. E.g., Michael P. Winship, "Reconsiderations: Were There Any Puritans in New England?" *New England Quarterly* 74 (2001): 118–38, at 132, who criticizes the "reflexive essentialism of Puritan scholars."

32. Peter Thuesen suggests that laypeople did not "simply dismiss their pastors as double-dealers." *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (New York: Oxford, 2009), 54.

33. Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 22, 81.

would respond by 'justifying' the sinner as part of a contractual agreement known as the covenant of grace."[34] The British theologian Alister McGrath, whose two-volume *Iustitia Dei* has become the standard source for those tracing the history of the doctrine of justification, cites Miller's "Marrow" unproblematically.[35]

Miller's influence also persists among those interpreters who, recalling Miller's description of Hooker as an "exquisite diagnostician of the phases of regeneration," understand Hooker chiefly as a psychologist of the soul. Like Miller, many American scholars have until recently tended to see Hooker almost entirely in a New England context, most often as an opponent of Cotton, forgetting that he was almost 50 when he first arrived in Hartford.[36] Because he did disagree with Cotton on the nature of conversion, locating him in such a context almost inevitably results in laying emphasis where Miller did, on Hooker's analysis on "the phases of regeneration" (what Miller's student Edmund Morgan called "the morphology of conversion").[37] But Hooker was never simply observing psychological changes in those converted by his preaching; his preaching was actively

---

34. *The Making of an American Thinking Class: Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in Puritan Massachusetts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 56. See also Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination*, 81, who cites Miller in imagining an "increasingly mellow" version of Puritanism in New England where "God's sovereignty was explicitly moderated by covenant theology." In 1986, Charles Cohen contended in the bibliographical discussion of *God's Caress* (p. 282) that Miller "recreated the field, defined it, endowed it with the prestige of his awesome intellect, and created a synthesis that, if eroded in countless ways, has not yet been replaced."

35. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 2:207 n. 8.

36. E.g., Norman Pettit, *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), esp. 88–101; David Leverenz, *The Language of Puritan Feeling: An Exploration in Literature, Psychology, and Social History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1980); Andrew Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989); Amanda Porterfield, *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*; Staloff, *The Making of an American Thinking Class*; Lisa Gordis, *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); some notable exceptions are Stephen Foster, "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630 to 1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 38 (1981): 624–60; David Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil War England* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004); and Theodore D. Bozeman, *The Precisionist Strain: Disciplinary Religion & Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

37. Edmund Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1965), 66–73.

producing those experiences. In addition, seeing Hooker primarily in a New England context obscures the evidence that, except perhaps on questions of church polity, his positions were fully formed in England and not in controversy with Cotton.[38]

An upside-down version of Miller's thesis was proposed by R. T. Kendall in his *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. Kendall praised Calvin but argued that his followers Theodore Beza and William Perkins had distorted Calvin's theology. None other than Thomas Hooker presented this "Beza-Perkins tradition" in its worst guise, and Kendall termed Hooker's teaching "a fully developed teaching of preparation for faith prior to regeneration." Kendall found that Hooker preached that people did not need special grace to "prepare" for salvation: "the natural man by virtue of common grace 'is able to wait upon God in the means, so that he may be enabled to receive grace.' "[39] Although vigorously disputed by many Reformed scholars, Kendall's thesis remains influential.[40]

While still under the influence of Miller's general approach, more recent American historians have questioned his admiration for Hooker. Andrew Delbanco portrays a "bitter and defensive" Hooker who grew "contracted" in New England, abandoning the Augustinian Platonism toward which he had

---

38. Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c. 1620–1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 300–303, tends to date even the development of his positions on polity to his experience in England and Holland, an interpretation with which I concur, as does Frank Shuffleton, *Thomas Hooker, 1586–1647* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).

39. R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 133 et passim. See also Kendall, "The Puritan Modification of Calvin's Theology," in *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, ed. W. Stanford Reid (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), 199–216, at 205, 212. Kendall would presumably agree with Miller as he imagined that "the horrified ghost of Calvin shuddered to behold his theology twisted into this spiritual commercialism." *New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, 389.

40. Although Alec Ryrie terms Kendall's book "the classic study of English predestinarianism," *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 7 n. 7, its arguments have in my view been persuasively refuted by Richard Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition on the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012). For other disagreement, see Leif Dixon, "Calvinist Theology and Pastoral Reality in the Reign of King James I: The Perspective of Thomas Wilson," *The Seventeenth Century* 23 (2008): 173–97; Jonathan Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), especially 220–21; and for earlier critiques Muller, "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy," *Calvin Theological Journal* 30 (1995): 345–75 and 31 (1996): 125–60; and Robert Letham, "Faith and Assurance in Early Calvinism: A Model of Continuity and Diversity," in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994), 355–84. See also Muller's entry, "*praeparatio ad conversionem*," in *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, 237.

struggled in England and that continued to animate Cotton. Michael Winship places much of the blame for the Antinomian Controversy on Thomas Shepard, but he suggests strongly that Shepard may have learned his theology from the "idiosyncratic" positions of his father-in-law, Thomas Hooker. Janice Knight lumps Hooker with an "Amesian" group trapped by the "logic of contract," over against the "passionate mysticism" of "Sibbesians" like Cotton. Knight also focuses on Hooker's anger, as opposed to Cotton's "meekness" and "tenderness," anger which she attributes in part to his frustration over his relative lack of position or effective patronage.[41]

It has been British scholars, for the most part, who have prepared the way for a new rebranding. From their perspective, Hooker needs to be understood as thoroughly involved in the efforts of "godly" Protestants for control of the Church of England. The research of Patrick Collinson, Peter Lake, Kenneth Fincham, Nicholas Tyacke, and Tom Webster has demonstrated convincingly that it is anachronistic to see Puritans in opposition to "Anglicans."[42] As John Spurr notes, Puritans were caught up in the long seventeenth-century process of working out the implications of the English Reformation. Not only did the "Anglicanism" of earlier histories not yet exist, but in the early decades of the seventeenth century—the very period during which Hooker's theology was being formed—a broad "Calvinist consensus"

---

41. Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal*, 170–77; Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636–1641* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 69–71, where Hooker functions as a kind of *éminence grise*; Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*, 64, 66–69, 86.

42. Especially Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) and *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religion and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988); Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), and (with Michael Questier), *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I," in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 23–49, 234–35, 251–56; Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1640*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c. 1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Webster, *Godly Clergy*. To these analyses should be added two books by American scholars, David Como's *Blown by the Spirit* and Theodore D. Bozeman's *The Precisionist Strain*. In his brief survey, *The Reformation: A History* (New York: Modern Library, 2004), 138, Collinson asserts, "It is hardly an exaggeration to say that [Puritanism] was the real English reformation."

prevailed in the Church of England.[43] Peter Marshall aptly summarizes the historiographical shift:

> Patrick Collinson has encouraged us to regard the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods as an essential part of the Reformation "process," and to see that the attempts of an army of godly ministers and lecturers to inculcate a truer understanding of the Protestant message must constitute the "real" Reformation, the fleshing-out of the skeleton released from the cupboard by the settlement of 1559. Most particularly, Collinson has transformed our understanding of "Puritanism," a phenomenon we can no longer view as an "opposition party," the symmetrical counterpart of Catholic recusancy, but rather as a set of attitudes and impulses making for "further Reformation" which was situated close to the mainstream of contemporary Protestantism. The work of Collinson, and of scholars such as Peter Lake and Nicholas Tyacke who have broadly endorsed his interpretation, has left us in little doubt about just how "Protestant" the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church was. His work has done much to demolish the idea that there was any such thing as "Anglicanism" much before the middle of the seventeenth century.[44]

Far from being its completion, the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559 was but a stage of an initially unpopular "Long Reformation" that extended well into the seventeenth century.[45] Martin Ingram speaks for many historians in describing this Long Reformation as

> a massive doctrinal and jurisdictional shift [that] involved among other things the destruction of religious houses (whose *raison d'être* had been as powerhouses of prayer, charity and holy living); the abolition of

---

43. John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–1689* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 8.

44. Marshall, "Introduction," in *The Impact of the English Reformation, 1500–1640*, ed. Peter Marshall (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 1–11, at 5–6. Michael Winship, "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospelers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s," *Church History* 70 (2001): 462–81, at 480, states that "the origins of puritan practical divinity reinforce Patrick Collinson's claim ("Comment on Eamon Duffy's Neale Lecture and the Colloquium," in *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke [London: UCL Press, 1997], 71–86, at 73) that "Puritanism represented the mainstream, ongoing thrust of the Protestant Reformation, its longterm fruition."

45. On its initial unpopularity, see J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984); Robert Whiting, *The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c. 1400–c. 1580*

prayers for souls in purgatory, thus effecting deep changes in parish religion and rupturing the bonds between the living and the dead; the restructuring of other aspects of worship, including changes in church services and the abolition of pilgrimages, processions and the veneration of the saints; a reduction in the numbers of the clergy and alterations (of which clerical marriage was one symptom) in their religious and social role. More generally it entailed the desacralization on a large scale of places, times and objects that had hitherto been seen as holy. These changes may be summarised as a move to a primary emphasis on faith rather than works, to a religion of the Word (scriptures and sermons) rather than ritual practice, and towards increasing stress on the personal responsibility of the individual in religious faith and observance. … the cataclysmic changes of the Reformation profoundly disturbed existing patterns of popular belief and observance, inducing in the short term bewilderment, loss of confidence, even alienation; so also did the only slightly less dramatic changes of the civil wards and interregnum. New patterns took time to establish and were always in some respects fragile.[46]

In his more recent work, Collinson spoke of Puritanism as part of a "second" English Reformation which brought the initial emphasis of Cranmer and his colleagues to maturity.[47] While broadly accepting Collinson's framework, early Stuart historians over the past decade or so have emphasized the differences between "moderate" and more radical Puritans and the instability of mechanisms that sustained consensus among them.[48]

A second important historiographical development has been the work of Richard A. Muller on Reformed theology. Muller's wide-ranging exploration

---

(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Christopher Haigh, "Success and Failure in the English Reformation," *Past and Present* 173 (Nov. 2001): 28–49. For its longer term success, see especially Eamon Duffy, "The Long Reformation: Catholicism Protestantism and the Multitude," *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, 33–70.

46. Ingram, "From Reformation to Toleration: Popular Religious Cultures in England, 1540–1690," in *Popular Culture in England, c. 1500–1850,* ed. Tim Harris (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 95–123, 241–47, at 97, 100.

47. E.g., "the Reformation matured in the secondary movement of exacting religious seriousness known as Puritanism," "'Not Sexual in the Ordinary Sense': Women, Men and Religious Transactions," in Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays* (London: Hambledon Press, 1994), 119–50, at 124.

48. Especially Como, *Blown by the Spirit* and "Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London," *Historical Journal* 46 (2003): 263–94; Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge*; Webster, *Godly Clergy.*

of the progress of the Reformed tradition from its beginning in thinkers like Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531) through the great systematicians of the late seventeenth century like François Turretini (1623–1687) and Herman Witsius (1636–1708) has given historians a new way of looking at theological developments in the early seventeenth-century. Scholars who previously tossed off terms like "predestination," "Calvinism," "Arminianism," "*ordo salutis,*" and "preparation" can now be far more attentive to their background and to the nuances of their meaning.

The three most recent individual studies of Hooker—by George Williams, Frank Shuffleton, and Sargent Bush—appeared before the impact of Collinson's and Muller's work was widely felt.[49] Williams was chiefly concerned to uncover every extant detail of Hooker's biography, but he did not hesitate to pass judgment on Hooker's theology in a way that might have satisfied Perry Miller, most notably in a comment on the lecture(s) published as *The Carnal Hypocrite*: "Hooker's treatise turns out be to a comprehensive scriptural defense of precisely that kind of moralism or works-righteousness once pilloried by Martin Luther in his proclamation of justification by faith alone."[50] Williams failed to see the similarities between Hooker's insistence that sinners experience divine wrath and Luther's notorious *Anfectungen*.

Shuffleton's straightforward biography likewise remains in the interpretative tradition of Miller. His analysis of Hooker's preaching, like Miller's, concentrates on the "balance between natural man's passivity in the work of salvation and his concurrent need for voluntaristic action." Shuffleton finds significant development between Hooker's English sermons and those preached in New England, arguing that the former may err on the side of "urging men to react under the influence of preparing grace" at the expense of "reminding them of their essential helplessness before union with Christ." The "maturity and greater depth of scholarship" behind Hooker's New England sermons, on the other hand, allowed him to be "much more careful to articulate the precise relationship between supernatural and natural action in the process of salvation."[51]

---

49. Williams, "The Pilgrimage of Thomas Hooker (1586–1647) in England, The Netherlands, and New England," *Bulletin of the Congregational Library* 19/l (Oct. 1967): 5–15 and 19/2 (Jan. 1968): 9–13, and "The Life of Thomas Hooker in England and Holland, 1586–1633," in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633,* ed. George H. Williams, Norman Pettit, Winfried Herget, and Sargent Bush, Jr. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 1–35; Shuffleton, *Thomas Hooker, 1586–1647*; Bush, *The Writings of Thomas Hooker: Spiritual Adventure in Two Worlds* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980).

50. Williams, "Life of Hooker," 8.

51. Shuffleton, *Thomas Hooker*, 254, 264.

Bush, as his title suggests, approaches Hooker's texts as a student of litera-
ture. Like Miller and many of Miller's followers, Bush wants to highlight con-
nections between Hooker's writings and those of later American giants like
Edwards, Emerson, and Thoreau. In several hundred pages, Bush expands on
Miller's depiction of Hooker as "exquisite diagnostician of the phases of regen-
eration." He sees Hooker's account of "the soul's progress from the earliest
stirrings of self-awareness to the climax of heavenly glorification" as a "tale
of adventure," a narrative that "follows a clear plot outline" and can be ana-
lyzed with literary tools. As Hooker preaches, "the story evolves into a myth
which offers the listener a new definition of himself and a new understand-
ing of his destiny." Where Miller had seen Hooker through the eyes of Peter
Ramus's modifications of Aristotle, Bush presents Hooker's myth as Platonic.
Regeneration occurs as an "upward ascent through the stages of redemption."
"Hooker's sympathy with … Platonic thought is nowhere so centrally present
as in his narrative exegesis of the long ascent of the soul to eternal commu-
nion with God."[52]

Reading Hooker's writings in the light of the work of Collinson and those
who follow his thinking impels one to conclude that Hooker is long overdue for
yet another rebranding, one that takes full account of his *Sitz im Leben* in early
seventeenth-century England. In the course of this book, it will become clear
that the positions Hooker took during his fourteen years in New England—
including even his positions on congregational polity—were almost entirely
formed before he arrived in the new world. He did not "harden" his positions
in reaction to those of John Cotton and the Antinomians or as a result of his dis-
appointment in not finding what he sought in New England.[53] Further, the the-
ology of the English sermons that constitute the bulk of his mature preaching
should not be understood in opposition to an "Anglicanism" (which had yet to
reach a mature form) or even to what Peter Lake has aptly called "avant-garde
conformity."[54] For the most part, they are unconcerned with Laudian ceremo-
nialism. If conventional wisdom imagines Hooker as the victim of Laud's per-
secution, this book will present Hooker's preaching as deliberately provoking

---

52. Bush, *Writings of Hooker*, 165, 185, 246, 242. In *Puritan Ordeal*, Andrew Delbanco pres-
ents a Hooker who rejects Augustinian Platonism; it is John Cotton who upholds it.

53. *Pace* Delbanco, *Puritan Ordeal*; Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*; Staloff, *American
Thinking Class*; and Patricia Caldwell, *The Puritan Conversion Narrative: The Beginnings of
American Expression* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

54. Peter Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge and Avant-garde Conformity
at the Court of James I," in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 113–33, 303–8.

Laud's intervention. Hooker struck at the heart of the Church of England by belligerently driving a wedge into the "Calvinist consensus," openly challenging the sort of worship fostered by *The Book of Common Prayer*.

Subsequent chapters will also contend that it is misleading to understand Hooker as a particularly sensitive observer of the stages of conversion, as if conversion were a well-defined human experience like puberty or menopause. Rather than assume that there exists a generic "experience of conversion" which humans may or may not undergo, and that Hooker was an unusually skillful analyst of that experience (Miller's "greatest analyst of souls"), the book will describe a Hooker who developed a set of expectations about how a "conversion" ought to occur and then imposed those expectations on the experiences of his hearers.[55] He did not simply observe and record the inner life of a "convert"; he actively created it. The book will also demonstrate, against Miller and those who follow him, that far from softening or unconsciously undermining the theology of John Calvin, Hooker's (and Stone's) theology was more extreme, more "Calvinistic" (to use an anachronistic term) than Calvin's. "Preparation" is misunderstood as humans doing something to provoke a response from God (Miller's imagining the prepared as "those who most strove to prepare themselves"). Rather, it was the preacher, as God's agent, who "prepared" initially unresponsive hearers by overcoming their resistance with his rhetoric.

Finally, I contend that while Hooker's mature thinking is better understood as arising in the context of the final two decades of the Jacobean Church of England than in his years at Hartford, it is still better understood against the broader background of what scholars like Collinson, Lake, and Como have come to call the "Long Reformation." If we conceive the English Reformation in the words of Alexandra Walsham as "a plural, protracted, and often fractious movement that sprawled across two centuries," we can locate Hooker as a participant in an ongoing, as yet incomplete, theological conversation.[56] Recent scholarship has finally buried the canard that New England Puritans were working their way out from under the long shadow of John Calvin.[57] Hooker's primary antagonists were not John Cotton or Anne Hutchinson but Jesuits and their Arminian imitators. In his published sermons and treatises, in other words, Hooker was wrestling with the broader theological issues raised by

---

55. Miller, "Preparation for Salvation," 263.

56. Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, & Memory in Early Modern Britain & Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 80.

57. Both summarized and epitomized in Peter Thuesen, *Predestination*.

the Protestant Reformation and not yet finally resolved. In his own mind, his most compelling conversation was with the written words of Scripture, but his theological training placed him in a tradition of interpretation that stemmed ultimately from the anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine.

By turning to the work of scholars like John Bossy and Jean Delumeau, this book will argue that Hooker's thought (along with Stone's) is most fully understood in an even longer *dureé*, the development of western Christianity, Protestant and Catholic, in the millennium and a quarter since Augustine.[58] Many historians of doctrine argue that the decisive disputes of the Protestant and Catholic Reformations—despite Luther's claims to have rediscovered the authentic meaning of Paul's letters—had largely to do with differing interpretations of Augustine. But most interpretations of Hooker's thought ignore the extent to which he took positions in deliberate opposition to those of Roman Catholic, and particularly Jesuit, thinkers.[59] I will argue that Hooker's mature theology is best understood as an extreme version of Augustinianism, developed in conscious opposition to Lutheran and Jesuit positions. His preaching is a particularly striking example of what Delumeau calls *surculpabilisation*, the creation of an intense feeling of guilt that characterized both Protestant and Catholic practice in late medieval and early modern Christianity. It is anachronistic to term him a "Calvinist," not because he disagreed fundamentally with Calvin but because he operated in the broader tradition of extreme Augustinianism and in the narrower tradition shaped by the writings of William Perkins.[60]

---

58. Bossy, *Christianity in the West, 1400–1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Delumeau, *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (Paris: Presses universitaire de France, 1971), English translation *Catholicism between Luther and Voltaire* (trans. Jeremy Moiser; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977); *La Peur en Occident; Le Péché et la peur*.

59. E.g., Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 1, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)*, 5 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971–90), 331. Jesuit priests worked clandestinely throughout England in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; see most recently Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow: Persecution, Martyrdom and the Politics of Sanctity in Elizabethan England* (New York: Continuum, 2011).

60. Diarmaid MacCulloch recently argued both that "*Anglicanism* is a word best jettisoned by historians" and that "*Calvinism* ought to go the same way." "Protestantism in Mainland Europe: New Directions," *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006): 698–706, at 702. Any dissenter must now contend with Richard Muller's carefully argued position: "Calvin did not originate this tradition; he was not the sole voice in its early codification; and he did not serve as the norm for its development." *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 68; see also his "Reception and Response: Referencing and Understanding Calvin in Post-Reformation Calvinism," in *Calvin and His Influence, 1509–2009*, ed. Irena Backus and Philip Benedict (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 182–201.

Delumeau argues that because early modern Europeans found themselves perpetually assailed by "a dangerous conjunction of fears"—plagues, famines, invasion by the Turks, violence from marauding soldiers, the rupture of the Catholic Church first by the Great Schism and then by the Protestant Reformation—they lived in "a climate of insecurity." To cope with these fears, people turned for explanations to theologians and clerics, who explained that God was punishing them for their wickedness. Heretics, witches, Jews, and Muslim Turks, all agents of Satan, were being allowed to terrorize sinful Europeans. Delumeau contends that a "massive intrusion of theology into daily life" produced an unprecedented fear of divine punishment throughout European populations, particularly as that punishment awaited sinners at the last judgment.[61] Theologians persuaded people to "substitute" this fear of sin and the last judgment for their pervasive fear of physical suffering and death. The result on both Protestant and Catholic sides was a "hyperacute awareness of sin," an "obsession with hell," and "almost morbid delight in original sin."[62]

One can separate Delumeau's controversial exercise in historical mass psychology from the evidence he presents that large numbers of Europeans, Protestant and Catholic, were obsessed with sinfulness—their own and that of their compatriots—and feared divine retribution. Looked at from the perspective of the *longue durée*, the terrifying God preached from early Hartford's pulpit becomes less exceptional if no less compelling.

The Hooker of Frederic Church's painting was a reflection of nineteenth-century American imagination. While he was certainly more "democratic" than Miller was prepared to admit, Hooker never imagined himself as escaping from tradition. Until God should choose to bring history to a close, Thomas Hooker was determined to bring "the heavy hand of old World authority" to the fields and forests of Connecticut.

---

61. Article 12 of the authoritative Augsburg Confession of 1530 almost casually explains that repentance must include "contrition" defined as "*terror*[s] smiting the conscience with the knowledge of sin" (terrores *incussi conscientiae agnito peccato*). *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Reprecht, 1986), 67, English translation *The Book of Concord*, trans. Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), 34; emphasis added.

62. "*une dangereuse conjunction de peurs*," *La Peur en Occident*, 17; *un climat d'insecurité*, ibid. 2; "*une intrusion massive de la théologie dans la vie quotidienne*," ibid. 23; "*une peur—théologique— était substituée a une autre qui était antérieure, viscérale et spontanée: medication héroique*," ibid. 27; "*de part et d'autre de la frontière religieuse, cette conscience suraiguë du péché, cette obsession de l'enfer, et accent mis avec une delectation presque morbide sur la faute originelle*," *Catholicisme*, 189, translated in *Catholicism*, 126. Bossy does not like the term *culpabilisation*; see his review of *Le Peche et la peur*. "Five Centuries of Sin," *Times Literary Supplement*, Feb. 24, 1984, 180.

The middle sections of this book will explore how Europeans in general and Hooker and Stone in particular came to imagine their dreadful God. But before turning to intellectual history, we must first do something more practical: learn something about the lives of Hooker and his colleague Stone and about the godly community Hooker created in the English town of Chelmsford.

2

Hooker and Stone in England, Holland, and New England

APART FROM A brief sojourn in Holland and his final years in New England, Thomas Hooker spent his life within easy reach of London and Cambridge, centers of godly Protestantism.[1] He was born on July 7, 1586, at Marefield in the county of Leicestershire. Local records designate his father as a "yeoman," which probably meant a successful farmer (but by no means a "gentleman").[2] While a boy, Hooker attended a nearby grammar school, almost certainly the school at Market Bosworth. Its founder, the godly Sir Wolstan Dixie, had also created a foundation that would later fund Hooker's scholarship at Emmanuel College.[3] From the reign of Queen Elizabeth well into the seventeenth century,

---

1. For an explanation of "godly," see the following chapter. George H. Williams, "The Life of Thomas Hooker in England and Holland, 1586–1633" and, for the period after 1633, "The Pilgrimage of Thomas Hooker (1586–1647) in England, The Netherlands, and New England (Part Two)," has unearthed nearly all the surviving evidence. Some additional material is presented in Deryck Collingwood, *Thomas Hooker, 1586–1647, Father of American Democracy. A Pilgrim's Guide to the England He Knew …* (Interlaken, NY: Heart of the Lakes Publishing, 1995). Collingwood's book is indeed a "guide" rather than a biography, but besides accurately locating the place of Hooker's birth to "Marefield" rather than Williams's "Markfield," Collingwood provides useful material on the places Hooker lived and worked in England. Stone has been largely ignored by scholars; for a concise account, see Baird Tipson, "Samuel Stone (1602–1663)," in James Levernier and Douglas Wilmes, *American Writers before 1800*, 3 vols. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983), 1392–94.

2. For the distinction between the two, see Roger Thompson, *Mobility and Migration: East Anglian Founders of New England, 1629–1640* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 101.

3. Joan Schenck Ibish, "Emmanuel College: The Founding Generation, with a Biographical Register of Members of the College, 1584–1604" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1985), 112.

many market towns established grammar schools whose curriculum was based firmly on the learning of Latin. Anthony Fletcher, who has studied the experience of children during this period, believes that these grammar schools were also "religious foundations": pupils prayed during the school day and attended the parish church on Sundays.[4] A pupil of Hooker's ability would have thoroughly absorbed the teachings of the established church. Hooker was also regularly exposed to the preaching of William Pesant, the rector of the parish church of St. Peter's, when he attended Sunday worship.[5]

Upon completing his grammar school education, Hooker matriculated as "Sizar" at Queen's College, Cambridge, on March 27, 1604. He was not quite 18. Like the society that surrounded them, Cambridge and Oxford in the early seventeenth century were hierarchical, and Sizars were the bottom rung of the student social ladder. They were scholarship students who "worked their passage" by waiting on the Fellows and the "Fellow Commoners" (sons of nobility and affluent gentry who enjoyed the right to dine with the Fellows). The young Hooker would have been reminded daily that he was socially inferior to the more distinguished Fellow Commoners and "Pensioners" (sons of lesser gentry or affluent clergy who were paying their own way). "It is ironic," said John Craig in his study of the rise of Protestantism in East Anglian market towns, "that the church with its emphasis upon common prayer and its proclamation of a gospel ostensibly for all should have reflected society's insistence upon ranks and status."[6]

Higher education was serious business for a Sizar; future employment depended on his academic achievement. Most Sizars aspired to a career in the church. If especially fortunate, they might eventually enjoy a generously endowed position as rector of a parish, and a distinguished undergraduate degree could improve their chances for preferment. Fellow Commoners could afford to be more casual; they used their experience at Oxford or Cambridge "as a kind of finishing school." Seldom proceeding

---

4. Anthony Fletcher, "Prescription and Practice: Protestantism and the Upbringing of Children, 1560–1700," in *The Church and Childhood*, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994), 325–46, at 335.

5. Pelsant or Pesant; Walker, *Hooker*, 10; Collingwood, *Thomas Hooker*, 96. Since grammar school boys were taught how to take short-hand notes and then expected to test their skills as they listened to sermons, it is likely that the young Hooker took notes on Pelsant's sermons along with his schoolmates. Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 97–99. Dixie appointed Pelsant to the Board of Governors of the school.

6. John Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemics: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns, 1510–1600* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 59.

to a degree, they generally left the university after enjoying undergraduate life for a couple of years to pursue legal training at the Inns of Court. Hooker's surviving sermons are filled with descriptions of deference—who deserved the right to command whom. As we read those descriptions, we need to imagine the impact of those initial months at Queen's.[7] As he developed his radical version of godly Protestantism, Hooker would come to gain status in an alternate world, a society where ministers could expect deference from their congregations. A plaque in Hartford marks the spot, now paved over, where Hooker and Samuel Stone dwelt prominently beside early Hartford's two leading laymen, John Haynes and William Goodwin.[8]

At some point in the next several years, possibly as early as late 1604, Hooker transferred his residency to Emmanuel College and improved his status from "Sizar" to "Scholar." Known as "the Puritan Colledge," Emmanuel reflected the values of its founder, Sir Walter Mildmay, and profited from the reputation of its distinguished long-time Master, Laurence Chaderton.[9] In the College's earliest years, communion was received sitting rather than kneeling, services were not conducted according to *The Book of Common Prayer*, and participants did not wear surplices. It was not until about the time of Hooker's matriculation that pressure from the authorities compelled the

---

7. Sarah Bendall, Christopher Brooke, and Patrick Collinson, *A History of Emmanuel College* (Woodbridge, 1999), 45–46; Richard Tyler, "The Children of Disobedience: The Social Composition of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1696–1645" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1976). Anthony Milton writes of the Laudian polemicist Peter Heylyn's similar "sensitivity to issues of status" growing from Heylyn's beginning his Oxford studies as a "batteler." *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 12.

8. Samuel Stone would write of the "high inward Estimation" in which he thought laypeople ought to hold their ministers, prizing them "above the men of the world." WB 469. For a discussion of how clergymen's high opinion of themselves could clash with lay attitudes, see Christopher Haigh, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 51 *et passim*.

9. Samuel Clarke, *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in This Later Age* (London, 1683), *Wing* C4538, 3. William Prynne reported that in 1629 William Laud called Emmanuel and Sidney Sussex Colleges "Nurseries of Puritanisme." *Canterburies Doome: or the First Part of a Compleat History of the Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of William Lavd Late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury* (London: John Macock for Michael Spark, 1646), *Wing* P3917, 369. For an argument that Chaderton's Puritanism was more radical than is usually thought, see Arnold Hunt, "Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference," in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, ed. Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 207–28, at 227.

College to conform its worship to the Prayer Book.[10] Richard Corbett's ballad, "The Distracted Puritan," reveals how unfriendly contemporaries thought of the college:

> In the howse of pure Emanuel
> I had my Education;
> Where my friends surmise
> I dazeld mine Eyes,
> With the light of Revelation.
> Boldly I preach, hate a Crosse, hate a Surplice,
> Miters, Copes, and Rotchets:
> Come hear mee pray nine times a day,
> And fill your heads with Crotchets.[11]

By Hooker's day, parents seeking a godly environment for their sons sought places for them at Emmanuel. Mildmay's original foundation had provided for half a dozen "Scholars" whose expenses would be supported by the College, and Sir Wolstan Dixie's foundation provided funds for two more, one of whom was to be a graduate of the school at Market Bosworth. Hooker would have found the combination of a scholarship and Chaderton's reputation impossible to resist. By early 1608 he had his B.A.; the following year he was appointed "Fellow" (*socius*) and "Catechist" (*catechistica*), positions he held till 1618. An M.A. followed in 1611. Seventeenth-century ordination records do not survive for the Diocese of Ely, but it was customary for Fellows to be ordained. Hooker was probably ordained to the priesthood about the time he received his M.A.[12]

In the Cambridge of Hooker's day, a newly elected Fellow was the very rough equivalent of an American junior faculty member; Fellows served as tutors to undergraduates while pursuing their own academic interests. Designation as a Fellow generally indicated that the incumbent had chosen a faculty life, though a former "Scholar" like Hooker might well have been expected to move "into the fast lane of ecclesiastical and academic preferment." Godly students

---

10. Rebecca Seward Rolph, "Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and the Puritan Movements of Old and New England" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1979), 191–96.

11. Richard Corbett, "The Distracted Puritane," in *The Poems of Richard Corbett*, ed. J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 57. A well-known "anti-Calvinist," Corbett later became Bishop of Oxford and subsequently of Norwich. See Nicholas W. S. Cranfield, "Corbett, Richard (1582–1635)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

12. Ibish, "Emmanuel College: The Founding Generation," 112–13, 264–65, 277.

sought Hooker out. The future biographer Samuel Clarke called him "one of the choicest Tutors in the University."[13]

But Sir Walter's foundation had ruled out permanent faculty careers for his Fellows. His "one aim" in establishing Emmanuel had been "rendering as many persons as possible fit for the sacred ministry of the word and the sacraments," and so the statute *De mora sociorum* required Fellows to leave the College after a set period of years in order to make themselves useful in the parish ministry of the wider Church. Fellows were to "proceed, as soon as by the public statutes of the University they can and may, to the degree of Doctor of Divinity," and once having achieved that goal, were to leave Emmanuel within a year. Should they chose not to proceed to the D.D., they were to forfeit their fellowship on the day they might have received it. Hooker never received a D.D., so by 1618—after spending a total of fourteen years at Cambridge—he had reached the limit of his possible service as Fellow.[14]

It is unlikely that Hooker's failure to proceed to the doctorate stemmed from any lack of intellectual ability. His appointment as Catechist or "Dean" (*decanus*) involved important academic responsibilities. He presided over the weekly theological disputations held from 4:00 to 6:00 on Friday afternoons. The next afternoon, from 3:00 to 4:00, he was expected to "expound and teach some article of the Christian religion." Assisted when necessary by other Fellows, the Catechist examined the scholars and pensioners, and he also had the authority to examine prospective Fellows "in Theology and the true knowledge of God."

Hooker had disciplinary as well as academic responsibilities. Emmanuel's Catechist was charged to keep track of other Fellows' attendance at services of worship and to supervise the monitors who oversaw student attendance at worship and at academic obligations outside the College. For these and related duties he received fifty-three shillings fourpence annually, an amount raised by an additional ten pounds in 1614.[15]

---

13. Clarke, *Lives of Eminent Persons*, 3.

14. Stubbings, *The Statutes of Sir Walter Mildmay Kt Chancellor of the Exchequer and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors, Authorised by Him for the Government of Emmanuel College Founded by Him* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 60, 91; Ibish, "Emmanuel College: The Founding Generation," reports that Fellows did not as a rule proceed to the D.D. while at Emmanuel.

15. *History of Emmanuel*, 46, 24; Stubbings, *Statues for Emmanuel College*, 95, 55, 129, cited by Steven R. Pointer, "The Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Election of 1622: The Constraints of a Puritan Institution," in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. Laura L. Knoppers (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), 106–21, at 110.

One of Hooker's colleagues, John Eliot, later told Cotton Mather that Hooker gained a reputation during his Emmanuel tenure as an enforcer of godly moral standards. By the time he was ready to leave Cambridge, Mather reported, "the Influence which [Hooker] had upon the Reformation of some Growing Abuses, when he was one of the *Proctors* in the University, was a Thing, that more eminently Signalized him."[16] Those who disparaged godly people as "busy controllers" would have found a ready example in Hooker.

Mather also tells us that as Catechist Hooker preached "briefly" and in a "*Scholastick way*" over many of the same points of practical divinity that he later expanded upon in his public ministry. Hearers took shorthand notes, and Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye related that those notes "were then so esteemed, that many Copies thereof were by many that heard not the Sermons, written out."[17] Such "scribal publication" was a typical practice for godly sermons; printing was subject to censorship and the vagaries of the marketplace. Although Goodwin and Nye claimed in 1656 that some of the handwritten notes were "yet extant," no copies of Hooker's Cambridge catechetical sermons appear to have survived.[18]

Toward the end of his tenure as Fellow, Hooker endured what Mather called his "*Storm* of Soul," that prolonged period of spiritual agony when he personally encountered his terrible God. As described in the last chapter, he cried out, "*While I suffer thy Terrors, O Lord, I am Distracted*" and remained in a state of anguish for "a considerable while." Eventually he reached the conviction that God intended to save him after all, but only after first enduring recurring fears that he was among those eternally damned. Unfortunately, we

---

16. *Piscator Evangelicus* 4–5 {*Magnalia* 1:333}.

17. The godly preacher was encouraged to imagine himself as a "prophet" (*propheta*) speaking to "hearers" (*auditores*), e.g., William Perkins, *Prophetica, sive de Sacra et Unica Ratione Concionandi Tractatus* (Cambridge: John Legatt, 1592), 112, trans. Thomas Tuke in *The Workes of That Famovs and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Vniuersity of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins* (Cambridge: J. Leggatt, 1616–18), 2:670, see also *Of the Calling of the Ministerie, Two Treatises, Works* 3:434. I will follow this convention and refer to a minister's audience or congregation as his "hearers."

18. *Piscator Evangelicus* 33–34 {*Magnalia* 1:347}; AR sig. C4ᵛ. The editor of Perkins's *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount* asks "those that haue vnprinted copies in their hands" to defer henceforth to the printed version, Perkins *Works* 3 sig. A5ᵛ. On scribal publication, see Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998) and David D. Hall and Alexandra Walsham, "'Justification by Print Alone?': Protestantism, Literacy, and Communications in the Anglo-American World of John Winthrop," in *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England 1588–1649,* ed. Francis J. Bremer and Lynn Botelho (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005), 334–85.

know nothing of the immediate circumstances that provoked this crisis, and Mather's second-hand account is frustratingly brief.

The episode clearly burned itself into Hooker's soul. Accepting Goodwin and Nye's assertion (written about the time of Hooker's death) that Hooker had "traversed the intricate Meanders, and the darkened (through temptations) windings of this narrow passage and entrance into Life," had dug "into the Mines and Veins of Holy Scriptures, to find out how they agreed with his own experiments," and had developed "by deep reflections upon every step of Gods Procedure with himself," one could say that during this "storm of soul" the doctrine he had imbibed from early childhood became deeply personal.[19] He had heard in his college lectures and read in his theology books of the anger of the terrible Augustinian God. Now he had confronted that anger directly. This was the God whose Gospel he would preach. Mather insisted that Hooker would extend comfort and compassion to weak believers, but that "others he Saved with fear, pulling them out of the Fire."[20] Judging from the evidence of his printed sermons, those "others" were the majority of his hearers.

Two powerful teachers helped shape Hooker's mind during his Cambridge years. The first was William Perkins, who had died the year before Hooker matriculated at Queens. Students throughout the 1590s had attended Perkins's lectures at Great Saint Andrews Church, but by Hooker's time it was Perkins's writings, steadily reprinted, that dominated godly conversation. Little known today, Perkins's works outsold Shakespeare's during the early seventeenth century.[21]

---

19. Philip Nye had told Samuel Hartlib in 1634 that Hooker's sermons about preparation contained "as many turnings and windings … as any whatsoever." Hartlib, "Ephemerides," transcribed in *The Hartlib Papers: A Complete Text and Image Database of the Papers of Samuel Hartlib (c. 1600–1662) held in Sheffield University Library*, 2nd ed. (Sheffield: Humanities Research Online, 2002), 29/2/21A.

20. Mather, *Piscator* 32 {Magnalia 1:346}. The reference is to the book of Jude, v. 23.

21. Robert Halley, "Memoir of Thomas Goodwin, D.D., Composed out of His Own Papers and Memoirs," in *The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D., Sometime President of Magdalene College, Oxford*, ed. John C. Miller, 11. vols. (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1861–65), 2:lviii "the town [Cambridge] was then [1612] filled with the discourse of the power of Mr Perkins ministry, still fresh in most men's memories"; David Hoyle writes of Hooker's Cambridge as "a university dominated by the reformed protestant theology of William Perkins." *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590–1644* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 25. Peter Iver Kaufman takes for granted that Perkins was "the most influential English theologian" at Cambridge during the late sixteenth century. "'Much in Prayer': The Inward Researches of Elizabethan Protestants," *Journal of Religion* 73 (1993): 163–82, 166. For Perkins's overall influence, see the statistics in Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Patrick Collinson calls Perkins "the most widely read of English divines," "England and International Calvinism, 1558–1640," in *International*

The second was Alexander Richardson (1563–1613). A graduate of Queens College, Richardson never pursued formal appointment in the Church of England. He retired from public life, ran a school, and created a household seminary at his home near Cambridge. There students, among them the future Boston pastor John Wilson and the theologian William Ames, would imbibe Richardson's particular system of Ramist logic and rhetoric. From Richardson, Hooker gained both a grounding in Ramism and the practical experience of life in a household seminary.[22]

Before we imagine Hooker bidding farewell to Cambridge, we should keep something in mind that it is easy for twenty-first-century readers to forget: Hooker left Emmanuel College steeped in a culture of Latin. For fourteen years, he had carried out his College work in Latin, disputed in Latin, read Latin theological works, and most likely tutored his students in Latin. Students at Emmanuel College during the time of Hooker and Stone were forbidden to converse in English in public settings; only "in private and familiar intercourse" was the vernacular to be used.[23]

Skilled translators find it useful to distinguish between someone's "first learned language" (English in the case of Hooker and Stone) and his or her "operative language." For the thousand years between 700 and 1700, writes David Bellos, "Latin was the language in which all educated Europeans operated in thought, formal speech, and writing, for purposes as varied as diplomacy, philosophy, mathematics, science, and religion." Since no child was

---

Calvinism, 1541–1715, ed. Menna Prestwick (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 197–223, at 222. In the opinion of Charles Hambrick-Stowe, Perkins was "the greatest theologian of the [Puritan] movement," "Practical Divinity and Spirituality," in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 191–205, at 194. Michael P. Winship, "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospelers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s," *Church History* 70 (2001): 462–81, at 476–77, citing Richard Rogers, *Seven Treatises* (London, 1603), 308, 24, notes that Rogers's highly influential *Seven Treatises* "drew upon Perkins extensively and praised him as uniquely proficient in both the divine and practical aspects of Christianity." W. B. Patterson, "William Perkins as Apologist for the Church of England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57 (2006): 252–69, at 269, argues that Perkins was "the most important and influential contemporary theologian of the Elizabethan Church of England in advancing its teaching and values and in shaping the Protestant religious culture of the nation." For much more on Perkins, see chapter 6.

22. Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 29–30. Cotton Mather reports of Wilson that "pursuant unto the Advice which he had from Dr. *Ames,* he associated himself with a Pious Company in the University, who kept their Meetings in Mr. *Wilson's* Chamber, for *Prayer, Fasting,* Holy *Conferences,* and the Exercises of True Devotion." *Memoria Wilsoniana: The Life of John Wilson,* 5, in *Johannes in Eremo,* For more on Richardson. see chapter 7.

23. Stubbings, *The Statutes of Emmanuel College,* 61.

born into a Latin-speaking home during this period, Latin speakers all had at least one other mother tongue, "but these vernaculars were not used as tools for elaborated thinking or expression." When students and their teachers needed to express precise theological concepts, they used Latin, and knowledge of Latin gave them ready access to whatever was being written by contemporaries both Protestant and Catholic on the continent.[24] Even though their surviving writings are in English, we need to imagine Thomas Hooker and Samuel Stone (as well as their Cambridge- and Oxford-educated colleagues, many of whom did publish in Latin) as bilingual. Hooker and Stone also used Greek and Hebrew, languages they learned in the course of their studies much as a twenty-first-century American student might learn German or Chinese.[25] But the biblical languages could never achieve a standing remotely comparable to Latin in their reading and thinking. Whenever we find Hooker or Stone preaching on a point of technical theological doctrine, we would be wise to imagine them devising effective ways to translate Latin concepts into the vernacular.

A graceful transition from Emmanuel into a comfortable parish living was never an option for Thomas Hooker. Like Ames and others in Alexander Richardson's circle, he had come to the conclusion that he could not "conform." He could not in conscience agree to the conditions that the Church of England would impose on him—formal subscription to its laws and prescribed liturgy—in return for granting him the right to serve as the rector of an ordinary parish. To conform, Hooker would have been required to read aloud parts of the *Book of Common Prayer* that he had come to believe were unscriptural. He would have been expected to wear clerical vestments that he believed were all too similar to the ones Catholic priests wore while celebrating the mass.

Nonconformity was not the only option for a godly candidate with reservations about the Church's liturgy and vestments. Many of Hooker's colleagues chose a path that Peter Lake has called "modified subscription." Subscribing in a "modified" fashion was analogous to what recent US presidents have tried to accomplish with "signing statements": agreeing to a congressionally approved bill without ever intending to enforce those parts of it with which they disagreed. Those with scruples could use "mental

---

24. David Bellos, *Is That a Fish in Your Ear: Translation and the Meaning of Everything* (New York: Faber and Faber, 2011), 61–62. *Hartford Puritanism* tries to respect the importance of Latin by citing works first written in Latin in the original, including Latin works like those of William Perkins that were later translated by contemporaries into English. To the extent possible, Latin citations will be confined to the footnotes, and translations will be provided for all but common expressions.

25. For some examples, see AR 10:75–76, 101, 108, 264, 323, 339, 360–61, 673–74.

reservations" and "public as well as private glosses and provisos" to sub-
scribe to the Church's requirements without sacrificing their conscientious
objections to some of its practices. They could "affirm their membership of
and loyalty to the Church of England" while keeping their consciences at
least partially pure.[26] Bishops often connived with the practice to get capable
preachers into underserved pulpits.

Rarely one to compromise, Hooker rejected this option. He knew full well
that his decision severely limited the possibility of his advancement in the
Church of England. Honoring his own judgment against that of an estab-
lished church, Hooker gave ample evidence of the remarkable self-confidence
that also characterizes his sermons. Opponents would see that same
self-confidence as a zealotry that often bordered on fanaticism.

A generation ago, historians imagined "Puritans" like Hooker on the
margins of an "Anglican" Church of England whose theology was best
exemplified in the writings of Richard Hooker.[27] Exhaustive research has
now demonstrated that it was Richard Hooker who stood on the margins.
Throughout the Elizabethan and early Jacobean period, a "Calvinist con-
sensus" dominated English theology.[28] Although Thomas Hooker certainly
operated on the radical extreme of that consensus, for the first forty years of
his life there was room for him under the broad theological umbrella of the
Church of England. Lectureships controlled by godly laymen or town corpo-
rations provided employment and stature for many "nonconformists" like
Hooker, so long as they avoided direct challenges to the church hierarchy.
Hooker's public career proved to be typical of a large group of godly preachers

---

26. Peter Lake, "Moving the Goal Posts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of
Conformity in the Early Stuart Church," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English
Church, c. 1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell
Press, 2000), 179–205, at 183. For an example of how a godly preacher might try to get
away with a "partial" subscription, see "Master Hugh Peter's *Subscription before the Bishop
of London*, August 17, 1627," in William Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery of some Prodigious* New
Wandring-Blasing-Stars, & Firebrands, *Stiling themselves NEW-LIGHTS*,. . . (London: John
Macock, 1645), *Wing* P3963, 32–33, and the discussion in Raymond Stearns, *The Strenuous
Puritan: Hugh Peter, 1598–1660* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954), 41–43.

27. Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, ed. W. Speed Hill, 3 vols. (Cambridge,
MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), originally published 1593. The two Hookers were not
related.

28. See above all Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, now supplemented by Peter Lake, "The
'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s," in
Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition, ed. Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury
Press, 2003), 90–121, at 229–33; and Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored*,
39–125.

able to continue their ministry until the ascendancy of William Laud and his party late in James I's reign.[29]

An admiring colleague later explained that "being a Non-conformitan in judgement," Hooker recognized that he could not aspire to "*Presentative* Livings"—those which would require subscription and the approval of the diocesan bishop. So after about a year during which he probably supported himself by occasional preaching (we unfortunately know nothing about this important period), he "was contented and perswaded" to accept an unusual "*Donative endowment*," the Rectorship of the church of St. Georges at Esher (Esher is now part of greater London, about twelve miles from the city center). Because authority to name the incumbent was entirely under the control of the godly gentleman Francis Drake, Hooker could avoid the need to make a formal subscription to the church hierarchy's expectations.

The choice of Hooker suited Drake's needs, too, because among other duties the incumbent would serve as chaplain to his family. Drake needed a chaplain who could meet the considerable spiritual demands of his wife, Joanna. The person who "perswaded" Hooker to accept this position was the renowned John Dod, who had previously ministered to Mrs. Drake and so had experience with her spiritual difficulties. Dod was in turn almost certainly in contact with a local godly conference such as the one Hooker himself later presided over at Chelmsford.[30] That Hooker had himself overcome serious spiritual temptation, and that he claimed to have a "new answering method" to help those in similar straits, could only have made Francis Drake more eager to engage his services.

Hooker lived in the Drake household; it was there that he met his future wife, Susannah, who was serving as Joanna Drake's woman-in-waiting.[31] He

---

29. The work of David Como has shown how fissures within the godly community constantly threatened to disrupt any apparent consensus. See "Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2000), 64–87; "Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London," *Historical Journal* 46 (2003): 263–94; and *Blown by the Spirit*. But Anthony Milton aptly characterizes the situation in the early years of the seventeenth century when he writes that "Puritans who were prepared to offer limited conformity, and to negotiate discreet private mitigations of royal policy while publicly acknowledging the King's authority, could still be absorbed within the Jacobean church." "New Horizons in the Early Jacobean Period," in *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 483–94, at 484.

30. Jasper Heartwell(?), *Trodden Down Strength by the God of Strength* (London, 1647), *Wing* H960, 116–17. Webster, *Godly Clergy*, esp. 30–32, discusses godly conferences at length.

31. The Hookers would name their eldest daughter Joanna, and Francis Drake left a bequest in his will to "Johana Hooker whoe is now in New England £30 to be paid her the day of her marriage." She eventually married Thomas Shepard. Walker, *Hooker*, 38.

also encountered an immediate challenge to his pastoral skill: Joanna Drake had fallen into a state of spiritual crisis. She had convinced herself that she was predestined to eternal damnation. Francis Drake had already brought in other godly ministers to care for her, and John Dod would have had Hooker's own successful recovery in mind when he recommended Hooker to Drake.

Details of Hooker's ministry with Mrs. Drake are scanty. But a close friend of the family did report two important pieces of information. First, he explained that she was "continually hammered and hewen with the tough acute disputations of this good man, Mr *Hooker.*" To learn as much as possible about her condition, Hooker was using his "new answering method" to draw out and refute the reasons behind her doubts about her election. Later in his career Hooker would become renowned for his ability to resolve "cases of conscience," particularly the "greatest" case of conscience "that ever was": "how a man may know, whether he be the son of God or no."[32] In Hartford, he would use "questions and answers" to determine whether the spiritual state of a candidate met the requirements for church membership.

Second, we learn that under his tutelage "shee continually grew still better, using to present her selfe constantly to the use of meanes; having prayer, catechizing, expounding and reading of the word, and singing of Psalms constantly in the family." In early Stuart England, these were the sorts of behaviors that served to distinguish godly Christians from their worldly neighbors. Bringing a doubter into the fellowship of the godly often served to fan the first sparks of faith into flame. Rather than assume that Joanna Drake needed to demonstrate a robust belief before being invited to share in the performance of godly practices, Hooker used those practices to help bring that robust belief into being.

Presumably still relying on Eliot, Mather reports that Hooker left his position in Esher to "more publickly and frequently Preach about *London.*" Even for a nonconformist, there were many opportunities for guest preachers in the city; the godly network had ways of providing for its own. Mather tells us that he "was not Ambitious to Exercise his Ministry among the *Great Ones* of the World, from whom the most of Preferment might be expected" but rather "chose to be where great numbers of the *Poor* might Receive the *Gospel* from him." A more skeptical biographer might have concluded that, given the number of candidates searching for visiting pulpits, Hooker took the opportunities presented to him.[33]

---

32. The title of a famous work by William Perkins, *A Case of Conscience, the Greatest that Ever Was: How a Man May Know Whether He Be the Childe of God or No* in *Works*,1:421–38.

33. Hooker would almost certainly have been aware that extreme Augustinians were increasingly on the defensive in mid-1620s Cambridge. See Katrin Ettenhuber, "'The Best Help

But the evidence of Hooker's surviving sermons bolsters Mather's interpretation. In his catechetical lectures at Cambridge, Hooker had lectured "scholastically," but after leaving the University he decided to develop a more "popular" preaching style, filled with images of kings forgiving traitors, doctors administering "physick" to their patients, and women laboring in childbirth. Colloquialisms and homely sayings abound. "Wishings and wouldlings keepe no house." "These words breake no bones, and all this winde shakes no corne with you." "Men flie off from Christ, and give him the backe in the day of trouble." A person who professed the truth of the Gospel but denied the power of it in her behavior "keepes a stall in both markets." Someone who recognized the need to repent but imagined repentance to be in his own power "shuffles for himselfe, and sharkes for his owne comfort." A hypocrite "thinks his penny good silver."[34]

In Hartford he would lambast the sort of worldly people who could "hug and harbor a varlet, a scummy wretch, that is not fit to sit among the Dogs of a mans Table." A "wise holy-hearted man," on the other hand, "would take the windy side." "Neuters in Religion" could "Plough with an Ox, and an Ass"; they were "Linsey-woolsey men, who can take the color of any Company."[35] King David, having arranged to have Uriah the Hittite placed in the deadly front line of battle so he could possess Uriah's wife Bathsheba, found that "the dead body of *Uriah* was dished out to him as his break-fast every morning." A man searching for a sign that his faith was authentic was like a "childe in the night being hungry." He "seekes for the dug, but if he doth not lay hold of it, he gets no good by it; so thou hast been a long time musling about a dry chip, and hast got no comfort."[36]

Preached in a plain style and enlivened with proverbs and homely sayings, Hooker's sermons were designed to appeal to hearers of every social station. The special concern for the poor identified by Mather shines out frequently.[37] We do not know precisely how long he preached around London;

God's People Have': Manuscript Culture and the Construction of Anti-Calvinist Communities in Seventeenth-Century England," *The Seventeenth Century* 22 (2007): 260–82, at 271.

34. SEC 162; FC 31, cf. SP 42, SEC 67; CTCL 90; SEC 489, 524, 66, FC 33. SEC 435; cf. CTCL 50, CCLP 397. Arnold Hunt argues that such colloquialisms were commonplace in most godly preaching, but that ministers conventionally edited them out in published versions, *The Art of Hearing*, 154–63.

35. CCLP 416, 418.

36. AR 10:218, SEC 68.

37. Hooker's theological mentor William Perkins argued that "though the promises of Gods grace be not denied vnto the rich, yet sure it is … that more of the poorer sort receiue and

quite probably he began accepting guest invitations while still at Esher. But the popular style caught on quickly. Before long, Mather tells us, "He grew famous for his Ministerial Abilities."[38]

He also came to the attention of the ecclesiastical authorities. One of Hooker's later adversaries, John Browning, stated that Hooker was silenced during this period by the Bishop of Winchester, Lancelot Andrewes. It is difficult to imagine a court preacher like Andrewes calling up the image of an infant "musling about a dry chip" or a godly man sitting "on the windy side" of a "scummy wretch."[39]

Cotton Mather's reference to Hooker's London preaching is tantalizingly brief, but Mather does reveal that just at this time, Hooker came under the influence of the third of his intellectual mentors, John Rogers (known as John Rogers "of Dedham" or more popularly as "Roaring Rogers," to distinguish him from other pastors with the same name). Long-established in Dedham, and no more willing to conform than Hooker, Rogers was periodically suspended from his lectureship. Influential laypeople usually found a way to have him reinstalled.[40] Hooker called him *The Prince of all the Preachers in England*" and borrowed from his distinctive preaching style.[41] Thomas Goodwin wrote that Cambridge students would ride down to Dedham "to get a little fire" from Rogers's sermons. When detractors spoke of Hooker's "bawling" or "rayling" in the pulpit, they were detecting

obey the Gospell, then of the rich." *A Godly and Learned Exposition ... upon the three first chapters of the Revelation, Works*, 3:*284.

38. *Piscator Evangelicus* 7 {*Magnalia* 1:334}. Hooker was not the only godly preacher to speak out on behalf of the poor; Bartimaeus Andrewes, for example, preached that it was often the "simple sort" who sought earnestly after Christ. John Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemics*, 23. Hooker achieved some stature during this period; Hugh Peter remembered that around 1623 he went from Cambridge "into Essex" and was "quieted ... by the Love and Labours of Mr *Thomas Hooker*." Hugh Peter, *A Dying Fathers Last Legacy to an Onely Child ...* (London: G. Calvert and T. Brewster, 1660), *Wing* P1697, 98.

39. Public Record Office, State Papers 16/151, folio 19^{r-v}, cited by Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 190–91. The "court preacher" description would apply only to the latter part of Andrewes's career; earlier he had preached much more widely; see Peter McCullough, "Introduction" to Lancelot Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, ed. Peter McCullough (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), esp. xvii–xix. Browning had been Andrewes's chaplain, *Hartlib Papers* 29/3/26B.

40. Godly supporters attributed Roger's final suspension, after which his health quickly declined and he died, to the pique of Bishop Matthew Wren. See the *Diary of Samuel Rogers 1634–38*, ed. Tom Webster and Kenneth Shipps (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), lxxii–lxiii.

41. Hilda Grieve, *The Sleepers and the Shadows: Chelmsford: A Town, Its People and Its Past* (Chelmsford: Essex County Council, 1994), 2:38; *Piscator* 8 {*Magnalia* 1:334}; William

the influence of "that worthy powerfull late thundering Preacher, Mr *Rogers of Dedham*."[42]

Well-connected in godly circles, Rogers used his influence to try to secure Hooker a position in Colchester, a major town in close proximity to Dedham. In Colchester, Hooker would have had ready access to Rogers's lectures and counsel.[43] Hooker failed to obtain the Colchester position, but in the meantime he came to the attention of the town fathers of Chelmsford, the county town of Essex and the grain market for the area supplying London. He was invited to assume the Chelmsford lectureship, and by late 1625 he was lecturing and serving as curate to the parish rector. Soon he would open a school in the nearby village of Great Baddow. He was not quite 40.

The lectureship had been founded in 1610 through a bequest from Thomas Williamson, a Chelmsford inhabitant who had made his intentions for the lectures clear:

> I strayne myself to make a begyning of this godly exercise of preaching in this place, because this towne of Chelmisford ys the shire towne of Essex, and a place of great resort of many people of every condicion and calling unto the market and fayres there, with the Assises, Sessions, and other sittinges upon the Kinges Ma[jes]ties commissions therin kept, trusting that God herafter of his gratious goodnes will stir upp some other of the professors of Christes gospel either in the towne or country ... to be followers of this my doing, the which God of his grace hath stirred me to.[44]

Williamson saw the lectures as an opportunity to edify both the inhabitants of Chelmsford and the many visitors who came to Chelmsford's markets, fairs, and sessions of court. Originally designed to be a rotating or "combination" lecture, it had by Hooker's time been assigned to a single lecturer. As opposed to a homily, preached during the *Prayer Book* service of communion or morning

---

Hunt, *The Puritan Moment: The Coming of Revolution in an English County* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 196.

42. E.g., SP 73, where Hooker's style of preaching is called "a kind of rayling that fits not a pulpit"; he is referred to as "*that Bawling* Hooker," *Piscator* 14–15 {*Magnalia* 1:337}; Hunt, *Puritan Moment*, 110; *Trodden Down Strength*, 96. For more on Rogers, see chapter 8.

43. John Yates, another Richardson student who had been a Fellow with Hooker at Emmanuel, did manage to find a position for a year as a school teacher in Dedham upon leaving Cambridge.

44. Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 2:37–38.

prayer, a "lecture" was free-standing and commonly occurred in the afternoon. Hooker lectured in the spacious parish church of St. Mary's (which in 1914 became the Cathedral Church of St. Mary the Virgin, St. Peter, and St. Cedd).[45]

Never before had Chelmsford had such a lecturer! Like his mentor, John Rogers, Hooker entertained while he edified. Hearers found a "rare mixture of *Pleasure* and *Profit* in his Preaching"; one local historian estimates that during his brief time in Chelmsford, "Hooker built up a popular following unrivaled by any other preacher in the county's history." Even a twenty-first-century reader of these lectures, many of which were taken down in shorthand and later published, cannot help but be moved by Hooker's rhetoric. In seventeenth-century Essex, he gained celebrity status. "Our people's pallats grow so out of tast, ʸt noe food contents them but of Mr. Hooker's dressing," wrote one of Archbishop Laud's informants. "I have lived in Essex to see many changes, and have seene the people idolizing many new ministers and lecturers," he continued, "but this man surpasses them all for learning and some other considerable partes, and ... gains more and far greater followers than all before him." "Tumults and troupes of the country" flocked to hear him, reports Cotton Mather, and not incidentally to spend money in Chelmsford's "*Inns* and *Shops*." One frequent hearer was the Earl of Warwick, Robert Rich.[46] The town fathers had found their man!

Not every citizen was pleased by Hooker's coming. Along with his entertaining lectures, he brought to Chelmsford a commitment to public moral reformation, particularly in the observation of the Sabbath. Mather reports that it was the custom before his arrival for a visitor to find people "filling the Streets with unsuitable Behaviours, after the Publick Services of the *Lords-Day* were over." Retiring to an inn or alehouse to imbibe, they soon spilled out into the public thoroughfare. Mather claimed that Hooker quickly "cleared the Streets of this Disorder, and the *Sabbath* came to be very visibly Sanctified among the People." On the evidence of Hooker's sermons, the reformation of manners was not so rapid. Although it is rarely possible to date a particular lecture, attacks on drunkenness and Sabbath-breaking do not appear to abate.

---

45. Collingwood, *Thomas Hooker*, 207.

46. Hunt, *Puritan Moment*, 197; Samuel Collins to Dr. Arthur Duck, PRO, SP Ser. Charles I, 142.113, cited in T. W. Davids, *Annals of Evangelical Nonconformity in the County of Essex* (London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder, 1863), 151; Mather, *Piscator* 9 {*Magnalia* 1:335}; Barbara Donagan, "The Clerical Patronage of Robert Rich, Second Earl of Warwick, 1619–1642," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 120 (1976): 388–419, at 405. On the competition for audiences between preachers and the stage, see Lake with Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, esp. 483–520.

Hooker also used his lectures to attack the formal religion of *The Book of Common Prayer*. English men and women whose religion consisted entirely in attending the authorized liturgies of the Prayer Book, he thundered, were badly deceived and almost surely headed for hell. Once the content of these lectures came to the attention of a micro-managing bishop, Hooker would have to have known that they would bring censure upon his ministry.

Hooker also lost no time in establishing himself as the leader of a godly ministerial conference in the neighborhood of Chelmsford, probably building on a more informal structure initiated by Richard Blackerby. The historian of Essex William Hunt detected "a continuous tradition of clerical conferences" in Essex, "extending from the public assemblies of the early 1560s down to the semiclandestine circle around Thomas Hooker in the late 1620s." "It was by his [Hooker's] means," reports Mather, "that those Godly Ministers held their *Monthly Meetings* for *Fasting* and *Prayer*, and profitable *Conferences*."

Hooker used the occasion of his conference to provide advice and counsel to younger ministers; his neighbor Samuel Collins, the vicar of Braintree, described him to the Chancellor of the diocese as an "oracle" to younger ministers and "their principal library." Both Collins and Mather noted his ability to assist colleagues "in his Neighbourhood and Acquaintance" in resolving difficult "cases of conscience" and "to be better establish'd in some great points of Christianity." Collins also suspected that "by private meetings and leaving schismatical books among them," Hooker's conference was leading the younger ministers to nonconformity. "There be divers young ministers about us that seldom study, but spend their time in private meetings and conference with him or such others as are of his society, and return home in the end of the week and broach on the Sundays what he hath brewed, and trade with his stock." Susannah Hooker was accused in December 1628 of refusing to come to church to give thanks after childbirth; "churching" was a ceremony often avoided by nonconformist women.[47]

Like others of its kind, Hooker's conference also served as a placement office, helping younger members come "to be here and there settled in several parts of the Country." Among the younger ministers who frequented Hooker's lectures was his future son-in-law Thomas Shepard, who wrote in his *Autobiography* that Hooker's conference debated whether to establish a

---

47. Hunt, *Puritan Moment*, 96; *Piscator* 11 {*Magnalia* 336}; Collins to Duck, op. cit.; Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 2:42. For Patrick Collinson's pathbreaking work on conferences, see esp. "The English Conventicle," in *Voluntary Religion*, ed. W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood (London: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 223–59. On the churching of women, see David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 196–229. On Hooker's radicalizing tendencies, see Anthony Milton,

lectureship at Coggeshall and place Shepard in it. "After fasting and prayer, the ministers in those parts of Essex had a day of humiliation, and they did seek the Lord for direction where to place the lecture: and towards the evening of that day they began to consider whether I should go to Coggeshall or no. Most of the ministers were for it … Mr. Hooker only did object to my going thither."[48]

At neighboring villages, first Great Baddow and subsequently Little Baddow, Hooker also kept a school. As Tom Webster explains, "a scrupulous nonconformist could obtain a schoolmaster's licence with a clear conscience, as Canon 77 exempted them from the third clause of the second article in the subscription, which avowed that the public liturgy 'and none other' should be followed in divine worship."[49] Mather writes of Hooker's keeping a keeping a school "in *his own Hired House* … at little *Baddow*" after abandoning the Chelmsford lectureship.[50] His usher there was John Eliot, later a missionary to Native Americans, who joined the Hooker household. "When I came to this Blessed Family," recalled Eliot, "I then saw, and never before, the Power of Godliness, in its Lively Vigour and Efficacy." It was a manuscript left by Eliot that served as the primary source material for Mather's biography.[51]

Early in his tenure at Chelmsford, Hooker had reached a compromise with his diocesan, Bishop George Montaigne of London. So long as Hooker promised "not to meddle with the discipline of the church," meaning presumably its structure of governance, Montaigne would tolerate Hooker's nonconformity.[52] But by early 1629, the political climate had changed, and Hooker's position became

---

Catholic and Reformed: the Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 537.

48. Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 31–32, 11; Collins to Duck, op cit.; Hunt, *Puritan Moment*, 96, 196; Shepard, *Autobiography*, in *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge*, ed. Michael McGiffert, Rev. ed. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 48. Shepard did not go to Coggeshall.

49. Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 81. Charged in March 1628 with teaching at Great Baddow without a license, Hooker had an attorney produce his license to teach grammar school in the consistory court in London. Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 42.

50. *Piscator* 10 {*Magnalia* 1:335}.

51. John Eliot to Richard Baxter, October 7, 1657, in F. J. Powicke, "Some Unpublished Correspondence of the Rev. Richard Baxter and the Rev. John Eliot, 'The Apostle to the American Indians,' 1656–1682," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 15 (1931): 138–76, 442–66, at 159–60. Despite their being constantly exhorted in sermons and tracts to replicate such a model of a spiritualized household in their own homes, few families actually achieved it. Fletcher, "Prescription and Practice," 332. See also Fletcher, *Growing Up in England: The Experience of Childhood 1600–1914* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

52. Williams, "Life of Hooker," 11.

precarious. The publication of Richard Montagu's *A New Gagg for the New Gospel* in 1624, followed by *Appello Caesarem* in 1625, had launched what Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke have called "a conscious propaganda effort the net effect of which was to reposition the English church on the ecclesiastical spectrum."[53] Mainstream "Calvinists," including the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, found themselves challenged by a group of "*avant-garde* conformists" under the inspiration of a group of court bishops led by Lancelot Andrewes (Bishop of Winchester from 1618 until his death in 1626), Richard Neile (Bishop of Durham from 1617 to 1632 and subsequently Archbishop of York), and William Laud (Bishop of London from 1628 to 1633 and then Archbishop of Canterbury). What became known as the "Laudian" program eventually included an "Arminian" theology of grace, baptismal regeneration, understanding the Eucharist as a sacrifice, repositioning communion tables as altars, bowing to the altar upon entering and leaving the sanctuary and at the name of Jesus during the liturgy, and reintroducing imagery into church buildings.[54]

Laud's more immediate impact on Hooker came after the conclusion of the 1629 Parliament. MPs had prevented the speaker from concluding the session by holding him in his chair, during which time Sir John Eliot pushed resolutions denouncing Arminianism and the continued collection of Tonnage and Poundage through the House of Commons. In reaction, the king dissolved Parliament. The existing policy of leniency toward nonconformist preachers, explains David Como, "presumably maintained in order to avoid alienating certain politically powerful members of the ruling elite, gave way to a much firmer regime of strict conformity." Royal instructions were issued requiring every lecturer to read the service from *The Book of Common Prayer* in his surplice and hood before beginning his lecture.[55] At the height of his career, Hooker was to be silenced.

---

53. Part of this effort involved censorship. In June 1626, Charles I issued a "proclamation for establishing of the Peace and Quiet of the Church of England," which forbad ministers from saying or writing "any new invention, or opinions concerning Religion, then such as are clearly grounded, and warranted by the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England." Suellen Mutchow Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 163, 188–89.

54. On the Laudian initiative, see Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 126–75. Nicholas Tyacke sees the York House Conference of 1626 as "the approximate point at which the circle of [Arminian or proto-Laudian] clerics patronized by bishop Neile of Durham emerged as the effective spokesmen of the English Church." *Anti-Calvinists*, 180. Further evidence is provided by Alexandra Walsham, "Vox Piscis: Or the Book-Fish: Providence and the Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline Cambridge," *English Historical Review* 114 (1999): 574–606.

55. Como, "Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London," 267–68; Towers, *Control of Religious Printing*, 212.

Once Hooker began to feel the pressure from the bishop's officers, his supporters upped the ante. Samuel Collins reported that "all men's eares are now filled with the obstreperous clamours of his [Hooker's] followers against my Lord [Bishop Laud] … as a man endeavouring to suppress good preaching and advance Popery." Recognizing that Hooker might be required to step down from the lectureship, his godly friends tried to provide some other means of support and promised him "maintenance … in plentifull manner for the fruition of his private conference." "All men's heads, tongues, eyes," continued Collins, "are in London, and all the counties about London taken up with plotting, talking and expecting what will be the conclusion of Mr Hooker's business."[56] Sometime after midsummer 1629, Hooker resigned the lectureship to devote his energies to itinerant preaching and running his school.

Even as a mere schoolmaster, however, Hooker remained a threat, and on July 10, 1630, an ecclesiastical court summoned him to appear before the Court of High Commission in London. This was his signal to leave the country. Placing his family under the protection of the Earl of Warwick, he departed for Holland early in 1631. In a farewell sermon to his distraught hearers, he asked them to compare him to the Apostle Paul as Paul left one of his mission churches:

> *Paul* must depart, and *Paul* must be imprisoned, and *Paul* must die; so that now he shall bee with you no longer to teach, to informe, to direct you, but the good Word of the Lord endures to comfort for ever, to cheere for ever, to assist, refresh for ever those that are weake and discouraged. I put you over therefore to a good Word, to an everlasting Word. … When the head of your Minister haply shall lie full low, or death overtake him, why yet remember that I have put you over to a Saviour.[57]

Once in the Netherlands, Hooker stayed in Rotterdam with Hugh Peter, another godly expatriate. Hooker had known Peter while Peter was a student at Cambridge; when Peter relocated to Essex before his decision to seek ordination, he had again sought Hooker out.[58] In conversations with

---

56. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, 368–69; PRO, State Papers, 142, 113; 144, 567.

57. SBU 129–30.

58. Hugh Peter, *A Dying Fathers Last Legacy to an Onely Child*, 98. Stearns, *Strenuous Puritan*, 19–21, 29. Once Hooker and John Cotton were in New England Samuel Hartlib thought that

Peter, Hooker consolidated his thinking about how the "true" church should be ordered. Did authority to appoint pastors and govern congregations stem from high officials (e.g., the king and his bishops as in the Church of England), from the sort of classes or presbyteries that governed the Dutch Reformed Church (made up of ordained and lay representatives from various congregations in a region), or from the individual congregations themselves (the essence of the position that would come to be known as Independency or Congregationalism)? Hooker had received an invitation from some members of the English Reformed Church at Amsterdam to serve as an assistant to the minister, John Paget, and he was awaiting a formal call.[59] Although it was a congregation of English-speaking expatriates, the Amsterdam English Reformed Church had joined itself to the Amsterdam Dutch Reformed Classis (the rough equivalent of a Scottish presbytery) and had agreed to be governed by its policies. Unfortunately for Hooker, Paget suspected that Hooker had already moved beyond presbyterian polity toward some form of congregationalism, and he persuaded Hooker to put his positions in writing. When Paget shared Hooker's positions with the Amsterdam classis, the classis not only overrode the congregation's unanimous recommendation to hire Hooker and but also denied the Elders the option of hiring him as a lecturer or assistant to Paget without formally calling him as a Pastor.[60]

Most of the congregation was furious, and Hooker was back on the job market with a bad taste in his mouth. The wishes of a congregation had been countermanded by a higher authority. In November 1631, he took a position as the associate of John Forbes at the English Merchant Adventurers' church at Delft, a church without any formal relationship to a Dutch Reformed classis. (Forbes had visited Joanna Drake before Hooker's arrival, and Hooker and Forbes had probably known one another in England.)[61]

Nathaniel Ward might be able to "stir up Hooker [and] Cotton to publish their Meditations [and] send all to H. Peters in Roterdam [who] can cause them to bee printed." *Hartlib Papers* 29/2/24B.

59. Probably at the encouragement of the congregation; Hugh Peter, William Ames, and John Forbes had previously sought this position, unsuccessfully in all cases. Stearns, *Strenuous Puritan*, 68.

60. Paget behaved similarly with John Davenport in 1634 and wrote a defense of his actions, *An Answer to the Unjust Complaints of William Best* (Amsterdam: Iohn Fredericksz Stam, 1634). See p. 69 for the decision of the Classis not to allow Hooker as an assistant or lecturer. Paget accused Hooker of "strengthning and animating [the more radical members of the congregation] against me" and suggested he would have preached "against that in the afternoone, which I had taught in the forenoone," 70.

61. *Trodden Down Strength*, 70–72.

Finally Hooker had an opportunity to lead worship as he wished. The two ministers set *The Book of Common Prayer* aside, using "no set forme at all no not in Baptising, nor in the celebration of the Lords Supper, nor in Mariage, but euery time speake as the Spirit enableth." Just as he had sworn to do in his discussions with Paget, Hooker refused to baptize children unless he could verify the faith of their parents.[62]

Although Mather reported that Hooker accepted a call to Rotterdam toward the end of his time in the Netherlands, there is no record of his having served there. Mather's claim that Hooker "spent the Residue of his Time in *Holland*" with William Ames is far more likely. Hugh Peter's Rotterdam church had called Ames as its second preacher on April 9, 1632, and even though Ames did not leave his position as Professor of Divinity at the University of Franaker until early 1633, Hooker, Ames, and Peter would have had ample opportunity to discuss congregational polity and similar topics. Ames's *Fresh Suit against Human Ceremonies* appeared in 1633 with an unsigned preface by Hooker.

Reading the preface, one can see that Hooker had decided to take off his gloves and go on the offensive against Laud and his allies. If the bishops claimed the authority "to appoynt Ceremonies at their pleasure," why then "let images be erected, let crosses & Crucifixes be sett up in every corner." "Thus is the foundation of superstition layd," he concluded, "the Gospell Stopped, and an open way made for Popery."[63] Any slim hope of a career in what was by then Archbishop Laud's Church of England would have vanished once his authorship of the preface became known.

Early in 1633, Hugh Peter took the audacious step of publicly remodeling his Rotterdam church along the lines that he, Ames, and Hooker had worked out.[64] Peter "gathered" the members of his church, presented them with a covenant that bound them to perform specified duties to God and to

---

62. Boswell Papers, Add. MSS. 6394, I, fol. 114, cited in Keith L. Sprunger, "The Dutch Career of Thomas Hooker," *New England Quarterly* 46 (1973): 17–44, at 41; Sprunger's article remains the best source for Hooker's experiences in the Netherlands, although Stearns, *Strenuous Puritan*, and Bremer, *Building a New Jerusalem: John Davenport, a Puritan in Three Worlds* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), also have valuable material on English congregations in the Low Countries. In Hartford, Hooker would continue to argue that only the children of faithful parents deserved baptism. He explicitly denied that the grandchildren of faithful Christians could be eligible for the sacrament if the immediate parents were unfaithful, thus repudiating the rationale behind the later "half-way covenant." SSCD 3:13–14.

63. Stearns, *Strenuous Puritan*, 75; PFS sig. I3ʳ. For "crosses & Crucifixes" in the early 1630s, see Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 227–73.

64. Francis Bremer reports that Sir William Boswell, England's ambassador to the Netherlands, informed the Privy Council that he believed Peter had drawn on the example of

each other, and excluded from the Lord's Supper anyone who refused to sign his covenant. Those who had accepted the covenant obligations then "called" Peter as their minister, and John Forbes—President of the unruly "English classis" in the Netherlands –re-ordained him (along with other ministers) in his new call.[65]

But even as Peter led his congregation down a strict congregational path, Hooker, less securely situated, had come to lose patience with Dutch Reformed Christianity and what he called its lack of "heart religion." "They content themselves with very Forms," he wrote to John Cotton, "but the Power of Godliness, for ought I can see or hear, they know not."[66] He was ready to return to England, but only in order to plan for his emigration to the New World. The previous December an organized group of those who had frequented his Chelmsford lecture, known to John Winthrop as "Mr Hooker's company," had already arrived in Massachusetts Bay.[67]

Once back in England, Hooker and those members of his "company" who had remained behind sought a second minister to serve as his co-pastor in the New World. After several unsuccessful efforts, they finally named a young preacher, Samuel Stone, to be "an *assistant* unto Mr. Hooker, with something of a disciple also."[68] Another Emmanuel graduate (B.A. 1624, M.A. 1627), Stone was born in Hertford on July 30, 1602, so he was sixteen years—almost a full generation—younger than Hooker. From 1627 to 1630 Stone had served as curate in Stisted, near Braintree and about twenty miles from Chelmsford. Pressure from Laud forced him to leave. With Thomas Shepard's help, he then took a position as lecturer in Towcester in Northamptonshire.[69]

---

a covenant drawn up by a "Mr. White" in England, almost surely John White of Dorchester. *John Davenport*, p. 133. On White's covenant, see Frances Rose-Troup, *John White, the Patriarch of Dorchester* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930), 219–31 and 419–21; and David Underdown, *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 91–92.

65. Stearns, *Strenuous Puritan*, 75–77. John Cotton's refusal to baptize his "Seaborn" son because he had not yet had a formal call from a gathered church is well-known; it is yet another indication that Cotton, Hooker, and Stone arrived in New England with well-developed ideas of "congregational" church order.

66. Hooker, Letter to John Cotton, c. April 1633, 177.

67. Thompson, *Mobility and Migration*, 187, 206; *The Journal of John Winthrop 1630–1649*, ed. Richard S. Dunn, James Savage, and Latitia Yeandle (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 79.

68. Mather, *Magnalia* 1:393.

69. Shepard, *Autobiography, God's Plot*, 48. At Emmanuel, Stone had encouraged Shepard to attend John Preston's sermons, which led Shepard to "set more constantly . . . upon the work of daily meditation," ibid. 41–42.

Along with John Cotton, Hooker and Stone took ship on the *Griffin* about July 10, 1633. The impression of the voyage never left Hooker's mind. Day after day he gazed out at a limitless expanse of water: "men who travel in the main Ocean; they see nothing but Water, and yet see neither Side nor Shore, Brim nor Bottom, and there is more Water to be seen."[70] The ship docked in Boston harbor on September 4. Hooker and Stone settled in Newtown (now Cambridge) and Hooker's "company," already gathered as a church, chose them "Pastor" and "Teacher" on October 11. Hooker then began a regular program of Thursday afternoon lectures, as did John Cotton at Boston. The next May 14 Hooker and Stone were formally made freemen.[71]

Within the first year of his arrival, Hooker and his company decided to move further west. Already by September 1634, a proposal from the Newtown settlers to migrate to Connecticut had reached the General Court. Hemmed in as it was by neighboring settlements, Newtown seemed too small to support farming on the level they envisioned; they yearned for the "fruitful" land along the Connecticut River.

But there was an additional consideration. An anonymous colonist reported to an English correspondent that "ther is great diuision of judgment in matter of religion amongst good ministers & people, which moued Mr Hoker to remoue." Specifically, the correspondent had heard that the churches of the colony were "so strict in admission of members … that more than one halfe are out of your church in all your congregations, & that Mr. Hoker before he went away preached against yt (as one report who hard hym) (& he saith) now although I knowe all must not be admitted, yet this may do much hurt, yf one come amongst you of another minde, & they should ioyne with hym."[72] Hooker disagreed with some congregations in Massachusetts Bay, in other words, about

---

70. CCLP, 489. The Vineyard fisherman Gale Huntington wrote in 1934 of the feeling of being "off shore, out of sight of land and on our own." "No matter how many times a man goes off shore, he always has that feeling, a little, I think, when the land drops from sight, of being on his own with only his shipmate or shipmates to depend on. And with that feeling comes a quickening of the blood, and a quickening of all the perceptions." "Dragging—1934," *The Dukes County Intelligencer* 54 (2012): 7–17, at 13.

71. Winthrop, *Journal*, 1:131; *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, ed. Nathaniel Shurtleff, 5 vols. (Boston: William White, 1853–4), 1:369. Had the members of "Mr. Hooker's company" already agreed to a covenant such as Hugh Peter imposed on his congregants? Records of the founding of what would become Hartford's First Church have unfortunately not survived.

72. Robert Stansby to John Wilson, April 17, 1637, *Winthrop Papers*, 3:389–90. The underlying motives for Hooker's removal remain in dispute. One influential school of interpretation, represented by Charles M. Andrews, believes that "we may dismiss … the religious

the criteria for church membership. Alongside political and economic disputes, this was an issue on which Connecticut and the Bay would remain at odds.

The main body of Newtown settlers set off on May 31, 1636; they arrived sometime in June at the spot the native tribes called Suckiaug, subsequently to be renamed "Hartford" after Stone's birthplace.[73] When he first set foot in Hartford, Hooker was nearly 50. Two years after the migration, he complained to John Winthrop that settlers in the Bay were disparaging Connecticut and discouraging people from going there; Winthrop retaliated by accusing those in Connecticut of plotting "by incouragements etc: to drawe Mr. Shepherd and his wholl Church from vs."[74] Many years later, Roger Williams recalled that Governor John Haynes of Connecticut had told him that "I am now under a Cloud and my bro. Hooker with the Bay (as you have bene). We have remooved from them thus farr and yet they are not satisfied etc."[75]

Once in Hartford, Hooker and Stone were free to use their own criteria to judge prospective church members. In another significant departure from the practice of Massachusetts Bay, where the franchise was limited to (male) church members, the ability to participate actively in local and colonial politics in Connecticut would not be tied to membership in a church. Hooker began a Wednesday afternoon lectureship during which he "re-preached" many of the sermons he had given at Chelmsford. He prepared some of these sermons for publication as *The Application of Redemption, By the effectual Work of the word, and Spirit of Christ, for the bringing home of lost Sinners to God*, allowing scholars to compare the printed texts with those of the similar English sermons. Because one of his Hartford hearers, Henry Wolcott, Jr. of nearby Windsor, took shorthand notes, it is even possible to determine the precise date at which Hooker preached many of the sermons in *The Application of*

---

motive as playing any important part in leading the Hooker company to migrate from Massachusetts to the Connecticut valley." "On Some Early Aspects of Connecticut History," *New England Quarterly* 17 (1944): 3–24, at 9. Edmund Morgan accepted these arguments, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966), 175–76.

73. Hertford, a town about twenty miles from London, was spelled "Hart Forde" in the 1559 Elizabethan charter, Collingwood, *Thomas Hooker*, 334.

74. *Winthrop Papers*, 4:75–84, 99–100; Winthrop's accusation was accurate; in a letter to Shepherd on November 1640, Hooker repeats a plea that his son-in-law relocate to what is now Middletown; see Hooker, Letter to Shepherd, Nov. 2, 1640. One is struck by the thinly veiled hostility in Hooker's December 1638 letter.

75. Roger Williams to Major John Mason and Governor Thomas Prince, June 22, 1670, *The Correspondence of Roger Williams*, ed. Glenn W. LaFantasie, 2 vols. (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1988), 616. For tension between Hooker and Winthrop, see Hall, *A Reforming People*.

Redemption.[76] Hooker's leadership was readily acknowledged by the neighboring churches along the Connecticut River. When he published his voluminous treatise on congregational polity, *The Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline*, he represented it as "the joint judgment of all the Elders upon the river."[77]

During his time in Connecticut (and quite probably well before) Hooker became notorious for his "Cholerick Disposition." In his short biography of Hooker, Cotton Mather apparently felt obliged to include an apology for it. Henry Whitfield of Guilford, wrote Mather,

> having exactly Noted Mr. *Hooker*, made this Remark, and gave this Report, more particularly of him, *That he had the best Command of his own Spirit, which he ever saw in any man whatever*. For though he were a man of a Cholerick Disposition, and had a mighty Vigour and Fervour of Spirit, which as Occasion served, was wondrous useful to him, yet he had ordinarily as much Government of his Choler, as a man has of a *Mastiff Dog* in a Chain; *He could Let out his Dog, and pull in his Dog, as he pleased*.[78]

In other words, Whitfield thought Hooker had both an angry disposition and the discipline to control it. The same will-power that he would prescribe to his godly followers enabled him to turn his anger into an evangelical weapon, holding it in or allowing it to flare up as he judged advantageous.

Mather recounts another incident, however, which suggests that Hooker may not always have succeeded in disciplining his anger. Having learned of an act of vandalism, Hooker confronted "an Unlucky Boy, that often had his Name up, for the doing of such Mischiefs." Even after the boy denied being the perpetrator, Hooker continued to berate him "in an angry manner." It was only later, when he had regained his temper (and perhaps had discovered the actual guilty party), that Hooker apologized to the unfortunate young man. "Indeed I was in a Passion, when I spake to you before," Mather reports him as having said, "it was my Sin, and it is my Shame, and I am truly sorry for it: and I hope to God I shall be more Watchful hereafter." Mather found the apology praiseworthy, but his account suggests that Hooker's fellow colonists

---

76. Wolcott Shorthand Notebook. The Hartford lectures published as *A Comment upon Christ's last Prayer In the seventeenth of John* do not appear to have an English counterpart.

77. SSCD sig. b2ʳ.

78. *Piscator Evangelicus* 30 {*Magnalia* 1:345}.

had reason to be wary of a temper that could suddenly get out of his control. Once he had regained that control, on the other hand, Hooker was not too proud to apologize to a social inferior.[79]

We have still another contemporary account of Hooker's temper from the Dutch sea captain Peter De Vries. From June 9 to 16, 1639, De Vries visited the fort which the Dutch continued to maintain at Hartford. During the visit, the merchant owner of an English ship carrying a cargo of "thirty pipes of Canary wine" invited Hooker's servant, whom he had known in England, on board. Not surprisingly, the servant had too much to drink. As a consequence, he was brought to the whipping post by the church to be punished for his drunkenness. Upset by the cruelty of the punishment, De Vries tried to intervene. He persuaded the Dutch commander to invite Hooker, other leading citizens, and their wives to a feast of cherries at the fort. During the meal, both De Vries and the ship's owner entreated Hooker to pardon the man. De Vries was struck that it was only after a long discussion—and the pleading of the Hartford wives—that an angry Hooker could be induced to relent.[80]

Scholars have not agreed on what to make of Hooker's anger. Janice Knight is inclined to attribute it to resentment about his not receiving preferment in the Church of England, but this is unlikely to be a satisfactory explanation. Right from the time he left Cambridge to take up a position in the Drake household, the available evidence suggests that he quite deliberately assumed an outsider's role. By choosing the path of nonconformity, Hooker knew full well that he was foregoing any realistic chance of advancement. Knight also contrasts John Cotton's "feminized piety" to Hooker's "masculine" depiction of sinners undergoing conversion, but Amanda Porterfield, to the contrary, argues that Hooker "struggled to control a violent temper and used images of female humility to represent that control."[81]

Might his experience of God's wrath have intensified an inherently angry temperament? One can only speculate. On the evidence of Hooker's published sermons, one can more certainly conclude that Hooker was generally able not only to master his "mighty Vigour and Fervour of Spirit" but also to employ it effectively in his preaching.

As had Hooker, Samuel Stone also came under the powerful influence of Alexander Richardson while at Cambridge. He subsequently studied with

---

79. *Piscator Evangelicus* 31 {*Magnalia* 1:345}.

80. Peter De Vries, *Voyages from Holland to America, A.D. 1632 to 1644*, trans. Henry C. Murphy (New York: Kraus Reprint, 1971), 126–27.

81. Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*, 22; Porterfield, *Female Piety*, 40.

Richard Blackerby, who ran another legendary household seminary nearby. Blackerby had settled at Ashdon on the Essex-Suffolk border in 1609, and he preached in the neighboring towns of Castle Hedingham, Stoke, and Hundon for the next twenty years. Blackerby also presided over a ministerial conference that was very likely the forerunner of the one Hooker led in Chelmsford.[82] As part of preparing recent graduates for the ministry, Blackerby was known for teaching them the Hebrew language, a skill Stone put to use in his preaching and writing.

In his role as "Teacher" of the Hartford congregation, Stone was expected to handle "Points of *Divinity*" and to employ "a more *Doctrinal* way of Preaching." Scholars can follow Stone's lectures in Wolcott's shorthand notes; the notes reveal that Stone preached week by week on the substance of his monumental *Whole Body of Divinity*.[83]

Hooker died on July 7, 1647; Stone succeeded him as primary minister of the Hartford Church and endured a series of difficulties with the congregation until his own death sixteen years later.[84] If he is remembered at all, it is for the comment recorded by Cotton Mather that compared the relationship between church elders and ordinary church members in congregational churches to "an Aristocracy, acting in the face or presence of a Silent

---

82. Hunt, *Puritan Moment*, 111.

83. See George Selement, "Publication and the Puritan Minister," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 37 (1980): 219–41, for an argument that whenever practicable, ministers in early New England preached what they later published. Hooker had advised all young ministers to "preach over the whole *body of divinity* methodically" in what Mather termed "the Amesian method," but Mather knew well that the (by 1702) better-known Ames had in fact learned his "method" from Richardson. *Magnalia* 1:346–47 (these comments about Hooker's advice do not appear in the 1695 *Piscator Evangelicus*). Mather recognized that Stone's *Whole Body* was constructed in "a *Richardsonian* Method." *Magnalia* 3:118. Stone served as Chaplain on the Pequot expedition, see John Mason, *A brief history of the Pequot War: especially the memorable taking of their fort at Mistick in Connecticut in 1637: Written by Major John Mason* (Boston, 1736). He may have shared Hooker's low opinion of "these poor Indians, amongst whom we live … the very ruines and rubbish of mankind, the forlorn Posterity of *Adam*." AR 7:318. Peter Thuesen's otherwise reliable *Predestination* (p. 52) repeats the oft-repeated but incorrect assertion that Samuel Willard's *Compleat Body of Divinity* "was the first truly systematic theology produced in America." In fact Willard had himself copied Stone's entire *Whole Body* in longhand in preparation for his own treatise.

84. For those difficulties, which began with Stone's insistence that as senior minister he deserved a veto over the hiring of his associate and ultimately stemmed from differences between Stone and the congregation's Ruling Elder, William Goodwin, see "Papers Relating to the Controversy in the Church at Hartford, 1656–59, *Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society* 2 (1870): 51–125; Walker, *History of the First Church in Hartford*, 151–76; and Paul Lucas, *Valley of Discord: Church and Society along the Connecticut River, 1636–1725* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1976), esp. chapter 2.

Democrasye."[85] Harvard graduates, among them John Cotton, Jr., occasionally studied with Stone while waiting for a call. Part of their "homework" was to copy the *Whole Body* in longhand.[86] At the turn of the twenty-first century, the Hartford city fathers and mothers decided to honor Stone and their connection to his birthplace by commissioning a statue by the English sculptor Henry Tebbutt.[87] Stone's figure, its features like those on the Hooker statue a product of the artist's imagination, stands over the churchyard where both he and Hooker lie buried.

New evidence may yet surface to fill out details of the lives of Hooker and Stone, but the reader is now well-prepared to turn to the godly community sustained by Hooker's preaching in the town of Chelmsford.[88]

---

85. WB 330, recalled in slightly different form by Mather, *Magnalia* 1:437. Hooker said similarly that "The Government of the Church, in regard of the Body of the people is *Democraticall*: in regard of the Elders *Aristocraticall*; in regard of Christ, truely *Monarchicall*." SSCD 1:206.

86. Sections of two of these copies survive in the collections of the Connecticut Historical Society; they can be used to expand and correct Samuel Willard's complete copy in the Massachusetts Historical Society. Willard used the *Whole Body* in his own work, e.g., *Covenant-Keeping, the Way to Blessedness* (Boston: James Glen, 1682), 36. David Hall, "Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century New England: An Introduction and a Checklist," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 115 (2006): 29–80, at 67, states that Harvard students often copied the *Whole Body*, but he is not aware of other surviving copies. Nathaniel Mather wrote to his father Increase in 1681 that "Mr Bellingham" [possibly Richard's son Samuel, who presumably had carried a manuscript copy of the *Whole Body* with him to England to be published] was "so drowned in Melancholy … that Mr Stone's body of Divinity is like to bee utterly lost with him." *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 4th Ser., 8 (1868): 32–33. In a 1677 letter, John Cotton, Jr., urged Increase to encourage his son Cotton to study "the Logicall & Theologicall notions of Mr. Stone, which I tooke in writing from him," ibid. 240.

87. An identical companion statue, cast from the same mold, stands in the Castle Hall grounds in Hertford, England. See Vivienne Smith, "Hartford's Founding Father," *Hertfordshipe Countryside* (Jan. 2000): 30–31.

88. Moses Coit Tyler, *History of American Literature, 1607–1765* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1949), 169, explains that when the parish house of the [First] Hartford Church was torn down in 1830, uninformed workmen dumped large quantities of Hooker's manuscripts into the Connecticut River. As recently as 1974, Sargent Bush, Jr. positively attributed to Hooker four books of English sermons whose authorship had previously been unknown. In the letter he wrote to Thomas Shepard on June 19, 1647, conveying news of Hooker's death, Stone reports that he is working on an "answer to Dr. Crispe." Stone, Letter to Thomas Shepard, June 19, 1647, 546. This was presumably the manuscript against the antinomians which Cotton Mather in the *Magnalia* reports as already having been lost by the end of the seventeenth century. It is hoped that this manuscript might yet come to light.

3

The "Reformation of Manners" in Chelmsford

Therefore let us lie in wait for the righteous; because he is not for our turn, and he is clean contrary to our doings: he upbraideth us with our offending the law, and objecteth to our infamy the transgressings of our education. He professeth to have the knowledge of God: and he calleth himself the child of the Lord. He was made to reprove our thoughts. He is grievous unto us even to behold: for his life is not like other men's, his ways are of another fashion. We are esteemed of him as counterfeits: he abstaineth from our ways as from filthiness: he pronounceth the end of the just to be blessed, and maketh his boast that God is his father. (Wisdom 2:12–16)

COTTON MATHER TELLS us that during Thomas Hooker's long tenure at Emmanuel College, he became notorious for the "Reformation" of some "Growing Abuses" among the students. Once settled in Chelmsford, Hooker turned his attention to the behavior of the townspeople. Sabbath drinkers were forced off the public streets, and those who attended Hooker's lectures were regularly reminded of God's displeasure toward anyone who ignored the divine will. Through those lectures, reports Mather, "there was a great Reformation wrought, not only in the *Town*, but in all the Adjacent *Countrey*." A twenty-first-century reader, studying the printed versions of the same lectures, will be struck by how often Hooker encountered people whom he considered "wicked" and by how thoroughly he detested them. Their "sinnes are written with a pen of Iron," he railed, "and are seen in every corner of the street." "Our townes swarme with such wretches"; "our villages [are] pestered with such ungracious miscreants."[1]

---

1. *Piscator Evangelicus* 8 {*Magnalia* 1:335}. SP 8; UP* 75–76. For pre-Hooker Chelmsford, see Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 2:39.

Interpreters have generally directed their attention to Hooker's understanding of individual conversions, neglecting his preoccupation with social reformation. But in classical Reformed theology—which Hooker took for granted as "orthodox" doctrine—conscientious discipline was a mark of the true church, ranked alongside the preaching of the word and the celebration of the sacraments.[2] It was Hooker's preoccupation with immoral activity that contemporaries in both Cambridge and Chelmsford found to be one of his most distinguishing marks. In this respect, he reveals himself as a fairly typical representative of the godly preachers of early Stuart England. Much as he wished to change the hearts of his hearers, he was also determined to reform their behavior.

What were the sins that he found particularly detestable? The catalog varied, but drunkenness, adultery (which for him and his contemporaries was broadly understood to include sexual intercourse outside of marriage), and unjust business dealings generally headed the list.[3] God "will set all your sinnes in order before you," he warned, "if not here for your humiliation, yet hereafter for your everlasting confusion, the drunkard shall then see all his pot companions, and the adulterer his mates, and the unjust person all his trickes." Or in another sermon, "is it good now to be drunk? is it good now to commit adultery? is it good now to blaspheme? is it good now to contemne Gods ordinances? would you now rayle on Gods Saints, and despise Gods truth, & prophane Gods Sabbaths?" His depiction of "a world of prophane persons, that are car[r]ied on with the pursuit of sin, from which they will not be plucked" included the usual suspects: "the drunkard will have his cups, and the adulterer his queanes, and the chapman his false weights." "The Minister of God cometh to pluck away a mans corruptions, to pluck away the world from the covetous, the strumpet from the adulterer, the cup

2. As important as discipline was for John Calvin, he did not make it one of the "marks" (*notae*) of the true church. Later Reformed theologians added it; the 1560 Scots Confession and the 1561 *Confessio Belgica* both make it a third mark. *The Confessioun of Faith professit and belevit be the Protestantes within the Realme of Scotland*, in *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche* (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1938), Cap. 18, 102: "ecclesiasticall disiplyne, uprychtlie ministrid, as goddis worde prescribeth, quhairby vice is repressed and vertew nurissed" and *Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Christiana atque Orthodoxa Confessio*, in ibid., art. xxix, 131: "*disciplina Ecclesiastica, ut vitia corrigantur.*" See Ford Lewis Battles's comments in his translation of Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 2:1023.

3. Perkins identified "the common crying sinnes of this land" as "swearing, cursing, oppression, sa[b]bath-breaking, drunkennesse, whooredome, and all vncleanesse." *A Godly and Learned Exposition … upon the three first chapters of the Revelation*, Works 3:*287.

from the drunkard, sensuall delights from the voluptuous." "Oh wash your hearts you adulterous and wash your hearts you drunkards, and you covetous wretches."[4]

Age did not soften his rhetoric. Once in New England, he fumed that Satan "framed" the hearts of wicked worldly people, and he looked forward to the time when Christ would pass final sentence on their wickedness. On the dreadful day of judgment, Christ would say to "those who have been enemies to my Grace, Gospel, Children, Glory, bring them hither, and slay them before my Face."[5]

Contrary to modern stereotypes, sexual offences do not always appear in his lists of egregious sins. Preaching to John Rogers's congregation in Dedham, Hooker focused his efforts on drunkenness, covetousness, and indifference to the Gospel: "A *Dedham* drunkard, or hypocrite, carelesse carnall Gospeller, or covetous one; the devils will rejoyce for him, when he comes to hell." "You will not yet forsake your sinnes, and abandon your corruptions?" he thundered at his hearers. "Will you still be drunk and riotous? will you still be proud? will you still sweare and curse and blaspheme? if you will part with these sinnes, and take mercy in stead of these, why yet there is hope." He congratulated a recent convert on having "forsaken thy god pride, and thy god covetousnesse, and thy god drunkennesse."[6]

Hooker's unceasing attacks on "covetousness" took him beyond the social norms of Chelmsford. In his mind, doing business on the Sabbath or lending money at interest were just as worthy of condemnation as habitual drunkenness or adultery. "Covetousness bids sell on the Lords day." "Art thou loth to heare it is unlawfull to sell on the Lords day, or to put thy money to usury?" Because he had seen its effects on the poor hearers to whom he had preached in London, "usury" earned his particular ire. Sounding like a seventeenth-century Charles Dickens, he painted a picture of usurers who would "grate upon men, and grinde the faces of the poore; and sucke the blood of the needy, they will exact upon men and take use upon use, they will

---

4. SP 50; UP *55; SP 257; SDD 229; SPos 80. Sometimes wicked behavior led to imprisonment. The archives of the Chelmsford house of correction in the first decades of the seventeenth century record prisoners being jailed for their lewd, vagrant, or disorderly life, for drunkenness, for absconding from their masters, for abandoning their wives and children, for profaning the Sabbath, and for begging. Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 2:9.

5. CCLP 411, 333.

6. FC 38; UP *59; see also SP 80; SEC 83. Alec Ryrie suggests that "carnal gospeller" might in some instances have been a code word for the illiterate, who "were largely excluded from self-consciously Protestant culture." *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 473–74.

not be contented to take the principall, but they will have consideration for all the time, until they have sucked the blood of a poore man that is under such a muckworme."[7]

Some hearers, recognizing how thoroughly English men and women had embedded drinking and swearing into their ordinary way of life, found Hooker's condemnations unrealistically exact. To one such hearer, who thought that a minister should "deal kindly with drunkennesse and adultery and malice," Hooker responded mockingly that the hearer was asking that the minister "not kill drunkennesse, but only take him prisoner, keep him in, reforme the outward face of drunkennesse, that we may not be drunken in the open streets, but in a corner, and so that men may not sweare at every turne, but when they come among gentlemen, that they doe it cunningly."

Hooker scarcely tried to veil his anger at the ungodly in his congregation: "All you drunken unbeleeving wretches, all you stubborne, prophane, malicious creatures ... there is no medling for you with the consolation and redemption that is in the Lord Jesus Christ." No one could fail to see the difference between the saints and notorious sinners. "You see how the godly are, and how the wicked behave themselves. The wife railes, and the husband ... if anything fall crosse, makes the wife and child pay for it ... these are the plague-sores of our townes."

Like most other godly preachers, he found many opportunities to remind wicked people of what lay in store for them after death. "Profane ones, who profess themselves to be Scorners and Opposers of grace ... wil have their portion ... in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." Godly people sought assurance that grace had transformed their hearts and disposed them to obey God's rule; the hearts of the wicked had been "framed" by Satan, whose "Seed of rebellion" had corrupted their dispositions. Every so often, Hooker let his notorious temper flare out: "I say thou hast an evill and unfaithfull heart, and thou art a dead man, and a miserable man, and thou art gone from the Lord God, the God of all happinesse, and therefore thou art but a damned man."[8]

Not surprisingly, the "wicked" responded in kind. "Adulterers" and "drunkards" would mutter that "it was well with the towne before the minister came

7. CTCL 38, 54; see also 44; FC 37; SP 85. Perkins had condemned usurers to hell, *Works* 3:94; see also 46, 176, 199, 218, 3:*465, 471. For some "worldly" defenses of covetousness, see Haigh, *Plain Mans Pathways*, 151; and for the overall context, Mark Valeri, *Heavenly Merchandize: How Religion Shaped Commerce in Puritan America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), esp. 21 and 31–32.

8. SP 79; SBU 82; PP 177; CCLP 95; CCLP 411; SEC 350.

there." Opponents might threaten to drag a preacher from his pulpit: "when Gods word doth meete with mens hearts, and lusts, they are mad; and if it were not for shame, and feare; they would pull a man from the Pulpit."[9] Hooker's "fellow brethren" were "railed on and disgraced"; "base wretches" would "condemne and despise God's children"; the godly endured "taunts and scoffs" from "scorners and mockers."[10]

"If a man begin to reforme his life," said Hooker, his neighbors "bend themselves all against him." Hostile townspeople "despised the word, and scorned the Minister, and mocked those whom conscience vexed." "These men exclaime against the nicenesse and precisenesse of Christians, and blame those that are holy and sincere … these profane ones, desperate, unreasonable creatures, that cast off Gods commands, that neglect the Ordinances, and wallow in the mire of their sins, that hate the sinceritie and power of Religion, that envie and malign the true professors of godliness." "You that are the Saints of God doe not wonder though you bee despised and hated by these wicked worldlings."

The unframed hearts of ungodly people could not help but resent godly behavior: "their hearts are transported with infinite indignation against the appearance of grace in the lives, and against the appearance of holinesse, in the courses of those which are the servants of the Lord"; they "hate poore Christians for the holinesse and grace which they have received from Christ."[11]

But it surely did not contribute to neighborly good will when Hooker insisted that the godly openly confront fellow townspeople about their sinfulness. He demanded that the saints in Chelmsford reprove errant brothers, seek out sin, and correct sinners. "All the sins of those drunkards and swearers are thine," he insisted, "if thou reprove them not." A hearer in doubt of the validity of her conversion could take comfort if she could honestly conclude that she "observes, and hates, and loathes, and discovers, and pursues all manner of traitorous devices and rebellious dispositions in others against the Lord Jesus Christ." "So farre as God hath put authority and opportunity into his hands," a godly hearer who could "see sin in others" was obliged to pursue it

---

9. SP 176; SH 193. Unpopular preachers were apparently fair game in Chelmsford; in November 1641 the tables were turned when a (presumably godly) crowd was reported to have attempted to rip the surplice off the rector, John Michaelson's back, John Walter, "Popular Iconoclasm and the Politics of the Parish in Eastern England, 1640–1642," *Historical Journal* 57 (2004): 261–90, at 274. Christopher Haigh, "The Character of an Antipuritan," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35 (2004): 671–88, at 684, argues for the widespread existence of "real people who branded the godly as 'puritans.'"

10. PHH 39; TCL 300; UP* 84, 92.

11. PP 224; UP* 58–59; SDD 179; SPos 123; SEC 270 = SImp 213.

"with deadly indignation."[12] In Hartford, Hooker insisted that if a godly person "sees any go out of the way … he cannot keep from counseling, reproving, perswading." He told of a recently converted servant who, because he could not "endure to see sin thrive," would "quicken" his colleagues if he saw them "lazy and idle," would "seasonably advise and pursue them with reproofs" if they proved "stubborn and perverse," and who would "make his complaints to the Governor for redress" if "his counsels [could] not take place."[13]

So we should not be surprised that those being reproved seldom took godly interference kindly. In a seventeenth-century version of "mind your own business," they would often "flye out and say, What is that to you? Every tub must stand upon his owne bottome, and if I sinne I must answer for it." Even in Hartford, Hooker found that if he tried to "cross them in their courses," he had "stirred a hornets nest."[14]

Opposition to the godly message seemed to coalesce in alehouses, where in Hooker's opinion "Alehouse-keepers, and Alehouse-haunters" lived "like a swine." "There are many," preached Hooker, "that sit upon the ale-bench, and sweare, and drinke, and raile against Gods servants." "When thou wast upon thy Ale-bench," Hooker accused one of his detractors, "there thou didst speake against holinesse and purity." God would call such a person to account "for all thy speeches against the people of God, upon thy ale-bench when thou diddest toss them to and fro." If Hooker believed he had touched the conscience of a hearer, he was infuriated when the person's drinking companions, with "drunkenness on the one side, and merriness on another, tooke away all the amazement whereby the soule might have beene wrought upon." "The ale-house is the bush," he fumed, "that harbors those ravenous beasts." If anyone backslid from a "Christian course," Hooker knew where to find him. "Hee flyes of from God, & fals from a Christian course, and goes to the Ale-house." He encouraged his hearers to imagine Christ (working presumably through Hooker's own ministrations), as he "followes poore sinners from Alehouse to Alehouse."[15]

---

12. CTCL 84–85; PP 353; SP 252; see also CTCL 77, SJ 244. Leviticus 19:18 decreed that unless one reproved her neighbor's sin, she would bring guilt upon herself. Although Alec Ryrie helpfully reminds us that English people recognized "an accepted—although not unlimited—right for superiors to correct their inferiors' sins: parents rebuked their children, husbands their wives, ministers their congregations" (*Being Protestant*, 399), Hooker is plainly pushing the godly beyond this norm.

13. AR 10:688–90, see also 684.

14. SP 251–52; AR 10:691.

15. CTCL 67–68; SP 191; SP 21, 42; SP 97–98; SH 123; UP* 38, cf. 10.

No one living near an American college campus will be surprised to learn that excessive and often rowdy drinking was a particular vice of the young in early modern Chelmsford. Apprentices and servants gathering with their friends in inns or alehouses supported a flourishing alehouse culture where "tipplers" could while away hours at the gambling table. "The cards and dice can bee sate at many houres," said Hooker, often accompanied by "railing and cursing, because the Dice fall crosse."[16]

In theory, anyone who drank in alehouses on Sundays during service time could be called to make an embarrassing public confession in church, draped in a special penitential sheet. In practice, few offenders were ever apprehended. Despite the disdain of respectable citizens, the number of alehouses continued to multiply. In 1620 the beerbrewer William Neale, who would be expected to know, told the Quarter sessions that he could name forty unlicensed alehouses in Chelmsford and the neighboring village of Moulsham. This meant that if most of the eighteen licensed inns and twenty licensed alehouses recognized by the 1602 manor court were still in business, anyone searching for a drink would have had up to eighty locations from which to choose. Two years earlier, the Essex Grand Jury had urged the suppression of the "multiplicity" of alehouses throughout the county, describing them as the "receivers of thieves, drunkards, and lewd persons; the puddles and sinks of all drunkenness and beastliness; the starving of poor women and children by their husbands, wasting that which otherwise would relieve them; the great overthrow and spoil of youths, and the very bane of the commonwealth."[17] Despite its harshness, then, Hooker's condemnation of notorious sins would not have shocked most inhabitants of Chelmsford. Nor would the themes of his preaching surprise historians of early modern Britain, who have discovered similar godly lecturing in many parts of the country.

Those same historians have often been inclined to read such diatribes as thinly veiled class antagonism. Whatever his intentions, the godly preacher was functioning as a spokesman for the disdain of the nascent middle class

---

16. CTCL 81. Arnold Hunt opines that the "focus of … tension between preaching and neighborliness was … the alehouse." *Art of Hearing*, 249. Paul Griffiths explains that "the alehouse had a prominent place in the social life of the young, providing a focal point for the assignations and intrigues of courtship, and opportunities to further social bonding among young men in particular," *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England 1560–1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 201, see also 202–8.

17. Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 2:22, 1:133. For town authorities' attitudes toward alehouses in another East Anglian market town, Bury St. Edmunds, see Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemics*, 129–30.

toward the alehouse culture of the poor.[18] Certainly those most attracted to the conviviality of the alehouse—as opposed to the more upscale taverns and inns—were often servants and laborers who sought not only merriment and cheap ale but also temporary refuge from the oversight of a domineering master or parent.[19]

Hooker knew that the alehouse created strong social bonds that a frequent drinker would find difficult to break. "The drunkard saith, I will not forsake my companions." When exactness interfered with neighborliness, Hooker invariably came down on the side of exactness, but he seems to have recognized that local officials could be caught in the middle:

> for Officers, if there be an Alehouse comes to be indited, when it comes to a dead lift, he will lift, and say, it is pitty you keepe such ill orders in your house, I would it were not so; mee thinkes it should be otherwise, that you should not doe so, living under such meanes, therefore I wish you would amend, &c. he gives them warning, and let them looke better to it hereafter; he wisheth them well, &c. but he sees, if he should crosse the drunkard and blasphemer, oh then the Crosse would come; the drunkard would forsake his shop, and he should lose custome: upon this consideration, he flings off all duty, rather then have a Crosse.[20]

Wittingly or unwittingly, godly preachers like Hooker were participants in what historians of early modern England have called a "Reformation of manners." Throughout the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, in towns and villages all across England, the "better sort" encouraged church wardens and magistrates to clamp down on abuse of alcohol, sexual promiscuity, and general rowdiness, especially among the young. Godly preaching reinforced these efforts. Misbehavior was offensive to God as

---

18. E.g., Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580–1680* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1982), 167–70.

19. Social historians remind us that 40–50 percent of the population was under 21; see E. A. Wrigley and R. S. Schofield, *The Population History of England 1541–1871* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 528, cited in Alexandra Walsham, "The Reformation of the Generations: Youth, Age, and Religious Change in England, c. 1500–1700," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 21 (2011): 93–121, at 96. Walsham argues (p. 110) that "in its second generation, Protestantism became a mechanism for enforcing patriarchal authority and repressing a vigorous adolescent subculture that fiercely resented the interference of parents and other 'busy controllers' in its activities."

20. SEC 342; CTCL 77.

well as to the social good. In the public mind, the campaign for reform of moral behavior became associated with the godly, who were derided as "busy controllers" and "pickthankly knaves." Faced with disruption created by rapid population growth and socioeconomic polarization, people called for better discipline and supported godly preaching to encourage it. Godly preachers like Hooker may have been widely resented for their zeal in clamping down on sin, but the program of bringing drinking, fornication, and youthful rowdiness under control enjoyed broad support.[21] As Hooker eagerly pursued sinners, his opponents recognized in him the archetypal "busy controller."

But if the goals of preachers like Hooker often appeared similar to those of the "Reformation of manners," they were never identical. It would be a gross oversimplification to identify the godly with the respectable burghers and the "wicked" with the poor. For one thing, Hooker's sermons take for granted that the godly will be scorned just as heartily by respectable people

---

21. E.g., SJ 244. A "pickthankly knave" was a sycophant. John Craig finds a "powerful consensus … for order and obedience" shared by the "middling sort" in the East Anglian market towns he studied (*Reformation, Politics and Polemics*, 180). The scholarship on "reformation of manners" is immense. There is a useful summary in Alexandra Walsham, "The Godly and Popular Culture," in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 277–93, at 279–82. I draw here on Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Paperbacks, 1995), including "Postscript: Terling Revisited"; William Hunt, *The Puritan Moment*, esp. 79–80, 128–29, and 142–43; Paul Griffiths, *Youth and Authority*, esp. 176–234; Marjorie Keniston McIntosh, *Controlling Misbehavior in England, 1370–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), who argues that something like "reformation of manners" had characterized English society long before the late sixteenth century; Paul Slack, "Poverty and Social Regulation in Elizabethan England," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Christopher Haigh (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985), 221–41, 260–61, 285–88; Martin Ingram, "Reformation of Manners in Early Modern England," in *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, ed. Paul Griffiths et al. (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996), 47–88; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, "Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700," in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 1–31; 26–267; 276–79; Patrick Collinson, "Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture," in *The Culture of English Puritanism*, 32–57; 267–68; 280–88; Peter Lake, "Defining Puritanism—Again?" in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society,1993), 3–29; Lake with Questier, *Antichrist's Lewd Hat*; Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49:4 (Oct. 1998): 620–51; Walsham, " 'Out of the Mouths of Babes and Sucklings': Prophecy, Puritanism, and Childhood in Elizabethan Suffolk," in *The Church and Childhood*, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994), 285–99. Tom Webster provides a useful summary of the relationship between puritans and the reformation of manners in his essay "Early Stuart Puritanism," in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 48–66, at 54.

as by the "wicked."[22] "The world," Hooker confided, "thinkes [the godly] silly simplicians, poore peasants, it is not a Gentlemans spirit." Later in the same series of sermons he spoke of "poore Christians" that "dwell in a smoaky cottage, and goe in a leather coat" or "weare a leatherne pelt." Would respectable people choose to associate "with a company of leather coate Christians, and to walke by such a strict rule?" Cotton Mather reported that after leaving Francis Drake's employ, Hooker "chose to be where great numbers of *the Poor* might Receive the *Gospel* from him," and the texts of some sermons clearly assume that many poor people were among his hearers. "Poore Christians … are accounted the off-scouring of the world."

Even in New England, Hooker presumed that some godly people would be poor. "Be ready to entertain the saints," he urged at his Hartford lecture, "though happily they dwel in a smoaky cottage, have course fare, be in a mean condition." Although "of mean Place and Parts, shallow Compass and Conceivings, poor, and feeble Abilities," they might still legitimately be "comforted, assured, perswaded of the Love of the Father."[23]

New converts were told to expect their neighbors to "grow strange, and looke afarre off." Hooker's frequent condemnation of avarice and "cozening" was typically directed toward men of business, as, for example, the "rich man" who prided himself on keeping his word but "oppresses and grindes the face of the poore" and looked out only for his "gaine." More often than not, "cozening" took advantage of poor people. Hooker imagined a rich man at the day of judgment having to admit, "Lord, I have cozened so many poore." If a wealthy man's shilling were "plucked out of the mouth of the poore," he ought to expect "wrath with it." Hooker's "particular application" could make such a man wriggle uncomfortably in his pew, as in this example:

> If there be any that I have cozened by my false weights, and false pretences, if I have wronged any man, not of four pounds, but of forty,

---

22. Alexandra Walsham argues that "a sense of being despised and hated by the impious and unregenerate was a vital element in Puritan identity. … Puritans, it may be said, deliberately courted and cultivated their own unpopularity. … the very conviction of being a persecuted remnant, separated from the mass of society by the ineluctable logic of the doctrine of double predestination, could ironically be immensely appealing and empowering." "The Godly and Popular Culture," 290.

23. CTCL 32; CTCL 67; SEC 330; CTCL 30–31, 299; SBU 87; SEC 429. Mather, *Piscator* 7 {*Magnalia* 1:334}; PP 225; CCLP, 118, 429, see also AR 4:235. Phillis Cunnington and Catherine Lucas describe butchers, masons, blacksmiths, coppersmiths, farriers, brewers, cobblers, coopers, woodworkers, tanners, and men working in the slaughterhouse as conventionally wearing leather aprons, *Occupational Costume in England from the Eleventh Century to 1914* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1967), 94–95, 101–4,

a hundred pounds; not some man, but any man, I will restore, &c. Beloved, this is a duty which God requires of every soule; and this is a way whereby thou mayest get some comfort to thy selfe, if thou art content to renounce thy sinnes, and receive mercy in the pardon of them. If therefore any here present shall goe away and hide his *stollen waters*, and bee loth to restore that which hee hath gotten by his cheating and false dealing, but saith his estate will be impoverished, and hee shall bee cast behinde hand; and what will the world say, I shall quite bee shamed for ever: Why, if thou beest afraid of shame, deliver thy money into the hand of some honest and faithfull Minister, and let him make up the matter privately.[24]

Did he have a specific hearer in mind, and could the other hearers in attendance have guessed his target?

Both preachers and town élites, then, clamped down on notorious sinners. Where Hooker and many of his godly colleagues broke with conventional wisdom was in including the good neighbor, the respectable citizen, the "carnal gospeller" or "Protestant at large," in the group toward whom God directed his anger.

there is a great long traine in the Devils campe, there are some leaders, and profest opposers of Christ, which the sunne is wearie to behold, and the earth is weary to beare, these are the souldiers, and captaines, and commanders, and poore ignorant creatures, and carnall gospellers that follow the baggage, they are of the black guard too, though they are the taile of the armie, yet they are of the armie of the Devill, and they are all young Satans, though their talents bee not so long, and their clawes so sharp, as others are; they have not learned the skill to make a prey of a poore man, as others have, but yet they will approve of that which others doe:[25]

116, 137, 328–29. In Shakespeare's *Henry VI, Part 2*, Act IV, scene 2, a character remarks that "the nobility think scorn to go in leather aprons"; the notes in *Arden Shakespeare* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957) indicate that "leather aprons" were worn by mechanics and workmen. In the opening scene of *Julius Caesar*, the sign of a carpenter's profession is said to be "thy leather apron, and thy rule." William Perkins found that "more of the poorer sort receiue and obey the Gospell, then of the rich." *Works*, 3:*284.

24. SImp 23; FC 23/205; PP 229; CTCL 85; SEC 170–71.

25. SSC 273.

"Carnall gospellers" might not have been the "captaines" and "commanders" in the Devil's army, but neither were they on the side of the angels. Their sins might not be notorious, their claws not so sharp, but they followed the devil nonetheless. In 1629, Hooker's last year in Chelmsford, a godly layman in Salisbury expressed similar "puritan" sentiments, lumping his good neighbors together with drunkards, swearers, and others whom he considered notorious sinners:

> I take it to be impossible to have true peace with God and not wars with men. … For no man can have true peace with God unless … he shall profess to fear God and to make a good conscience the rule of his actions. … If he be careful therein, let him be sure he shall have wars with the drunkard, with the profane swearer, with the maypole dancer, with every loose man and swaggerer, nay almost (which is lamentable to speak) with all his neighbours. For all of them in a manner will term him a Puritan, and perhaps the best of them will tell him that he marreth all with his preciseness, that he hath undone even the city or place where he liveth by it.[26]

Condemning notorious sinners may have made the reputations of preachers like Hooker and drawn the attention of historians, but it was to the good neighbor, the "Protestant at large," that Hooker's efforts were just as often directed.[27] Godly preachers loved to brag about their success in converting notorious sinners, but "civil believers" were probably the most receptive audience for their message. A "Puritan's" good neighbors rarely complained when he clamped down on drunkenness or profanity, but "the best of them" would chaffe when they were "marred" by his "preciseness." "Thou mayst heare, and fast, and pray, and read, and come to the supper of the Lord," said Hooker, "and yet have an unfaithfull soule, and goe downe to hell."

---

26. Paul Slack, "The Public Conscience of Henry Sherfield," in *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays Presented to G. E. Aylmer*, ed. John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 151–71, at 151. In 1627, Hugh Peter said of worldly people that "rather than they wil marry their daughters to a puritan they will rather to a Cobbler." Robert Keayne, "Sermon Notes June 1627 to June 1628," transcribed by Susan M. Ortmann in "Gadding about London in Search of a Proper Sermon: How Robert Keayne's Sermon Notes from 1627–28 Inform Us about the Religious and Political Issues Facing the London Puritan Community" (M.A. thesis, Millersville University, 2004), 48.

27. *Piscator* 14–16 {*Magnalia* 1:337–38}.

If even the respectable civil professor failed to meet Hooker's standards, who did? Who were the "godly" in Hooker's Chelmsford? Hooker's surviving sermon texts make it plain that both admirers and detractors presumed that people like Hooker and his followers belonged to a distinct and easily identifiable group. Over the past several decades, talented historians of early modern Britain have shown how people who took the words of men like Hooker to heart came to stand apart from their neighbors, and how godly preaching divided communities.[28] Detractors accused them of drawing "into a body of themselves, ingrossing afore-hand, the name of brethren, The Godly, the Church, the good Christians." They were a "sect," a "holy crew," a "godly crew," "holy brethren," a group of "silly Christians ... daily troubled and disquieted for their [spiritual] estates," "our tender conscienced people."[29]

To themselves, by contrast, they were "the godly," "people of God," "saints of God," "God's people," "good Christians," "scrupulous spirited," "such as are one with Christ," "such as doe walke exactly before God."[30] Although they often used the derogatory term, "puritan," detractors were most likely to call people like Hooker "nice fellows," "precise fellows."[31]

---

28. Seminally Patrick Collinson, "The Godly: Aspects of Popular Protestantism," in Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), 1–18, and subsequently *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559–1625*, 230–31, 268. For examples of division in specific towns, see Wrightson and Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village*, and David Underdown, *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). Alexandra Walsham describes the town of Walsham-le-Willows as "a deeply disunited community—a paradigm of the animosity and confrontation fervent Protestant evangelism could provoke." " 'Out of the Mouths of Babes and Sucklings': Prophecy, Puritanism, and Childhood in Elizabethan Suffolk," in *The Church and Childhood*, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994), 285–99, at 290. David Como puts it succinctly: "In their behavior, dress, and speech—aspects of life that fell under the contemporary rubric of 'conversation,'—the godly shared particular styles that set them apart from other members of early modern English society; these styles both defined the community, and defined individuals as members of the community." *Blown by the Spirit*, 29. For a dissenting opinion, see Ryrie, *Being Protestant*, esp. 469–72.

29. PFS sig. E1ᵛ; SEC 453; SU 50; PP 75, 79 SEC 462; UP* 83.

30. SJ 290; SEC 419; PP 271; SP 59; PHH 38; SU 52, 50.

31. E.g., TCL 31, 77, 99; SU 12; SJ 144. Perkins repeatedly described how the godly were "so much branded with the vile tearmes of Puritans and Presitians" and how godly behavior was commonly "nicknamed and tearmed precisenesse," *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:15, 195, see also 189, *A Godly and Learned Exposition or Commentarie vpon the three first Chapters of the Revelation, Works*, 3:*357, and *A Treatise of Gods Free Grace, and Mans Free Will, Works*, 1:744. Cotton Mather did not hesitate to call Hooker *Puritanus, Piscator Evangelicus* 12 {*Magnalia* 1:336}.

Members of countercultural groups generally develop characteristic behaviors that reinforce their distinctiveness and allow them to identify each other. Wayne Meeks has shown how the apostle Paul's practice of addressing the recipients of his letters as "saints" or "holy ones" (*hagioi*) played a role "in the process of resocialization by which an individual's identity is revised and knit together with the identity of the group." When accompanied by similar special terms for those outside the group, such labels taught members of the Pauline communities "to conceive of only two classes of humanity: the sect and the outsiders."[32]

"Puritans" in early seventeenth-century England were observed by their neighbors to set aside time for meditation, pray regularly in their families, remain after sermons or lectures to recapitulate the main points and compare their notes with those of other devout hearers, shun long hair and foreign fashions, avoid swearing and blaspheming, and rigorously observe the Sabbath. In many parts of England, bands of godly people would "gadd" or "goe by troupes" to hear sermons by favored preachers, singing Psalms along the way.[33] The saints of Dorchester (if we can trust the doggerel of a detractor) abandoned their home parish whenever their minister, John White, preached out of town. "[A]t devine service none of them shall yee see / but after him They runne as pigges after a sowe / detesting divine service appoynted us now."[34]

Both the godly and those who observed them seemed to agree, though, that something over and above these specific behaviors set "puritans" apart and made them easy to identify and to deride. That something was their

---

32. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 85.

33. Since Hooker had been recruited to Chelmsford to draw crowds, not a few of his hearers had in all likelihood "gadded" to hear him. As they passed an alehouse, the tipplers would frequently yell insults, some of which are preserved in Hooker's published lectures. On gadding to sermons, see most recently Haigh, *Plain Man's Pathways*, 111–13, and for an example of derisive comments from the alehouse, 125. British historians tend to use a small "p," American historians to retain the capital "P." For a time, the existence of a distinct body of "Puritans" within the larger Church of England came into question, most notably in C. H. George and Katherine George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570–1640* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961); and C. H. George, "Puritanism as History and Historiography," *Past and Present*, no. 41 (Dec. 1968): 77–104. From a different direction, Patrick Collinson has tended to see "puritans" as the cutting edge of a "long" English Reformation. Historians like David Como stress the variety of "puritan" opinions and the efforts of puritan leaders to reign in the more eccentric; see especially "Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England."

34. "Yow Puritans all," in *Records of Early English Drama: Dorset*, ed. Rosalind C. Hays and C. E. McGee (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 181.

"niceness, and exactness, and preciseness." Godly people were scrupulously exact, precise, "nice" in following what they took to be God's will. Even in Hartford, Hooker found that many colonists would "loath the holiness of the lives, the exactness of the wayes of such who indeed set themselves most against sinful carriages." But an authentic saint embraced exactness: "what narrow search and inquisition doth the soul set up in its daily course, weighs the words he speaks, examines each thought and stirring of affection."[35]

If "the godly" or "the saints" seem to have been the terms Hooker and Stone generally preferred to use for themselves, and "puritan," by contrast, arose as a term of abuse, what did the abusers mean to convey when they spoke of a "puritan"?[36] Some of Hooker's Chelmsford hearers certainly did not welcome being labeled as "puritan"; they told Hooker that if they were to take his message to heart, they "should bee scoffed at and counted a Puritan." What, more precisely, did Chelmsford citizens who scoffed at puritans find so objectionable in the late 1620s?

One such citizen put it succinctly: "This is a hard saying who can abide it. What so strict. To be pinioned to so nice courses. What, never take up a gay fashion, but always creepe into a corner, to deny a manselfe, with a company of leather-coate Christians, and to walke by such a strict rule?"[37]

---

35. UP* 88, see also SDD 237, 243; AR 10:691, 683. Peter Lake contends that "the label, indeed the insult, 'puritan', came to be internalized and appropriated by the godly themselves, and the deployment of the term as an insult integrated into their own complex, intensely dialectical account of their own identity as the 'godly' and of their relation as such with a hostile and ungodly world." "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 80–97, at 86. T. D. Bozeman, *The Precisionist Strain: Disciplinary Religion & Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), brilliantly describes the "ways of exactness."

36. "[B]y *Saints*," said Perkins, "we vnderstand not dead men inrolled in the Popes Calender, but all that are sanctified by the blood of Christ, whether they be liuing or dead," *An Exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles, according to the Tenour of the Scriptures, and the consent of Orthodoxe Fathers of the Church, Works*, 1:308. Patrick Collinson, "The Godly"; see also Alexandra Walsham, " 'A Glose of Godlines': Philip Stubbes, Elizabethan Grub Street and the Invention of Puritanism," in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, ed. Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 177–206, for the way even someone who supported episcopacy could be accounted a "puritan." Peter Lake explains how "the godly and their enemies looked at each other, and, not liking what they saw, decided what to say and do about it … it was, in large part, in such charged exchanges that puritanism, name and thing, was born and achieved its multiple meanings and ideological resonances." "A Charitable Christian Hatred," at 150, see also 160; *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 53; and *Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, 527–29.

37. CTCL 99, 30.

Three characteristics stand out from his statement. First, Puritans were precise: "strict," "nice," "exact." Second, Puritans were "mopish," "melancholy" people who crept into corners to pray and avoided gay companions. Third, Puritans "differenced" themselves from ordinary men and women and kept company with people like themselves.

The Land of Uprightnesse

Hooker agreed with his detractors that he wanted his hearers to be precise. Godly people walked "in ways of holiness and precisenesse." In an admiring eulogy, Samuel Stone called Hooker "exact" in following the will of God. While Hooker did not expect them to achieve the perfect obedience to God's will that Adam had enjoyed before the fall—"the exactnesse that *Adam* had in creation"—he did expect them to strive for it. "What hee had in perfection, wee must have in desire." A saint would "make conscience … in all duties," would "walke exactly before the Lord." Hooker's godly hearers were people who lived in "the land of uprightnesse," who walked "in that way that God chalks out."[38]

Members of the godly community kept track of each other's activities and were prepared to intervene if they detected questionable behavior. Hooker warned the Chelmsford godly to be "very careful to attend thereunto, and be advised thereof" if even "the meanest Saint of GOD" were to suggest that "such a course is sinfull, such a practice is unlawfull," On one occasion, asking God's patience for an unrepentant sinner, Hooker pleaded for "one moneth, one yeare longer" to give him time to learn to "pray in his family, sanctify the Sabboth, and live holily, and strictly." If his worldly neighbors used the term "puritan" to brand people who lived in a world where God had made his expectations plain and required strict obedience to those expectations, Hooker was content to bear the title. Describing an ideal Christian, Hooker said he would be "a righteous man, a holy man, one that makes conscience of his waies." He would be

> willing and contented, constantly to take up a Christian course, to walk according to the rule of Gods word, to abstain from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, to live in all holiness of life and conversation, to studie and indeavour to keep a good conscience in all things both towards God, and towards men.

---

38. SSCD I:c3ʳ, SDD 237; 7; PP 81; SEC 507; SU 25; SBU 110–11.

In agreeing to adhere to a strict set of rules, godly people chose to set themselves—by persistent acts of will—in conscious opposition to prevailing social norms. "Shall I enter upon the way that is called holy," asked one inquirer, "and walk therein with that preciseness and strictness that the word of God requires?" "My pleasure, and my profit, and my preferment tell me, that it will be marvelous tedious, irksome, and grievous to take such courses."[39]

Mopish and Melancholy

If the godly themselves described "the way that is called holy" as "tedious, irksome, and grievous," can we be surprised that outsiders often condemned those they called "puritans" as sad and bereft of joy? Worldly people caricatured Puritans as people who took themselves and their duty so seriously that there was no room left for ordinary human pleasures. To outsiders, such "precise fellows" seemed perpetually tinged with melancholy, "always … poring on our corruptions." If Hooker succeeded in bringing a formerly worldly hearer to examine his behavior, his companions would tell him "it was only a fit of melancholly that perplexed you" and warn him that, all too often, melancholy led to madness. "Do not smoak out your dayes in melancholy," they would warn. "If you beleeve the Minister," they might continue, "he will make you goe out of your wits." "Wicked people say, that swearers and drunkards goe on merily laughing and rejoycing, and these Christians they goe drooping. If this bee grace, saith one, God blesse me from it"; "we may hap to runne mad, if we were of your opinion"; "come (say they) cast care away, fling away and casheer those melancholly imaginations: we have many failings, let us not therefore be pondering of them, and make ourselves so much the more miserable." Members of the Family of Love, who were still active in the neighborhood, told some in Hooker's congregation that it was "unprofitable for a believer to trouble himselfe for his sinnes, and to goe up and downe with his heart full of griefe, and his eyes full of teares."[40]

---

39. SPos 125; SG 41; SDD 180; SDD 142, see also TGS 136: "the life and conversation of a Christian is a marvellous, tedious, and laborious life." Christopher Haigh describes godly life as a challenging routine of "prayer, Bible-reading, psalm-singing, and family catechizing—fitted around necessary labours as best [the godly] could," a routine worldly people had no wish to emulate. "God was immediate and his demands urgent, life was a constant struggle to do his will, and salvation was only for his chosen few." *Plain Mans Pathways*, 179, 227.

40. The phrases "mopish and melancholy" and "tender and conscientious" occur in AR 10:445; SEC 415; SP 92; UP* 52; SEC 453; SEC 415; SP 92; SP 96; SJ 181, see also 190 and Bozeman, *Precisionist Strain*.

Even in Hartford, scoffers noticed that when people first took on the "ways of exactness," they grew sad and brokenhearted. "Flinty hearted" sinners would wonder "at the feebleness of the distressed and broken-hearted, that they should be such children, persons of such feeble and milksop dispositions to sink at a Sermon and be troubled at the words of a Preacher." The godly might "sit moping in a corner, sink under the burden of their sins and smoak out their dayes in a melancholick pressure and pensiveness of spirit." Hooker admitted that scrupulous people were often "sad."[41]

Severing and Differencing of Men

Finally, Puritans were thought to imagine themselves as superior to ordinary English men and women, aloof from ordinary society. They shunned gay, colorful, distracting apparel in favor of something more serious. Hooker's sermons tended to draw attention to "the world's" disdain for those it called "puritans," but he also left no doubt that puritans disdained the world. A serious Christian was obligated to separate from "loose, vain, jovial company." Once in Hartford, Hooker continued to remind his hearers that the world was full of "evil men," and those who zealously practiced the ways of exactness could expect fierce opposition from them. The inevitable result would be "severing and differencing of men."[42]

Hooker knew, as did his audiences, that these characterizations were stereotypes. But so long as they were rightly understood, he claimed the epithet "puritan" with pride. Puritans were the successors of the beleaguered saints of the New Testament church, who had also suffered the disdain of their more worldly neighbors. Describing the apostle Paul before his own dramatic conversion, planning to burst into a clandestine meeting and take a group of early Christians captive, Hooker imagined Paul saying, "I will take those Puritaines in their Conventicles."[43] As Meeks concludes in his study of the Pauline communities, "the natural kinship structure into which the person has been born and which previously defined his place and connections with the society are here supplanted by a new set of relationships."[44] The Chelmsford "saints" had

---

41. AR 10:429; e.g., "resolve it sadly," 588, 229. In addition to its predominant meaning as "sorrowful," "sad" in early seventeenth-century parlance also carried the connotation of "grave," "steadfast," or "serious."

42. SP 95; AR 6 291; AR 10 90.

43. SG 28.

44. Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 88.

chosen to take God's will with ultimate seriousness, to place it at the center of their lives rather than—as they imagined was the situation for their neighbors—at the periphery.

To gain a closer look at the set of behaviors that separated the "godly" from the "world," we can return to the passage from John Eliot's letter to Richard Baxter. Eliot was describing how a "communion" of godly Christians existed in Chelmsford within the larger "Parochial" or parish structure of the Church of England.

> I have known before I came to N.E. in the BB[s] times, a communion of Christians who held frequent communion together, used the censure of admonition, yea and of excommunication, wth much presence of Christ, only they had not officers, nor sacraments; and, notwithstanding this their liberty together, they held publik Parochial communion so far as avoyded offense, and interested themselves in all good means for the public good of the p(ar)ish where they lived. Dr. Goodwin and Mr. Nye have put a pr(eti)ous Epistle before Mr. Hooker's worke touching conversion, where they shew how a common p(ro)fession accepted for Christianity will soone cause conversion, that necessary saving work. Now, in this way of Christians injoying a two-fold communion, and that w(it)hout offense, may not p(ar)ochial communion be upheld so as to keepe the whole heape of chaff and corne together, only excluding the ignorant and prophane and scandalous fro(m) the sac(rament) and other pr(i)viledges by the imp(ro)ving the discipline of Christ.[45]

Eliot was trying to convince Baxter of the advantages of a "church-type" structure, one where everyone within the geographical boundaries of the parish—"the whole heape of chaff and corne together"—would attend services in the parish church. Unless the minister knew that a parishioner was "ignorant" of the basic teachings of the Gospel or that her behavior was scandalous or profane, she could be encouraged to receive the Lord's Supper. Some parishioners—the "chaff"—would be in an unconverted state, but their participation in the Church's ordinances might be just the path to their eventual conversion.

The true Christians—the "corne," Hooker's "godly"—enjoyed what Eliot calls a "two-fold communion." They participated fully in the life of the parish, both the regular worship services—"publik Parochial communion"—and the "secular" parish activities (e.g., providing for the poor, maintaining moral discipline) so critical to the life of an English town. The godly Richard Blackerby,

---

45. John Eliot to Richard Baxter, October 7, 1657, 159–60, op. cit.

Stone's mentor, "not being capable of a Benefice, because he could not sub-scribe," did not let his scrupulosity keep him from full participation in parochial activities. "He would all days, Lords-days and Week-days, when divine Service was read in the Parish-church, go with his Family to the very beginning, and there behave himself with … Reverence and Heavenliness."[46]

But they also enjoyed a separate communion among themselves. Eliot's letter recalled his experience in Chelmsford "in the Bishops' times" [before the Civil War] while he served as Hooker's usher in the local school. The godly met regularly among themselves, functioning as a kind of church within a church. They had a clear identity and clear boundaries, so much so that they were prepared to "admonish" one another for misbehavior and even to exclude them from fellowship if that misbehavior were sufficiently serious. Relying on the parish church for its preaching and sacraments, and expecting to recruit new participants from among its parishioners, this more exclusive body would offer an advanced spiritual life to a godly élite.

Traditionally, it had been baptism and the Eucharist that served Christian communities as primary boundary-setting institutions, and these were the very ordinances that the Chelmsford godly lacked. How did the godly in Chelmsford find other ways to distinguish themselves from the world?

Eliot's letter offers no further details, but the printed texts of Hooker's Chelmsford lectures allow us many glimpses of the life of the godly as Hooker and Eliot knew it. They were first of all people who were "willing and contented, constantly to take up a Christian course, to walk according to the rule of Gods word, to abstain from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, to live in all holiness of life and conversation, to studie and indeavour to keep a good conscience in all things both towards God, and towards men." Their resolution "to take up a Christian course" should have clearly distinguished the saints from the world.[47]

But resolve "to walk according to the rule" could be difficult to measure. One person's genuine "indeavour to keep a good conscience" could be anoth-er's wishful thinking. In practice, saints were those who pursued a range of highly visible godly activities. Hooker's lectures frequently allude to these activities. "As the Spouse in the *Canticles* sought to the watch-men to enquire after Christ," he said at his Chelmsford lecture,

> the heart … never ceaseth going and enquiring, if it can gaine any intel-ligence of Jesus Christ. It goes to prayer, to see if it can speake with

---

46. Clarke, *Lives of Eminent Persons,* 61.

47. SDD 178–80.

> Christ there; and from thence it goes to the Word, to see if that will
> reveale Christ; and to conference, if that will mention it, and saith, See
> you the Lord Jesus Christ? The hungrie soule comes to the Church, to
> see if it can heare any newes of Christ: And thus it continues, till at last
> the Lord Jesus Christ is pleased to come himselfe, after the soule hath
> hungred for him, and sought for him, as *Marie* said: *Oh if you can, tell
> me where my Lord is:* So the soule goes from one place to another, from
> Prayer to the Word, and from the Sacrament to Fasting, and asketh of
> the ordinances, Where is my Saviour?[48]

In this touching description of a hungry soul eagerly wandering from one
spiritual activity to another, the reader can catch a glimpse of the spiritual
ground for which godly ministers like Hooker fought.

Ever since Constantine had put an end to the official persecution of
Christians in the early fourth century, most Christians expected to relate to
God through formal, routinized worship. If they prayed, they were expected to
use memorized prayers like the *Pater noster* or the *Ave Maria*. Renee Targoff
has argued that defenders of the officially sanctioned liturgy, most famously
Richard Hooker, found the efficacy of common prayer "in its capacity to com-
pensate for the natural deficiencies of spontaneous and private devotion."
Richard Hooker's opponents countered that reading prayers aloud did not
necessarily "produce or even reflect a sincere experience of those prayers"
but instead cultivated "at best passivity, at worst hypocrisy."[49] Decades before
Laudian ceremonialism arose as an alternative to godly practice, godly min-
isters were insisting that God required more of the average Christian than
faithful attendance at the services of her parish church. As she took part in
the officially sanctioned "ordinances" or "means" of grace, she needed to "find
Christ," "speak with Christ," "hear news of Christ." Some kind of encoun-
ter, something that led to a personal connection, would have to take place.
Thomas Hooker rarely missed a chance to remind his hearers of the distinc-
tion between a hearer's simple "attendance on the means" and her need to
experience Christ personally through those means. Hooker's God demanded

---

48. SImp 164–65; see also FLGT 292; SEC 154–55, 209, 240; SJ 230; SH 189; CCLP 375. The
biblical reference is to Song of Solomon 3:2–3. A good brief summary of godly practices can
be found in Alexandra Walsham, "The Godly and Popular Culture," 286–89.

49. *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England*
(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 38–39. Richard Hooker's *Of the lavves of eccle-
siasticall politie Eyght bookes* first appeared in 1593.

that each hearer have such an experience, even so far as to include a direct encounter with his wrath.

In Protestant theology, the primary "ordinances" or "meanes" through which God's grace was believed to flow were preaching and the two sacraments: baptism and the Lord's Supper. But there were other important ordinances, several of which Hooker enumerated in this passage: private prayer, "the Word," fasting, and something called "conference." "The Word" meant exposure to the Bible, either read at home or preached about by a minister. Literate hearers often owned Bibles and could read them on their own; others might have someone else read to them.[50] The other activities, to which psalm-singing, meditation, and family prayer (including grace before meals) should be added, require further description. Together, they allow us to imagine the spiritual life of Chelmsford's communion within a communion as Eliot described it to Baxter.[51]

In early seventeenth-century parlance, "conference" could be any activity during which someone "conferred" with one or more other persons. In the Old Testament book of Numbers, Balaam had "conference" with his ass.[52] Likewise in the New Testament, Judas might have "desired some conference with Christ privately" after betraying him in the garden.[53] The friends of a man in debt might have "conference" with his creditor to help alleviate the man's plight.

The term could also be used to describe a person's habitual manner of conversing with others. "Thy speeches, thy conference, thy carriages, and thy actions," said Hooker to a Hartford hearer who needed comeuppance, could be said only to "meddle now and then" with "the things of Heaven and happiness." Twenty-first century Americans use the term "conversation" in both these ways. By contrast, Hooker tended to use the term "conversation" as an all-inclusive term for verbal and even non-verbal behavior. "As the Carpenter laying his Rule often to his work, makes it the more even and straight, so

---

50. SImp 192. Later in the same sermon Hooker described "preaching" and "reading" separately.

51. Charles Hambrick-Stowe carefully describes godly devotional practices in New England in *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), especially chapter 5 and 6. For a friendly critique, see Baird Tipson, "The Elusiveness of 'Puritanism,'" *Religious Studies Review* 11:3 (July 1985): 245–56, at 250–51.

52. Numbers 22:1–35, cited in AR 10:145. Alec Ryrie discusses conferencing in *Being Protestant*, 390–97.

53. SP 244; see also AR 10:669.

comparing thy selfe with the *Word*, and *framing thy whole conversation to that rule*, will make thy heart … to become faithfull and honest unto thee."[54]

Still a third sort of "conference" was the monthly clerical conference to which Cotton Mather referred and which so threatened the authority of Bishop Laud: Hooker would gather the young ministers of the area for professional guidance and placement. Laurence Chaderton had relied on such conferences to edify the students while he was Master at Emmanuel College. He left a full description in the Emmanuel orders, a description which reveals how similar conferences were run outside the College walls. Ministerial conferences or "prophesyings" provided occasion for ministers or prospective ministers to preach before a gathering of their peers. Members of the clerical audience would be edified, but they would also be responsible for critiquing the content and style of the sermon.

At Emmanuel, individual students (all preparing for a ministerial career) would take turns "expounding" a biblical text. Other participants would pass judgment on whether the doctrine which the student preacher derived from his text was "surely grounded on the place whence hee draweth it." They would also comment on his rhetorical ability: "yf the maner of delivery bee defective." Because the Queen considered such conferences subversive, they were condemned as dangerous "conventicles" and officially forbidden. Chaderton and the other Emmanuel Fellows accordingly swore "that no man which is not of the company bee made party to that whiche is done amongst us."[55]

When Hooker described how the heart went "to conference" to seek Christ, though, he was describing a fourth kind of conference, something he called "holy conference."[56] Some of the members of Hooker's congregation were apparently meeting regularly to "conferre" about godly matters. These meetings could occur in the privacy of a godly household. While explaining that the onset of conversion often occurred before a hearer was conscious of it, Hooker described how "often the Lord meets with a poore sinner, and reveales

---

54. SJ 173; CCLP 69; PHH 14–15; emphasis added. See David Como's observation in n. 2 above.

55. "A Mutuall Conference in Communication of Giftes among Students in Divinity Confirmed by the Canonicall Scriptures," in Stubbings, *Statutes of Emmanuel*, 106–12. An excellent discussion of the genesis of clerical conferences can be found in the "Introduction" to *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church: Dedham and Bury St. Edmunds. 1582–1590*, ed. Patrick Collinson, John Craig, and Brett Usher (Woodbridge: Boydell Press/Church of England Record Society, 2003), xxvi–xlii.

56. FLGT 292; SEC 411; SH 189.

himselfe to him before he be aware of it, as many a man haply drops into the congregation, *or fals into a house where there is conference.*"[57]

More often, though, Hooker was describing the kind of gathering that Eliot had called a "communion": meetings of godly people that occurred within the context of, but distinct from, the ordinary worship of the parish.[58] One occasion for holy conference was the time immediately following a minister's lecture. Describing a distressed hearer who gained some comfort after having been brought "to the word of God, and to holy conference," Hooker confided regretfully that the comfort was soon gone. "Hee is no sooner gone from the congregation, or from the place of conference, but hee is the same man that he was before, still doubting of God's love." Hooker could refer disparagingly to someone who pridefully misused the occasion of "conference" to boast of his superiority to others. "In conference, he would have it knowne that he is learned, full of knowledge." "In conference, in reproving of sinne, a man would have his parts seene." Such grandstanding was to be condemned as glorifying "selfe" rather than God. "Haply you have not that vaine of talking and conference which others have," he told another hearer; "this is commendable, but there is a great deale of pride and vanitie in it now adayes." "You will bungle at Prayer and Conference," he told a Hartford hearer, "and in all the duties of Obedience."[59]

It was this fourth kind of conference that undergirded the corporate life of a godly man or woman. Conferences like those to which Hooker referred arose throughout England wherever a critical mass of saints could be found. After the well-known lecturer Richard Bernard completed his morning sermon, for example, some of his hearers would retire to the rectory to hear the sermon repeated, have their shorthand notes corrected, and be catechized, "all before the second sermon in the afternoon." The main activity of these gatherings, explains Patrick Collinson, was repetition. Not that the entire sermon was repeated verbatim; focus was on the major topics or "heads" (in Hooker's case, Doctrines, Reasons, and Uses), that were impressed by repetition on the minds of the hearers. Ability to "repeat" a sermon was plainly expected of a

---

57. SEC 443; SEC 343; emphasis added. Collinson explains that during Elizabeth's reign the term "conference" was reserved for clerical conferences, *Conferences and Combination Lectures,* xxvii. Several decades later, Hooker was using the term more broadly. Bishop Laud would undoubtedly have called these gatherings "conventicles."

58. Once in New England, Eliot continued these "private meetings, wherein we pray, and sing, and repeat sermons, and confer together about the things of God," cited in Mather, *Magnalia* 1:535.

59. CTCL 36, 64; SEC 236; AR 5:279.

godly man or woman. One way to recognize a hypocrite was by her admission that "I cannot repeat a sermon."[60]

Conferences that focused on repetition of sermons descended from the practice of "prophesying" in gatherings such as the one Chaderton had organized at Emmanuel College. Two or three trained ministers would preach on the same biblical text, each contributing his linguistic or rhetorical talent to the goal of drawing out the meaning. When Elizabeth insisted that such gatherings subverted the established hierarchy and should be shut down, a related practice often arose in their stead: gathering to repeat and discuss the officially sanctioned sermon or lecture that had just been delivered. In the dioceses of the Province of York, Archbishop Toby Matthew actively encouraged sermon repetition. Evidence of the practice also exists for towns like Sheffield, Leeds, Bingley, Wakefield, Bradford and Halifax, where holy conference often took place in the same church building where the conference participants had just heard the sermon preached.[61]

Samuel Hartlib, an admirer of Hooker's sermons, left a revealing entry in his notebook that suggests how conferences offered ministers a unique window into the hearts and minds of their hearers:

> The benefits of Conference are very many et [and] great. 1. by it Ministers may come to sound the knowledge of their hearers. 2. by it wee come presently and more directly to the point. 3. by it wee shal truly edifie them for wee shal know how to stoope to them. 4. wee get hints et [and] occasions

60. Drawing on Bernard's experience, Arnold Hunt provides an excellent description of sermon repetition in *The Art of Hearing*, 72–79. Bernard is also cited in Haigh, *Plain Mans Patheways*, 113, see also 114–15 and 123, where Haigh describes a group of laypeople who would meet in a private home for Bible reading and psalm singing. Collinson, "The English Conventicle," in *Voluntary Religion*, ed. William J. Sheils and Diana Wood (London: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 223–59, at 240–41. The fact that many hearers took notes and had a chance to correct them during the repetition suggests that even the sermon texts circulated by unauthorized "scribal publications" were likely to be generally (if not word for word) accurate. SEC 124. Robert Keayne, who was shortly to immigrate to New England, heard a "Mr. Malthouse" preach a sermon on July 15, 1627, during which Malthouse told his hearers that worldly people would "scoff at us for repeating sermons." Keayne, "Sermon Notes," 38.

61. Collinson, "The Foundation and Beginnings," in *A History of Emmanuel College*, ed. Sarah Bendall, Christopher Brooke, and Patrick Collinson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), 13–55, at 50–51; David J. Lamburn, "Politics and Religion in Early Modern Beverly," in *The Reformation in the English Towns, 1500–1640*, ed. Patrick Collinson and John S. Craig (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), 63–78, 254–57, 304–5, at 69. Not all serious hearers stayed at the church for the post-service conference. After attending John Rogers's weekly lecture in Dedham, "when others staid, discoursed, dispatched business," John Angier "went home to his chamber, meditated, prayed, work'd the Sermon upon his heart for about an hour, and thereby imprinted it so lastingly upon his memory, that he never forgot many passages."

for the greatest Meditations vpon which happily wee should never have lighted all our life-time in our retired and privat Meditations. 5. it is more quicking then sole hearing.[62]

On the evidence of Hooker's admonitions against showing off, it seems almost certain that both laypeople and clergy took part in Chelmsford conferences for sermon repetition, the laypeople comparing notes and passing judgment on the relative success of the clerical contributions. At Emmanuel, Hooker had learned the value of such conferences.

"Fasting" was more than abstaining from food in private. Fasts had been an ordinary part of the life of the medieval church, occurring on occasions set aside in the liturgical calendar specifically for that purpose. The Church of England continued the traditional practice of designating set days for fasting, although in response to crisis or occasion for celebration, the authorities could spontaneously declare special nationwide public fasts, thanksgivings, or other prayers.[63] Godly fasts were different, organized *ad hoc* without official sanction. Cotton Mather reported that Hooker not only observed frequent "*Publick Fasts*" but would also set aside one day each month "to Private *Prayer* with *Fasting*." Samuel Stone was known for his personal "frequent fastings" when he would "set apart whole Days for *Fasting* and *Prayer*." Stone explained that "in times of sorrow," the godly community should "seek to God in a more than ordinary manner, to remove those Evils that are incumbent, and to desire some blessing." On one of his lists of "holy duties," Thomas Hooker included the expectation "to frequent often dayes of humiliation."

Godly practice was to set aside "servile work" and to devote an entire day to a series of sermons, punctuated by prayer and psalm-singing. Participants were to abstain not only from food but from "all brave and costly apparel,"

Oliver Heywood, *A Narrative of the Holy Life, and Happy Death, of that Reverend, Faithful and Zealous Man of God, and Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Mr John Angier* (London, 1683), *Wing* H1772, 7.

62. Hartlib, "Ephemerides 1634 (late)," transcribed in *The Hartlib Papers: A Complete Text and Image Database of the Papers of Samuel Hartlib (c. 1600–1662) held in Sheffield University Library*, 2d ed. (Sheffield: Humanities Research Online, 2002), 29/2/49B–50A. For Hartlib's opinion of Hooker, see 29/2/9A, 19A, 20B, 24B, and 33A.

63. Natalie Mears counted ninety-four occasions of such special worship between 1535 and 1643. On fast days, "all adults between the ages of sixteen and sixty, excluding the sick and laborers involved in harvesting or other heavy work, were expected to have only one moderate meal. Those who could 'forbeare from bodily labour' were expected to occupy themselves with prayer, reading, hearing, and studying the scriptures of 'good exhortations': 'No parte therof to be spent in playes, pastimes, or ydlenesse, muche lesse in lewde, wicked, or wanton behauviour.'" "Public Worship and Political Participation in Elizabethan England," *Journal*

"cheerfullness," "the lawful use of the marriage bed," and any "gestures of loftiness." The day would end when everyone "broke the fast" at a shared meal.[64]

Meditation during the fast would remind the godly of their sinfulness. Despairing of their own abilities, they would "confess ourselvs worthy to be destroyed, and submit to God." A saint's conviction that she had angered God and could not possibly make amends drove her to rely more completely on God's promises of mercy. Continued contrition and humiliation reinforced faith. Days of fasting had their counterpart in "days of Thanksgiving." "When we receive Extraordinary mercy from God," wrote Stone, "we feast ourselves, and give solemne thanks and praise to the Lord."[65]

Not only during the fast (or feast), but also on their way to and from the place of fasting, godly men and women sang the same "scripture psalms" that they often sang as they "gadded" to a sermon in a neighboring parish. Worldly people heard the singing and often mocked the singers. As part of Scripture, the Book of Psalms had been "indited by an Infallible unerring Spirit" and thereby given "a stamp of Divine authority and majesty" that placed the psalms above any merely human compositions. "Being of divers compositions and postures; of thanksgiving, petition, gratulation, complaint, and deprecation," the psalms could speak to a godly person in almost any spiritual state. The "hymn" that Jesus had sung with his disciples after celebrating the Last Supper (Matt. 26:30) was almost surely one of the Hallel Psalms (113–118) from the Passover rite, and "singing of Psalms with a lively voice" had since become "a duty of the Gospell." "All your faculties," wrote Samuel Stone to his godly readers, would "be filled with sweetness" while singing the Psalms. Before Hooker arrived at Esher to minister to Joan

---

of British Studies 51 (2012): 4–25, at 12–13, citing *A fourme to be vsed in common prayer twice a weeke, NSTC* 16505, Cii^v–Ciii^r.

64. *Piscator* 27–28 {*Magnalia* 1:344}; Mather, *Magnalia* 3:117; ST 15, WB 520. [From this point I include citations from Stone's *Whole Body*, which while finalized in Connecticut is intended to describe ideal English practice]. Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, 260–63. Webster, *Godly Clergy*, provides an extensive discussion of fasting, 60–74. Perkins had described fasting as "the religious abstinence of Gods church from all meates and drinkes for a time, for the furtherance of their praiers, when they humble themselves vnto God for the preuenting or remoouing of some heauie iudgement." *The Combat betweene Christ and the Diuill Displayed, Works*, 3:*377. For an extended discussion, see Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:156–60. See also Ryrie, *Being Protestant*, 195–99, at 198, who calls fasting "a whetstone which sharpened prayer," and Ryrie, "The Fall and Rise of Fasting in the British Reformation," in *Worship and the Parish Church in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Natalie Mears and Alec Ryrie (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2013), 89–108.

65. WB 524.

Drake, her friends had made great efforts "to get her to joyn in singing of Psalmes."[66]

Psalm singing or "vocall Prayer in meetre" was just one of the many sorts of public and private prayer that set godly people apart from their neighbors. If faith was the instrument by which a desperate soul placed all his trust in God's help, prayer was the "messenger," sent to Heaven "to fetch in supplyes," to receive the help that God had promised to those who believed. Sorry for his sins and sensible of his own inability, the faithful hearer turned to God in faith and communicated with God in prayer. "The soule feeling his own wants and necessities, is sensible of his absolute need of help, so prayer ... is dispatched, and runs to Heaven for helpe, there being no help in the creature." The act of praying also helped the saint who prayed to become more receptive to divine blessings: "the heart [is] put into such a capacity, that it is fit to receive whatsoever is received." So critical was prayer, thought the godly, that anyone who did not regularly turn to it was probably misleading herself about the authenticity of her faith.[67]

Worldly neighbors who happened to be nearby could scarcely fail to notice that saints were in the habit of breaking into spontaneous prayers—which they called "ejaculations"—when occasion arose. Ejaculatory prayer might be provoked when a saint met with an unexpected difficulty in a business dealing, visited a sick neighbor, or met another believer on the street. The godly also resorted to longer, "more solemne" prayers, when they could find an opportunity to free themselves from distractions and focus all their attention on sending a series of specific petitions for divine assistance, "a succession of expressions cast out of the quiver of grace in the heart, and flowing in order,

---

66. *Trodden Down Strength*, 95–96, 106; WB 510–11. Beth Quitslund argues that by the seventeenth century, psalm singing outside of organized worship "was conspicuously the province of the godly"; "the sound of psalms could tell you where an isolated group of the godly could be found." "Singing the Psalms for Fun and Profit," in *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012), 237–58, at 247, 252. Alec Ryrie concurs: "private Psalm singing remained the preserve of the self-consciously godly (and of separatists).' Although he adds that "by the seventeenth century, even the pious had their doubts." "The Psalms and Confrontation in English and Scottish Protestantism," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 101 (2010): 114–37, at 120–21. For an extensive discussion of Protestant psalm-singing, see Christopher Marsh, *Music and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 391–453. An enclosed CD offers musical examples.

67. WB 505–6. Stone's extended discussion of prayer, which includes an analysis of the Lord's Prayer, occupies WB 505–24. Alec Ryrie writes of prayer as "not so much a duty as a symptom of your spiritual state." "Sleeping, Waking and Dreaming in Protestant Piety," in *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012), 73–92, at 83.

one after another." Hooker expected the saint "to pray daily in secret with sorrows and teares."[68]

A saint was even permitted to "entreat the Lord to inflict Evill upon his Enemies for the enlargement of his own people," a practice known as "imprecation." Stone warned the godly not to pray "in a revengefull spirit" and to "take heed of venting our carnall principles in our Imprecation," but it was allowable to "pray against false brethren" and "such Enemies as abuse civill Justice and authority" so long as one prayed "not against their persons, but their sins," asked God "to confound their plots, rather than their persons," and entreated him " to inflict such Evills on them, as may lead to their conversion, rather than their confusion."[69] It is unlikely that the objects of the imprecation appreciated these efforts.

The godly were also widely known for the practice of "oeconomical prayer"—"praying in family"—which Stone defined as "that which is made by a family joyning together, morning and Evening, in the same Divine service." Hooker described how a recently recruited saint discovered the importance of this practice: "the Lord informes him, and his conscience perswades him, that hee must *pray in his Family*." Praying in one's family would certainly include the uncomplicated act of saying grace before meals, something William Perkins had singled out as a distinguishing mark of godly behavior.[70]

But godly family prayer was much more expansive. Every master of a family, wrote Stone, ought to be "a Christlike man" who "should exercise the office of a spirituall priest, prophet, and King": a prophet "in teaching his family," a King "in Governing," and a priest "to offer up spirituall sacrafices." Every family could be "a little church," or even "a little Heaven, when they see the face of God, and worship him, and enjoy his presence there; without this, a family is a little hell."[71]

---

68. WB 507–8; ST 17.

69. WB 522–23.

70. "We must by blessing our meates and drinkes distinguish our selues, though not from such as are the seruants of God, yet from all vngodly and carelesse men," Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:239.

71. WB 513–14. See also Ryrie, *Being Protestant*, "Prayer in the Household," 363–405. Hooker does not discuss interior decorating, but Tara Hamling reminds us that "during the period from about 1560 to 1660 it was common for scenes and characters from the Old and New Testaments to be depicted in the interiors of manor houses and the town and rural houses built by merchants and prosperous farmers." "Old Robert's Girdle: Visual and Material Props for Protestant Piety in Post-Reformation England," in *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie (Farnham, UK: Ashgate,

Nor could family prayer be neglected in the master's absence. Should the head of the house be away, his wife was to assume responsibility to lead prayer, "and in her absence the Eldest son." The godly family was to gather for prayer "at the least every morning and Evening"; Stone's teacher Richard Blackerby would "early call his Family (or any other Family in which he was, and wherein he had any influence) together, and as constantly as the Sun rose and set, he failed not Morning and Evening to spend some time in Reading and Expounding some part of the Scripture and Prayer." On the Sabbath, Blackerby would pray on six separate occasions with his family.[72]

It was also the master's duty to teach the catechism to children and servants and to be "strict" in maintaining household order. Writing of godly childrearing, Anthony Fletcher cites "the vivid examples of leadership by those Puritan patriarchs and clerics who, following the model of the advice-book writers, sought to inculcate godliness through household religion."[73] As noted above, even outside the family saints were obligated to reprove sin, not only sin committed by other saints but also sin committed by the worldly.[74] Whether or not they identified themselves personally as godly, magistrates were continually badgered by godly ministers and laypeople to prosecute drunkenness, lasciviousness, and greed.

Their very appearance set the godly apart. Rejecting the "light behaviours" of their worldly neighbors, they refused to wear their hair in what they took to be a sexually alluring manner—"all these proud and whorish lockes, and these Spanish cuts"—and avoided colorful clothing—"wanton and garish attires." To the godly, such things were nothing but occasions for sinning, or as Hooker put it more imaginatively, they were "the Tent wherein [a worldly man's] vaine filthy light heart hath lodged."

2012), 135–63, at 140. It would be interesting to know whether such biblical depictions were more or less common in prosperous godly households.

72. WB 514; Clarke, *Lives of Eminent Persons*, 58, 62.

73. Fletcher, "Prescription and Practice: Protestantism and the Upbringing of Children, 1560–1700," in *The Church and Childhood*, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994), 325–46, at 331; WB 513–14; Clarke, *Lives of Eminent Persons*, 62; SEC 448, 173. "The Master of the Familie," taught William Perkins, had a duty "to bring his familie to the Church or Congregation on the Sabbath day, to looke that they doe religiously there behaue themselues, and after the publike exercises ended, & the Congregation is dismissed, to take account of that which they haue heard, that they may profit in knowledge and obedience." *Christian Oeconimie: or, A Short Survey of the Right Manner of Erecting an d Ordering a Familie, according to the Scriptures, Works*, 3:*698–99.

74. CTCL 84–85; PP 353; SP 252; see also CTCL 77; SJ 244; SP 253.

"Fashion not your selves like unto this world," the apostle Paul had written to the Romans, and Hooker was convinced that Paul's words were meant for his Chelmsford hearers. "What strange apparell, and haire laid out, and what Spanish locks bee there now adayes?" he asked. "These strange fashions doe argue strange distempers of spirit." Choices in clothing and hairstyle that seemed innocuous to the world were of great moment to the saints. "The Lord speakes plainely by the Prophet *Zephany*" [Zeph. 1.8.], thundered Hooker, "'Hee will visit all those that are cloathed with strange apparell'."

An angry God could even send a Spanish invasion to punish Englishmen and women for their vain fashions. "When the fire shall flame about your eares, and the enemies come to plucke your feathers from your Caps, then you will remember this. You would not have God to dispose of your cloathes, and haire, and the like, and therefore God will now dispose of your lives and liberties." Unwillingness to shun worldly fashion argued an ungodly and unregenerate heart. "He that will not have these base trifles to bee at Gods command, surely hee will never have his heart at Gods disposing, and therefore neither mind, nor heart, nor life."[75]

It was probably in their strict observation of the Sabbath that the godly set themselves off most visibly from their worldly neighbors. English Protestants in the early decades of the seventeenth century were generally known for their Sabbatarianism, which was mockingly termed a figment of the English imagination (*figmentum Anglicanum*) by Dutch theologians.[76] A statute dating from

---

75. Hooker's translation of Romans 12:2. SH 164–65. William Perkins had spoken against those who "doe beautifie their heads with bought haire" and condemned "the painting of faces," the "colouring of the haire," and the "wearing of long haire," as an abuse of God's workmanship which took God's name in vain. *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:81. Once again, young people were the primary offenders. Paul Griffiths writes that "a 1638 committee set up to investigate opulent dress also discussed a suitable curb on the 'libertie [taken by apprentices] in wearing of long haire.' Improper haircuts elicited sharp responses from moralists. They dwelled upon the dreadful portent of long hair in male youth." *Youth and Authority*, 229. In 1649 the Massachusetts Bay General Court did "declare and manifest our dislike and detestation against the wearing of such long haire, as against a thing unciviland unmanly whereby men doe deforme themselves, and offend sober and modest men, and doe corrupt good manners." *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 15, 37–38, cited in Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936), 88. In Hartford, Hooker continued to cite Rom. 12:2 against "loose locks and long Hair," AR 7:309–310.

76. *British Delegation and the Synod of Dort*, ed. Anthony Milton, xlviii. Kenneth L. Parker, *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). Haigh, *Plain Mans Pathways*, 92–97, discusses godly and profane attitudes toward Sabbath practices. Speaking of the first two-thirds of the seventeenth century, Christopher Durston concludes that "most English men and women seem to have retained a preference for a less spiritually intense Sunday" than the

the early years of Elizabeth's reign forbad any inhabitant of Chelmsford from having his shop window open on Sunday after the last ringing of the bells to matins, and the rule also forbad the sale of food and drink. Men and women could be sentenced to time in the Chelmsford house of correction for "profaning the Sabbath."

A notorious example was John Pearse, who was accused a decade before Hooker's arrival of opening his alehouse on Sundays during divine service. Pearse was undoubtedly an extreme case. He called his neighbors "knaves" and "whores," had amorous relations with fourteen women, among them his wife's sister, and had beaten his wife and broken her head. When admonished by one of Hooker's predecessors against swearing and drunkenness, he answered "saucily" that "he cared not a turd for him." The magistrates committed Pearse to the house of correction. Examples like Pearse help explain Hooker's anger toward alehouses and alehouse keepers.

Tradesmen who delivered goods on Sunday could also run awry of the authorities. After admonishing him for almost a decade, they finally required the "waggoner" Thomas Heditch in 1625 to "otherwise order" his deliveries to Chelmsford. It appears that they showed considerable restraint in enforcing Sabbath statutes, pursuing only the most notorious cases.[77]

Hooker and his godly brethren were less tolerant. We know that Hooker brought a particularly rigorous brand of Sabbatarianism to Chelmsford, and he seems rarely to have missed an opportunity to criticize those who took Sabbath regulations lightly. "Would you know," he asked, "whether you may buy, or sell, or bowle on the Sabbath day? Aske, would the *Lord Iesus* bowle, or buy, or sell, on the Sabbath day? would hee drop into Ale houses?" Only the "sinfull" would "still sell, and talke vainly on the Sabbath day." Only a negligent magistrate would fail to enforce Sabbath regulations. "A good officer will not suffer others to be idle, and absent from *Church*, to *worke*, to *buy, sell, drinke* &c."[78]

Samuel Stone was also known for his "exact Sabbaths." "When the Weekly *Sabbath* came," said Cotton Mather, "which he still began in the *Evening* before, he would compose himself unto a most heavenly Frame in all things, and not let fall a *Word*, but what should be grave, serious, penitent."[79] Rather

godly might have wished. " 'Preaching and Sitting Still on Sundays': The Lord's Day during the English Revolution," in *Religion in Revolutionary England*, ed. Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 205–25, at 222.

77. Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 1:132; 2:9, 20.

78. CTCL, 28, 44, see also 38, 54; PHH 37.

79. *Magnalia* 3:117.

than a fast, the Sabbath for Stone was a triumphant feast, "whereby we sport ourselves with God." "Weekly Sabbaths should be, and are our delights," he wrote, occasions when God "gives most royall entertainment to his servants." The Sabbath was a day of rest and recreation, a day on which the godly need "not attend the workes of our particular callings" but "must rest from all common workes, Speeche, thoughts … all vain or common recreations." Instead, God would enable the saints "not only to see and possesse the good things of himself, but also to have the sweet of them."[80]

If we assume that the same Sabbath practices that Cotton Mather found "grave, serious, and penitent" were a source of delight to Stone, we can imagine the extent of the gap between the saints and their worldly neighbors. Most working men and women looked forward to their one day off; they would simply not want to "spend whole days in communion with [God], and be taken up with his majesty so long together, and that with delight." Remembering how he used to spend the Sabbath before his conversion, a godly man might recall his "wicked legs, which formerly carried mee so nimbly to see sports, and ranne swiftly to doe mischief."[81] A saint's exact—and in Stone's case, eager—celebration of the Sabbath became a confirmation of his special favor with God, "a sign that God selects him from the common peoples of the World, and sets him apart for communion with him."

So far as Stone was concerned, conscientious observance of the Sabbath was the touchstone by which godly behavior ought to be measured. Citing Ezekiel 20:12. "I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the LORD that sanctify them," Stone explained that the way a person observed the Sabbath would reveal how serious she was about keeping the whole of God's law. "Keeping the Sabbath" would meet not only the requirements of the first table of the ten commandments (the first four) but also those of Jesus's two great commandments: loving God and loving one's neighbor as oneself. "Those who keep the Sabbath, keep all the commandments." A person's failure to honor the demands of the Sabbath demonstrated just as plainly that she did not enjoy God's favor. God would consider "the breach of his Sabbath, as a violation of his covenant."

By such a repertoire of distinctive practices, godly people in the early decades of the seventeenth century stood visibly apart from their worldly neighbors. A generation before, William Perkins had argued that "euery

---

80. For Stone on the Sabbath, see especially WB 444, 431–33, 443.

81. ST 17. Paul Griffiths writes that for young people, Sunday was "a day of rest and a chance to escape the monotonous rhythm of everyday work for spiritual or worldly refreshment." *Youth and Authority*, 189.

man who takes God for his father, must … separate himselfe, that men by his godly life may knowe whose childe he is." The saints had to be ready to expect that many of their neighbors would be offended by their piety and react with derision. "Now a daies, if a man carrie but a shew of humilitie, of good conscience, and of the feare of God, hee is accounted but a silly fellow, hee is hated, mocked, and despised on euery hand." "Oh he is a precise fellow, he goes to heare Sermons, he is too holy for our companie." But just as "by our liues and conuersations, very many among vs denie Christ," spending their time "in drunkennesse and surfetting, in chambering and wantonnesse," so the godly would be known for a different sort of behavior.[82]

Although worldly and godly might live in the same town or village, Hooker and Stone insisted that their differences not be blurred. "Though thou livest with thy [worldly] Father," said Hooker, "yet thou hatest his base courses, and though thy livest with thy [worldly] friends, yet thou hatest their wicked practices." The ability to "heartily love good Christians," advised Hooker, and "hate and avoid wicked and dissolute men," was a sign or "marke" of a sound Christian.[83] From two directions, godly behavior polarized communities. As Patrick Collinson observes, the pattern of godly activities served not only to create a "thick fabric of sociability" for the participants but also provoked "the hostile perception of onlookers."[84]

So rigorous was the fellowship of the godly that even some of those who had immigrated to New England to enjoy "the Discipline and Government of Christ" found the close scrutiny of their neighbors more than they could manage. Now "confined … to the narrow compass of the Covenant of the Gospel" in Hartford, a colonist might find himself unable to tolerate it.

> When he comes to be foulded in the fellowship of the Faith, and that men follow him home to his doors, and watch him in his retired carriage, and have occasion to grapple with his spirit in the specials which

---

82. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:134, 149. Paul Griffiths reports that the godly author Thomas Brooks ranked "mocking and scoffing at religious men and things" fourth in his catalogue of the sins of youth, *Youth and Authority,* 124. Haigh suggests that being hated by profane people was taken as proof one was "sufficiently godly. It was reassuring to be scorned by the worldlings." *Plain Mans Pathways,* 122,

83. SEC 83; PP 386.

84. "Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture," in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700,* ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 32–57, 267–68, 280–88, at 48–49; see also Collinson, "The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful," in *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England,* ed. Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 51–76.

concern his particular course, as when he had failed and offended, and therefore follows him with Physick answerable and appointed for the purpose, a seasonable admonition. … He begins secretly to distast and undermine the strictness of those waies that formerly he did come into these Parts for, that he might seek them, find and enjoy them as he often professed.[85]

For the most part, though, Hooker's experience with laypeople led him to have confidence in their judgment. Lay church members could generally tell the difference, he thought, between hypocrisy and true godliness, and lay political wisdom was also likely to be sound. When John Winthrop suggested that important decisions be reserved to the political élite, Hooker retorted that "a generall counsel chosen by all to transact businesses which concerne all" was "most safe" and "most sutable to rule."[86]

This chapter has described the way a particular group of English men and women attempted to restructure their everyday activities in order to meet the demands of the God they believed they had encountered in their reading of a vernacular Bible. A careful reading of Scripture seemed to them to legitimate a different form of community. Challenging the norms of conventional English culture, they tried to create this community within the limits allowed by their authorities.

Some of Hooker's hearers—"Mr. Hooker's company" in John Winthrop's designation—immigrated to New England. There they were given the opportunity to create a culture in which their values were the norms. God's will, as they understood it, would regulate everyone's everyday activities, not just those of a countercultural group. Now given the freedom to do so, they would add officers and sacraments to the common religious life they had already known in old England. Hartford's First Church would be the culmination of their efforts. These efforts need to be understood, as some British historians have insisted, as part of England's "Long Reformation," as one outcome of the gradual Protestantization of English life. Far from a new creation, Hartford's religious polity was a logical and organic development of the religious life the godly colonists had known in England.

Hooker and Stone, the spiritual leaders chosen to lead this company, reinforced belief in a God who demanded that his saints live "in but not of the

---

85. AR 10:421–22.

86. Letter to John Winthrop, c. Dec. 1638. On lay participation in admission to church membership, see chapter 12.

world" by scrupulously observing every one of his commandments. Through the words of his preachers, this God terrified godly and ungodly alike; anything less than complete submission to his will could bring his wrath to bear on his most faithful followers. How did Hooker and Stone come to imagine God in this way? The next three chapters explore the theological developments that led them to preach "the terrifying God."

4

Why People Want What They Want: St. Augustine of Hippo and His God

When shall we learn, what should be clear as day,
We cannot chose what we are free to love?[1]

La Statua del Commendatore: Pentiti, cangia vita, è l'ultimo
momento!
Don Giovanni: No, no, ch'io non mi pento.[2]

Imagining God

In 1835 Ludwig Feuerbach announced to the learned world that what it had called "religion" was the dream of the human mind. Christians had deluded themselves into thinking that the God whom they worshipped had any existence outside their own imaginations. Honest investigation would demonstrate that their "God" was nothing more than a projection of their own innermost yearnings. In the novelist George Eliot's translation two decades later, English readers of *The Essence of Christianity* were told that a religious person "projects his being into objectivity and then again makes himself an object to this projected image of himself thus converted into a subject."[3] Once Sigmund Freud had further developed the notion that believers

---

1. W. H. Auden, "Canzone," in *Collected Poetry of W. H. Auden* (New York: Random House, 1945).

2. W. A. Mozart, *Don Giovanni*, libretto by Lorenzo da Ponte, Act II, scene 5.

3. Feuerbach, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam Jun., 1969) [first published 1835], *The Essence of Christianity*, trans. George Eliot (New York: Harper & Row, 1957)

unknowingly objectify their own subjectivity, more and more people found themselves concluding with Freud that "God" was an "illusion," nothing more than a product of the human imagination. In the realm of religion, "imagination" came to mean "self-delusion." When the heirs of Feuerbach and Freud say that people "imagine" God, they generally mean that people make God up.[4]

Combined with the mind's inability to eliminate all forms of self-interest from its deliberations, limitations in its ability to perceive the world outside itself lend plausibility to any contention that humans are likely to deceive themselves when they try to imagine what their culture has come to think of as "God." But rather than begin with the assumption that all human imaginings of God are illusory, a student of the past is wiser to begin with a more inclusive understanding of imagination.

The anthropologist T. M. Luhrmann stated this understanding succinctly in a recent op-ed column in *The New York Times*: "Any faith demands that you experience the world as more than just what is material and observable. This does not mean that God is imaginary, but that because God is immaterial, those of faith must use their imaginations to represent God."[5] Scholars of religion like to say that imagination is the "paradigmatic" faculty, the way human beings "recognize in accessible exemplars the constitutive organizing patterns of other, less accessible and more complex objects of cognition."[6] In other words, the way believers imagine God may possibly be delusional, but it may just as well be their best effort to conceive of a reality beyond their finite ability to comprehend.[7] Believers may object that God is unchangeable and so beyond any individual moment in time, but the challenge before the student of the past becomes one of describing how "God" was imagined by particular people at a particular time and place.

[first translated 1854], 29–30. As is widely known, Karl Marx would later modify Feuerbach's argument to suggest that those in power use religion deliberately to drug the proletariat into accepting its miserable condition.

4. Most famously Freud, *Die Zukunft einer Illusion* (1927), English translation *The Future of an Illusion*, trans. W. D. Robson-Scott (London: Hogarth Press, 1928).

5. Luhrmann, "The Benefits of Church," *New York Times*, April 21, 2013.

6. The phrase is from Garrett Green, *Imagining God: Theology and the Religious Imagination* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 66–67.

7. This is not to deny that many educated people take for granted that religion is always delusional; this appears to be the assumption, for example, of John Stachniewski's *The Persecutory Imagination*.

How did Thomas Hooker and Samuel Stone imagine God? Where did they learn to imagine God as they did? The next three chapters will address these questions. We will find that they came to think of God in a manner ultimately shaped by the imagination of an African bishop, Augustine of Hippo, who was active in the late fourth and early fifth centuries. So influential were Augustine's writings that western Christian theologians would be wrestling with his way of imagining God for the next thousand years. In the early seventeenth century, Hooker and Stone would come to imagine God through the lens of an extreme form of Augustinian theology, one that they would pass on to their hearers in England and New England.

The control that Augustinian theology had over Hooker and Stone reveals itself most fundamentally in their assumptions about human behavior. Underneath every word they preached was the belief that people acted as they did because of what they wanted. In the faculty psychology of their day, the "will" drove people to make the important choices of their lives. What they called the "understanding," by which people used their reason to achieve optimal outcomes, was hardly neglected, but it was the will, a person's wanting, that gave ultimate direction to her behavior.[8]

If people chose what they wanted, what predisposed people to want what they ultimately chose? What was the origin of human wanting? Hooker and Stone took their answer to answer this question from an intellectual tradition shaped by the writings of Augustine.[9]

Virtually all of Augustine's voluminous corpus explores human motivation, but his analysis reached its sharpest point in a series of treatises written toward the end of his life against Pelagius, a British layman living in Rome, and Pelagius's followers. So influential did these "anti-Pelagian" treatises become that many historians of doctrine will argue that the decisive disputes of the Protestant and Catholic Reformations had largely to do with differing interpretations of these very treatises. In his magisterial study of the doctrine of justification, for example, Alister McGrath contends that although

---

8. The essential reference remains Norman Fiering, "Will and Intellect in the New England Mind," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 29 (1972): 515–58, later expanded in *Moral Philosophy at Seventeenth-Century Harvard: A Discipline in Transition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981). For Hooker's and Stone's voluntarism, see below chapter 7.

9. I rely heavily throughout this chapter on Peter Brown's *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, new Edition with an Epilogue (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), a portrayal of Augustine since deepened by Brown's *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) and *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 A.D.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

there is undoubtedly truth in the portrayal of the Reformation as a redis-covery of the Bible, "it is considerably more accurate to portray it as a redis-covery of Augustine's doctrine of grace." "Such was the importance that the Wittenberg Reformers came to attach to Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings," writes McGrath in another study, "that a theology of justification consistent with those writings came to function as a criterion of the catholicity of the church."[10]

This same "Augustinianism," historians argue, represented a radical break with what Christian theologians had previously said about the human will. Just as the behavior described in the last chapter set godly Protestants over against their more "worldly" neighbors, Augustine's assumptions about the human will set him and his followers at odds with what many Roman citizens took for granted about human behavior. But it was Augustine's theological *novum*, not the conventional wisdom of the centuries before him, that was to shape subsequent western Christianity.[11] More than a thou-sand years after his death, the countercultural positions that Augustine took in his controversy with Pelagius—"extreme Augustinianism"—still exerted an extraordinary influence on the preaching and writing of Hooker and Stone.[12]

The controversy began, according to Augustine, when Pelagius, well-known in Rome for his letters exhorting Christians to a more perfect life, took issue with a quotation from Augustine's *Confessions*. "Give what you command," Augustine had asked of God, "and command what you will." As Augustine recounted the incident, Pelagius "could not bear" these words, contradicted

---

10. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 2:1–2, and *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), 179. See also Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 5 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971–90), 1:331.

11. Most recently Kyle Harper, *From Shame to Sin: The Christian Transformation of Sexual Morality in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 140: "Augustine came to espouse a view of divine grace and original sin that cut against centuries of Christian voluntarism." See also Paula Fredriksen, *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Doctrine of Jews and Judaism* (New York: Doubleday, 2008), esp. 176–84.

12. I use the term "extreme Augustinianism" throughout this book to refer not only to the positions Augustine took in the anti-Pelagian treatises but also to the conclusions, such as double predestination and the irresistibility of divine grace, that some theologians drew from them. The differences between Augustine and, say, Luther, Perkins, Gregory of Rimini, or Cornelius Janssen are important, but for my purposes they are all extreme Augustinians; they largely accept what these treatises, particularly the latest ones, say about grace and free will.

them "excitedly," and nearly came to a quarrel with the bishop who had quoted them.[13]

Pelagius recognized immediately what Augustine's prayer had implied: no one was capable of obeying God's commandments without some extra divine assistance. The implication could not have been more unwelcome. Lax Christians in Rome were always looking for a way to avoid Pelagius's strenuous demands, and now Augustine had handed them the perfect excuse. Throughout the *Confessions*, in fact, both before and after his conversion, Augustine continually drew attention to his failings. Not only had he frequently made bad choices, but he also explored the underlying tendencies—toward pride, selfishness, and sexual gratification, for example—that had predisposed him to make those choices. The young Augustine's need for God's direct intervention in his personal life, without which he would never have come to faith and have persisted in it, was a constant theme of the *Confessions*.

Pelagius had nothing but contempt for moral weaklings. He could not abide an approach to ethical living that began with human frailty. Every human being had been born with the ability not simply to lead a "good" life but to be morally perfect. Although he admitted that no human being had actually achieved perfection, Pelagius was prepared to argue that a new-born infant could theoretically live an entire life without sinning. In the words of Augustine's biographer Peter Brown, Pelagius argued that "to treat grace as if it were a force that came from outside the self, was to do no more than objectify one's own inertia." In a phrase that was to horrify Augustine because it seemed to imply no need for any divine assistance, Pelagius wrote to the young

---

13. *mea verba … ferre non potuit, et contradicens aliquanto commotius, pene cum eo qui illa commemoraverat litigavit, De dono perseverantia.* xx.53, in J. B. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Latina* (hereinafter *P.L.*), 45:1026; the bishop was citing *Confess.* X.xxxi.45, *da quod iubes, et iube quod vis., P.L.* 32:798; *The Confessions*, trans. Maria Boulding, O.S.B., *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, vol. I/1 (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1997), 267. The following discussion of the Pelagian controversy is drawn chiefly from Brown, Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition* (100–600), and J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1960). Apart from a number of sermons and letters, Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings are to be found in *P.L.* vols. 44 and 45. They have been given a modern translation by Roland J. Teske, S.J., in *Answer to the Pelagians I, II, III, and IV*, vols. 23–26 of *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century* (New Rochelle, NY: New City Press, 1990–). This passage occurs in the Teske translation, 4:227–28. For a thorough discussion of the controversy, see Aimé Solignac, "Pélage et Pélagianisme," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1937–), XII/2:2889–2942. In *Through the Eye of a Needle*, e.g., 358, Brown argues that the Pelagian controversy ultimately stemmed from the clash between two views of wealth and the human condition: one brought to North Africa by exiles fleeing Rome after the sack of 410 and the other long held by the North African bishops. Because later vernacular terms often derive and gain meaning from a Latin original, I have included Augustine's text in the footnotes.

aristocrat Demetrias that "no one except you yourself will be able to endow you with spiritual riches."[14] By assuming that humans that could choose the good only if God constantly intervened to prop up their moral weakness, Augustine was destroying the foundation of everything Pelagius stood for.

One can best understand Pelagius, argues Brown, as a man trying to stem what he perceived as a tide of social and moral decay at the twilight of the western Roman Empire. Although they were Christian, Pelagius and his followers Caelestius and Julian of Eclanum admired the secular or "pagan" ideal of the Roman citizen, autonomous in his choices and virtuous in his choosing.[15] One had to understand, Pelagius taught, that each person came into the world with an absolutely free will; she or he was always fully capable of choosing either good or evil. Even a history of bad choices would not prejudice future decisions; people could at any time overcome their past and turn to the good.[16]

In the eyes of these fourth-century Romans, every individual Christian was perfectly capable of living a moral life: she had only to make the proper choices when confronted by ethical dilemmas. When God created a human being, God wanted that person to live a righteous life, a life which would result from the total of that person's autonomous choices for the good. Should she fail to choose the good, fail to live up to God's standards, the consequence was certain: she would be "consumed in eternal fires."[17] Pelagius envisioned human life on earth as a strict meritocracy; Christians would receive rewards and punishments *secundum merita*, according to merits.[18]

Pelagius had studied the letters of Paul and had written expositions of them. He was well aware of Paul's difficulties with a merit system, and he recognized that Paul had insisted on the need for divine assistance—grace—in gaining the

---

14. Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 305, discussing Pelagius's comment, *Spirituales vero divitias nullus tibi, præter te, conferre poterit, Epistula ad sacram Christi virginem Demetriadem* XI:1, *P.L.* 30:15–45, at 28, English translation "To Demetrias" in *The Letters of Pelagius and His Followers*, trans. B. R. Rees (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1991), 29–70, at 48.

15. E.g., Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 392: "Julian represents one peak of Roman civilization."

16. See *Opus imperfectum contra Julianum* I.91, *P.L.* 45:1108, *Unfinished Work in Answer to Julian, Answer to the Pelagians*, 3:115; Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 308–9.

17. *De natura et gratia*. xlix.57, l.58, *P.L.* 44:275, *Nature and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 1:253–54; *æternis eos ignibus exurendos, De gestis Pelagii* iii.9, vi.20, x.22, *P.L.* 44:324–25, 331, 333, *The Deeds of Pelagius, Answer to the Pelagians*, 1:341, 348, 350; Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 464.

18. *De gratia et libero arbitrio* v.11, *P.L.* 44:888, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians* 4:78; see also *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* III.viii.24, *P.L.* 44:606, *Answer to the Two Letters of the Pelagians, Answer to the Pelagians*, 2:180–81.

reward of eternal life. Just as Paul had despaired of achieving righteousness by fulfilling works of the law, so Pelagius was more than willing to acknowledge the practical necessity of divine grace. God made grace available, thought Pelagius, in a number of ways. God's primary act of grace was his very creation of human beings with the free will to choose and the ability to obey his commandments. Clearly describing his expectations for human behavior, as God had done by revealing the law, was also grace.[19] During his ministry on earth, Jesus had taught his followers, had exhorted them to believe, and had set an example of perfect behavior, further instances of divine grace.[20] Most decisively, Jesus's sacrificial death on the cross had wiped every believer's moral slate clean. In baptism, whatever sins had previously been committed were entirely forgiven.[21] Creation with freedom to choose and ability to obey, revelation of the law, Jesus's teaching, exhortation, and example, and his remission of all previous sin—all this grace was available to anyone who sought to live a perfect, Christian life. Just as the "worldly" citizens of Thomas Hooker's Chelmsford made what they thought of as commonsense assumptions about human life in the world, Pelagius and his followers believed they were expressing, in sharper fashion, the assumptions of cultured Romans. They were shocked at Augustine's countercultural opinions.

As is generally the case in disagreements, the antagonists attacked what they felt to be weak points in each other's positions. These attacks could and did provoke even more forceful statements of the original positions, but they also had the potential to inspire an antagonist to develop a position beyond what had originally been written. This was particularly true for Augustine, the most influential Christian thinker of his age. So it was fateful not only for this controversy but also for the subsequent history of Christianity that Pelagius focused his initial attacks on Augustine's understanding of human sexuality.

Moral athlete that he claimed to be, Pelagius had no difficulty with the position that sexual intercourse outside of marriage—fornication or adultery—was unacceptable. But Pelagius was stunned to read Augustine's argument that a husband and wife, sacramentally married, were somehow

---

19. *Pelagiani legem dicunt esse Dei gratiam, De grat. et. lib. arb.* xi.23, *P.L.* 44:895, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians,* 4:86.

20. *De gratia Christi, et de peccato originali* I.ii.2, I.xxxviii.42, *P.L.* 44:361, 379, *The Grace of Christ and Original Sin, Answer to the Pelagians,* 1:404, 424.

21. Ibid.; *De grat. et. lib. arb.* xiii.26, *P.L.* 44:896–7, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians,* 4:88. *cum Deus tam multis modis benignitatem suam asserat, id est, præcipiendo, benedicendo, sanctificando, coercendo, provocando, illuminando,* Julian of Eclanum cited in *Opus imp.* III.cvi, *P.L.* 45:1291, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians,* 3:334.

acting sinfully when they enjoyed sexual relations with each other, Did you actually teach, he accused Augustine, not only that sexual intercourse within marriage was unavoidably sinful but also that infants so conceived necessarily partook of that sin? Did you therefore deny that God created every man and woman with a neutral will—just as free to choose good as to choose evil—and ask Christians to believe that infants came into the world already inclined toward evil, guilty of a bad choice made long before their birth?[22]

In the course of defending himself against these and subsequent attacks by Pelagius and his followers, Augustine developed and articulated a series of related doctrines—original sin, the need for God to "prepare" the human will before it would be capable of doing good, human inability to "merit" divine grace, and predestination—that came to define "Augustinianism." It was this Augustinian "program" of doctrines, rather than Pelagius's more common-sense conviction that God would reward or punish people on the basis of their behavior on earth, that Hooker and Stone would eventually carry to Connecticut.

To refute Pelagius, Augustine turned to Scripture. His Latin Bible rendered Romans 5:12 as "Sin came into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, through one man [Adam], in whom all men sinned [*in quo omnes peccaverunt*]." Among the blessings conferred upon the first man at his creation in the Garden of Eden, argued Augustine, was the ability to refrain from sinning.[23] But because Adam's will was truly free, he had turned his back on God's commandments and had "fallen" into a state of alienation from God. To Augustine, Adam's disobedience was unimaginably evil. So angry was God, so utterly betrayed by his creature, that he determined to punish not only Adam and Eve but also every one of their descendants over endless generations.[24]

---

22. For a succinct summary of Pelagian and Augustinian positions on human sexuality, see Peter Brown, "Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century A.D.: Augustine and Julian of Eclanum," in *Tria corda: scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, Biblioteca di Athenaeum 1, ed. E. Gabba (Como: New Press, 1983), 49–70.

23. As Thomas Hooker put it, PP 213, "Adam had an uncontrollable liberty of will, whereby hee could begin his owne worke."

24. Augustine's fullest discussion of the "Fall" from Eden can be found in book XIV of his *De civitate Dei contra paganos*, *P.L.* 41:403–36. I use the translation by Philip Levine in the Loeb Classical Library, *Saint Augustine: The City of God against the Pagans*, 7 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957–72), 4:259–407. Another influential text was Psalm 51:5: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquitie: and in sinne did my mother conceiue me."

For from the moment of Adam's fall, every human being would now be born into the world in the same state of alienation as, and deserving the same punishment God had visited upon, their first ancestor.[25] While they were still developing in their mother's womb, human beings were already tainted with this "original sin," and from the instant of their birth they were incapable of not actively sinning (*non posse non peccare*).[26] For Pelagius, newborns came into the world morally neutral—equally able to sin or not to sin—and could, as Christians, find life tilted to the good by God's grace. For Augustine, newborns entered the world morally evil, liable for punishment by their complicity in the fall of Adam, and desperately in need of a divine grace that would not only tilt the playing field but also change the negative inclination of their hearts and wills. A thousand years after Augustine, Martin Luther would teach this Augustinian theology to his people in the second verse of his very first congregational hymn, *Nun freut euch, liebe Christen g'mein*:

> *Fast bound in Satan's chains I lay; Death brooded darkly o'er me.*
> *Sin was my torment night and day; In sin my mother bore me.*
> *Yet deep and deeper still I fell; Life had become a living hell,*
> *So firmly sin possessed me.*[27]

In Connecticut a hundred years after Luther, Samuel Stone concluded his extensive discussion of the same doctrine of "originall sin" with the memorable phrase: "all wee are skins filled with Adam's blood."[28]

Why else, Augustine demanded of Pelagius, was the Church—not to mention anxious parents—so desperately eager to baptize infants in danger of dying? The very existence of infant baptism proved that babies entered the world laden with guilt, guilt that needed to be washed away by baptismal water

---

25. *De civ. Dei.* XIV.1, *P.L.* 41:403, *City of God* 4:259. Hooker PP 220: "Adam *stood or fell for us as well as for himself*"; PP 242 "Adams sin is rightly charged upon us." AR 10:394: "As the will of a child of *Adam*, in generation it turns from God to sin, not by any first power of its own, but by the perverting work of the next Parent."

26. Henry Chadwick opines that in asserting that "even within marriage the sexual act cannot be done without some taint of cupidity," Augustine "injected a powerful and toxic theme into medieval theology." *Augustine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 114, cited in Peter Brown, *Body and Society*, 353.

27. *Dem teuffel ich gefangen lag, Im tod war ich verloren, / Meyn sund mich quelet nacht und tag, Darynn ich war geporen. / Ich fiel auch ymer tieffer dreyn, Es war keyn gutts am leben meyn, Die sund hat mich besessen. D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar, 1883–) (hereinafter *W.A.*), 35:423–24, this translation from *Martin Luther's Spiritual Songs*, trans. Richard Massie (London: Hatchard & Son, 1854), 47–50.

28. WB 147.

even before the helpless infant had had a chance to commit actual sin.[29] Why else, unless they were born complicit in the original sin of Adam? The more desperate humankind's need for grace, the more terrible must have been Adam's original transgression.

But how could Adam's descendants be held responsible for a sin that occurred long before their birth? Because original sin was transmitted by an infant's parents during the act of sexual intercourse that had conceived it. "By the begetting of the flesh," wrote Augustine, original sin was passed from parent to child.[30]

Think back to the beginnings of the human race, he told his Hippo Regius congregation, to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. After their great sin, disobeying God by eating the forbidden fruit, they had been "ashamed." What had they done next? They had covered their genitals with fig-leaves. "That's the place!" thundered Augustine. "That's the place from which the first sin is passed on." "This shame at the uncontrollable stirring of the genitals," writes Peter Brown in explaining Augustine's argument, "was the fitting punishment of the crime of disobedience. … Sexual feeling as men now experience it, was a penalty. Because it was a penalty for disobedience, it was itself disobedient, 'a torture to the will': thus it is the element of loss of control in the sexual act, that is isolated."[31] The "disobedience of the genitals" became for Augustine a paradigm of the disobedience to God's will that marked not only Adam and Eve but every one of their descendants. Because this disobedience was an inevitable component of the act of sexual intercourse by which every infant was conceived, every infant was deeply complicit in Adam's momentous disobedience, causing God to pursue what Brown calls "his awesome blood-feud against the family of Adam."[32] Wicked, needy humanity deserved nothing but divine wrath.

---

29. *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.xx.22, *P.L.* 44:427, *Marriage and Desire, Answer to the Pelagians*, 2:43.

30. *generante carne illud tantummodo trahitur, quod est originale peccatum, De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.xv.20, *P.L.* 44:120, *The Punishment and Forgiveness of Sins, Answer to the Pelagians*, 1:45.

31. *De civ. Dei* XIV.16–21, *P.L.* 41:424–30, *City of God*, 4:353–75; Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 388, citing *Sermon 151: Ecce* [Gen. 3:1–7] *unde trahitur originale peccatum, ecce unde nemo nascitur sine peccato, Sermo* 151.V, *P.L.* 38:817, English translation *Sermons on the New Testament*, trans. Edmund Hill, O.P., *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century III/5* (New Rochelle, NY: New City Press, 1992), 43–44. For Julian of Eclanum's characterization of Augustine's position, see *Opus imp.* III.cxlii, *P.L.* 45:1303–4, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians* 3:347.

32. *Augustine of Hippo*, 393; for Brown's more recent perspective on Augustine's attitude toward human sexuality, see 500–502.

Twelve centuries later, Samuel Stone would still be explaining that "our whole Nature is poisoned with originall corruption by natural generation." It was no accident that Abraham's male descendants were to be circumcised (for Stone circumcision was the "type" of Christian baptism), for the removing of the foreskin of the penis, "the shamefullest member, and instrument of Generation" was God's way of signifying "the viciousness of our nature." Thomas Hooker would likewise speak of "that Curse we inherit from the Loyns of our first Parents."[33]

Pelagius found this entire argument completely unbelievable. How could the same God who was willing to forgive a person's own sinful acts hold that same person accountable for the sin of a distant ancestor? He was willing to concede that someone with a habit of making bad choices was probably going to continue to make bad choices unless that habit were reformed. But even habitual sinners could be "stunned" into action by the fear of hell and the good example of Jesus, and the sacrament of baptism would wipe their moral slate clean.[34] Pelagius was certain that "Nothing evil passed from Adam upon the rest of humanity except death."[35]

It was left to Pelagius's brilliant young follower, Julian of Eclanum, to pursue the argument further. Julian found Augustine's position logically absurd. "If sin, then, is natural, it is not voluntary; if it is voluntary, it is not inborn. These two definitions are as contrary to each other as necessity and [free] will are contrary."[36] Far worse, it was morally reprehensible:

> We are, then, asked why we do not agree that sin is natural. We reply, Because it has not a shadow of probability, not to mention of truth, not

---

33. WB 533. AR 7:306–307. The Augustinian doctrine of original sin had long been a given in Western Christian theology, e.g., William Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition or Commentarie vpon the three first Chapters of the Revelation, Works,* 3:*359. With reference to early modern Europe, Jean Delumeau writes of original sin that "*il nous faut … lui accorder toute sa place—et elle est immense—dans l'univers mental d'autrefois.*" *Le Péché et La Peur* 273, *Sin and Fear* 245.

34. *De grat. Christi, et de pecc. orig.,* I.x.11, *P.L.* 44:365, *The Grace of Christ and Original Sin, Answer to the Pelagians* I:408–9, cited by Brown, *Augustine of Hippo,* 371–72; *De pecc. mer. et remiss.* III.viii.15, *P.L.* 44:194, *The Punishment and Forgiveness of Sins, Answer to the Pelagians* 1:129; *De grat. Christi et de pecc. orig.* II.xiii.14, *P.L.* 44:391, *Grace and Original Sin. Answer to the Pelagians,* 1:440.

35. *Ex Adam nihil mali transisse per cæteros, nisi mortem,* cited in *Contra duas epis. Pel.* IV.ii.2, *P.L.* 44:609, *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians, Answer to the Pelagians,* 2:186–87.

36. *istæ duæ definitiones tam contrariæ sibi sunt, quam contrarium est necessitas et voluntas,* *Opus imp.contra Jul.* IV.93, *P.L.* 45:1393, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians,* 3:458, cited by Pelikan, *Emergence of the Christian Tradition,* 315.

a shadow of justice, nor of piety; because it makes the devil appear to be the creator of human beings … it attacks and destroys free choice. … You say that all human beings are so incapable of any virtue that in the womb of their mothers they are filled with sins from long ago. You write that the force of these sins not only drives out natural innocence, but also forces people thereafter into all the vices through their whole lives. … [Your doctrine] extinguishes attempts at every sort of goodness. … It was no less disgraceful than sacrilegious to cling to the shame over the sex organs as the highest testimony for his [Augustine's] position.[37]

These are not words of mild disagreement. Although both were ostensibly Christian, they imagined God in completely different ways, so that an immense chasm separated Augustine and Julian on the issues that mattered most to both. From Julian's point of view, Augustine seemed to be ignoring obvious truths, things that no reasonable person could possibly question. What could have driven Augustine to take positions that seemed so radically at odds with the conventional wisdom of an élite Roman?

As a bishop constantly brought up against the weaknesses of human nature, Augustine was struck by how far human beings had fallen from their idyllic first moments in the Garden of Eden. He could imagine, for example, "what the intercourse of Adam and Eve in Paradise might have been like if they had not fallen. Such intercourse would have been an act of solemn delight, where two fully physical bodies followed the stirrings of their souls, 'all in a wondrous pitch of perfect peace'. It was only Adam's purely mental act of pride, followed by disobedience to God, that destroyed forever a potential joyful harmony of body and soul."[38] After the fall, intercourse had degenerated to a lustful coupling where the partners' souls abandoned control to an almost animal passion.

See the injury which the will's disobedience has inflicted upon human nature. Let him pray to be healed! Why does [the Pelagian] expect so much from the ability of nature? It is wounded, injured, beaten, ruined;

37. *quia nullum habet verisimilitudinis, nodum veritatis, nullum justitiæ, nullum pietatis colorem: quia diabolum conditorem hominum facit videri … quia liberum arbitrium … infringit et destruit … ut in ipsis matrum visceribus, antiquis criminibus impleantur. … pro summis assertionis suæ testimoniis genitalium pudorem amplexatu,* Julian *Ad Florum,* cited in *Opus imp. contra Jul.* Book III, 67–74, *P.L.* 45:1278–79, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians,* 3:319–20, and cited by Brown, *Augustine of Hippo,* 387.

38. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo,* 501. For Augustine's discussion of Edenic marriage, see *De civ. Dei* XIV.23–26, *P.L.* 41:430–35, *City of God,* 4:379–401.

it is in need of a true confession, not of a false defense. Let it ask, then, for the grace of God, not that by which it is created, but that by which it is restored.[39]

The human condition was one of radical need. The autonomous individual choices so important to the Pelagians could never liberate anyone from her sinful condition. People needed outside help, and that help would come from the sacraments and clergy of the Catholic Church. At this critical juncture in Christian history, Augustine denigrated the efforts of the individual layperson and drove her to rely on an ordained ministry.

For Augustine simply saw no sign of the moral freedom that Julian so casually took for granted. He conceded that humans were born with free choice (*liberum arbitrium*); nothing forced them to choose badly. In Pelagius's terms, everyone could choose the good; they had not lost the capacity (*possibilitas*).[40] But would they? Did they want to; would they voluntarily subordinate their own selfish inclinations to God's will? Here Augustine and Pelagius parted company. Pelagius had argued that the willing, the *velle*, was in human power. Augustine, drawing on his reading of Scripture, his knowledge of his own will, and his experience as bishop, disagreed. In the Garden of Eden, Adam had been a free agent, but since the fall, he and his descendants had become enslaved, physically to the devil and psychologically to ignorance, concupiscence, and death.[41] At the deepest level of their souls, humans pridefully sought their own satisfaction rather than God's; they continued to participate in Adam's disobedience and rebellion. They could have served God, but they did not want to. They remained free, but with that freedom they invariably rejected God. Given the ability and the will to do something good, Pelagius had argued, humans could do that good. No, said Augustine. Without the assistance of the church, the prideful will would pursue its own ends, and no good would be done.[42]

---

39. *vulnerata, sauciata, vexata, perdita est ... Gratia ergo Dei, non qua instituatur, sed qua restituatur, quæratur, De natura et gratia* liii.62, *P.L.* 44:277, *Nature and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 1:256.

40. *De gratia Christi et de peccato originale* I.iii.4–iv.5. *P.L.* 44:361–62, *The Grace of Christ and Original Sin, Answer to the Pelagians*, 1:404.

41. In Augustine's vocabulary, explains J. N. D. Kelly, "concupiscence stands, in a general way, for every inclination making man turn from God to find satisfaction in material things which are intrinsically evanescent." *Christian Doctrine*, 364–65.

42. *De prædestinatione sanctorum* v.10, *P.L.* 44:968, *The Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:157–58. In his *Confessions*, Augustine described how he watched infants

Where Pelagians had thought of grace as a reward for meritorious living, Augustine saw it as a precondition.[43] Grace had to precede, to "come before" (*prævenire*) any choice of the good, because it was this "prevenient" grace that made selfless acts possible. Prevenient grace readjusted the will's very inclination, drawing it toward God's commandments instead of self-gratification.[44] "The human will does not attain grace by freedom," Augustine could write in a characteristic turn of phrase, "but rather attains freedom by grace."[45]

In describing the way prevenient grace exerted influence on a reluctant human will, Augustine tended to use one of three characteristic verbs. Grace might "incline" (*inclinat*) it, "prepare" (*præparat*) it, or "frame" (*fingit*) it. "You suppose," said Augustine, "that good works have their origin in yourself alone" (*ex te ipso tibi existentibus*), but in reality God "framed, i.e. formed and created you" to do those works (*te Deus finxit, id est formavit et creavit*). When the Psalmist prayed (Ps. 51:10a), "Create in mee a cleane heart, O God"; he asked God to reform, reshape, literally re-create his heart toward good works. "We are framed, i.e. formed, and created" (*fingimur ergo, id est formamur et creamur*), Augustine continued, in order that we might do good works; "we did not prepare ourselves, but God prepared us that we might walk in them."[46] If a person wanted to keep the commandments, she could, but she would not want to unless her will had first been "prepared" (*præparatur voluntas*). "We act when we act," he continued, but God "acts it that we act, by applying extraordinarily efficacious powers to our will."[47] God's initiative in "preparing" or "framing" the human will thus became the hinge on which the whole

driven by desires (*voluntates*) but frustrated by their inability to express and attain them. *Confessiones* I.vi.8, *P.L.* 32:664, *Confessions*, 43–44.

43. *laborant … ostendere gratiam Dei secundum merita nostra dari*, said Augustine of the Pelagians, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* v.11 *P.L.* 44:888, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:78.

44. *cum data [gratia] fuerit, incipient esse etiam merita nostra bona, De grat. et lib. arb.* vi.13, vi.15, xviii.38, *P.L.* 44:889, 890, 904, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4: 79–81, 97.

45. *Voluntas quippe humana non libertate consequitur gratiam, sed gratia potius libertatem, De correptio et gratia*, viii.17, *P.L.* 44:926, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:120; see also *De grat. et lib. arb.* xiv.28, xv.31, *P.L.* 44:897, 899, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:89–92.

46. *non præparavimus nos, sed præparavit Deus, ut in illis ambulemus, De grat. et lib. arb.* viii.20, *P.L.* 44:893, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:83–84.

47. *Certum est nos facere, cum facimus: sed ille facit ut faciamus, præbendo vires efficacissimas voluntati, De grat. et lib. arb.* xvi.32: *P.L.* 44:900–901, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:93, see also *De præd. sanct.* v.10, *P.L.*, 44:968, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer*

Augustinian system turned. Without divine preparation, no human being would turn to God and obey his will.

"Applying extraordinarily efficacious powers" had two important components. First, God's omnipotence assured that his framing of the will invariably succeeded in getting the person to will what God wanted. God could direct a human will "wherever he might wish" (*quocumque voluerit*).[48] But second, despite what the phrase might seem to imply, God did not simply overpower the reluctant will. Grace operated subtly. As Holy Spirit, God worked in the human heart to "incline" the will toward the good.[49] God might be omnipotent; grace might be irresistible; but God used his power to incline, not destroy the human heart.[50] Using another metaphor, Augustine could speak of the Holy Spirit's "enkindling" the will.[51]

Only after grace had framed, prepared, inclined, enkindled a person's will would the person become capable of faith and obedience. Prevenient or "operating grace" (*gratia operans*), secretly bestowed in the heart, softened a person's resistance to God.[52] Once "framed" or "prepared," the person's will would be capable of working together with additional internal divine activity (God's "cooperating grace" or *gratia cooperans*), that supported the prepared

---

to the Pelagians, 4:154. Athanase Sage argues that the phrase *præparatur voluntas a Domino* (Proverbs 8:35 in Augustine's Latin Bible) serves as an "Ariadne's thread" to direct a reader through the maze of arguments about Augustine's doctrine of grace, "Praeparatur voluntas a Domino," *Revue des Ètudes Augustiniennes*, 10 (1964): 1–20.

48. *De grat. et lib. arb.*, xxi.43, *P.L.* 44:909, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:102–103.

49. *manifestatur, operari Deum in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates*, ibid.

50. *[Deus] habens humanorum cordium quo placeret inclinandorum omnipotentissimum potestatem*, *De correp. et grat.* xiv.45, *P.L.* 44:943, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:140. William Perkins would later cite Augustine as his authority for arguing that God worked "internally" (*intrinsecus*) to incline the will toward the good but only "externally" (*extrinsecus*)—by propounding good objects to someone whom he knew would choose to reject them—when permitting evil to occur. *De praedestiationis modo et ordine* (Cambridge, 1598), 69, English translation, *A Christian and Plain Treatise of the Manner and Order of Predestination*, trans. Francis Cacot and Thomas Tuke, *Works* 2:621. God worked by "inclining the will in milde and easie manner [*suaviter inclinando*]. *A Treatise of Gods Free Grace and Mans Free Will, Works*, 1:740.

51. *Spiritu sancto accenditur voluntas, De correp. et grat.* xii.38, *P.L.* 44:939, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:135. In Christian tradition, the heart was thought to be the seat of the will. The same Hebrew word, for example, is translated as either "heart" or "will" depending upon the context.

52. *occulte humanis cordibus ... tribuitur, De præd. sanct.* viii.13: *P.L.* 44:971, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:160.

will in its inclination to choose the good.[53] The very ability to cooperate with God, let alone the ability to act independently, would be impossible unless God had first worked to move a person's will inwardly.

By so identifying "preparation" with the prevenient *gratia operans*, Augustine intended to extinguish any suspicion that God merely responded to human initiative. Grace—implementing a free divine decision—initiated and directed the entire process by which a person turned from disobedience to obedience. God prepared the errant will; then God assisted the prepared will to choose and to do the good.

Paul had written (Rom. 10:14–17) that faith generally arose when people were listening to someone preach the gospel, the good news that God had made salvation available to sinful humans through Christ's death and resurrection. This meant for Augustine that God chose to work in a human heart while a person was listening to a sermon, to a minister expounding God's promises as written in the Bible. As the people whom God meant to call heard the minister's words, God kindled, inclined, framed, prepared their hearts so that "they should be converted and believe when they heard [the Gospel]."[54] Confronted by the fact that among a multitude of hearers, some believed and others turned away, Augustine replied simply that the believers had had their wills prepared by the Lord; the doubters had not.[55]

How did God decide which human beings would be internally moved to obedience and which would be left in their original sin? It was this question that led Augustine to the doctrine of predestination. The answer lay in an utterly mysterious divine decision, taken before the creation of the world, that determined each individual's final fate. *Sub specie æternitatis*, the preparation for grace that a person experienced as occurring during the course of her time on earth was actually set in place before the beginning of time, set in place when God predestined her to salvation.[56] Those whom God had "elected," whom he had predestined to

---

53. *Et quis istam etsi parvam dare cœperat charitatem, nisi ille qui præparat voluntatem, et cooperando perficit, quod operando incipit. Quoniam ipse ut velimus operatur incipiens, qui volentibus cooperatur perficiens . . . . Ut ergo velimus, sine nobis operatur; cum autem volumus, et sic volumus ut faciamus, nobiscum cooperatur, De grat. et lib. arb.* xvii.33, *P.L.* 44:901, *Grace and Free Choice, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:94.

54. *eo audito convertantur et credant, De præd. sanct.* xix.39, *P.L.* 44:989, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:182.

55. *aliis præparatur, aliis non præparatur voluntas a Domino*, ibid., vi.11: *P.L.* 44:968, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:158.

56. *Prædestinatio est gratiæ præparatio. … Quocirca prædestinatio Dei quæ in bono est, gratiæ est, ut dixi, præparatio: gratia vero est ipsius prædestinationis effectus*, ibid., x.19, *P.L.* 44:974–75, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:165.

salvation, would in time have their hearts inwardly moved, would come to obey, and would be rewarded with eternal life.[57] The rest—the reprobate—would be left in their disobedience and punished with eternal death.[58]

But how could Augustine reconcile this doctrine of predestination with what appeared to be the unambiguous teaching of the New Testament (1 Tim. 2:4) that God "will haue all men to bee saued"? Since God's intentions could not be frustrated, did Augustine imagine that the Bible did not actually mean what it so plainly seemed to say? Possibly. He suggested that the passage might be understood "not that there is no person whose salvation [God] does not desire, but that no one is saved unless God desires it."[59] Or perhaps the passage had been intended as instruction for pastors, "to desire that all to whom we preach … may be saved."[60] Or perhaps by "all people," the Scriptures actually meant "all those predestined to salvation": "all the predestined may be understood, because every kind of human being is among them."[61] No Pelagian would have been persuaded by any of these explanations. Had Augustine's polemic driven him to prefer his own logic to the plain meaning of Scripture?

---

57. *Quicumque ergo in Dei providentissima dispositione præsciti, prædestinati, vocati, justificati, glorificati sunt, non dico etiam nondum renati, sed etiam nondum nati, jam filii Dei sunt, et omnino perire non possunt, De correp. et gratia* ix.23, *P.L.* 44:930, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:124.

58. *facturo Deo aut misericordiam, aut judicium: misericordiam quidem, si a massa perditionis ille qui corripitur, gratiæ largitate discretus est, et non est inter vasa iræ quæ perfecta sunt in perditionem, sed inter vasa misericordiæ quæ præparavit Deus in gloriam* (Rom. ix.22, 23); *judicium vero, si in illis est damnatus, in his non est prædestinatus, ibid.*, ix.25, *P.L.* 44:931, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:126. Richard Muller writes that "the concept of predestination or of divine decrees can only be properly understood as it is seen to represent one aspect, the causal aspect, of an eternal solution to the temporal predicament: it is the vertical line of the saving will that intersects, at a particular temporal moment, the history of salvation and the life of the individual in that history." *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 19.

59. *diceretur nullum hominem fieri salvum, nisi quem fieri ipse [Deus] voluerit, Enchiridion* ciii, *P.L.* 40;280, English translation *The Enchiridion on Faith, Hope and Charity*, trans. Bruce Harbert. In *On Christian Belief. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century* I/8 (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2005), 332–34, cited by Pelikan, *Emergence of the Christian Tradition*, 391.

60. *omnes quibus prædicamus … salvos fieri Deus jubet, De corr. et grat.* xv.46–47, *P.L.* 44:944–45, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:141–42.

61. *intelligantur omnes prædestinati, qui omne genus hominum in eis est, ibid.*, xiv.44, *P.L.* 44:943, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:139. William Perkins would make a similar argument, see *Armilla Avrea, id est, Theologiæ Descriptio Mirandum Seriem Causarum & Salutis & Damnationis iuxta Verbum Dei Proponens*, 3d ed. (Cambridge: John Legatt, 1592),

Assuming that the grace of God was given "not according to the merits of the recipients, but according to the good pleasure of his will," could anything be known about that will?[62] Was there a plausible explanation why a merciful God would want to condemn anyone to eternal punishment, let alone condemn people who were no less deserving than the ones he chose to reward? Augustine could say, and did, that God's judgments were unsearchable, and his ways past finding out.[63]

But Augustine could also write as if God had something to prove. Just as dispensing grace to some unworthy recipients demonstrated that God was merciful (*misericors*), not dispensing it to other equally unworthy recipients demonstrated that God was just (*justus*). God would have been completely within his rights not to save anyone; that he saved many was a great grace.[64] Those fortunate enough to have enjoyed his favor might be tempted to take some credit to themselves, so it was important that they be taught to give all the credit where it belonged, to God. God taught this lesson by damning the reprobate, so that the elect would know what their own fate would have been if they had gotten what they deserved. God decided not to offer grace to large numbers of people, wrote Augustine, "so that he may make known the riches of his glory to [the elect]."[65] In other words, God's purpose in damning the reprobate was educational: the elect would learn how gracious God was for not damning them as well.[66]

How could the elect learn how fortunate they were and how gracious God was? Predestination would have to be preached! Cautiously, to be sure; the clergy had to be careful not to expound it in such a way as to undercut human

---

342, English translation *A Golden Chaine: Or, the Description of Theologie, Containing the Order of the Causes of Saluation and Damnation, According to Gods Word, Works*, 1:109, *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:296, *De Prædestinationis Modo et Ordine*, 89, *Treatise on Predestination, Works*, 2:623.

62. *non secundum merita accipientium, sed secundum placitum voluntatis ejus, De dono perseverantiae.* xii.28, *P.L.* 45:1009, *The Gift of Perseverance, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:208.

63. Ibid., xii.30, *P.L.* 45:1011, *The Gift of Perseverance, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:210, citing Rom. 11:33.

64. *constat magnam esse gratiam, quo plurimi liberantur, De præd. sanc.* viii.16, *P.L.* 44:972, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:163. Fredriksen draws particular attention to this development in Augustine's thought, *Augustine and the Jews*, 180–81.

65. *ut notas faciat divitias gloriæ suæ in vasa misericordiæ*, citing Rom. 9:23, *De dona persev.* xii.28, *P.L.* 45:1009, *The Gift of Perseverance, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:208.

66. Augustine made a similar argument in *de civitate Dei* XIV.26–27, *P.L.* 41:434–36, *City of God*, 4:395–405.

initiative. But it had to be preached nevertheless, so that diligent Christians would know that their diligence came from, and had been foreknown by, God.[67]

Needless to say, Pelagians found this entire program unbelievable and deeply abhorrent. God as they imagined him would never secretly insinuate himself into human psyches and, having overcome their inevitable resistance, incline their wills in a direction they would not otherwise have chosen. Pelagius and his followers denied "any supply of power from without" or "any additional assistance of God's cooperation and inspiration of love."[68] It was simply wrong, Pelagians believed, to contend that grace might somehow "infuse a desire of virtue into a reluctant heart."[69] Their way of thinking respected the assumption behind the countless biblical passages that exhorted human beings to take the initiative by choosing to obey God's law: the assumption that human beings had the free will, and the ability, to do so.[70]

But was it consistent with the jealous God of the Bible, mightily concerned with his glory and honor? Did it place too much value on human choosing, imagining God as reacting to human initiative? Despite Pelagius's talk of grace, was his God not finally a score-keeper who condemned or exonerated each human being according to what that human being had independently chosen to do or not to do? Did Pelagius's position sufficiently respect the countless biblical passages that told of God's taking the initiative, of God's overcoming

---

67. *De dono persev.* xxii.57, *P.L.* 45:1028–29. *The Gift of Perseverance, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:230–31. In his *Lectures on Romans*, Luther quotes a pertinent passage from Augustine's *Enchiridion* "it was right that those who are redeemed should be redeemed in such a way as to show, by the greater number who are unredeemed and left in their just condemnation, what the whole race deserved, and whither the deserved judgment of God would lead even the redeemed, did not His undeserved mercy interpose." *Diui Pauli apostoli ad Romanos Epistola, W.A.* 56:404, English translation, *Luther: Lecture on Romans*, trans. Wilhelm Pauck (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 276, citing *Enchiridion* xcix, *P.L.* 40:278, *Enchiridion on Faith. Hope, and Love, On Christian Belief,* 331: *universum genus humanum tam justo judicio divino in apostatica radice damnatum, ut etiam si nullus inde liberaretur, nemo recte posset Dei vituperare justitiam; et qui liberantur, sic oportuisse liberari, ut ex pluribus non liberatis, atque in damnationem justissima redactis, ostenderetur quid meruisset universa conspersio, et quo etiam istos debitum judicium Dei duceret, nisi eis indebita misericordia subveniret.*

68. Pelagians cited in *De grat. et de pecc. orig.* I.ii.2–iii.3, *P.L.* 44:361, *Grace and Original Sin, Answer to the Pelagians*, 1:403.

69. Pelagians cited in *Contra duas epis. Pelag.* IV.ii.2, *P.L.* 44:609, *Answer to Two Letters, Answer to the Pelagians*, 2:186.

70. E.g., Rev. 3:20: "Behold I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him"; cf. Rev. 22:17, Joel 2:12, Zach. 1:3, and James 4:8.

initial human resistance to obey?[71] Did it allow the creator to retain his "sovereignty," to remain in control of his creation?

Augustine believed that it did not. As he saw it, the Pelagians had grossly underestimated the corruption of the human will since the Fall. Human selfishness had completely perverted human decision-making. Every descendant of the first human beings had inherited an "original" sin which was itself worthy of punishment and which inevitably led to further selfish actions. Because original sin was deeply rooted in the human will, humans had become so thoroughly self-centered that no person would ever want to serve God.

The Pelagian conception of divine intervention—Christ's forgiving past sins, setting a perfect example, exhorting to obedience—could never overcome the will's selfish inclination, because that kind of intervention remained external (*extrinseca*) to the individual act of choosing. Augustine was convinced that God's intervention had to be deeply internal (*intrinseca*), working directly on the human will to redirect it toward obedience to God. Through his activity as Holy Spirit, God would work internally to direct a person's choice toward the good. Without that internal activity, Pelagius's external helps could never turn that person back to God. Unless a special divine operation became directly involved in the act of choice, unless God worked within the human heart to incline it to obedience, external helps—including the most cogent appeals to human reason—would be ineffective. Redemption did not finally depend on what humans chose to do; God would choose when and under what circumstances he would move a human will to obedience. When he did so, the influence of his grace on the innermost activity of the human will would inevitably lead that will to respond as God wished. For Augustine, the path to salvation was a zero-sum game, and all the initiative and control had to rest with God.

As Augustine and Julian tossed proof texts at each other, Matthew 23:37 was drawn into the argument. Here Jesus says, "O Hierusalem, Hierusalem . . . how often would I haue gathered thy children together, euen as a hen gathereth her chickens vnder her wings, and yee would not?" Taking the passage at face value, Julian read it as demonstrating that the children of Jerusalem had had the ability to thwart Jesus's wish that he gather them as a hen gathers her chicks. "His intention was blocked by the human will." If Jesus had not meant that salvation would ultimately result from human choosing, his words here would simply not be just (*non potest constare judicii*).

Augustine disagreed. God as Augustine imagined him would brook no resistance to his wishes. "Heaven forbid," Augustine countered, "that a

---

71. E.g., John 6:44: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him," Romans 9:15–16, Phil. 2:12b–13.

human being should block the intention of an omnipotent God. … Just as it is certain that Jerusalem did not want her children to be gathered by him, so it is certain that he gathered whichever of them he willed, even though she was unwilling."[72] We will encounter this passage again in subsequent chapters.

Augustine's Terrifying God

But Augustinianism came with a heavy price. Even without the benefit of having read Augustine's final and most extreme treatises, Julian of Eclanum left the Christian world with a catalog of the fearful consequences of Augustine's doctrine and Augustine's God. If even baptized parents could still pass sin on to their infant children, then baptism was defective; it was incapable of forgiving all sins. Far worse, if those infants had the misfortune to die before being baptized—but also before they had committed any actual sin—Augustine's God could and did use their "original sin" as the rationale to condemn those infants to eternal flames. "Who is there who is so mad, so cruel, so forgetful of God and of justice, so treacherous a barbarian as to pronounce these little ones guilty?" How could Augustine have strayed so far from religious feeling, from learning, and finally from mere common sense that he could imagine a God who was capable of such a crime?[73]

As Julian saw it, Augustine's God was the actual author of sin. Augustinian theology destroyed free will, undermined the law which the Prophets and Apostles had taught, extinguished human effort, and imagined people in bondage to a sin so powerful that it forced people into every form of viciousness throughout the course of their lives. In a challenge to extreme Augustinianism that has never ceased to reverberate, Julian protested that if God were not just, he would simply not be God.[74] As Abraham had said to God as the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah

---

72. *dicit intentionem suam humana voluntate impeditam fuisse*, Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Florum*, and Augustine's answer: *Absit ut impediatur ab homine omnipotentis … intentio. … Sicut certum est Jerusalem filios suos ab illos colligi noluisse, ita certum est eum etiam ipsa nolente quoscumque eorum voluit, collegisse.* Both in *Opus imp.* I:93, *P.L.* 45:1109, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians*, 3:115–16.

73. *Quis ille fuit, qui hos adjudicaret reos, tam excors, tam trux, tam oblitus Dei et æquitatis, barbarus perduellis? … [Deus] pro mala voluntate æternis ignibus parvulos tradit … ab religione, ab eruditione, a communibus postremo sensibus aufugisses … Dominum tuum crinimosum putares*? Julian, *Ad Florum*, cited in *Opus imp.* I.xlviii, *P.L.* 45:1069–70, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians*, 3:74–75.

74. *Dicis … bonum Deum, qui mala, id est peccata, condat, informet, extendat;* Julian, *Ad Florum*, cited in *Opus imp.* III.clxi, *P.L.* 45:1314, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians*, 3:359; *per totam vitam in vitia universa coactricem*, Julian, *Ad Florum*, cited in *Opus imp.* III.lxxi, *P.L.* 45:1279, *Unfinished Work*, 3:319; *Contra Julianum*, II.i.2, ix.31, *P.L.* 44:672, 694, *Answer to*

hung in the balance, "Shall not the Iudge of all the earth doe right?" (Gen. 18:25) Could one who is "capable of so many crimes," wrote Julian of Augustine's deity, "still be called 'God'?"[75]

"Pelagianism" was finally condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431, but even before the condemnation some Christians had already developed a compromise position. Later known as "Semipelagians," these thinkers agreed that it was erroneous to imagine God as having to "wait" on human actions, as having to reserve judgment until human creatures had used their freedom well or badly.[76] They imagined a God who knew from the outset, from before the beginning of time, whom he would save and whom he would abandon to just punishment for disobedience. God's omniscience gave God infallible foreknowledge; he could "look" into the future and know precisely how each creature would use his or her freedom. God could then, the Semipelagians imagined, determine to save precisely those creatures, and only those, whom God foreknew would use their freedom well.[77] By this scheme, God did not have to reserve judgment on whether to save any individual human being until he had seen how that human being behaved. His choice to save or damn preceded the creation of the world. Before heaven had come into being, God knew the name of every future inhabitant. Although human creatures freely responded, or failed to respond, to God's call, God's priority and free initiative in the process of salvation had been preserved.

Or so the Semipelagians imagined. But Augustine and the leaders of the early Church found the Semipelagian conception of God only slightly less

---

Julian, Answer to the Pelagians, 2:304. 328; *justitia, sine qua deitas non est,* Julian, *Ad Florum,* cited in *Opus imp.* I.xxxviii, *P.L.* 45:1064, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians,* 4:69. *Creat igitur malum Deus. Et puniuntur innocentes, propter quod fuit Deus. … Et imputat hominisbus crimen manuum suarum Deus. … Et fructum ab homine bonitatis reposcit, cui malum ingenuit Deus.* Julian, *Ad Florum,* cited in *Opus imp.* III.cxxviii–cxxxiii, *P.L.* 45:1300–01, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians,* 3:343–44. Alister McGrath explains how Augustine's notion of divine justice conflicted with Julian's Ciceronian notion in "Divine Justice and Divine Equity in the Controversy between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum," *Downside Review* 101 (1983): 312–19.

75. *Et qui tot crimina capit, adhuc vocatur Deus?* Julian, *Ad Florum,* cited in *Opus imp.* III. cxxxv, *P.L.* 45:1301, *Unfinished Work, Answer to the Pelagians,* 3:344. In *From Shame to Sin,* Kyle Harper is struck by the discontinuity between Augustine's positions on grace and free will and those of earlier Christian thinkers, who might well have sided with Pelagius.

76. Alister McGrath believes the term "Semipelagian" is anachronistic and prefers the term "Massilian." *Iustitia Dei* 1:72.

77. *"Præscibat ergo," ait* [semi-]*Pelagianus, "qui futuri essent sancti et immaculati per liberæ voluntatis arbitrium: et ideo eos ante mundi constitutionem in ipsa sua præscientia, qua tales futuros esse præscivit, elegit. Elegit ergo," inquit, "antequam essent, prædestinatans filios, quos futuros sanctos immaculatosque præscivit: utique ipse non fecit, nec se facturum, sed illos futuros*

objectionable than that of the Pelagians. Whether God had to reserve judgment until creatures had acted freely, or whether he knew the outcome of their free actions in advance, salvation in the final analysis still rested on human choices rather than God's merciful grace. This was a way of conceiving God's activity that the Church could not accept.

A hundred years of further controversy led to the Second Council of Orange (*Concilium Arausicanum II*) in 529. The last official effort for several centuries to define Catholic faith on the disputed issues, the Council largely adopted the positions of Augustine. It rejected the notion that God decided to elect certain individuals solely because he knew ahead of time what they would do, and it affirmed that divine grace anticipated human free will.[78]

But the Council fathers shrank from the extremes of Augustine's position. They refused to affirm that the human will could never resist God's gracious inclination, and they would not support the notion that God would predestine anyone to damnation.[79] Well aware of the argument that both these positions followed logically from the Augustinian positions they had supported, the Council fathers nonetheless refused to enshrine them as the official teaching of the Church. While it remained available in Augustine's writings (most prominently in his final works against the "Semipelagians," "On the Predestination of the Saints," and "On the Gift of Perseverance," and in his unfinished second treatise against Julian), what Peter Brown calls "'the Augustinian system' in its most extreme form" remained outside the boundaries of Christian dogma.[80] In Jaroslav Pelikan's judgment, the Church refused to accept "the identification of the primacy of grace with a particular and idiosyncratic theory of predestination."[81]

---

esse prævidit." Augustine quoting a Semipelagian in *De præd. sanct.* xviii.36, *P.L.*, 44:987, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:179; see also ibid., xix.38, 3:987–88, *Predestination of the Saints, Answer to the Pelagians*, 4:181.

78. But see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei* 1:74, who argues that the pronouncements of the Second Council of Orange (Orange II) actually disappeared from sight in the centuries before the Reformation.

79. Kelly, *Christian Doctrine*, 371; Pelikan, *Emergence of the Christian Tradition*, 328–29.

80. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 355. Robert Lowry Calhoun, Jaroslav Pelikan's predecessor as Professor of Historical Theology at Yale, remarked that "the one point at which a stark condemnation is pronounced [by the Council] is the one which would have made Augustinianism into the stern determinism which many later interpreters of Augustine [such as Hooker and Stone] took it to be." *Scripture, Creed, Theology: Lectures on the History of Christian Doctrine in the First Centuries* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011), 405.

81. Pelikan, *Emergence of the Christian Tradition*, 324–25.

But it was precisely this "Augustinian system in its most extreme form"—this program of original sin, the need for God to "prepare" the human will before it would be capable of doing good, human inability to "merit" divine grace, and predestination—that Hooker and Stone preached in England and brought with them to New England. It seemed to many that the Augustinian God condemned innocents to eternal suffering because of the sins of a distant ancestor, that for no other reason than his own whim he saved some and damned others, that he left no room for human initiative toward the good, and that because it occurred according to his eternal plan, he was the actual author of sin. Hearers in both Chelmsford and Hartford would be taught to fear this God, the same God whom Julian had found wrathful, arbitrary, and unjust. As Hooker said in Chelmsford,

> Now that I might meet with that erronious opinion of *Pelagians*, consider what I say, they say it is of necessity required, that a poore sinner have his minde inlightened, but the will of man is unaltered, and left free to refuse or chuse grace if it please; so that they put a kinde of ability in the will, to take or refuse Christ and grace when it is offered; but here is a deepe mistake, because the will of man is as farre averse from God, as the minde is blinde, nay it is more averse from God than the minde is blinde, and it is more hard to be framed: therefore there must be this effectuall perswading, as the understanding must have the truth cleered to see a Christ, so the will must be perswaded, that it may receive power from him.[82]

Students of early New England sometimes imagine people in the pews as wistfully wanting to believe but waiting anxiously for God to call them to faith. Augustinians like Hooker never imagined unconverted hearers as eager to believe. They were not hoping that God would show them some sign that he would entice them to salvation. Preaching would never be intended to recall hearers to the better half of their nature. Hearers simply did not want to believe. Were it in their power, they would reject whatever help God might offer. Preaching would need divine power to accompany it, power that could change the fundamental orientation of the human will.

---

82. SEC 288–89. Among the more "Calvinist" party in the mid-1620s, it became a commonplace to identify Arminianism with Pelagianism. Thomas Goad and Daniel Featley produced *Pelagius Redivivus* in January 1626, a tract which Alexandra Walsham finds to be "a stinging and sarcastic assault on 'Arminius and his schollers.' " "Vox Piscis: Or the Book-Fish: Providence and the Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline Cambridge," *English Historical Review* 114 (1999): 574–606, at 597.

"The good Pelagian," writes Peter Brown, "was a 'good citizen'."[83] Despite its undeniable insights into human willfulness, the Augustinian program could only seem profoundly counterintuitive to such good citizens as Pelagius and his followers. So we should not be surprised to find "good neighbors" in both Chelmsford and Hartford reacting to Hooker's preaching much as Pelagius had. The God Hooker imagined would be no easy sell in either old or New England.

---

83. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 371.

5

The Search for Alternatives to Extreme Augustinianism

AFTER 529, WESTERN Christian theologians confronted the uneasy compromises of the Second Council of Orange.[1] For all its efforts, Second Orange simply had not settled the matter of God's control over human freedom. The relentless logic of mature Augustinian theology did not drop from sight, and theologians did not cease to explore ways to embrace or escape it. "On no Christian doctrine was the Augustinian synthesis inherited by the ninth century as ambiguous as on predestination," writes Jaroslav Pelikan, "and on no doctrine was the theological controversy as bitter."[2] The ninth-century thinker Gottschalk of Orbais was formally condemned for proposing an extreme Augustinian doctrine of double predestination, including the belief that Christ died only for the elect, but Gottschalk was able to cite many passages from Augustine in his defense, and several influential theologians rallied to his side. Pelikan suggests that attacking Gottschalk may even have been a subtle way of charging Augustine himself with heresy.[3]

---

1. Jaroslav Pelikan states that "the authority of … the Council of Orange was so firmly established that all the various combatants in the predestinarian controversy of the ninth century had to acknowledge it." *The Christian Tradition*, 3:81. Peter Brown's description of post-Augustinian Gaul is instructive: "What has been called a 'Gallic consensus' emerged. This consensus did not reject Augustine. Rather, when writing of grace and freedom, authors from Lérins and Marseille chose their words carefully. They agreed with much of what Augustine had said, but they did so on their own terms." *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 428–29.

2. Pelikan, *Christian Tradition*, 3:80–81.

3. K. Vielhaber, "Gottschalk der Sachse (ca 803–69)," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3d. ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohn [Paul Siebeck], 1958), 2:1814; Pelikan, *Christian Tradition*, 3:80–95; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 1:130–31, concludes that "Godescalc's doctrine of

By the twelfth century, during what historians now term the period of "early scholasticism," theologians had begun to teach openly that "preparation" need not occur entirely from divine initiative. By taking certain actions, humans could actually influence God's decision to save or damn them. These early scholastics remained loyal to Augustine in teaching that God's first act of grace (*gratia operans*) was necessary to place someone in a position to be saved. But with an eye on passages like Zechariah 1:3, " 'Turn to me', said the Lord of hosts, 'and I shall turn to you'," some theologians reintroduced the notion of human initiative.[4] From two complementary directions, they suggested that by his own efforts a would-be Christian might make his will capable (*capax*) or fit (*habilis*) to receive God's gift of righteousness.

First, most early scholastic writers approved of the axiom, *facienti quod est in se Deus non denegat gratiam* ("God does not refuse grace to anyone who does one's best").[5] Doing one's best (literally, what was "in oneself") generally meant repenting for past misdeeds and resolving to do better. While they recognized that such repentance prior to justification could make no claim upon God, several theologians called it the *occasio* or even the *causa sine qua non* of the infusion of grace. Alain de L'Isle (c. 1128–1203), for instance, explained that although repentance could not be said to cause the forgiveness of sins, God would certainly not forgive anyone who failed to repent. Just as by opening a window the householder made it possible for the sun's light to brighten his house, so repentance made justification possible.[6] Peter of Capua (d. 1214) argued similarly that God stood constantly ready to give grace. As

---

double predestination, *praedestinatio gemina*, is a logical consequence of a fundamentally Augustinian understanding of the relation between nature and grace." So it is instructive that the seventeenth-century Dutch Remonstrants very likely took their five points (later condemned at the Synod of Dort; see chapter 6) from a ninth-century attack on Gottschalk's doctrine. See Stephen Strehle, "The Extent of the Atonement and the Synod of Dort," *Westminster Theological Journal* 51 (1989): 1–23, at 2.

4. My discussion of early scholastic theology draws primarily from Artur Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik,* 2 vols. (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1952–56), especially vol. I, chapter 8, "*Die Vorbereitung auf die Rechtfertigung und die Eingiessung der Rechtfertigenden Gnade,*" supplemented by McGrath, *Iustitia Dei,* 1:37–179. For the scholastics' loyalty to Augustine on *gratia operans* and justification, see Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte,* 1:51, 238.

5. For a thorough discussion of this concept, see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei,* 1:83–91.

6. *nec pœnitentia est causa efficiens remissionis peccati, sed tantum gratuita Dei voluntas. Est tamen causa sine qua non, quia, nisi, homo poeniteat, non dimittitur a Deo peccatum. Sic sol domum illuminat, quia fenestra aperitur, non tamen apertio fenestræ est causa efficiens illuminationis, sed occasionalis tantum, sed ipse sol est causa efficiens illuminationis. Contra hæreticos libri quatuor, lib. 1 c. 51,* cited in Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte,* 1:257.

soon as the would-be Christian had made his free will fit for grace, God would infuse it.[7]

Second, theologians developed the concept of a special merit which provoked God to respond with grace: *meritum de congruo*. Everyone agreed that unaided human effort could never claim to deserve saving grace (truly deserving merit, *meritum de condigno*, remained completely beyond the capacity of fallen human nature). Yet even someone in a sinful condition could perform good works that in some fashion "corresponded with" (*congruunt*) God's expectations. *Meritum de congruo* did not "earn" God's gracious response, but it "prepared" (*præparat*) or "disposed" (*disponit*) a person for it. If a would-be Christian could achieve *meritum de congruo*, God could—without infringing on his justice—mercifully choose to reward it with saving grace.[8]

Such theologians, then, redefined the concept of "preparation" from a divine to a human activity. God was willing to treat a human initiative as if it were enough to provoke divine favor. Since God knew before the beginning of time how each person would behave, God could elect those whom he foresaw would do their best and leave the others to the just punishment of their sinful lives. Recognizing their efforts as *meritum de congruo*, God in a kind of *quid pro quo* could reward them with his favor.

With the inevitable modifications and qualifications, these ideas remained current through the medieval period. In his survey of high and late medieval intellectual history, Steven Ozment characterizes the "traditional teaching of the medieval church" as insisting that good works were "the *sine qua non* of saving faith." While most theologians argued that some kind of divine encouragement had to precede those works, the recipient of that encouragement could respond to it while still in a state of sin and freely cooperate with it, doing what was in herself (*quod est in se*) to perform the "meritorious" works that earned salvation.[9]

It is important not to overlook the variety of late medieval thought. Alongside the mainstream tradition characterized by Ozment, there were still those who held to what they believed to be the authentic teaching of

---

7. *Et concedimus, quod homo potest facere, ut habeat gratiam, etiam ille, qui est iniustus, quia potest liberum arbitrium applicare et se reddere habilem. Quod si faciat, habebit gratiam, quia Deus semper est presto eam dare.* Summa (Clm 14 508 fol. 34), cited in Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte*, 1:260.

8. Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte*, 1:264, 268–80, 298–302. Both condign and congruent merit continued to have currency in Protestant–Catholic debate; Samuel Stone explicitly rejects both kinds of merit, WB 151.

9. Ozment, *The Age of Reform 1250–1550: Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 233.

Augustine. The leading theologian of what has come to be known as the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, Gregory of Rimini, taught an extreme Augustinianism not unlike that of Gottschalk of Orbais. In the words of Alistair McGrath, Gregory defined predestination "as the divine decision to grant eternal life, and reprobation as the decision not to grant it—and both are understood to be acts of divine will." McGrath finds Gregory's views "widely propagated within the Augustinian Order, by theologians such as Hugolino of Orvieto, Dionysius of Montina, Johannes Hiltalingen of Basel, Johannes Klencock and Angelus Dobelinus."[10]

But William of Ockham and some of his contemporaries moved in the opposite direction. Relying entirely on her own powers (*ex puris naturalibus*), they argued, a person could do works good enough to provoke God to assist her with grace. Once that grace was been given, she could then cooperate with it to merit salvation.

But how could a fallen human being possibly merit salvation? Did not God's justice demand a level of achievement far beyond the capacity of any sinner? Earlier medieval theology had addressed the gap between human ability and God's expectations by positing the notion of an infused grace. Without compromising his justice, God could give something to a fallen human being that would make her worthy of his forgiveness and favor. He could infuse a "habit of created grace" that he could then justly reward.[11]

Without denying that this was how God worked in practice, Ockham and his fellow adherents to what became known as the *via moderna* challenged the idea that God had to work this way, that God had no choice but to make on ontological change (alter a person's being) in order to move that person toward salvation. God was omnipotent, they argued; he could do whatever he wanted. Had he chosen to do so, he could have saved people simply by fiat, without any intermediary activity. That God acted as he did was a result of a deliberate decision unconstrained by any external factors.

God, they imagined, had chosen to establish a covenant (*pactum*) with human beings. Anyone who could fulfill the conditions of the *pactum* would be appropriately rewarded. In his freedom, God could set any conditions he

---

10. *nullus est reprobatus propter malum usum liberi arbitrii quem illum Deus praevidet habiturum. … nullus est reprobatus quia praevisus fore finaliter cum obice gratiae.* Gregory of Rimini, *In I. Sent.* dist. xl, xli q. 1 a. 2; *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum*, ed. A. D. Trapp, 6 vols. (Berlin and New York, 1979–84), cited in McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 1:143.

11. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 1:145–46; and *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), 82–84.

chose; he and he alone would decide what conditions met a "just" standard for gaining his favor.

The *pactum* God actually did choose to establish provided for him to accept a much lower "price" for his favor than an equitable notion of justice might seem to demand. Fully understanding that any possible human achievement would add up to infinitely less than what he had a right to expect, God voluntarily committed himself to accept a sinner's best efforts (*quod est in se*) as achievement enough. Doing *quod est in se* would initiate a process in which God would inevitably—because he had so committed himself—respond with the help that could lead to salvation. It would serve as *meritum de congruo*. Because an infinite God could do anything he wanted, he could commit himself in his freedom to a deal that constrained him, a *pactum* that committed him to accept less than the "price" to which he was theoretically entitled. *Via moderna* theologians therefore imagined the *facienti quod est in se* and *meritum de congruo* (notions with which everyone had been wrestling for centuries) as part of a formal agreement, a binding commitment on God's part. "Let's make a deal," they imagined God as saying; "I'll lower the price of salvation to a level that you can actually afford. Once you do your part, I'll absolutely guarantee you that I'll do mine."[12]

Gabriel Biel (d. 1495), a prominent theologian of the *via moderna* on whom Martin Luther initially depended, understood *pactum* theology in this way. Anyone who wished to be accepted by God had to abhor sin—thereby removing the barrier that stood between God and herself—and to resolve to obey God—thereby creating what Biel called a "good motion" toward God. Because of God's voluntary commitment to the *pactum*, such actions would invariably move God to accept her. In his authoritative study of Biel's theology, Heiko Oberman concluded that Biel thought of such preparation as "a purely human performance," at best "under the general influence of God." Biel stated quite bluntly that by doing good works (*operando bona opera*), a sinner disposed himself to receive grace (*disponit se ad recipiendum gratiam*), "nor can he dispose himself by grace for grace, for then he would have grace before he had it." For Biel, Oberman concluded, grace was "not the root but the fruit" of preparatory good works.[13] Although Biel "intended to safeguard the Augustinian heritage,"

---

12. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 1:126–27, 170–71; *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 58–60. McGrath argues that *pactum* theology supported "a more biblical concept of God who, though omnipotent, has entered into a covenant with the descendants of Abraham."

13. *Nam deus paratus est cuilibet disponenti se ad gratiam dare eam; ergo peccator disponens se recipit gratiam. Et quomodo disponet se ad recipiendum gratiam quam non habet nisi operando bona opera, licet nondum iustificatus? Neque enim potest se disponere ad gratiam per gratiam, alias*

Oberman still judged his doctrine of justification "essentially Pelagian." Along with several other influential late medieval theologians of the *via moderna* (Oberman lists Ockham, Guillaume Durand de Saint-Pourçain, Pierre d'Ailly, and Bartholomaeus Arnoldi von Usingen), Biel taught a voluntary preparation for justification in no way dependent on special divine initiative.[14]

Martin Luther began his career as an adherent of this very theology. In his first set of lectures on the Psalms, Luther stated plainly that God gave grace to anyone who prepared herself by doing *quod in se est*, that doing *quod in se est* constituted *meritum de congruo*, and that this was so because of God's *pactum* with his human creatures.[15] What constituted doing *quod in se est*? Achieving a state of "humility" (*humilitas*) or being "humble before God" (*humilis coram Deo*): a person recognized that she was totally unworthy of God's favor. As Alister McGrath explains, "by the *pactum*, God has ordained to accept *humilitas* or *humiliatio* as *iustitia fidei*, the covenantal righteousness which alone is valid in his sight, despite being insignificant *coram hominibus*."[16]

But by the time of his next set of lectures (1515–16), on Paul's letter to the Romans, Luther had repudiated this theology as Pelagian. It was "totally absurd," he thundered, to think that God would infallibly infuse grace to the person who did *quod in se est*, as if that person were capable of doing anything on her own.[17] Admitting that he had once believed it himself, he now rejected

---

haberet gratiam priusquam haberet et hic est maximus huiusmodi operum fructus. Has et multas alias utilitates bonas ferunt bona opera extra charitatem facta, Gabriel Biel, *Sermones dominicales de tempore*, 99 F, cited in Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, MA, 1963), 141 n. 6, see also 132, 138. See as well Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* Ia2ae. 109, 6 ad 2, 112, 3 ad 1, English translation *Summa Theologica*, trans. the Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007).

14. Ozment, *Age of Reform*, 234, 38–42; Oberman, *Harvest*, 140–41, 427, 177, 426. Commenting on the position of *via moderna* theologians like Biel, Ozment concludes that "these men desired to preserve human freedom, even from the salutary causality of a prevenient infusion of grace." "All the subtle and important qualifications notwithstanding," he continues, "this theology taught that people could at least initiate their salvation." Alister McGrath does not believe it is accurate to term Biel's theology "Pelagian," but he concedes that Biel and some of his fellows take positions that "approach, although do not strictly constitute, Pelagianism." *Iustitia Dei*, 1:168, 170; *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 61–62.

15. *Hinc recte dicunt Doctores, quod homini facienti quod in se est, deus infallibiliter dat gratiam, et licet non de condigno sese posit ad gratiam preparare, quid est incomparabilis, tamen bene de congruo propter promissionem istam dei et pactum misericordie*, Dictata super Psalterium, W.A. 4:262

16. *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 122–23, citing *Dictata super Psalterium*, W.A. 4:462: *Et sic fit Iustitia. Quia qui sibi iniustus est et ita coram deo humilis, huic dat deus gratiam suam.*

17. *Ideo absurdissima est et Pelagiano errori vehemeter patrona Sententia Vsitata, Qua dicitur: "Facienti quod in se est, Infallibiliter Deus infundit gratiam', Intelligendo per 'facere, quod in se*

the opinion that salvation was in any way dependent upon a decision of the human will.[18]

Many years later, Luther spoke of his change of mind as having occurred in the tower of his Augustinian monastery, and historians have since referred to it as his "tower experience" (*Turmerlebnis*). On the evidence of his lectures, it seems to have taken place during the year 1515, although debate continues over the exact date.[19] But it clearly led him to a new understanding of the role of humiliation in the justification of a sinner. From this point forward, Luther continued to speak of *humiliatio* as a precondition for justification, but he no longer considered it something that a person could achieve on her own. Only God could convince someone of her absolute unworthiness, and he did it by unleashing his wrath. 1 Samuel 2:6–7 became a favorite text: "The Lord kills and makes alive; he brings down to hell and brings back again. The Lord makes poor and makes rich; he humbles and he exalts." It is God's nature, Luther said in the Romans lectures, "first to destroy and to bring to nothing whatever is in us before he gives us of his own."[20] Threats of hell and eternal damnation deprived an individual of all confidence in herself, and in her doubt and despair she would recognize that God alone could save her.

---

est', aliquid facere Vel posse. *Diui Pauli apostoli ad Romanos Epistola, W.A.* 56:502–503, English translation *Luther: Lectures on Romans*, trans. Wilhelm Pauck (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 390. He also said, as had Augustine, that predestination was the sole preparation for grace: *Optima et infallibilis ad gratiam praeparatio et unica dispositio est aeterna Dei electio et praedestinatio. Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam. 1517, W.A.* 1:221–28, no. 29, 225, *Disputation against Scholastic Theology* [1517], trans. Harold J. Grimm, *Luther's Works*, 55 vols. (St. Louis and Philadelphia: Augsburg and Fortress, 1955–75) (hereinafter LW), 31:11.

18. *Haec tantum vacua verbo sunt, presertim cum hoc 'consequentis contingere' velint intelligere aut saltem occasionem intelligendi dant, quod nostro arbitrio fiat Vel non fiat salus. Sic enim ego aliquando intellexi. Ad Romanos Epistola, W.A.* 56:382, *Lectures on Romans*, 390, cited by McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 131.

19. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 142–47. The Luther scholars Ernst Bizer and Heinrich Bornkamm engaged in a legendary debate over the timing of Luther's theological breakthrough which included the relationship between *fides* (Glaube) and *humiliatio* (Demut). Bizer, *Fides ex auditu: Eine Untersuchung über die Entceckung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes durch Martin Luther*, 3rd ed. (Neukirchen: Verlag des Erziehungsverein, 1966), esp. 29–39 and 193–203; Bornkamm, "Zur Frage der Iustitia Dei beim jungen Luther," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 52 (1961): 16–29 and 53 (1962): 1–60. For our purposes, sides need not be taken in that debate; the important point is the young Luther's insistence on *humiliatio*. One can see a handsome picture of the tower at http://www.welcometohosanna.com/ MARTIN_LUTHER/1EARLY_YEARS.html.

20. *Quia Natura Dei est, prius destruere et annihilare, quicquid in nobis est, antequam sua donet, Ad Romanos Epistola, W.A.* 56:375, see also 193, 450, cited in Pauck, "General Introduction," *Lectures on Romans*, xl.

Luther called the experiences of divine anger which had led him to understand the Bible in this way *tentationes* or *Anfectungen*, and he argued that anyone who had not undergone them could not really know God.[21] The way Luther's *Anfectungen* led him to emphasize the extraordinary depth of humiliation has no parallel in the sermons of Augustine, but it bears an uncanny resemblance to Thomas Hooker's "storm of soul," a resemblance which will be examined in chapter 9.

Luther's most profound rejection of late medieval *pactum* theology came in response to a defense of free will by Erasmus of Rotterdam. *De Servo Arbitrio* (*On the Enslaved Will*, 1525) sharply rejected every hint of *facienti quod est in se*. Congruent merit, Luther fumed, was just condign merit in disguise. So long as people imagined that God's grace depended in even the smallest respect on human initiative, they would base salvation on their own efforts and never throw their entire trust on Christ.[22] Prior to an internal renovation of the will by the work of the Spirit, a person could "do and endeavor nothing to prepare for that renovation."

Just as Augustine had done, Luther traced sin to a fundamental perversion of the human will. Sinful people wanted the wrong things, things that fed their own self-esteem rather than respected God's will. Commenting on Romans 3:22, where Paul says "through the Law comes the knowledge of sin," Luther wrote:

> So then, whenever something is prescribed or forbidden to us and we notice how unwilling we are to comply, we should thereby recognize that we do not love good but evil. And precisely thus we should come to know ourselves as evil and sinful, for a sinner is one who *does not want* to fulfill the law which prescribes the good and prohibits evil. For

---

21. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 151–55. In a famous article, Wolfhart Pannenberg showed how Luther's concept of salvation by faith alone created *Anfectungen* about his own election. "Der Einfluß des Anfechtungserfahrung auf den Prädestinationsbegriff Luthers," *Kerygma und Dogma* 3 (1957): 109–39. A reader might recall that Sigmund Freud and his followers emphasized a patient's need for an embrace of helplessness before genuine change could occur. Article XII of *The Augsburg Confession* (1530) speaks of contrition as "**terror[s]** smiting the conscience with a knowledge of sin" (***terrores incussi conscientiae agnito peccato***); emphasis added, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 67, *The Book of Concord*, 34.

22. Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, W.A. 18:770, 777, English translation *The Bondage of the Will*, trans. J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston (Westwood, NJ: Fleming Revell, 1957), 293, 304–5. Ozment characterizes Luther's position here as an "extreme doctrinal defense of supralapsarian predestination." *Age of Reform*, 294; see also Pannenberg, "Einfluß des Anfechtungserfahrung," 110.

if we were righteous and good, we should readily assent to the law and take delight in it, just as now we take delight in our sins and evil desires.[23]

Only faith, apart from works of the law, allowed a Christian to be incorporated into Christ's death and resurrection, and the granting of the grace that made faith possible stemmed entirely from God's predestinating purpose.[24]

As had Augustine, Luther understood the process of salvation as a zero-sum game. By trying to leave some room for human initiative, proponents of congruent merit were in reality denying the saving work of Christ, "for if I obtain the grace of God by my own endeavor, what need have I of the grace of Christ for the receiving of my grace?" The notion that anyone could take even the smallest step toward God without the help of grace was complete nonsense. It was true that a graceless person acted freely and spontaneously, but in reality her actions, like everything in creation, were determined by God's preordaining will. "Everything we do, however it may appear to us to be done mutably and contingently, is in reality done necessarily and immutably in respect of God's will." Were this not so, he asked Erasmus, "how could you believe, trust and rely on [God's] promises?"[25]

So "free-will," as Erasmus wished to understand it, was an illusion. Without God's intervention, the human will was entirely captive to evil. It was, as Augustine had written against Julian, "enslaved rather than free." The will's "proneness and inclination to evil," its "incessant agitating and impulse to evil" led to an inevitable result: "we *will* sin and evil; we *speak* sin and evil; we *do* sin and evil."[26]

What, then, of the numerous scriptural passages, adduced by Erasmus, that exhorted people to obey God's commandments? What of God's numerous

23. Luther, *Ad Romanos Epistola, W.A.* 56:254, *Lectures on Romans,* 107; emphasis added.

24. *nihil facit, nihil conatur, quo paretur ad eam renovationem ... De Servo Arbitrio,* 18:754, *Bondage of the Will,* 268; *gratia ex proposito seu praedestinatione venit, De Servo Arbitrio W. A.* 18:772, *Bondage of the Will,* 297. The notion that a person's salvation depended entirely on the trustworthiness of God's word of promise, rather than primarily on any quality in her that might "deserve" God's favor, was a part of the Ockhamist heritage that Luther continued to uphold. See Ozment, *Age of Reform,* 244 *et passim*.

25. *sponte et libenti voluntate facit, De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:634, *Bondage of the Will,* 102; *De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:777, *Bondage of the Will,* 305; *omnia quae facimus, omnis quae fiunt, etsi nobis videntur mutabiliter et contingenter fieri, revera tamen fiunt necessario et immutabiliter, De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:615, *Bondage of the Will,* 80; *eius promissionibus credere, certo fidere et niti? De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:619, *Bondage of the Will,* 83–84. McGrath believes that this position effectively makes God the author of sin. *Iustitia Dei,* 2:15.

26. *servum potius quam liberum, De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:665, *Bondage of the Will,* 143, citing *Contra Julianum,* II.viii.23; see also *De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:636, *Bondage of the Will,* 104; *pronitas et proclivitas ... assidum illum raptum et imputum voluntatis ad malum, De Servo*

offers of pardon and forgiveness, scattered through the Old Testament and the New? Despite appearances, these had never been intended to encourage obedience, because the enslaved will had no inclination or ability to obey.

On the contrary, they served to reveal human impotence. Faced with requirements they could not possibly fulfill, people would be driven to recognize the utter insufficiency of human works and to place all their confidence in the work of Christ. Adam in the Garden was the archetype of human powerlessness. Without the aid of additional grace, even the free will with which he had been created could achieve nothing good. To show everyone, "by the fearful example of that first man, with a view to breaking down our pride, what our free-will can do if it is left to itself," God had deliberately withheld that grace.[27]

In defense of free will, Erasmus had cited a series of New Testament passages, and the first was none other than Matthew 23:37: "O Hierusalem, Hierusalem, … how often would I haue gathered thy children together, euen as a hen gathereth her chickens vnder her wings, and yee would not?" It seemed to Erasmus—just as it had to Julian of Eclanum—that the position Luther had taken inevitably placed the blame for their refusal to be gathered back on Jesus. It was he (in his divine nature) who had predestined that they would not be given the ability. That predestination made it completely impossible for them to respond to his wishes. Why then was he asking them to do something that he knew very well they were unable to do? "Why torment yourself with vain tears that we will not be gathered," one could imagine then saying to Jesus, when your own decree has determined that we will not be gathered? Why blame us for what you did? You may say that you wished to gather us together, but "at the same time you were wishing us not to do so …."

It was inconceivable to Erasmus that Matthew 23:37 could be interpreted in such a way as to make Jesus a liar. When he said: "'I wished to gather you together … you refused," he obviously assumed that they had the ability to choose either to be gathered or not to be gathered.[28]

Arbitrio, W.A. 18:736, *Bondage of the Will*, 242–43; *nos volumus peccatum et malum, loquimur peccatum et malum, facimus peccatum et malum, De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:670, *Bondage of the Will*, 147.

27. *Ostensum est ergo in isto homine, terribili exemplo pro nostra superbia conterenda, quid possit liberum arbitrium nostrum sibi relictum ac non continuo magis ac magis actum et auctum spiritu Dei, De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:675, *Bondage of the Will*, 156, see also *De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:766, *Bondage of the Will*, 287.

28. *Si cuncta fiunt necessitate, nonne merito Hierosolyma poterat respondere deploranti domino: Quid inanibus lacrimis te maceras?. … Cur nobis imputas, quod tua voluntate, nostra necessitate factum est? Tu volebas nos congregare et idem in nobis nolebas, cum hoc ipsum operatus sis*

The logic of Erasmus's argument forced Luther to admit that there were two radically distinct wills in God: Jesus's will—the will of God incarnate (*deus incarnatus*)—was not the same as what Luther called the "secret will of the Divine Majesty" (*secreta voluntas maiestatis*). Jesus might "weep, wail, and groan over the destruction of the ungodly," but the will of the Divine Majesty "purposely abandons and reprobates some to perish."[29]

Luther granted that the notion of two seemingly inconsistent divine wills defied human reason. He even seemed to take pleasure in drawing attention to the paradox at the heart of the way he imagined God. There was a God "behind" the God whom the scriptures described as offering mercy freely, a God who by his "dreadful hidden will" (*occulta et metuenda voluntas*) ordained that only an elect few would actually partake of that mercy. Just as paradoxical was the nature of faith: Christians were called to believe that God was ultimately just, good, and merciful, even though to ordinary human reason he appeared unjust, arbitrary, and even cruel. Luther insisted that God deliberately "concealed" his mercy and loving-kindness behind what appeared to be anger, and his righteousness underneath what seemed to be unrighteousness.[30]

Unaided by faith, anyone paying attention to God's actual behavior would be struck by the fact that he saved so few and damned so many. They would see anger and unrighteousness rather than mercy. It was not unreasonable, admitted Luther, for Erasmus to claim that Luther's God seemed "to delight in the torments of poor wretches and to be a fitter object for hate than for love." Only "the highest degree of faith" could trust in a merciful and just God "behind" what appeared so horrific.[31] It was not even permitted for humans to ask why God did so; they were only "to stand in awe of God who both can do and wills to do such things."[32]

---

in nobis, quod noluerimus. Atqui in verbis domini non accusator in Iudaeis necessitas, sed prava ac rebellis voluntas: Ego volui congregare, tu noluisti. Erasmus, *De Libero Arbitrio ΔIATPIBH, sive Collatio*, ed. Johannes Walter (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Buchhandlung, 1910), 39, English translation *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation*, trans. E. Gordon Rupp (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 59.

29. *Huius itidem Dei incarnati est flere, deplorare, gemere super perditione impiorum, cum voluntas maiestatis ex proposito aliquos relinquat et reprobet, ut periant. De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:689, *Bondage of the Will*, 176.

30. On *deus absconditus*, see McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, 149–58.

31. Ibid., 18:684, 707, *Bondage of the Will*, 169, 201–202; *fidei summus gradus, credere illum esse clementem, qui tam paucos salvat, tam multos damnat; … qui tantam iram et iniquitatem ostendit, W.A.* 18:633, *Bondage of the Will*, 101.

32. *Nec nobis quaerendum, cur ita faciat, sed reverendus Deus, quo talia et possit et velit, W.A.* 18:689, *Bondage of the Will*, 176.

Where Augustine had simply endured Julian's charge that his doctrine violated common sense, the Luther of *De Servo Arbitrio* reveled in the irrationality of God's actions. That God should hold Pharaoh to expectations that God knew perfectly well could not be met without grace, deliberately withhold that grace, and then harden Pharaoh's heart, would remain "absurd to the judgment of reason." "Reason will insist that these are not the acts of a good and merciful God." "It hugely offends common sense or natural reason," he thundered at Erasmus, "that the God whom we represent in our preaching as so full of goodness and mercy should of his mere will abandon, harden, and damn people, as if he took delight in the sins and eternal torments of such wretches."[33]

Nor were reason and common sense misjudging. Even to theologians operating with the light of grace, it was "inexplicable how God can damn someone who by his own strength cannot do anything but sin and [so] be guilty." Short of the light of glory, available only in heaven, God's actions would simply not "make sense." To the questions why God had hardened Pharaoh's heart, or why he had let Adam fall and pass original sin on to his descendents, no answers could be given beyond "what takes place must be right, because God wills it." Only faith, relying despite the evidence of reason and common sense on God's mercy and promises, could trust that God was ultimately righteous. Even though it was impossible to understand how it could be just for God "to damn the undeserving," a Christian would "continue to believe that it is so."[34]

Here was Luther's fideism at its boldest. Faith defied common sense, defied ordinary logic. Where Augustine had tried to refute Julian's charge that his theology made God a capricious, wrathful tyrant who was himself the ultimate author of human sin, Luther conceded that human reason (*ratio humana*) had plenty of warrant for imagining God in this way. Without the additional knowledge that could come only by the light of grace, reason was *ratio carnalis*: "fleshly" or "carnal" reason. To humans mired in their own selfishness,

---

33. *Absurdum enim manet (ratione iudice)*, W.A. 18:707, *Bondage of the Will*, 201; *Haec dictabit ratio non esse boni et clementis Dei.* 708, *Bondage of the Will*, 201; *hoc offendit quam maxime sensum illum communem seu rationem naturalem, quod Deus mera voluntate sua homines deseret, induret, damnet, quasi delectetur peccatis et cruciatibus miserorum tantis et aeternis, qui praedicatur tantae misericordiae et bonitatis etc.*, W.A. 18:719, *Bondage of the Will*, 217. Later Lutherans moved away from statements such as these, which seemed to teach predestination to damnation.

34. *insolubile, quomodo Deus damnet eum, qui non potest ullis suis viribus aliud facere quam peccare et reus esse*, W.A. 18:785, *Bondage of the Will*, 317; *Quia ipse sic vult, ideo debet rectum esse, quod fit*, W.A. 18:712, *Bondage of the Will*, 209; *quomodo hoc iustum sit, ut immeritos damnet, incomprehensibile est modo, creditur tamen ...* W.A. 18:731, *Bondage of the Will*, 234. Steven Ozment terms Luther's position an "extreme doctrinal defense of supralapsarian predestination." *Age of Reform*, 294.

carnal reason would function like what we would today call "rationalizing," using apparent logic to avoid unpleasant truth.[35] In the "taken-for-granted" world of carnal, common sense logic, God would indeed seem cruel and his actions horrific. When God required behavior from his fallen creatures that God knew very well was impossible, carnal reason could only conclude that he was mocking them.[36] All the more necessity for the preacher, speaking from his pulpit, to stress the great gap between that world and the invisible reality known only to faith.

De Servo Arbitrio recapitulated and expressed in the sharpest possible terms what Luther took to be the Augustinian position on the capacity of the will before grace. For this reason, it seems anachronistic to identify sixteenth-century extreme Augustinianism primarily with John Calvin. Calvin's writings were but one manifestation of an extreme Augustinianism that found expression in many sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thinkers, Protestant and Catholic.[37]

But there is no denying that Calvin, Luther's younger contemporary, incorporated an equally extreme Augustinianism into his most influential work, the *Christianae religionis Institutio* or *Institutes*. The *Institutes* drew special attention to, and are most commonly remembered for, God's absolutely unconditional predestination. As Augustine had implied but not explicitly stated in his final treatises against the Semi-Pelagians, the *Institutes* described an absolute predestination of the reprobate that paralleled God's predestination of the elect. Admitting that God's will to create some human beings for the purpose of manifesting his justice in their reprobation was an "awe-inspiring" or "terrifying" decree (*decretum horribile*), Calvin nonetheless felt compelled by scripture and the logic of extreme Augustinianism to assert a "double predestination" (*prædestinatio gemina*) of some to salvation and the remainder to damnation.[38] Horrified

---

35. The term "carnal reason" occurs frequently in Thomas Hooker's sermons.

36. *Hoc est, quod supra dixi de argumentis rationis carnalis, quod rideri hominem putet praecepto impossibili, W.A.* 18:676, *Bondage of the Will*, 158.

37. Richard Muller reminds us that "Calvin and other Reformed thinkers, whether earlier or contemporaneous or later, all held to one or another form of the Augustinian understanding of predestination, as taught in Romans 9 and other biblical texts, namely, that salvation depends on the gracious will of eternal God, and therefore it is intended by God from eternity that some be elected to salvation and others not." Such a doctrine "certainly cannot be the criterion by which either Calvin or anyone else ought to be identified as a 'Calvinist'." *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 64.

38. John Calvin, *Christianae religionis institutio 1559* in *Calvini Opera Selecta*, ed. Peter Barth and Wilhelm Niesel, 5 vols. (Munich, 1926–36), III.xxi–xxiv, English translation *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 920–87; *Quos Deus præterit, reprobate, Institutio.* III.xxiii.1, *Institutes*, 947. The translation of *horribile* as "awe-inspiring" or "terrifying" is suggested by Alister McGrath, *A Life of*

opponents angrily rejected this way of imagining God's activity and derided it as "Calvinism." The term would soon come to characterize a particular Protestant version of extreme Augustinianism, but it was the thinking of Calvin's successors Beza and Perkins, rather than that of Calvin himself, upon whom Hooker relied for his own preaching on predestination.

Catholic Theologians Respond to the Protestant Reformers

Luther and Calvin had jumped eagerly upon Biel's supposed Pelagianism, but in fact Biel's teaching on justification represented only one among many options in the Roman Catholic tradition. It became the task of the Council of Trent (1545–1563) to set the limits within which Catholic theologians could teach on the relationship between grace and free will. In his exhaustive *History of the Council of Trent*, Hubert Jedin saw the Council's challenge as drawing together divergent Catholic positions as well as responding to the new teachings of the Protestant Reformers.[39]

As part of their decree on justification, the fathers pronounced on preparation for justification. Concerning the necessity and origins of preparation, they wrote:

> The beginning of this justification in adults is to be derived from God's prevenient grace, i.e, from his calling, by which they are called without the appearance of any merits of their own, so that those who by sin had been turned away from God are disposed [*disponantur*] by his reviving and assisting grace [*per eius excitantem atque adiuvantem gratiam*] to turn themselves to their own justification by freely assenting to the same grace and co-operating with it [*eidem gratiæ libere assentiendo*

John Calvin: A Study in the Shaping of Western Culture (Cambridge, MA: Basic Blackwell, 1990), 167. Richard A. Muller concludes that "in Calvin's formulation both election and reprobation rest on the sovereign will of God and are to be equally considered as results of a single divine counsel. Unlike many of his contemporaries and successors, Calvin did not shrink from the conclusions that permission and volition are one in the mind of an eternal and utterly sovereign God: reprobation could not be viewed simply as a passive act of God." *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 24. Even those in the Reformed tradition sometimes find Calvin's understanding of God inconsistent with the "radically vulnerable" God of the Bible; see, for example, Walter Brueggemann, *Like Fire in the Bones: Listening for the Prophetic Word in Jeremiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 128 and 203.

39. Hubert Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, 4 vols. in 5 (Freiburg i/Br.: Herder, 1949–75); English translation of vols. 1 and 2 in *A History of the Council of Trent*, trans. Ernest Graf,

cooperando]. Thus as God touches a person's heart by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the person himself does nothing at all while receiving that inspiration. *He can of course reject it but he cannot without God's grace move himself by his free will to the righteousness before him.* From which, when it is said in holy scripture, "Turn to me and I shall turn to you" [Zechariah 1:3], we are reminded of our freedom; when we reply, "Turn us to you, Lord, and we shall be turned" [Jer. 31:18], we confess that God's grace anticipates us [*Dei nos gratia præveniri*].[40]

Unlike Gabriel Biel, the Council conceived of the initial act of "preparation" as a divine activity. It attributed the initiative in justification to God's prevenient grace, first reviving adults (as *gratia excitans*) and then assisting them to cooperate with it (as *gratia adiuvans*). People remained free to reject this prevenient grace, but they were helpless to move toward justification without it.

In the following chapter (*Modus præparationis*), the Council fathers explained how the revived adults cooperated with grace to prepare themselves. After conceiving faith (*concipientes fidem*), the adults accepted the truth of God's revelation, particularly his promise to justify the wicked by Christ's redemption. Then "while understanding themselves to be sinners," from fear of God's justice they considered God's mercy, and "by turning themselves they are raised up into hope" (*convertendo in spem eiiguntur*) that they themselves might be objects of that mercy. Next they began to love God and to repent of their sin, and finally they resolved to be baptized, to start a new life, and to observe God's commandments. The Council left no doubt that all these stages were preparatory, for the next section, defining justification, began by stating that justification followed the *præparationem seu dispositionem* just described. And, of course, none of these "things which precede justification" could merit (*promeretur*) justification itself, the infusion of sanctifying grace. Because only divine grace could justify, preparation was a necessary but not sufficient condition for justification.[41]

But because human beings quickly became involved in preparatory works, Jedin could conclude that the Tridentine decree on justification affirmed "the

---

2 vols. (London: Thomas Nelson, 1957–1961). John O'Malley calls Jedin "the master who led the way" and contends that his work "has in the main withstood the test of time remarkably well." *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 12.

40. *Acta Consilii Tridentinæ,* Sessio VI, Cap. 5, in H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (Freiburg, 1955), no. 797; emphasis added; and Jedin, *History of Trent,* 2:166–96, 239–316.

41. Ibid., chapters 6, 8, Denzinger, 798, 800, and canons 4, 7, and 9, Denzinger, 814, 817, 819.

necessity of a preparation on the part of man and the co-operation of his free will." Further, it carefully delineated numerous preparatory stages: faith in revelation (or "historical" faith), acknowledgment of sin, fear of divine judgment, hope that the adults themselves might be redeemed, beginning of love, repentance, and finally resolve to be baptized and to lead a new life of obedience. Although none of these stages was possible without grace, all required human cooperation, and all had to occur prior to justification in order to dispose the soul properly for the actual infusion of grace. John O'Malley's recent study of the council concludes that it perpetuated the *facienti quod est in se.* "For all Trent's insistence on the determining role of grace in justification," writes O'Malley, "what to a considerable extent prevailed in post-Tridentine Catholicism was a persuasion that doing one's best was a prerequisite for God to give his grace."[42]

By their insistence on justification by grace without any human contribution, the Reformers defiantly ruled out this Catholic solution to the problem of reconciling grace and free will. They denied the possibility even of graciously assisted human preparation for justification. Calvin's *Acts of the Council of Trent with an Antidote* (1547) set the pattern for all the later responses. Insisting that the unregenerate will was not merely entangled in sin but utterly powerless to choose God, that no sinner would accept grace if he had the power to resist it, and that justifying grace came through faith alone and not through prior human works, Calvin denounced the Catholic understanding of preparation. Not only was it completely unscriptural, he fumed, but it was also un-Augustinian. The Tridentine fathers "in a new factory hammer out something unknown to Augustine"; they ignored "what has been handed down from Augustine."[43] Calvin argued that Augustine had known no partial, preliminary grace that helped the weak will dispose itself for justification. Justifying grace irresistibly drew the will to faith without any prior human cooperation. The only possible effective preparation was the immediate disposition of the will by grace. If they referred to acts of special grace before justification, *gratia excitans* and *adiuvans* were figments of the Roman Catholic imagination.

Responsibility to discredit these heretical Protestant teachings fell in particular to the theologians of the newly formed Society of Jesus. The *Spiritual*

---

42. Jedin, *History of Trent*, 2:307. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council*, 254.

43. *quod … ab Augustino traditum est …* John Calvin, *Acta Synodi Tridentinæ cum Antidoto*, in *Corpus Reformatorum Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, ed. Wilhelm Baum, Eduard Cunitz, and Eduard Reuss, 59 vols. (Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke & Son, 1863–1900), 7:444–45, English translation in *Tracts and Treatises on the Reformation of the Church*, trans. Henry Beveridge, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1851), 3:111.

Exercises of the Society's founder, Ignatius of Loyola, warned his fellow-Jesuits against the "poisonous [Protestant] error whereby liberty is taken away." Jesuits were told not to insist so strongly on the doctrine of grace that "works and free will may receive any prejudice or be held for naught." Loyola advised them against being drawn into any discussion about predestination that might lead people to "grow slack in the works that conduce to the salvation and spiritual profit of their souls" on the grounds that God had already predetermined that they would be saved or damned.[44] To imagine God's actions in the Protestant manner, Jesuits thought, removed all meaning and purpose from human endeavor. Jesuit thinkers took upon themselves the challenge of seeing the relationship of God's gracious initiatives and a person's gracious response as something other than a zero-sum game.

The most influential of the early Jesuit theologians, Luis de Molina (1535–1600), developed his position expressly from those canons of the Council of Trent which anathematized anyone who taught that human free will was extinguished after Adam's fall. Molina argued that Protestant positions not only negated human freedom but also, blasphemously, made God the ultimate author of sin. Just as Julian of Eclanum had before him, Molina argued that if Protestant positions were to be accepted, "our freedom of choice is altogether destroyed, God's justice with respect to the wicked vanishes, and a manifest cruelty and wickedness is discerned in God."[45] It was not enough to defend the will's spontaneity in choosing evil, as Luther had; even in its "fallen" state, the human will had to be actually capable of choosing good. To Molina, authentic

---

44. *no debemos hablar tan largo instando tanto en la gracia, que se engender veneno, para quitar la libertad …. que las obras y libero arbitrio resiban detrimento alguno o por nihilo se tengan.…. y con esto entorpeciendo se descuidan en las obras que conducen a la salud y provecho spiritual de sus ánimas.* Ignatius of Loyola, *Ejercicios Espirituales,* "Para el sentido verdadero que en la iglesia militante debemos tener … reglas," no. 15–17 in *Obras Completas de San Ignacio de Loyola,* ed. Candido de Dalmases, S.J. (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1963), 272–73, trans. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola. Spanish and English with a Continuous Commentary* by Joseph Rickaby, S.J. (London: Burns & Oates, 1915), 223–24. For a judicious summary of the content of the *Spiritual Exercises,* see John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 37–50. O'Malley argues (e.g., 278) that the early Jesuits were less concerned with the threat of Protestantism than is usually assumed.

45. *libertas arbitrii nostri omnino tollitur, perit iustitia Dei adversus impios, crudelitas ac impietas manifesta in Deo conspicitur,* Luis de Molina, *Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiæ Donis, Divina Præscientia, Providentia, Prædestinatione et Reprobatione Concordia,* ed. Johannes Rabeneck, S.J. (Oña: Collegium Maximum S.J., 1953), Pars IV. Disputatio 50. no. 14: p. 323; the *Concordia* has been partially translated by Aldred J. Freddoso as *On Divine Foreknowledge (Part IV of the Concordia)* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), this passage occurs on page 139 of the translation.

freedom of the will meant that, faced with a choice between two objects, the chooser had to be just as capable of choosing the one as the other. A genuinely free will could choose to decline God's offer of grace as readily as to accept it.[46]

Molina set out to demonstrate that both the Protestants and the medieval Semipelagians had failed to understand how an omniscient God could reconcile the apparently contradictory notions of divine sovereignty and human initiative. He began, as had the Semipelagians, with God's foreknowledge (*præ-scientia*). Molina explained that Christians had to conceive of God's possessing three distinct kinds of knowledge about the world before it had ever come into being. Through his "natural" knowledge, God would know everything that he could hypothetically create. He would imagine an infinite number of possible worlds, any one of which he could bring into existence if he chose.[47]

Once God had decided to create one particular world among the infinite number of possible worlds that he might have created, through his "free" knowledge he would know everything that would occur in that about-to-be-created world. In particular, he would know ahead of time what decisions each human being would make in every situation, from birth until the moment of death.[48]

In describing God's "natural" and "free" foreknowledge in this way, Molina was breaking no new ground. His elegant and controversial contribution, which had first been proposed by his teacher, Pedro Fonseca, was to imagine God's having a third kind of foreknowledge. This was God's *scientia media* ("middle" knowledge), so called because it included elements of both the other kinds. God's *scientia media*, argued Molina, enabled him to grant complete

---

46. E. Vansteenberghe, "Molinisme," *Dictionnaire de theologie catholique*, 10:2103, citing *Concordia* Qu. 14. art. 13. Disp. 3, 22; see also Anton Pegis, "Molina and Liberty," in *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance*, ed. Gerald Smith (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1939), 85–90. For a thorough explanation of Molina's position, see Vansteenberghe's entire article, 10:2094–2187.

47. *Unam mere naturalem, quae proinde nulla ratione potuit esse aliter in Deo, per quam omnia ea cognovit ad quae divina potentia sive immediate sive interventu causarum secundarum sese extendit tum quoad naturas singulaorum et complexiones eorum necessarias tum etiam quaod contingentes, non quidem quod futurae essent vel non essent determinate, sed quod indifferenter esse et non esse possent, quod eis necessario competit atque adeo sub scientiam Dei naturalem etiam cadit. Concordia,* IV Quæst. 14. Art. 15. Disputatio 52: Utrum in Deo sit futurorum contingentium scientia. Qua item ratione cum ea libertas arbitrii rerumque contingentia consentient, 339, *On Divine Foreknowledge,* 168.

48. *Aliam mere liberam qua Deus post liberum actum suae voluntatis absque hypothesi et condicione aliqua cognovit absolute et determinate ex complexionibus omnibus contingentibus, quaenam re ipsa essent futurae, quae non item. Concordia,* IV Quæst. 14. Art. 15. Disputatio 52, 339, *On Divine Foreknowledge,* 168.

freedom to human actors while retaining absolute control over their salvation or damnation.[49]

Molina's reasoning proceeded as follows. The Semipelagians had argued that God used his "free" foreknowledge to look into the future and thereby discover which of the humans he planned to create would try the hardest to live as he commanded. Once he had identified those who would be obedient, he determined to reward them with salvation. Luther and Calvin had attacked this position on the grounds salvation would still ultimately depend on human choice. God would still be responding to a human initiative.

Molina agreed; the Semipelagian way of imagining God's activity gave too little credit to divine grace. But to imagine that the human will had absolutely no ability of its own to choose the good was contrary not only to the Catholic faith but also to the light of nature and true philosophy. Calvin's views in particular seemed to him "silly and absurd" (*frivole et inepte*), and he was furious that Calvin had "falsely and impudently" (*falso et impudenter*) claimed Augustine as the patron of his error (*patronum sui erroris*).[50] By leaving no room for human initiative in the process of conversion, the Protestant scheme would in effect make God responsible for the damnation of those he did not choose to save. Since both the Pelagian and the Protestant extremes were unacceptable, the truth had to lie somewhere in between. God resolved the apparent dilemma, argued Molina, by using his *scientia media*.

Beginning with the limitless number of hypothetical worlds God could create, God's *scientia media* took the further step of imagining how human actors would actually behave under the conditions and circumstances of each hypothetical world. Molina started by making the same assumption as the Semipelagians: that God's foreknowledge "could penetrate created free choice in such a way that in it He perceived which part it would turn itself toward by its own innate freedom—even though it could, if it so willed, incline itself toward the opposite part."[51]

---

49. *Tertiam denique mediam scientiam qua ex altissima et inscrutabili comprehensione cuiusque liberi arbitrii in sua essentia intuitus est, quid pro sua innata libertate, si in hoc vel illo vel etiam infinitis rerum ordinibus collocaretur, acturum esset, cum tamen posset, si vellet, facere re ipsa oppositum … Concordia,* 340, *On Divine Foreknowledge,* 168.

50. *non solum cum fide catholica … sed etiam cum lumine naturali veraque philosophia pugnat, Concordia,* Pars I. Disputatio 1. nos. 12–15 against the "Pelagians," no. 18 against Luther, no. 19 against Melanchthon, and no. 20 against Calvin, 9–13.

51. *ita illud penetraret ut in eo inspiceret, in quam partem pro sua innata libertate se esset inflexurum, cum, si vellet, posset se inflectere in oppositam, Concordia,* IV Disputatio 50, no. 15, 324, *On Divine Foreknowledge,* 141.

Take, for example, the cases of Peter and Judas. Both were apostles; both had had direct and extended exposure to Jesus's life and teaching. One denied Christ; the other betrayed him. Peter repented and now enjoyed eternal salvation; Judas, despite his remorse, was suffering the pains of hell. But suppose God had imagined them in a different set of circumstances in a different hypothetical world. Might Judas have repented and been saved? Might Peter have failed to repent and have been damned?

So long as God had yet to decide which world he would chose to create, his knowledge of the infinite number of possible worlds he could create—and of how human beings would behave in those possible worlds—remained purely hypothetical. But because one of the hypothetical worlds would be the world that God actually did choose to create, *scientia media* would include knowledge about the future of that world, too, "real" knowledge about the one "real" world God would actually bring into existence. Still, most of the *scientia media* would remain hypothetical, allowing God to know what human beings would have done under the conditions of any of the infinite number of possible future worlds.

As he imagined each of these possible hypothetical worlds, continued Molina, God would imagine himself offering gracious assistance to human actors. As free agents, these humans would choose either to accept or to reject this assistance. But God would know the exact conditions under which any particular human agent would accept or reject his help. God's *scientia media* included what later Molinists came to call (drawing on Acts 1:24 and 15:8 where God is said to "know the hearts" of his human creatures) a "supercomprehension of the heart" (*supercomprehensio cordis*). As Molina himself put it, "God, because of the depth of His intellect and *His absolutely eminent comprehension of the created faculty of choice*, knew with certainty in His essence which sins each created faculty of choice was by its freedom going to fall into on the hypothesis that it should be placed in such-and-such order of things and circumstances."[52] By virtue of this supercomprehension, God knew "the most secret inclinations" and penetrated "the most hidden recesses" of the human heart, and was thus "able to foresee with mathematical certainty the free resolves latent in man's will."[53]

---

52. *neque aliud sit ad quod reduci possit quam ad certitudinem scientiae mediae qua Deus altitudine sui intellectus eminentissimaque comprehensione arbitrii creati in sua essentia certo cognovit, in quae peccata pro sua libertate quodcumque creatum arbitrium laberetur ex hypothesi, quod in tali vel tali ordine rerum et circumstantiarum collocaretur, Concordia*, IV Disp. 53.9, 371; *On Divine Foreknowledge*, 218.

53. J. Pohle, "Molinism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 437–41, at 440.

God's *scientia media* would reveal to him that Peter, acting freely, would under the conditions and circumstances of one possible world refuse an offer of grace that he would accept in the conditions and circumstances of another possible world. Likewise Judas would accept under one set of conditions what he would refuse under another. In other words, God would know that the same human actor would accept or reject an offer of gracious assistance, depending upon the conditions and circumstances under which that offer was made. Those conditions and circumstances would exist in some possible worlds but not in others, so that any given human being's fate depended entirely upon the particular conditions and circumstances which God chose to create.

Using the insight from his *scientia media*, Molina imagined, God would make his decision. He would know all the hypothetical worlds that it was possible for him to create, and he would know how free human actors would behave in each one of those worlds. Among the infinite number of possible worlds, God would choose one to bring into actual existence. This act of God's choosing would also be an act of predestination, because by choosing to bring any particular world into being, God would predestine to salvation those humans whom he already knew would freely accept his offer of grace in that world. Because he already knew infallibly which human beings would respond and believe in the conditions and circumstances of the particular world he had chosen to create, creation and predestination were practically speaking the same act.

Logically then, concluded Molina, foreknowledge had to precede predestination in the mind of God. God as Molina conceived him would predestine only those human beings who (God already knew by his *scientia media*) would infallibly accept the offer of grace. "It is not the case that created free choice was going to do this rather than the opposite because God foreknew it, but, to the contrary, God foreknew it because free choice was going to do it by its innate freedom—even though it was really able to do the opposite if it so willed."[54]

In this fashion, Molina believed he had finally reconciled grace and free will, and he entitled his great work *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione, et reprobatione. …* (*The Harmony of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace, Divine Foreknowledge, Providence, Predestination, and Reprobation. …*). Human freedom was maintained, he

---

54. *non ideo liberum arbitrium createm facturum esse hoc potius quam oppositum, quia Deus id praescivit, sed a contrario ideo Deum id praescivisse, quia liberum arbitrium pro sua innata libertate id erat facturum, cum, si vellet, posset re ipsa facere oppositum, Concordia* IV. Disputatio 51 no. 18, 333; *On Divine Foreknowledge*, 157.

argued, because humans acted freely, completely unaware that God infallibly knew exactly how they would exercise their freedom until the day of their death. God's sovereignty was maintained because God retained complete control over who would achieve final salvation. God knew with certainty, through his *scientia media*, how any individual human being would react to his offer of assistance under any conceivable set of conditions and circumstances. The same human being, exercising the same free choice, would accept grace in some conditions and circumstances and refuse it in others. So it was ultimately not free human choice that determined any person's salvation or rejection but rather God's decision to bring one particular set of circumstances and conditions into being rather than another.

To understand why a human actor faced with an ethical decision would in no way be constrained by the fact that God already knew how he would decide, wrote Molina, one could consider the situation of a farmer deciding how to produce a crop. Such a farmer would be considered crazy (*insanae mentis*) if, "worried about God's foreknowledge, he became remiss in sowing his seed and if for this reason, lured by the idea that God foreknows everything from eternity and that things are going to occur just as He foreknew they would, he did not plant his seed or was going to plant less than he otherwise would have." God's foreknowledge neither helped nor hindered him; he was going to reap as he had sown. "The more seed he has planted, the more he will reap; but if he has planted nothing, then he will harvest nothing—a situation he ought afterward to attribute not to God's foreknowledge but to his own stupidity and negligence." Much crazier (*multo dementior*) would be anyone who, "worried about God's foreknowledge and lured by a similar line of reasoning," became "more remiss and lax in acting righteously, in restraining his drives, in overcoming temptation, and in doing those things that are required in order to attain a greater reward of beatitude." Rather than blame God's foreknowledge and predestination, he should rather blame himself—"especially since, whereas the farmer's labor might be wasted because of adverse weather or chance events, this man by contrast can be deprived of the fruits of his labor by no cause other than his own will."[55] Not only did the *scientia media* explain how God could preserve his own sovereignty while respecting free will, it also allowed Christians to preserve their common-sense understanding of human motivation.

But could people not blame God, speculated Molina, for creating a world in which he knew with certainty that some humans would refuse grace,

---

55. *neque postea praescientiam et praedestinationem divinam, sed se ipsum incusare debet, Concordia* Qu. 14. Art. 15. Disp. 52, 356, *On divine foreknowledge*, 194–95.

especially since he could have a created a different world under whose conditions and circumstances he knew that these same humans would accept it? Could an all-knowing and all-powerful God not have imagined, and created, a world in which every human being would be offered sufficient gracious assistance to believe and be saved? Even if one were to start, as Molina had, with the assumption that God would not want to save everyone, could God not be blamed for failing to give everyone at least a chance at salvation? By choosing a creation in which he foreknew that some individuals would not be placed in conditions and circumstances that would provoke a favorable response to his offer of assistance, would not God be as responsible for the damnation of those who refused grace as for the salvation of those that accepted it?

It was at this point that Molina introduced his second important contribution to the discussion: a different way of conceiving the traditional Scholastic distinction between sufficient and efficacious grace (*gratia sufficiens, gratia efficax*). Every human being, he argued, possessed the capacity to respond to God's gracious offer of salvation if he or she so chose. Should any human being choose to respond, the grace which God offered was fully sufficient to bring that human being to salvation. Molina even went so far as to argue that the divine assistance extended to those who would ultimately be saved was no greater than that extended to those who would reject salvation. The same sufficient offer of grace that a human actor chose to refuse would have been efficacious to save that actor had he chosen to accept it. Sufficient grace was extended to all human beings to save them if they so chose. In the traditional language of theology, *facienti quod est in se, Deus non denegat gratiam.*[56]

Given the circumstances and conditions of this particular world, of course, God would know in advance that not all human beings would so choose. His grace, his offer of divine assistance, would actually be efficacious only to those human beings whom he foreknew would choose to accept it in this particular set of circumstances and conditions. Unlike their less fortunate fellows, these human beings had been placed in circumstances where they would exercise their free choice by accepting God's gracious offer, though they could have refused it. But because God's offer was always sufficient to save anyone who chose to accept it, Molina argued that the responsibility for refusal fell squarely on that human being and not on an insufficient offer of grace from God.

---

56. *efficax dicatur cum quo arbitrium pro sua libertate convertitur ... illud vero inefficax dicatur cum quo arbitrium pro eadem sua libertate non convertitur, Concordia* III. Disputatio 40, no. 11, 248. *facienti ex suis naturalibus quod in se est semper Deus conferret sufficientia auxilia ad fidem et justificationen per concursum generalem,* I, Disputatio 10, no. 1, 48; Nigel Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), 98.

Looked at from the human direction, it was human choice which turned *gratia sufficiens* into *gratia efficax*. Only if the human subject gave her consent would sufficient grace become efficacious. The same grace would remain "merely sufficient" (*gratia mere sufficiens*) and inefficacious (*gratia inefficax*) without the free cooperation of the will. So Molina could confidently assert that "the cause of each person's salvation is to be found not in God's foreknowledge but in that person's intentions and actions."[57] Election was *post prævisa merita*; God's predestination depended upon God's foreknowing whether individual human wills would respond positively or negatively to the offer of grace.

Molina's system offered theologians a very different interpretation of the Augustinian *præparatur voluntas a Domino* than had Luther's or Calvin's.[58] To follow its reception would lead us far beyond the scope of this study. Suffice to say that the publication of the *Concordia* created a theological firestorm.[59] The Dominican Domingo Bañez, eager to remain faithful to the teaching of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, argued that God's gracious activity in turning a sinner to the good had to be imagined as going beyond simply placing that sinner in a set of circumstances where God foreknew that his offer of grace would be accepted. The power of sin was far greater than the Jesuits were imagining; no one could escape it by simply being presented with a "moral persuasion," an offer of grace under the right circumstances. Using Thomas's language to express what he believed to be Augustine's position, Bañez insisted that grace operated by what he called a "physical premotion" (*præmotio physica*) to turn the sinful heart toward God. God persuaded "physically" rather than just "morally." Bañez argued further that sufficient grace did not become efficacious because of a person's response; grace was *per se efficax* or *per se inefficax*.[60]

Jesuits and Dominicans attacked one another ferociously.[61] In their efforts to undermine the Jesuit position, Bañez and other Dominicans often turned to

---

57. *non in praescientia Dei unicuique salutis causam poni, sed in proposito et actibus suis, Concordia* IV Q. 14 Art. 15. Disp. 52.22., 348, *On Divine Foreknowledge,* 182. See Fredosso's "Introduction," in *On Divine Foreknowledge,* 37.

58. Nigel Abercrombie writes of the *Concordia* that "it would be difficult to name a single treatise of dogmatic theology which has more profoundly affected the history of dogma." *Origins of Jansenism,* 93.

59. Williams Perkins wrote of the "long and tedious disputes … made by many touching the concord of Gods decree, and the libertie of mans will." *A Treatise of Gods Free Grace and Mans Free Will, Works,* 1:740.

60. See P. Mandonnet, "Bañez, Dominique," *Dictionnaire de theologie catholique,* 2:140–45.

61. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits,* 302–7, describes a tradition of antipathy between Jesuits and Dominicans in Spain.

the extreme statements of the late Augustine. Finding no easy resolution, the Pope finally intervened in what became known as the *de auxiliis* controversy (about "aids or "helps") and forbad either side from pursuing further public attacks on the other.[62]

British Protestants were well aware of the Catholic battles. William Perkins cited Bañez favorably. George Carleton, leader of the British delegates to the Synod of Dort, and fellow delegates John Davenant and Samuel Ward all found the Dominican position much closer to the truth. Davenant appealed to Bañez and his fellow Dominican Diego Alvarez in disparaging *facienti quod est in se* and referred to Bañez as *optime* and *doctissimus* in his published writings. The Harvard commencement theses of 1668, 1678, 1679, 1699, and 1704 include refutations of the *scientia media*, suggesting that Protestant interest (at least in New England) remained high throughout the seventeenth century.[63]

By Hooker's day, influential Jesuits like Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) and Francisco Suárez (1548–1617) had retreated somewhat from Molina's position. An extraordinarily influential thinker in his time, Bellarmine made himself a particular target for Protestants by publishing his *Controversies* (*Disputationes de Controversiis Christianæ Fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos* [1586–93]), a powerful defense of the theology of the Council of Trent against the Protestant

---

62. See Antonio Astrain, "Congregatio de auxiliis," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Appleton, 1908), 4:238–39; and T. Ryan, "Congregatio de auxiliis," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 4:110–13.

63. Perkins, *De Prædestinationis Modo et Ordine: et de Amplitudine Gratiæ Divinæ Christiana & perspicua disceptatio* (Cambridge, 1598), 34, English translation *A Christian and Plaine Treatise of the manner and order of Predestination, and of the largeness of Gods grace*, trans. Francis Cacot and Thomas Tuke, *Works*, 2:613; Carleton, *An Examination of Those Things Wherein the Author of the Late Appeal …* (London, 1626), *NSTC* 4635, 127; Davenant, *Dissertatio de Morte Christi* (Cambridge, 1650), *Wing* D317, 40, 51, English translation *On the Death of Christ,* trans. Josiah Allport (London, 1832), 407, 431, cited in Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: the Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600– 1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 232. *Determinationes Quæstionum Quarundam Theologicarum* (Cambridge, 1634), *NSTC* 6294, 235–36. In his *Animadversions* (London, 1641), *Wing* D315, 116, 125, 301, Davenant refers to the Jesuit/Dominican quarrels. Ward called Bañez *eruditissime* in *Gratia Discriminans* (London, 1627), *NSTC* 25027, 29–30 and *Opera Nonnulla* (London, 1658), *Wing* W811, 128. Carl Trueman and Carrie Euler contend that "on the crucial issue of the nature of human will in salvation, seventeenth-century British divines, Reformed and Arminian, tended to look to late medieval Dominican paradigms and Renaissance Catholic writings of Jesuits and Jansenists to provide them with a sophisticated and nuanced conceptual vocabulary by which to carry the polemical discussion forward." "The Reception of Martin Luther in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," in *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, ed. Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 63–81, at 63–64. For the theses, see Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936), Appendix B "Theses and Quaestiones 1643–1708," 580–638.

Reformers. William Ames, another Alexander Richardson student with whom Hooker remained in close contact, knew Bellarmine's positions well and wrote extensively against them.[64]

Like Molina, Bellarmine denied that there was any essential difference between sufficient and efficacious grace. Sufficient grace would become efficacious when God foreknew that it would be offered under propitious circumstances; it remained inefficacious when God foreknew it would be refused (though under different circumstances it might have been welcomed and thus have become efficacious). Early in his career, Bellarmine stated plainly that "the only difference between sufficient and efficacious grace is to be found in the fact that … those who have the first are called at such a time and in such a way as God foresees will not lead to their acceptance of the grace, whereas those who possess the second are called at the hour and in the manner that He foresees will cause them to welcome His invitation."[65] The circumstances surrounding God's offering, not the quality of the grace he offered, provoked the response.

But unlike Molina, Bellarmine insisted that God chose those whom he would save before any consideration of human merit (*ante prævisa merita*), and that God therefore deliberately offered grace in exceptionally favorable circumstances to those whom he had already chosen: "in the manner and place and at the time that God foresaw were suited to his disposition and would infallibly lead to acceptance."[66]

This modification changed the emphasis of God's activity. In Molina's scheme, God chose certain human beings because he already knew, through *scientia media*, that those human beings would respond positively to his offer. In the particular world he had chosen to create, those were the human beings who would accept the grace God offered. Bellarmine's God made his choice to elect certain human beings before ever employing his foreknowledge. Only after choosing them did he learn from his *scientia media* what it would take, what exact circumstances would be required, to make each chosen individual an offer of grace that would certainly be accepted. While for Molina grace was efficacious because God foreknew it would be so, for Bellarmine it was

---

64. Ames, *Bellarminus Enervatus* (Oxford, 1629), *NSTC* 551. Ames's treatise was in John Harvard's library, as were four volumes of Bellarmine's works. Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935), 265.

65. "Lectures at the Roman College, April 23, 1580," cited by James Brodrick, S.J., *The Life and Work of Blessed Robert Francis Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J. 1542–1621*, 2 vols. (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1928), 2:5.

66. Letter to John Deckers, S.J., October 5, 1591, in ibid., 2:32.

efficacious because God made it so, because God deliberately fit it to the particular situation of each chosen individual.

As a result of its emphasis on God's tailoring the offer of grace in just such a way as to guarantee its acceptance, Bellarmine's position (which was shared by his Jesuit colleague Suárez) became known as *Congruism*. It was the fit, the "congruity," between the circumstances of the offer and the disposition of the human respondent that made the grace efficacious. The term stems from Augustine, who had written that God chose to have mercy on those persons whom he "called" in such a manner as he knew would "fit" (*congruere*) them, so that the call would not be refused. The elect were called "congruently" (*congruenter*).[67] Since God, thought Bellarmine, would know through his *scientia media* which circumstances would evoke a positive response, God could deliberately create those propitious circumstances for those he had already chosen. The offer of grace would then invariably be accepted.

Unlike the Protestants, explained Bellarmine, Catholics ascribed to the unregenerate will some power to perform supernatural works, though only a remote and imperfect power. Unlike the Pelagians, Catholics taught that no one could actually perform such works without grace. The unregenerate will remained free, but its freedom was "as it were tied up and entangled." *Gratia excitans* could loosen and disentangle the will's freedom by conferring upon it a "proximate power" to perform good works, but the will retained the freedom to refuse grace if it so chose. If it chose to accept grace, the will then cooperated with *gratia adiuvans* to dispose or prepare itself for justification by performing "works of repentance (*opera poenitentiæ*)." Only into the prepared will would God infuse justifying grace.[68] Bellarmine found such dispensation of special grace over time entirely Augustinian. Augustine's divine preparation was identical to *gratia excitans*, and his *gratia cooperans* was similarly *gratia adiuvans*.[69]

---

67. Augustine, *De Diversis Quaestionibus ad Simplicianum* I.ii.13: *Illi enim electi, qui congruenter vocati; illi autem, qui non congruebant neque contemperabantur vocationi, non electi, qui non secuti, quamvis vocati. … cuius autem miseretur, sic eum vocat, quomodo scit ei congruere, ut vocantem non respuat, P.L.* 40:119, English translation *Miscellany of Questions in Response to Simplician*, trans. Boniface Ramsey, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century* I/12 (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2008), 174–231, at 195, cited by Pohle, "Molinism," 440; see also Fredriksen, *Augustine and the Jews*, 178. A more technical explanation of Congruism by Walter McDonald can be found in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Appleton, 1908), 4:251–52.

68. Bellarmine, *Disputationes de controversiis Christianæ fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*, in *Roberti Bellarmini Opera Omnia*, ed. Justinus Fevre (Paris, 1873), 6:43, 136–43.

69. Ibid., 139.

Bellarmine and Molina agreed that God did not invade the human mind, so to speak, and change the orientation of a reluctant will. Rather, the offer of grace would be made in such a way that human beings of their own accord would find it attractive and would freely choose to accept it. God's persuasion was "moral," not "physical," as their Dominican opponents held.

Many Elizabethan and Jacobean divines established their theological reputations by penning long Latin treatises against the Jesuits; Bellarmine was a particular target. "Throughout Europe," writes Anthony Milton, "attacks on Bellarmine were regarded by Protestants as a way of demonstrating their confessional orthodoxy."[70]

If we step back from the details for a moment and consider Molina's and Bellarmine's broadest assumptions about God's interaction with human subjects, we can see how these Jesuit thinkers took positions that were fundamentally Tridentine. They honored the pronouncements of the Council of Trent by insisting that human nature, though sinful, retained some capacity to contribute to the initial work of grace. God's actions would locate, add additional ability to, and cooperate with that human capacity. Such a way of conceiving the cooperation of divine and human activity would be entirely consistent with the famous dictum of St. Thomas that grace perfects human nature rather than destroys it (*gratia non tollit naturam, sed perfecit*).[71]

"Protestant" positions, insisting on Luther's *sola gratia*, rejected any human contribution as "synergistic." God initiated and brought to completion the work of justification without any human contribution. Protestants believed that by weighing the separate contributions of God and the human will, Jesuit positions

---

70. The standard work on Protestant–Catholic relations during the early Stuart period is now Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*. Prominent examples of Latin anti-Catholic polemic would be Andrew Willet, *Synopsis Papismi* (London, 1600), *NSTC* 25698, 14–18; William Whitaker, *Disputatio de sacra Scriptura, contra huius temporis papistas, inprimis Robertum Bellarminum Iesuitam, pontificium in Collegio Romano, & Thomam Stapletonum, regium in Schola Duacena controversiarum professorem* (Cambridge, 1588), *NSTC* 25366; John Rainolds, *De Romanae Ecclesiae idololatria, in cultu sanctorum, reliquiarum, imaginum, aquæ, salis, olei, aliarumq[ue] rerum consecratarum, & sacramenti Eucharistiæ, operis inchoati libri duo in quibus cum alia multa variorum papismi patronorum errata patefiunt: tûm inprimis Bellarmini, Gregoriiq[ue] de Valentia, calumniæ in Calvinum ac ceteros Protestantes, argutiæq[ue] pro papistico idolorum cultu discutiuntur & ventilantur* (Oxford, 1596), *NSTC* 20606; Robert Abbot, *Antichristi demonstratio contra fabulas pontificias, & ineptam Roberti Bellarmini de Antichristo disputationem* (London, 1603), *NSTC* 43; and, of course, William Perkins, *Problema de Romanæ Fidei Ementito Catholicismo* (1604), *NSTC* 19734; translated anonymously as *The Problem of the Forged Catholicism* in *Works*, 2:485–602, and *A Reformed Catholike* (London, 1597), *NSTC* 19735.8, in *Works*, 1:555–624, discussed in Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 14–18, 177.

71. *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 1, art. 8 ad 2, English translation *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007), vol. I, part I, 6.

misunderstood God's gracious work. They made grace a commodity rather than a divine redirection of the human will.

The theological concept that came to characterize the Jesuit way of conceiving God's activity in redemption was the "concourse" of God, the *concursus dei* or *concursus divinus*. Ultimately, nothing happened without God's involvement. Through his general concourse (*concursus generalis*) God enabled everything to happen that did happen. But when the Jesuit theologians spoke of God's concurring in human acts that led to salvation, they imagined God and the human subject "running together" toward salvation, God supporting but not interfering with human free will. While both Molina and Bellarmine recognized that no individual human being could achieve final salvation unless God first took the initiative by making his *gratia sufficiens* available, they conceived of God as building upon, and cooperating with, the human disposition toward good that remained in human nature even after the Fall. Rather than inducing a free choice of the human will, divine grace acted simultaneously with it. Grace "ran together" with that residual disposition toward good in bringing about the redemption of those God had chosen to redeem.

Bañez and his fellow Thomists in the Dominican Order were by no means the only Catholic thinkers who reacted strongly to what they saw as direct attacks on Augustinianism. A professor at the University of Louvain, Michel de Bay (1513–1589, usually known by his Latinized name, Baius) took the position that "the sole repository of orthodox teaching upon Grace" was to be found in the anti-Pelagian treatises of Augustine. In 1567 Pope Pius V condemned seventy-nine propositions from de Bay's writings in the bull *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*.[72] De Bay submitted, was allowed to retain his professorship, and even became chancellor of Louvain in 1575. His opponents protested that he was continuing to advance his version of Augustinianism, and in 1580 Pope Gregory XIII, through a Jesuit representative, forced de Bay to retract his errors in the presence of the entire university. Uncowed, de Bay retaliated by drawing up a series of thirty-four "Jesuit" positions and having them condemned by the university in 1587.[73]

Accusations flew back and forth. De Bay died two years later, but his followers carried on his program. Two of the most influential were Jean du Vergier de Hauranne (later Abbé de Saint-Cyran) and Cornelius Jansen; the two studied theology together in the first years of the seventeenth century

---

72. The young Robert Bellarmine, at the time a Professor of the Jesuits in Louvain, wrote a treatise against de Bay: *Sententiae Michaelis Baii … refutatae* (1569–76); see Gustavo Galeota, "Bellarmini, Roberto (1542–1621)," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 5:525–31 at 525.

73. Nigel Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism*, 92. Although clearly sympathetic to the Jesuits, Abercrombie's work remains invaluable. For a more recent account, with extensive

at the University of Louvain. Jansen and Saint-Cyran continued their friend-ship and studies after graduation, focusing their attention in particular on the writings of Augustine. In 1638, dying of an epidemic, Jansen produced a manuscript of the result of his research that was published in 1640 as *Augustinus*.

Reflecting the influence of de Bay, Jansen's *Augustinus* set forth a Catholic version of extreme Augustinianism. While allowing for traditional practices like confession and the veneration of saints, Jansen advanced a predestinar-ian theology that either explicitly or implicitly argued that grace was irresist-ible, that *facienti quod est in se* was Semipelagian and therefore false, and that Christ's redemptive activity was limited to the predestined elect. Although no Jesuits were mentioned by name, everyone knew that *Augustinus* was an attack on Jesuit theology.

In 1653 the Papal Bull *Cum occasione* censured "Five Propositions" which were thereafter known as "Jansenism." But Jansenist sympathizers, now centered in the Parisian convent of Port-Royal and including Blaise Pascal and the playwright Jean Racine, did not surrender. In 1656 Pascal published his *Provincial Letters*, a scathing critique of Jesuit casuistry. Half a century later, Pierre Bayle's *Dictionnaire historique et critique* opined that "tout homme qui examine les choses sans préjugé, et avec les lumières nécessaires" (all men who examine the thing without prejudice, and have the requisite enlightenment) would find that the Augustinianism which Rome officially upheld and the Jansenism which it condemned were "une seule et meme doctrine" (one and the same doctrine).[74] In their dedicatory letter to Thomas Hooker's *Application of Redemption*, Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye explicitly exempted "the Dominicans" and "*Jansenius* of late and his followers" from those who "continued in the midst of Popish Darkness."[75]

It is against the backdrop of this resurgence of extreme Augustinianism that the positions of Thomas Hooker and Samuel Stone need to be

---

bibliographical citations, see "Le Jansénisme," in Delumeau, *Le catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire*, 155–81, *Catholicism between Luther and Voltaire*, 99–128. Delumeau finds "*le drame de l'Eglise romaine entre le temps de Luther et celui de Voltaire*" in the challenge of reconciling "*les formules augustiniennes*" with "*les définitions contraire*" of the Council of Trent. *Catholicisme*, 157, *Catholicism*, 100.

74. 1702 edition, art "Augustin." Samuel Ward, a fellow British delegate with Davenant and Carleton at the Synod of Dort, took an interest in Janssen's *Augustinus*: SSC, Ward MS O/7, cited in Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 232.

75. "To the Reader," AR sig. B1ᵛ.

understood. Anti-Puritans like Richard Bancroft and William Laud would be eager to consign them to the "Calvinist" camp, but they are better understood as products of, and perhaps fighting a rearguard action to preserve, an extreme Augustinianism far broader, more diverse, and in the early seventeenth century more influential than Calvin's writings alone.

6

The Terrifying God of William Perkins, Thomas Hooker, and Samuel Stone

Yow Puritans all wheresoeuer yow dwell
ymitateing your master the dyvell of hell
leave of[f] your devises the world to delude
least god from his blisse your soules do exclude
. . . .

others there are that are knowne very well
which for purenes of lyfe they say they excel
yea Sainctes *of heaven already chosen they bee*
to iudge the good, and evill of euery degree
yea in this present life they let not to maynteyne
that their deere frendes are damnd for lyeing vaine
And for theire reward hell fire they haue gained
And thus Parkyns *hath said that his father hath obteyned*
. . . .

I could wish he [Satan] had Parkyns *in that pownd*
But what a Clowne is this & Rascall Scismatike knaue
that will iudg his frends such vglie tormentes to haue . . .
yea this Scismaticke dogge *and ympe of the dyvell*
doth maynteyne that god is the author of evill … [1]

---

1. Anonymous, "To the execrable Companie [and pack] of Puritans and the deepest desemblinge Anabaptistes of this tyme Enymies to the kynge and state, Lett this I praie thee be Delyured with speed." *Records of Early English Drama: Dorset*, ed. Rosalind Conklin Hays and C. E. McGee (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 181; emphasis added.

HOW DID THE tradition of extreme Augustinianism come to shape the theology of Hooker and Stone? To answer that question, one must look closely at the theology of the men who taught them, both at Cambridge and in the household seminaries of Alexander Richardson and Richard Blackerby. The previous chapter followed the fortunes of extreme Augustinianism to the beginning of the seventeenth century (with Jansenism as a coda), precisely the time when Hooker came under the influence of his Cambridge professors. What were they teaching him (and his younger contemporary Samuel Stone)?

In a careful study of Cambridge divinity in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, David Hoyle concludes that the University was "dominated by a confident reformed orthodoxy" epitomized by the writings of William Perkins.[2] Largely forgotten today, Perkins was almost certainly the most influential Protestant scholar in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England.

Recall that both Hooker and Stone had been fluent in Latin since grammar school, a fluency which gave them an access that modern scholars can only envy to virtually the entire printed corpus of western Christian theology. The Cambridge college libraries contained a vast array of biblical commentaries, theological treatises, and devotional works by Reformed, Lutheran, and Catholic theologians. But judging from the evidence of their preaching and writing, both printed and in manuscript, it is plain that a "Perkinsian" theology was the primary influence on their work.

Perkins considered Augustine "the most judiciall Divine of al the ancient Fathers," and the three large folio volumes of his collected *Works* lay out an Augustinianism as extreme as any previously encountered. Heavily influenced by Calvin's colleague Theodore Beza, Perkins developed a theology that shocked many contemporaries by its unrelenting insistence on divine sovereignty.[3]

---

2. *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590–1644* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 59, 25 *et passim*. Popular libels against Perkins lead Arnold Hunt to conclude that "he was regarded as the main English exponent of predestinarian theology, and that his name … had become popularly associated with a particular school of theology not just in academic circles but in the consciousness of many who had never read his writings." *Art of Hearing*, 364.

3. It has often been argued that Beza, more than his Geneva colleague Calvin, shaped English Reformed theology in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Particularly in his *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, Richard Muller provides a compelling rebuttal. Whatever their modifications of Calvin, no one denies that Beza's positions decisively influenced Perkins. The pages that follow oversimplify complex channels of influence by assuming that Hooker and Stone read earlier Reformed theologians through "Perkinsian" glasses.

It should cause a reader no surprise, for example, to find bitter denunciations not only of Gabriel Biel but also of Molina and his colleagues in the Society of Jesus. Thinking particularly of the Jesuits, Perkins coldly accused Catholic theologians of Pelagianism. "I doubt not therefore to auouch that the present religion of the Church of Rome reuiues, in part, the heresie of *Pelagius*, and in these last daies propounds it againe to the world with new varnish and fresh colours."[4]

One need not undertake an exhaustive study of Perkins's *Works* to gain a good sense of the way he imagined God; a few representative positions will suffice. One might start with his explanation of why God brought the world into being. As had most Christian thinkers, Perkins presumed that God created the world to manifest his glory. But God's "glory," like any manifestation of God's infinite being, would be hard for humans to comprehend. When Moses begged God to "shew me thy glory," God demurred. God's glory was his "face," which no man could see and live. "While my glory passeth by … I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand." Only after God had passed by was Moses granted a look at his "back parts" (Exod. 33:17–23). The fullness of God's glory had to remain beyond human comprehension;

---

4. *A Treatise of Conscience, Works*, 1:522; *A Treatise of Gods Free Grace and Mans Free Will, Works*, 1:732. When he took issue with Catholic doctrine on preparation and *mertium* or *dispositio de congruo*, Biel was the authority he cited, e.g., *Armilla Avrea, id est, Theologiæ Descriptio Mirandum Seriem Causarum & Salutis & Damnationis iuxta Verbum Dei Proponens*, 3d. ed. (Cambridge: John Legatt, 1592), 298–99, English translation *A Golden Chaine: Or, the Description of Theologie, Containing the Order of the Causes of Saluation and Damnation, According to Gods Word, Works*, 1:95–96. See also *Armilla Aurea*, 312, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:100. The first (1590) English translation of the earlier Latin first edition of the *Armilla* was made by Robert Hill, but changes in the translation of the greatly expanded 1592 edition, the one included in Perkins's *Works*, suggest it may have had another translator; the anonymous 1592 translator identifies himself as "an other." On Hill, who subsequently held the "premier pulpit" in Norwich, England's second largest city, see Julia Merritt, "The Pastoral Tightrope: A Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London," in *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell*, ed. T. Cogswell, R. Cust, and P. Lake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 143–84; Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norfolk c. 1560 –1643* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 81–84, and "Predestination and Parochial Dispute in the 1630s: The Case of the Norwich Lectureships," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 59 (2008): 407–25; and Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, 347–48. Hill claimed that at Perkins's request he had "made the first fruits of his [Perkins's] labours to speake English," All future citations to the *Armilla* are to he 1592 edition unless otherwise indicated. *The Combate betweene Christ and the Deuill displayed: or, a Commentarie vpon the Temptations of Christ, Works*, 3:*sig. Lll3ʳ. Perkins frequently cites Augustine in his favor against Roman Catholics and recent German divines, e.g., *Armilla Aurea*, 302, 303, 326, 342, 343, 344, 348, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:97, 108, 109, 110. Perkins considered every pope since Boniface III, who assumed the title *caput omnium ecclesiarum* in the early seventh century, to have been an Antichrist; see *An Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:260.

only God could completely know and appreciate the perfection of his own infinite being.[5]

But God was prepared to allow humans to recognize some portion of his power, majesty, and magnificence. Although he had created them with finite minds, they were still able to gain some intimation of the divine perfection. Every reasonable creature could glimpse God's glory through observing the natural world, for example, and those fortunate enough to be exposed to Christian teaching could perceive it even more clearly in the Bible.

Although the Old Testament texts seem to emphasize God's power or reputation when they speak of his glory, theologians like Perkins understood divine glory morally. Divinity manifested itself most clearly in the attributes of mercy and justice. "God hauing decreed to glorifie his name in shewing his mercie and iustice vpon his creature, hereupon in time createth men to shew his mercie in the saluation of some, and to shew his iustice in the just and deserued damnation of other some."[6] God mercifully redeemed a minority of sinners who were utterly unworthy of his favor, and he justly punished the equally unworthy majority.

---

5. The Hebrew *kavod* "evokes the idea of weight or that which confers weightiness … and hence esteem or respect," i.e., *gravitas* in today's parlance. Ceslas Spicq, art. *doxa, Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 1:364. In his *Theology of the Old Testament*, 286, Walter Brueggemann characterizes God's glory as his absolute power: "Yahweh, in Yahweh's glory, is a power and a presence like none other, before whom Israel submits in confidence and before whom powers resistant to Yahweh finally submit because they have no choice. The glory of Yahweh is to itself and for itself, and Yahweh, in Yahweh's glory, accommodates to no one and to nothing." In *Israel's Praise: Doxology against Idolatry and Ideology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 66, Brueggemann explains that in the Exodus narrative, "the majesty of Yahweh and Yahweh's absolute legitimacy are expressed as 'getting glory' over Pharaoh," e.g., Exodus 14:4, "I will get glory over Pharaoh and all his host." Jerome H. Neyrey, S.J., argues that "glory" in the New Testament involved enhancing reputation, and that both God and Jesus expected "glory" rather than "thanks." "Lost in Translation: Did It Matter If Christians 'Thanked' God or 'Gave God Glory?'" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2009): 1–23.

6. *An Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:152, see also 298, 316; *De Prædestinationis Modo et Ordine*, 1, English translation *A Christian and Plaine Treatise of the Manner and Order of Predestination, and of the Largeness of Gods Grace*, trans. Francis Cacot and Thomas Tuke, *Works*, 2:606. *Deus ordinavit omnes homines ad certam conditionem æternam, hoc est, vel ad vitam, vel ad mortem, **propter gloriam suam**, Armilla Aurea*, 19; emphasis added; *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:16. See also *Armilla Aurea*, 349, 354: *Atque ita est plena exequutio decreti reprobationis; vnde elucet lumina Dei iustitia in puniendo peccato: ex qua præterea existit gloria Dei, Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:110, 112. Samuel Stone agreed that glory should be understood as moral. "Glory," he wrote, "is perfect goodness made manifest." WB 371. T. D. Bozeman writes perceptively of the English Presbyterian depiction of "God the king fiercely solicitous of his ethical glory." *The Precisionist Strain*, 31.

Such a way of imagining God left no room for human initiative in redemption. On the critical issue of the relative importance of God's grace and human free will, Perkins summarized "the difference betweene us, and the Church of Rome" as follows: If one asked, "wherein lieth the efficacie of Gods grace," some Catholics would answer "that it lies ordinarily in the free consent and co-operation of free will ioyned with grace." Perkins placed Molina in this camp. "L. Molina saith, that our will maketh grace to be effectuall … and sometime againe he saith, will is but a condition, and no cause of the efficacie of grace. But alwaies he graunteth, that it lieth in mans will whether grace shall be effectual, or no." To Perkins, this way of conceiving God's activity took control from God's will and placed it in human hands. God would have "a depending will, whereby God wil[l]s and determines nothing, but according as he fore-sees that the will of man will determine it selfe." Molina imagined that "when grace is offered on Gods part, will within stands as the Porter, to open or shut, or as master Controller to accept or repel the worke of God."[7] Perkins could never accept such a role for the human will.

Perkins was equally disdainful of the Jesuit distinction between sufficient and effectual grace. "Nor do I … respect the distinction between sufficient and efficacious grace: for I do not recognize any grace that would be sufficient to convert a sinner which would not be efficacious, … because freedom of the will is altogether absent in spiritual things."[8] Since God had no need of human cooperation in the activity of turning the human will to himself, he would extend grace "which is indeed sufficient to salvation" only to those whom he intended to redeem. Sufficient grace would then invariably be effectual.[9]

---

7. *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:735, 718; Perkins appears to be citing Molina's *Concordia*, Pars 7 Qu. 23. Art. 4 and 5, Disp. 1 from the (1595) Antwerp edition; the comparable pages in the 1953 edition cited above are 489–90 and 493–94; see also *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:718–19; *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of Galatians, Works*, 2:178–79. Perkins seems to be presuming Jesuit use of the *scientia media* when he discusses how Catholics understood God's treatment of Peter and Judas, *Armilla Aurea*, 306–307, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:98.

8. *Neque … moror distinctionem gratiæ sufficientis & efficacis: non enim agnosco gratiam sufficientem vllam ad conuersionem peccatoris, quæ non est efficax, … quia deest planè liberum arbitrium in spiritualibus, De Prædestinationis Modo,* 142, *Treatise of the Manner and Order, Works,* 2:637; see also *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works,* 1:742, and *A Godly and Learned Exposition … upon the three first chapters of the Revelation, Works,* 3:*280. Here, as in many other respects, Perkins followed Theodore Beza, who was among the relatively few Reformed theologians to reject the sufficient/effectual distinction, see W. Robert Godfrey, "Reformed Thought on the Extent of the Atonement to 1618," *Westminster Theological Journal* 37 (1974–75): 133–71, at 141. Thomas Hooker will follow Perkins.

9. *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works,* 1:741.

Perkins characterized Congruists like Bellarmine as those who found "the efficacie of grace in the congruitie of the object, that is, in moral perswasions, which God knowes to be apt and fitte to moove and allure the will according to the condition thereof, even as a beast is mooved by the sight of a bottle of hay." By "morall perswasions," Perkins understood choices which God arranged to be presented to the human will, choices which God knew, by his foreknowledge, that the will would find overwhelmingly attractive.[10]

To Perkins, these Catholic positions were utterly wrongheaded. When God effected the conversion of someone whom he had elected before all time, he left no room for that person's will either to resist or to work alongside his grace. "By all this which hath bin said, it appears what is the difference between vs, and the Church of Rome in the point of free-wil. They say, liberty of grace to wil wel is onely weakned, diminished, and held captiue by sinne: we say it is quite lost and abolished by the fall of Adam." Not only did sinners fail to offer any cooperation with God's grace, they would refuse it if they were able.[11]

To repeat, if Molinists and Congruists claimed that human freedom to choose to move toward God was "only weakned, diminished, and held captive by sinne," extreme Augustinians like Perkins countered that such freedom was "quite lost and abolished by the fall of Adam." It was folly to imagine, as Molina had, that the fallen will could be the "master Controller" of salvation. It was equally foolish to conceive, as Bellarmine had, of God's drawing sinners by mere moral persuasion, as if they were hungry horses to whom grace could appear as attractive as a bale of hay. Perkins could not imagine how merely "moral" persuasions could evoke any lasting response from human beings whose habitual disobedience made them completely disinclined to turn to God. Only by overpowering the will's resistance by an internal, physical act of grace could God redeem it. Until an elect person had already been converted, there was no role whatsoever for free choice. Perkin's position was uncompromising:

the mind is vncapable of any good thought, and the wil of a good desire, til God once againe create in them a new qualitie or propertie of holinesse, that the minde in thinking may thinke well, & the will in

---

10. *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:735–36, see also 741.

11. Ibid., 1:735, see also the Dedicatory Epistle, *Works*, 1:718; *A Godly and Learned Exposition upon the Whole Epistle of Jude, Works*, 3:*484, and *A Reformed Catholike: or, a Declaration Shewing How Neere We May Come To the Present Church of Rome in Sundry Points of Religion: and Wherein We Must for Ever Depart from Them, Works*, 1:559, as well as *A Godly and Learned Exposition upon … the three first chapters of the Revelation, Works*, 3:*356.

willing may will well, or, will that which is good. For though it be the nature of the will, to wil or nill, yet the power and formall beginning of wel-willing is the integritie or goodnesse of the will. It is obiected, that the will to accept and receiue grace, is in vs before grace be receiued. *I answer* thus, the first act of will, whereby the will in his regeneration begins to assent vnto God, & begins to wil to be conuerted, is indeede the work of the will, (because it is the will that willeth) yet doth it not arise of the naturall strength of the will, but from the grace of God that renueth it. For, *to will to be regenerate, is the effect & testimony of regeneration begun.*[12]

Such a position eliminated any possibility of human preparation. It showed "that doctrine of the Church of Rome to be false, whereby they teach that before iustification there must be a disposition and aptitude in a man thereunto." Perkins insisted that his position was in fact the core teaching of the Church of England. "I haue deliuered the truth of this weightie point of religion [predestination], which also is the doctrine of the Church of England."[13]

But it also opened him to the same charges that had dogged extreme Augustinianism since Julian of Eclanum: that God was capricious, cruel, and the ultimate author of sin. Perkins recognized the charges: "It is obiected," he told his Cambridge students, "that by this doctrine god shal[l]be the authour of sinne."[14] Throughout his writings he rarely missed an opportunity to try to explain the charges away. But by the second decade of the seventeenth century, just a few years after his death in 1602, he had nonetheless become identified in the popular mind with a doctrine of predestination that portrayed God as capricious and tyrannical. The scurrilous poem at the head of this chapter, which appeared anonymously in Dorchester, lampoons him as a "scismaticke dogge" who makes God the "author of evill."

---

12. Ibid., 1:734; emphasis added. Note that "desire" is identified as an act of will; this, too, goes back at least to Augustine, who had written "what is desire or joy but an act of will in sympathy with those things that we wish" (*quid est cupiditas et lætitia nisi voluntas in eorum consensione quæ volumus?*), *de civ. Dei* XIV.6, *P.L.* 41:409, *City of God*, 285.

13. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:293, *A Godly and Learned Exposition upon the Whole Epistle of Jude, Works*, 3:*580.Even in the late Elizabethan England of William Perkins, argues Eamon Duffy, Catholicism was still a live option for a great many English men and women. See "Bare Ruin'd Choirs: Remembering Catholicism in Shakespeare's England," in Eamon Duffy, *Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition: Religion and Conflict in the Tudor Reformations* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012): 233–53, 290–93.

14. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:287; see also *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:64.

The extremity of Perkins's Augustinianism becomes absolutely clear as one examines four of his central positions:

(1) *God actively predestined some human beings to salvation and others to eternal punishment for no cause other than God's own good pleasure.* As an omnipotent, omniscient being, God was certainly capable of foreseeing how humans would behave once he had created them (or even of imagining how they would behave in the infinite number of possible worlds that the Jesuits assumed that he had considered but decided not to create). But he chose not to. God's decrees of predestination to salvation and damnation were to be imagined as logically prior to his foreknowledge (i.e. *ante prævisam fidem*), and there could be no explanation possible for his decisions beyond the fact that he had made them. "There can be nothing more absurd," argued Perkins, "then to seuer the foreknowledge of God from his counsel or decree." "To say that foreseene faith or vnbeliefe are the moouing causes whereby God was induced to ordaine men either to saluation or to iust damnation … is to make the will of God to depend vpon the qualitie and condition of the creature." "This is flat to hang Gods will vpon mans will," he said in another place, "to make euery man an Emperour, and God his vnderling."[15]

Strictly speaking, God did not create human beings in order to damn them to eternal punishment, but he did create them knowing that without divine assistance—which he would deliberately choose not to offer—they could not but remain in sin and be finally damned for their sinful behavior. (Conceiving of God's decree to damn some humans as logically preceding his decision to allow Adam's fall is the doctrine of supra-lapsarianism. The logical steps through which God was imagined to reason were his *signa rationis*.)[16] To

---

15. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:293, 294, 295.

16. *Præposterum est illud, primo præscire deum, humanum genus creatum, lapsum, & in Christo redemptum; eum deinde homines ita præscitos ordinare vel ad vitam vel ad mortem. Finis enim est primum in agentis intentione … Iam autem, creatio generis humani, lapsus in Adamo, & redemptio generis humani, media sunt exequendæ prædestinationis, & proinde ei subordinantur: Finis autem decreti diuini est, gloriam suam manifestare, aliis hominibus ad gloriam et fœlicitatem provehendis, & aliis iusto iudicio perdendis. Ergo non est existimandum, deum prius cogitasse de mediis exequendi consilium suum, quàm consilium vllum de ipsa electione vel reprobatione hominim capiat. Armilla*, 349, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:111. "This seemeth preposterous that God did first foreknow mankind created, fallen, & redeemed in Christ: and that afterward hee ordained them so foreknown to life or to death. For the end is the first thing in the intention of the agent. … Now we know this, that mans creation, & his fall in Adam, are but meanes to execute Gods predestination, and therefore are subordinate vnto it: but the end of Gods decree, is the manifestation of his glory, in sauing some, and condemning others. Therefore we may not once imagine, that God did first consult of the meanes whereby he determined to execute his decree, before he deliberated of the election, and reprobation of man." Although Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 169, finds elements

Perkins, reprobation was never simply an afterthought, the fate of the majority passed over by God's active decision to elect a minority. God deliberately chose to manifest his justice in the damnation of the greater part of his human creatures.[7] Although he admitted that it might be thought a "hard speech," he was willing to profess "that God would haue some particular men depriued of grace and redemption by Christ."[18] Perkins knew that his detractors found his doctrine "sundry ways scandalous"; they charged that he taught "that God created men so, as he will saue but a fewe, making them for this ende, to cast the greatest number to hell." To opponents, "our doctrine is a doctrine of blasphemie; for that wee teach that God to haue decreed the fall of man, and so make God the author of mans sinne."[19] Forty years later, as a prisoner in the Tower of London, Archbishop William Laud (for the most part reticent to express his personal views on matters of doctrine) said of such supra-lapsarianism that "my very soul abominates [it]. For it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world."[20]

(2) *"The Fall" was neither accidental nor contingent.* Although God did not actively will Adam's fall into sin (for otherwise God could justly be deemed

---

of infra-lapsarianism in Perkins; he nonetheless terms him a "supralapsarian." See also Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1991), 16 *et passim.* Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 38, corroborates this judgment. Infralapsarians believe that only after Adam's Fall does God choose some human beings out of the fallen mass of humanity, leaving the rest in the sin that will deserve damnation. See Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms,* "*supra lapsum,*" 292.

17. *Deum nolle vllum hominem damnari falsum est.* Armilla (1592), 343, *Golden Chaine, Works,* 1:109, "it is an vntruth for a man to say, that God would have none condemned." Nicholas Tyacke concludes that supra-lapsarianism was a minority position among the delegates to the Synod of Dort; the majority were "sublapsarians." Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists,* 96. The "Tabula" attached to Perkins's *Armilla Aurea* became notorious for its "black lines of damnation" that paralleled white lines of salvation, e.g., Richard Corbett, "The Distracted Puritane," op. cit. The Dutch Remonstrants similarly objected to Perkin's contention in the *Armilla Aurea* (330–33, *Golden Chaine, Works,* 1:107–8) that *In executione reprobationis tribuit Reprobis vocatis illluminationem, μεταμέλειαν, fidem temporariam, gustum donorum cælestium & vitæ æternæ sanctitatem. Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium in Foederato Belgio* (Herderwiici, 1620), 2:32. See *The British Delegates and the Synod of Dort (1618–19),* ed. Anthony Milton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), xlvi *et passim.*

18. *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works,* 3:251.

19. *A Godly and Learned Exposition … upon the Three First Chapters of the Revelation, Works,* 3:*298, see also 250.

20. Laud's answer to Lord Saye and Sele's speech on the liturgy, cited in Hunt, *Art of Hearing,* 374.

the author of sin), God arranged things in such a way that Adam would inevitably transgress, and God permitted Adam's transgression to occur precisely according to God's eternal plan.[21] Adam had to fall, because "vnlesse Adam had fallen for himselfe & others; there should haue bin found no miserie in men, on whome God might take pitie in his sonne, nor wickedness which he might condemne; and therefore neither manifestation of iustice, nor mercie" and so no occasion for God's glory to be shown.[22] Once he fell, Adam and all his offspring deserved eternal torment. God's leaving Adam to his own devices in the Garden of Eden was like a man holding a staff upright in a field and then letting it go. The man would not need to push the staff to the ground, because no sooner would the man withdraw his hand than the staff would fall of its own accord.[23]

(3) *Christ died and rose again to benefit the elect only*. As the second Person of the Trinity, Christ as God the Son agreed to and participated in the decrees of election and reprobation. Along with the Father and the Holy Spirit; he took part in the decision to manifest divine mercy—through the creation of the minority of humankind to be saved—and to manifest divine justice—through the creation of the majority to be damned to eternal punishment. But once he had accepted his role as Mediator in the divine plan of election, he agreed to restrict his redeeming work entirely to the elect. The reprobate might hear the promises of salvation preached from the pulpit, but those promises were never meant for them and could not extend to them. God might allow reprobates to be exposed to the outward means of salvation—preaching, the sacraments, even the discipline of the church—"but yet he quite withdraweth the operation of his spirit, whereby a conuersion might be wrought."[24] From his first imagining of the reprobate, before their creation, until the moment he presided over their judgment to eternal damnation, Christ could relate to them

---

21. *Nam lapsus iste, neque fortuitò, neque insciente Deo, neque connivente, neque nuda permissione, neque repugnante Deo contigit: sed mirabili quadam ratione non sine voluntate Dei, neque tamen approbante Deo evenit. Armilla*, 29, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:19: "For we must not thinke, that mans fall was either by chaunce, or God not knowing of it; or barely winking at it, or by his bare permission, or against his will: but rather miraculously, not without the will of God, and yet without all approbation of it."

22. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:160.

23. *Armilla*, 27, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:18; see also *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:740: "when God suspends or withdrawes sustenation & gouernement from the will, it cannot of it selfe, but will amisse; as the staffe in my hand presently fals, when I doe but pull backe my hand."

24. *A Treatise Tending unto a Declaration, Works*, 1:416.

only with condemnation for their failure to obey.[25] The elect, on the other hand, would inevitably be drawn by irresistible internal grace to faith and salvation. "Christ our high Priest being now in his sanctuary in heauen," he explained in his lectures on the creed, "hath in memory all the Elect, and their very names are written as it were in tables of gold before his face." [26] Initially unwilling and totally undeserving, these chosen ones would sooner or later, through divine influence, turn to God and his commandments.

Perkins's formulations of what has conventionally been called "Limited Atonement" resemble those of Calvin's colleague Theodore Beza.[27] Jacob Andreae reflected the thinking of most later Lutherans when he called Beza's (and Perkins's) teaching "absurd, dreadful, and clearly blasphemous."[28] In early

---

25. *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:34: "In *vnbeleeuers* Christ fulfilled the Law, when he executeth the curse of the Law vpon them." Wolfhart Pannenberg makes a similar point in speaking of the consequences of such a doctrine of predestination in the theology of the early Luther, "Der Einfluß des Anfechtungserfahrung," 119. On Perkins's "particularism" and its implications, see especially Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 27–68.

26. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:217, see also 264.

27. Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, while finding the term anachronistic (p. 106), argues that such a position, with modifications, was common among Reformed theologians. See especially 61.

28. Jacob Andreae, *absurda, horrenda, et manifeste impia quae Beza docet de morte Christi*, cited in Theodore Beza, *Ad Acta Colloquii Montisbelgardensis Tubingae Edita, Theodori Bezae Responsionis, Pars Altera*, Editio Prima (Geneva, 1588), 200, cited in turn in W. Robert Godfrey, "Reformed Thought on the Extent of the Atonement to 1618," *Westminster Theological Journal* 37 (1974–75): 133–71, at 141. Richard Muller writes of "the arch-predestinarians Beza and Perkins," *Thought of Arminius*, 266. As described in chapter 5, Gottschalk of Orbais had taken a similar position in the ninth century. Later Lutheranism retreated from the extreme Augustinianism of *De Servo Arbitrio* and explicitly condemned the supra-lapsarianism of Beza (and later Perkins), e.g., *Quod nolit Deus, ut omnes salventur, sed quod quidam, non ratione peccatorum suorum, verum solo Dei consilio, proposito et voluntate ad exitium destinati sint, ut prorsus salutem consequi non possint, Formula Concordiae, Epitome XI, Negativa.* 3, in *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelish-lutherishen Kirche*, 821, *The Book of Concord*, 497; see also *Formula Concordiae, Solida Declaratio. XI.* 81, *Book of Concord*, 629. Alister McGrath judges that "later Lutheranism marginalized Luther's 1525 insights into divine predestination," *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 142. Jonathan Moore contrasts Perkins's denial that the Holy Spirit worked in any fashion in the hearts of the reprobate with the "softer" positions of later English Reformed thinkers like James Ussher and John Davenant, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 191–92. Nicholas Fornerod reports that Jean Diodati, one of the Genevan delegates to the Synod of Dort, said during the 1640s "'*que l'opinion de Monsieur de Beze avoit esté nommée* truculenta *par les Anglois* [i.e., the English delegates],' meaning 'cruel' or 'dreadful,'" and that the Genevan delegates had had to work hard to keep Beza's position from being condemned at Dort. "'The Canons of the Synod Had Shot off the Advocate's Head': A Reappraisal of the Genevan Delegation," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dort (1618–1619)*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 181–215, at 208–9.

seventeenth-century Dorchester, one skeptic heard his minister, John White, preach this doctrine and chose to set his personal distaste to homely verse:

> *The Saviour of the world Christ Iesus in Person/*
> *Of his sacred death was broughte in question*
> *How that he was not the Sauiour of vs all*
> *But of the elected which cann neuer fall*
> *And how he suffred & did dye for none*
> *but for his people and such as weare his owne*
> *O wretch and silly man yf white be thy skynne*
> *Yet blacke and defiled is thy soule within*
> *Noe mortall man but the dyvell did devise*
> *To cutt & curtaile Christes passion in this wise*
> *But Christ our redeemer without all exception*
> *For all mankind suffred his passion*[29]

(4) *Predestination was to be actively preached, not avoided as beyond the reach of ordinary Christians.* Inevitably, some would prefer a kinder God, might even think God unfair and unjust. "If God therefore loue *Iacob* and hate *Esau*, for nothing seene in themselues, but because he will so doe," said Perkins, God's action "might seme to the eye of flesh a thing vniust and partial." It might be difficult for Christians "to adore and reuerence the iudgements and workes of God, howsoeuer they seeme vnto vs, and may be harsh in our shallow reason."[30]

But because God had deliberately chosen to manifest his glory to his reasonable creatures through the salvation of some and the damnation of others, no one ought to remain ignorant of God's decision. All human beings—elect and reprobate—needed to recognize how God was glorified through the exercise of his mercy and justice, needed to be actively instructed in the mysteries of the divine decree. Citing Augustine, Perkins could even say that the elect would profit from the pains of the reprobate; the vessels of honor would benefit from knowing of the eternal punishment that God had ordained for

---

29. "To the Counterfait Company & packe of Puritans," *Records of Early English Drama: Dorset*, 182. Robert Adyn, almost certainly the author of this doggerel, stated in an affidavit that John White preached "that Christ was not the Savyor of the whole world, nor did dye for the synnes of the whole world, but for his elected and chosen people only, and that our said Savyor Christ hath not his fatherly care over any more than his elected," "Answer of Robert Adyn, Defendant . . . ." ibid., 197.

30. *A Godly and Learned Exposition vpon the Whole Epistle of Iude, Works*, 3:597.

the vessels of wrath.[31] Nor did Perkins fail to describe this punishment: "most horrible fire," "terrible horror of conscience," "tormented with incredible horror and highest anxiety from the sense of God's wrath poured out upon them forever."[32] This was the doctrine, the godly were told, upon which they should build their hope of salvation:

> that we may haue comfort in distresse, & some thing to stay vpon in al[l] our troubles: we in this world are as strangers in a farre countrie: our passage homeward is ouer the sea of this world: the ship wher[e]in we saile is the Church: & satan stirres vp many blasts of troubles & temptations, & his purpose is to sink the ship, or to driue it on the rock; but we must take the anchor of hope & fasten it in heauen vpon the foundation of Gods election, which being done we shal[l] passe in safetie & reioyce in the midst of all stormes & tempests.[33]

It is difficult to imagine a more uncompromising presentation of God, and the reader strains to find some softening in the harshness.[34] There is none. Might God, argued some Lutherans, have ordained some human beings to salvation and have simply left the rest to their own devices, foreknowing that they would be condemned? This was the position of the contemporary Danish Lutheran

---

31. *In quantum vasa [ad contumeliam] fiunt eos ad aliquem vsum facere, vt per eorum ordinatas pœnas vasa, quæ in honorem fiunt, proficiant. Armilla Aurea*, 344, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:109, citing Augustine, *De Diversis Quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*, I.II.xviii, *P.L.* 40:123, *Miscellany of Questions in Response to Simplician*, 200. Peter Lake argues that Perkins and his godly English followers "were called not to play down so much as to accentuate and apply what [revisionist historians] took to be the most counter-intuitive and off-putting of their doctrines—predestination and providence." *The Antichrists Lewd Hat,* xvii. Julia Merritt writes of Robert Hill (first translator of the *Armilla*)'s "conviction that the doctrine of predestination should not in any way be watered down or passed over when preaching in a lay congregation." "The Pastoral Tightrope," 152–53. The editor of the sermons of Thomas Newhouse, who took Hill's place at St. Andrews Norwich in 1603, noted "how lawfull and meet a thing it is to preach and publish the doctrine of predestination," *Certaine Sermons Preached by T. Newhouse Set Forth by R. Galliard* (London, 1614), *NSTC* 18493, sig. A3ᵛ, cited in Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents*, 84.

32. *horrendissimum ignem, terribili horrore conscientiæ, Incredibili horrore & summa anxietate toti creciantur ex sensu iræ diuinæ in eos effusæ in æternum, Armilla Aurea*, 352, 354, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:112.

33. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:292.

34. Richard Muller points to a notoriously harsher example: the Lutheran Matthias Flacius Illyricus, who taught "the replacement of the *imago Dei* with the *imago Satanae*" after the Fall and that "the very substance of fallen humanity was sin." *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 60. Lutherans repudiated his position in the 1570 *Book of Concord*.

Neils Hemmingsen, who along with Andreae had called Perkins's doctrine "unjust and cruel."[35] No, God actively ordained the reprobate to be subject to his hatred.[36] Might the number of the damned, compared to those of the saved, be relatively few? No, only "a little part of mankind" would be saved.[37] Given that the reprobate could take no part in Christ's redeeming work, might God at least have compassion on their plight? No, he hated them for their sin. God's forsaking the reprobate was best compared to a farmer's killing an ox or a sheep for his own use; a human was not worth so much to God as a fly was to a human.[38] God did have his reasons (just reasons, Perkins had to presume) for acting this way, but those reasons would always remain mysterious (*inscrutabile*) to his human creatures.

It should be obvious that this notion of God's activity would limit the scope of any offer of salvation, including Christ's promises in the New Testament. Any divine promise would necessarily be conditional, offering salvation if the hearer should respond, if the hearer should believe, and ultimately if the hearer

---

35. *verentes fortasse ne deum iniustum & crudelem facerent*, *Armilla Aurea*, 337, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:107: "uviust and vnmerciful." A few pages later he calls his doctrine *duriorem. Armilla Aurea*, 348, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:110. Nicholas Tyacke found that Hemmingsen's theology inspired that of the "anti-Calvinists" Lancelot Andrewes, William Barlow, and John Overall, *Anti-Calvinists*, 20, see also 38–39, 59. Hemmingsen's commentary on Paul's letter to the Ephesians, published in London in 1576 and translated into English by Abraham Fleming in 1581, contained an extended discussion of predestination. *Commentarivs in Epistolam Pavli ad Ephesios* (London, 1576), *NSTC* 13057.5, 39–53, *The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule . ... To the Ephesians … Faithfully Expounded … by Nicholas Hemming*, trans. Abraham Fleming (London, 1581), *NSTC* 13058, 53–72. In apparent reference to Theodore Beza's famous "Table" of Predestination, which had appeared in his *Summa totius Christianismi* (Geneva, 1555) and which heavily influenced the *Armilla*, Hemmingsen condemned "tables of fate" or "destiny" (*tabulae Parcarum*) and the idea that Christ was sent into the world to redeem "only some persons, selected from the entire human race" (*quosdam selectos tantum de genere humano redimeret*). He insisted that God's promise of grace extended to all human beings (*Promissio gratiæ,quæ vere vniuersalis est*), 39, 43, 44, *Epistle to the Ephesians*, 54,59, 60.

36. *Armilla Aurea*, 344, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:109.

37. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:164, see also 282; *Treatise of Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:744.

38. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:287; *Nos enim ipsi in quotidiana bestiarum mactatione & laniena iniusti esse nolumus, neque reuera sumus: Dei tamen respectu non sumus tanti, quanti bovis vel culix est; De Prædestinationis Modo et Ordine*, 25, *Treatise on Predestination, Works*, 2:611. See also *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:251, where Perkins compared God to a man who had a flock of sheep and might "sende some of them to the fatting for the slaughter, and others keepe for breede." "The basest and least creature is something in regard of man," he continued, "but man is nothing vnto God." See also *Works*, 3:63, and *A Godly and Learned Exposition vpon the Whole Epistle of Iude, Works*, 3:597.

should be among those chosen before the foundation of the world.[39] A minister passing judgment on the sincerity of a parishioner's faith, a church passing judgment on a candidate for membership, would have to consider whether the conditions had been satisfied. And the truth of that judgment would depend upon whether it was ultimately consistent with the secret divine decree (*decretum arcanum*) that stood behind all human history.

Similarly, individual Christians could have no unconditional assurance of their own salvation; only if their response to God's call were genuine, if their faith were authentic, if their names were written in Christ's book before the beginning of time, could they be certain of their ultimate reward.

Finally, though Perkins would probably have shied from the expression, God's love in Christ was conditional. Born with original sin and further polluted by the actual sins they would inescapably commit, the reprobate were completely outside the limits of Christ's love. Only if they were destined to salvation would they come under Christ's care.[40]

As had Luther (and the scholastic tradition before him), Perkins explained this conditionality by imagining a distinction in the divine will. Scriptural passages like 1 Timothy 2:4, which asserts that God wishes all people to be saved, and Matthew 23:37, when Jesus weeps over the recalcitrant inhabitants of Jerusalem, expressed God's *voluntas signi* (usually Anglicized as his "signifying will"), that portion of his will that he wished to reveal to humanity. But behind that will stood the *voluntas beneplaciti*, the will of God's good pleasure, an inscrutable decree to

---

39. So Perkins explained that although God's decree of election and reprobation was absolute, the Gospel was "propounded with a condition." *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:295. Richard Muller explains that "faith is not a condition of a decree but a means by which the decree is executed. Faith, however, is a condition in the promise of salvation." *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition,* 154.

40. Perkins did say that "As he [Christ] is *Redeemer*, he loues his creatures with a special and a peculiar loue; which is not common to all, but proper to that part of mankind, which is chosen to saluation before the world was," *A Godly and Learned Exposition upon ... the three first chapters of the Revelation, Works,* 3:*364. Walter Brueggemann concludes that the Old Testament is inconsistent on the question of whether God's promises are conditional or unconditional: "In the end ... the command of Yahweh is relational and cannot be factored out as conditional or unconditional. Rather, like any thinkable relationship rooted in profound fidelity, this covenant relation is characteristically conditional and unconditional at the same time. Israel does not worry about that logical contradiction in the nature of its relation to Yahweh; thus this relationship is unconditional, because Yahweh is utterly committed to Israel. Yet the relationship is conditional, because Yahweh has large intentions that pertain, above all, to Israel. Different texts in different circumstances bear witness to the different nuances of that relationship." *Theology of the Old Testament,* 199.

elect and reprobate in what had sometimes to appear as a contradiction to the *voluntas signi.*[41]

Among historians of New England, it became almost conventional wisdom to accept the argument, first proposed seventy years ago by Perry Miller, that Perkins and his followers softened the harshest effects of the divine decree. Although Perkins was not the first British theologian to imagine God's having made "covenants" with his human creatures, the many editions of his works rapidly disseminated what has been called a "covenant theology."[42] Through their use of the concept of the covenant of grace, by which God was understood to have bound himself to those who believed in him, Miller argued that "covenant theologians" like Perkins subtly encouraged people to exert some influence on God's decisions. If God had promised to save anyone who met the conditions set forth in the covenant, those who met the conditions could trust that promise, knowing that God would never break his word.[43]

But because Miller was unfamiliar with the roots of *pactum* theology in Duns Scotus and the theologians of the *via moderna*, he misunderstood the nature of the covenant conditions. *Pactum* theologians had used the concept of covenant as a way to describe a mechanism by which God bound himself to accept a person's *quod est in se* as the *meritum de congruo* that would necessarily win his favor. It rationalized an earlier assumption that humans could take the initiative toward their justification.

Perkins had a different understanding of God's covenant. Since they usually used the term *foedus* rather than *pactum* for "covenant," that understanding can conveniently be termed "federal theology" to distinguish it from the earlier *pactum* theology.[44] As Perkins understood things, the condition of God's original covenant with Adam—the so-called covenant of works (*foedus operum*)—was obedience to his will. But Adam's fall and the bequeathing of original sin to all his descendants had rendered this condition unfulfillable. Christ then introduced a second covenant, promising redemption to anyone

---

41. E.g., *A Treatise of Gods Free Grace, Works,* 1:723. For a helpful discussion of *voluntas beneplaciti* and *voluntas signi* in Calvin, see Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition,* 116–19. Samuel Stone would term the two wills the "Essentiall" will and the "Preceptive" will, WB 2.

42. Alister McGrath finds the first clear British statement of a double covenant—works and grace—in the *Sacra Theologia* of Dudley Fenner (1585), *NSTC* 10773.5. He traces the introduction of covenant theology into England to Heinrich Bullinger's *Decades,* translated into English in 1577 and commended by Archbishop John Whitgift. *Iustitia Dei* 2:113.

43. Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century,* ch. 13: The Covenant of Grace, e.g., 394; "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity."

44. Reformed theologians did sometimes use the term *pactum* as well as *foedus*; Samuel Stone, for example, referred to the covenant of works as a *pactum operum,* WB 109.

who believed in him. The very name of this new covenant, the covenant of grace (*foedus gratiae*), recognized that its conditions were understood to be graciously given by God, not dependent upon human effort. Simply stated, the conditions of the covenant of grace were achievable only by the elect, and by them inevitably. So-called "covenant theology" was perfectly consistent with the most extreme Augustinianism. Although he was one of the earliest and most prominent proponents of the covenants of grace and works, Perkins never let his understanding of covenant promises compromise his commitment to complete divine sovereignty over human destiny.

Miller plainly imagined Perkins use of the covenant as a kind of *pactum*, in which God responded to human initiative—a person's doing her best—rather than a *foedus gratiae* in which initiative came entirely from God. The covenant of grace does play an important role in Perkins's theology (less so in Hooker and Stone), but it is to assure believers of their salvation rather than to place any claim on God.[45] When Perkins and Hooker spoke of God's reaching out to fallen human beings, they invariably use the language of "promise" rather than the language of "contract."

One might ask, with Julian of Eclanum, why anyone would wish to believe in Perkins's God. In her treatment of the sermons of John Donne, less extreme in his Augustinianism than Perkins, Deborah Shuger terms Donne's theology "absolutist" and argues that Donne and his fellow Augustinians found it compelling because its descriptions of divine behavior corresponded with their experience of the utterly arbitrary behavior of kings and patrons.[46] God's "psychological make-up" resembled that of a Renaissance nobleman, concerned above all to maintain his superiority and willing to be perceived as a tyrant living by his whim. "Donne holds that 'God's first purpose was his owne glory,' a self-directed intentionality he associates with princes. In a thoroughly aristocratic manner, God resents whatever threatens to derogate from this glory."[47]

---

45. Reformed scholars like Lyle Bierma, "Federal Theology in the Sixteenth Century: Two Traditions?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 45 (1983): 304–21; Joel Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991); and Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, dismiss the frequently made assertion that there was a "weaker" covenant theology alongside that of Perkins. For a good discussion of the role of the covenant in assuring salvation, see John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), ch. 7: "Covenant and Assurance," 155–91.

46. Debora Kuller Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), ch. 5: "Absolutist Theology: The Sermons of John Donne," esp. 162, 169, 175, 186.

47. Cf. Machiavelli's notorious characterization of subjects' attitude toward their ruler in *The Prince*, no. 17, "it is much safer to be feard, then be lov'd. … feare restrains with a dread

Absolutist theology valorized "obedience, guilt, and fear" and was intended to generate terror, insecurity, and guilt. Shuger finds Donne determined "to rub the hearer's nose in the terror of divine wrath" and judges that the dynamics of his preaching "push Donne's conception of God close to the demonic or tyrannical, a conclusion he recognizes and resists."

Shuger's argument would be still more compelling had she appealed to the many instances of God's "absolutist," self-regarding behavior in the Bible.[48] But her characterization helps underscore not only how God's seemingly arbitrary behavior could provoke fear from his human creatures but also why so many contemporary hearers found it persuasive.[49] It should not surprise the reader to find Thomas Hooker comparing God's condescending mercy to that of the King of England, as in this passage:

> if the King of *England* should proclaime a pardon to some notorious Traytor that had plotted some dangerous treason against his person, this were much; but that the King should lay downe his Crowne and come creeping to him, and beseech him upon his knees to take mercy, and not to be punished, why this is a thing beyond all expectation, when the soule shall thinke, what a King intreat a Traytor, a Rebell; a Conqueror intreat a slave to take mercy; what shall heaven stoop to earth, shall majesty stoope to misery; shall the great God of heaven and earth that might have condemned my soule, that is a God holy and just, and if I had perished and beene damned, might have tooke glory by my

---

of punishment which never forsaks a man." *Nicholas Machiavel's Prince* (London, 1640), *NSTC* 17168, 130–31. The contemporary author Kathleen Norris famously characterized such a God as a "monster God," *Dakota: A Spiritual Geography* (New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1993), 96.

48. For these, see Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, "Yahweh is *for Israel* (or more generally "for us," *pro nobis*) in fidelity, and at the same time Yahweh is intensely and fiercely *for Yahweh's own self*," 227; "Old Testament theology must reckon with an ominous dimension in Yahweh that falls outside any rule of law," 249; "There is, in addition to legitimated sovereignty and determined fidelity, an element of Yahweh's power that seems occasionally, in the imaginative testimony of Israel, to spill over into Yahweh's rather self-indulgent self-expression. … On such occasions, the action or speech of Yahweh seems to have no function other than to permit Yahweh to engage in an unfettered show of self-assertion," 276; "Yahweh's self-regard is massive, savage, and seemingly insatiable," 556. John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination*, argues that the "Calvinist" God was "a communal construct from which the individual could not easily escape" and that Donne was "a victim of the Calvinist persecutory imagination," 158, 254, see also 7.

49. Christopher Haigh argues that many others did not: "The Taming of Reformation: Preachers, Pastors and Parishioners in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England," *History* 85 (2000): 572–88, at 577–82; *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 293.

destruction; is it possible, is it credible that this God should not only entertayne me when I come, and command me for to come, but intreat, and beseech me to come and receive mercy from him; oh the depth of the incomprehensible love of God![50]

Yes, God in this instance condescended to show mercy to an unworthy sinner, but Hooker was quick to remind his hearers that God might just as easily have taken glory by that sinner's damnation and destruction. The King who arbitrarily showed mercy to a traitor was Hooker's favorite metaphor for describing God's treatment of elect sinners.

Not only Lutherans found Perkins's God to be an arbitrary tyrant. Toward the middle of the decade of the 1590s, a public dispute erupted at Perkins's own Cambridge. In October 1594, Samuel Harsnett of Pembroke College had preached a confrontational Paul's Cross sermon on Ezekiel 33:11: "As I live (saith the Lord) I delight not in the death of the wicked."[51] Harsnett took direct aim at the terrifying God of Beza and Perkins. What kind of God, asked Harsnett, could "designe many thousands of soules to Hell before they were … to get him glory in their damnation"? The "phansies, Imagination, and shewes" of "the men of Geneva" would compare God's desire for glory to that of a Prince who would say, "I will beget mee a Sonne that I may kill him, that I may so get mee a name." To justify his son's death, the Prince would imagine, "I will beget him without both his feet, and when he is growne up, having no feet, I'le command him to *walke* upon paine of *Death*: and when he breaketh my *commandement*, I'le put him to *death*."

Turning to God's permission of Adam's fall, Harsnett angrily asserted that the kind of explanation offered by Beza and Perkins made God "the Author of sin."[52] On their account, "the Almighty God in the eye of his counsel, did not only see, but say, that *Adam* should *fall*, and so order and decree, and set downe his *fall*, that it was no more possible for him not to *fall,* then it was possible for him not to *eat*." The "Genevan" Adam was no freer than a restrained inmate in an asylum.

---

50. UP *35–36.

51. For a distinctly unflattering portrayal of Harsnett, see Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 157–62. A more sympathetic portrait is provided by Frank W. Brownlow, *Shakespeare, Harsnett, and the Devils of Denham* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993), 35–47.

52. John White's Dorchester critic said of Puritans, "what other fruyt may there be expected / from theis Counterfaite brethern elected / who wickedly doe hold and so doe professe / that god is the Author of all sinfullnes," *Records of Early English Drama: Dorset*, 183.

> if you should take a sound strong man (that hath power to walk and to lie still) and bind him hand and foot (as they do in *Bedlam*) and lay him down; and then bid him *Rise up and Walke*, or else you will stir him up with a Whip; and he tell you that there be chains upon him, so that he is not able to stir: and you tell him again, that that is no excuse, for if he look upon his health, his strength, his legs, he hath power to walk or to lie still; but if upon his chains, indeed in that respect he is not able to walk:

"He that should whip that man for not walking," concluded Harsnett of Perkins's God, "were well worthy to be whipt himselfe."[53]

In language that echoed Erasmus and Julian of Eclanum, Harsnett claimed that Perkins made God into a liar. To support that claim he appealed to Matthew 23:37. When Christ lamented, "O Hierusalem, Hierusalem … how often would I haue gathered thy children together, euen as a hen gathereth her chickens vnder her wings, and yee would not?" Perkins would have him shed "Crocodiles teares." Perkins's theology implicated Christ in the very decrees of election and reprobation that had made it impossible for the inhabitants of Jerusalem to be gathered; Christ himself had destined the people over whose fate he supposedly wept to eternal perdition. Had he been forthright, Christ would have said, "But ye *could* not, for *I* and my *Father* have sate in councell in *Heaven*, and from all eternity have made a decree, that ye should never come to *heaven*, though I my selfe a thousand times should be crucified for you."[54]

The following April, in what Peter Lake suspects may have been an organized effort by "avant-garde conformists," William Barrett, a chaplain of Gonville and Caius College, preached a university sermon criticizing the determinism of extreme Augustinians like Perkins. Barrett was almost

---

53. Harsnett, "A Sermon Preached at S. Pauls Cross," printed in *Three Sermons Preached by the Reverend, and Learned Dr. Robert Stuart … To which is ad[d]ed, a fourth Sermon, Preached by the Right Reverend Father in God, Samuel Harsnett, Lord Arch-Bishop of Yorke* (London, 1656), 121–66, at 133, 154, 141, 134; Peter Lake, "The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s," in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, ed. Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 90–121, 229–33, at 109, argues for the importance of this sermon, as do Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c. 1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 84–85. Perkins repeatedly tried to refute this argument, e.g., *Works*, 1:287–88; 3:63; 3:*298. Lake, "Anglican Moment," 109, suggests that Harsnett might have been encouraged by an "anti-predestinarian" sermon preached at Hampton Court by Lancelot Andrewes the previous March, printed in *Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Sermons and Letters*, 108–21, 353–65. See also Tyacke, "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2000), 5–33, at 18.

54. Ibid., 163–65; emphasis added to "could."

certainly encouraged by the teachings of the Huguenot exile Peter Baro (1534–99), since 1574 the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity. Although ordained in Geneva by Calvin himself, Baro had asserted publically as early as 1579 that the human will was capable of refusing divine grace. Privately, he believed that "God has predestinated such as he from all eternity foreknew would believe on Christ" and "hath likewise from all eternity reprobated all rebels, and such as contumaciously continue in sin."[55] Where Perkins had devoted 14 pages of the 1592 *Armilla* to a refutation of the predestinarian positions held by Neils Hemmingsen, Baro upheld those positions.[56]

The Cambridge theological establishment rose to defend itself. Barrett was forced to recant, and Baro lost his Professorship. The extreme Augustinianism of divines like Perkins and his colleague William Whitaker would continue to dominate Cambridge. But Perkins had no illusions that his opponents had been persuaded by their defeat.

"Many students," he warned in his lectures on the Sermon on the Mount, were still drawn to "Popish Commentaries and Postils" rather than to those of the Protestant reformers. Over and over he required his student hearers to recognize "the errour of some diuines," who like Baro and Hemmingsen had based God's predestination on foreseen faith. "How erroneous and false the diuinitie of some Protestants is," he said in his lectures on the apocalypse, "which ascribe

---

55. *Petri Baronis Stempani … in Jonam prophetam prælectiones 39* (London, 1579), *NSTC* 1492; citations from H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction at Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 344, 388. Baro's letter to Hemmingsen, which included *Summa Trium de Praedesintation sententiarum,*" was published in *Praestantium ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolae,* 2nd. ed. (Amsterdam, 1684), 29–32. The most recent work on Baro and the controversies of the 1590s is David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590–1644* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007). Anthony Milton reports that John Overall (later to become a Bishop) supported Baro, and that Perkins preached against Overall, "Anglicanism by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall," in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 159–76, at 166.

56. *Armilla Aurea*, 337–52, *Works*, 1:107–11; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 29–40. In a 1596 letter to Hemmingsen, Baro lamented that "we have hitherto been permitted to hold the same sentiments as yours on grace, but we are now scarcely allowed publicly to teach … much less to publish them." C. S. Knighton, "Baro, Peter (1534–1599)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed., Sept. 2010, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1492. In 1633, John Chappell, the municipal lecturer at St Andrew's, Norwich, defended himself against charges of "Arminianism" by retorting that "the Lutheran churches held these things before Arminius." Matthew Reynolds, "Predestination and Parochial Dispute in the 1630s: The Case of the Norwich Lectureships," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 59 (2008): 407–25, at 418.

the cause of this distinction betweene man and man, to the libertie of mens will being renewed by grace."[57]

Just before his death, Perkins published an English *Treatise on Gods Free Grace and Mans Free Will,* a final effort to articulate and defend his position. He chose as his text the very passage that Harsnett had used against him five years earlier: Matthew 23:37ff. Like Luther, Perkins yielded not an inch as he explained that when Jesus spoke of his wish to gather the children of Jerusalem together, he was expressing only his signifying will and not the will of his good pleasure:

> The words, *I would haue gathered you,* are not to be vnderstood of the decree of God, but of his signifying will, and namely of the ministery of the word. For when God sent his word to Hierusalem by his Prophets, he thereby signified that it was his pleasure and will to gather and conuert them. And he is said to will the conuersion of the Iewes in and by his word, two waies. First, because he approoued it as a good thing in it selfe, being agreeable to his goodnesse and mercy. Secondly, because he commanded, and required it of them as a dutie of theirs, and as a thing necessarie to saluation. Some may happily say, it is a point of hard dealing, for God to command the Iewes to do that which they can not do, & to complaine because they are not gathered: & that a master might as wel[l] command his seruant to carrie a mountaine vpon his backe, & complaine because it is not done. I answer thus: If a master could giue to his seruant power & ability to carry a mountaine, he might then command him to doe it: and if he should by his owne default loose this ability, the said master might stil[l] command him & complaine, if he did not the thing commanded. And this is the case with God. For he gaue all men grace in our first parents to obey any of his commandements: this grace in them we haue cast away, and doe not of our selues so much as desire it of God: and God for his parties not bound to giue vs this grace againe. He therefore may iustly command vs to turne vnto him, though we now be vnable to turne.[58]

---

57. Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works,* 3:235–36, 251–52, and *A Godly and Learned Exposition … upon the First Three Chapters of the Revelation, Works,* 3:*239, 315, 334, 350. The most persuasive accounts of Cambridge in the 1590s are those in Lake, "Anglican Moment," and Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored,* 74–125, supplementing Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists,* 2–57.

58. *A Treatise of Gods Free Grace and Mans Free Will* (Cambridge, 1601), reprinted in *Works,* 1:717–46, here 1:726.

It is unlikely that Harsnett would have been persuaded.

It was the Dutch Reformed theologian Jacobus Arminius who most famously rejected the willful, self-seeking, extreme Augustinian God that he found in Perkins's writings and argued for a God whose power was tempered by his justice. God's freedom of action, thought Arminius, had to have its limits. If God wanted his human creatures to marvel at the righteousness of his acts, he simply could not condemn most of them to eternal punishment for doing things that he had not given them the ability to avoid doing.[59] Like Julian of Eclanum before him, Arminius imagined a God whose defining characteristic was his justice. Arminius's God acted with a sense of right and wrong that would be understandable to, and respected by, his human creatures.[60]

Interpreters influenced by Perry Miller have found it helpful to portray the New England preachers as navigating carefully between the Scylla of "Antinomianism" and the Charybdis of "Arminianism."[61] The term "Arminianism" tends to be loosely defined, but it has commonly been understood as an antidote to "Calvinist predestination." Responsible use of human free will could provoke God to respond with the grace necessary for conversion. Human beings could influence God's willingness to save them.

There is truth in this characterization, as there is in most oversimplifications. But those who have seen in Arminius an early champion of the powers of the unaided human will may be surprised to discover how he actually described the will's powers. Since Adam's fall, he wrote, "the free will of man towards the true good is not only damaged, wounded, weakened, bent, and diminished; but it is also captive, ruined, and lost. Its powers are not only

---

59. *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, in *Iacobi Arminii … Opera theologia* (Lugduni Batavorum: Godefridum Basson, 1629), 656, English translation *An Examination of the Treatise of William Perkins concerning the Order and Mode of Predestination*, trans. W. R. Bagnall, in *The Works of James Arminius*, 3 vols. (Auburn and Buffalo: Derby, Miller, and Orton, 1853), 3:319; see also *Declaratio sententiæ I. Arminii de prædestinatio, providentia Dei, libero arbitrio, gratia Dei &c., Opera,* 105–106, English translation *Declaration of Sentiments*, trans. W. R. Bagnall, *Works*, 1:221–22.

60. The best treatment of Arminius's thought is now Richard A. Muller, *Thought of Jacob Arminius*. Perkins's defender (and Alexander Richardson student) John Yates provided "a Defence of Mr Calvine against Bellarmine; and of M. Perkins against Arminius" in *Gods Arraignement of Hypocrites* (Cambridge, 1615), *NSTC* 26081, 47–160. Some English readers were reading Arminius's treatise against Perkins and finding it persuasive; see Andrew Cambers, "Pastoral Laudianism? Religious Politics in the 1630s: A Leicestershire Rector's Annotations," *Midland History* 27 (2002): 38–51, at 39–40, 42.

61. E.g., David D. Hall, *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 258.

debililated and useless unless they are assisted by grace, but nonexistent except as excited by grace."[62] Such a description could easily have been written by any number of his early seventeenth-century Reformed contemporaries. By imagining Arminius as an Enlightenment figure before his time, scholars run the risk of wrenching his positions out of context. What did Arminius teach, and why did his Reformed contemporaries find his writings dangerous and unacceptable?

Arminianism did not spring *de novo* from Arminius's brain. Like other sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theologians, he was writing in the context of the debates over extreme Augustinianism that obsessed both Catholic and Protestant writers, and he drew heavily on the ideas that arose during those debates. His position on some issues did anticipate later developments, but Arminius may be more helpfully understood as looking backward rather than forward. He was recycling, and adapting to a Protestant guise, earlier attempts to resolve the dilemma of finding room for human agency in the creation of an omnipotent God.

Just as Julian had challenged Augustine, Arminius began by challenging Perkins on the issue of human responsibility for sin. What kind of God, knowing that humans would sin without his help, would deliberately withhold that help? In the words of the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. 2:16), Perkins's Gospel would be "the savour of death unto death" to most of those who heard it.[63] Once he had chosen to withhold his help, how could God hold humans accountable, and condemn them to eternal punishment, for doing what they could not possibly have avoided?[64] Unless he were simply to save everyone, argued Arminius, any truly just God would have to allow for some element of human initiative, some human agency, in the process by which a person achieved salvation.

Arminius found Perkins's portrait of God—an arbitrary and unjust being who chose to condemn people before they had even been created—simply blasphemous. This God had chosen to create Adam in such a way that,

---

62. *Liberum hominis arbitrium ad verum bonum non modo vulneratum, sauciatum, infirmatum, inclinatum & attenuatum est, sed & captivum, perditum, amissum: viresque ejus non modo debilitatæ, & cassæ, nisi adjuventur a gratia, sed & nullæ nisi excitentur ab eadem, Disputationes publicæ.* XI.vii, in *Opera*, 263, *Public Disputations*, trans. James Nichols, *Works*, 1:526. Arminius may have been thinking of Augustine's statement in *De natura et gratia* liii.62, *P.L.* 44:277, *Nature and Grace*, 1:256, cited in chapter 4 above.

63. *Per hanc Prædestinationen ministerium Euangelij respectu majoris parties auditorium constitutur odor mortis ad mortem, Declaratio sententiae.* I.3.xviii, *Opera*, 111, *Declaration of Sentiments*, *Works*, 1:233; see also *Declaratio sententiae*, *Opera*, 101, 102, *Declaration of Sentiments, Works*, 1:214, 216.

64. *Nisi possint credere, imo & velle credere, non possunt jure puniri eo quod crediderunt, Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera,* 754, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:485.

without further help, he could not avoid sinning, and then this God had deliberately chosen to withhold that help. Perkins's explanation of Adam's fall—that he had fallen, "in some miraculous manner" (*mirabili quadam ratione*) "not without the will of God" (*non sine voluntate Dei*) but still "without God's approval" (*neque tamen approbante Deo*) could not excuse Perkins's God from ultimate responsibility.[65] Rather than Adam—or the serpent who had tempted him—this God was the actual "author of sin" (*peccati auctor*).[66]

Arminius also attacked Perkins at other points. To argue, as Perkins had, that God decided first to hate a portion of humankind, and only afterwards to arrange for them to fall into sin, perverted the proper order of God's decisions (the *signa rationis*). God hated the reprobate only after they had sinned, not before.[67] Echoing Julian and Molina, Arminius found Perkins's position "harmful to salvation" because it taught people that their own efforts could have no bearing on their ultimate fate.[68] Perkins's insistence that ministers preach God's denial of his love to the reprobate, as if that would cause the elect to appreciate God's mercy more fully, was dangerous and wrong.[69] In sum, Perkins's doctrine could be found "neither in Scripture nor in the Fathers" and "ought not to be excused from many-sided absurdity."[70] By describing God in this terrible manner, Perkins had grossly misrepresented God's actual nature. Perkins doctrine was "repugnant to the nature of God," "repugnant to the justice of God," and "repugnant to

---

65. *Armilla Aurea*, 29, *Golden Chaine*, *Works*, 1:19.

66. *Deum peccati auctorem facis, per negationem gratiæ sine qua peccatum vitari nequit*, *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, *Opera*, 682, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins*, *Works*, 3:363; *facies enim desertione ista Deum peccati auctorem*, *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, *Opera*, 687, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins*, *Works*, 3:371, *causa fuit Deus peccati & lapsus Adami*, *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, *Opera*, 650, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins*, *Works*, 3:309; see also *Apologia adversus Articulos XXXI*, *Opera*, 1:44: *Vt* [Perkins's doctrine] blasphemia multiplicis prævium. … Primo, *Deum esse authorem* peccati, *The Apology against Thirty-One Defamatory Articles*, *Works*, 1:298.

67. *Non enim odit Deus quia reprobat, sed reprobat quia odit*, *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsianæ*, *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, *Opera*, 675, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins*, *Works*, 3:351.

68. *Hæc doctrina saluti etiam hominum* noxia est, *Declaratio sententiae*, I.3.xvi, *Opera*, 110, *Declaration of Sentiments*, *Works*, 1:230.

69. *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, *Opera*, 680, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins*, *Works*, 3:360.

70. *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, *Opera*, 638, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins*, *Works*, 3:290; *à multiplici absurditate excusari non valeat*, *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani*, *Opera*, 747, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins*, *Works*, 3:474.

the goodness of God."[71] It was horrifying to assert (*horrendum est*), as Perkins's mentors Beza and Calvin had done, that God's justice could allow him to predestine to eternal death a rational creature who had never sinned.[72]

Scholars under the influence of Perry Miller have generally characterized "Arminianism" as a sort of *facienti quod est in se,* teaching that humans could use their free will to provoke God into responding with grace. This was decidedly not Arminius's position. It was "absurd," he wrote, to teach that "God will not deny his grace to any one who does what is in him."[73] Without the assistance of grace, the debilitated human will could do nothing but sin. No one could initiate her own conversion.

Arminius also taught, unlike Pelagius and Julian, that the Holy Spirit had to call people "internally" as they heard the preached word "externally" in the process of coming to faith. But the internal call was not, as Perkins had taught, "an omnipotent and irresistible influence." Even though the human will was seriously debilitated, it retained an ability to refuse grace.[74] In Arminius's opinion, Perkins had confused freedom with spontaneity. Animals acted spontaneously when they foraged for food, but their actions could not meaningfully be called "free." God might move the human will secretly and beneath consciousness, but if he did so in such a way that it could not but be moved (*ut non possit non moveri*), the will's actions could not legitimately be called "free."[75] Arminius's God worked internally, but he worked in a manner that respected the will's integrity. "By a gentle and delightful persuasion, an impulse which not only does not abolish the free consent of the will, but actually reinforces it," a "gentle persuasion … adapted to incline the will of man," he offered hearers the possibility of choosing to believe.[76] Arminius's opponents, including Thomas Hooker, would come

---

71. *Dico, quod hæc doctrina pugnet cum* natura *Dei … cum* iustitia *Dei. … cum* bonitate *quoque Dei, Declaratio sententie, Opera,* 105, *Declaration of Sentiments, Works,* 1:221–22.

72. *Articuli nonnulli, De Prædestinatione,* VIII, XI. *Opera* 951, *Certain Articles,* trans. James Nichols, *Works,* 2:484. *An iustitia Dei permittat ut creaturam rationalem non peccatricem destinet æternæ mortis? N., Declaratio Sententiae, Opera,* 105, *Declaration of Sentiments, Works,* 1:250.

73. Deus *gratiam suam nemini negabit facienti quod in se est … existimamus* absurdum, *Apologia, Opera,* 158–59, *Apology, Works,* 1:328–29.

74. *Omnes irregeniti habere liberum arbitrium, & potentiam Spiritui Sancto resistendi, Articuli nonnulli, De Vocatione Peccatorum ad communionem cum Christo,* V, *Opera,* 958, *Certain Articles, Works,* 2:497.

75. *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera,* 710, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works,* 3:412.

76. *Disp. priv.* XLII.x, 393, *Seventy-Five Private Disputations, Works,* 2:105; *Gratiæ auctor statuerit per gratiam suam non cogere homines ad adsentiendum, sed leni & suavi suasione movere,*

to associate Arminian conversion with these "moral persuasions" and accuse Arminians of failing to recognize that fallen humans needed something stronger, a "physical" intervention by the Holy Spirit.

Unlike Perkins's God, who chose to condemn the majority of humankind before the creation of the world, Arminius's God genuinely wished to save every human being. He offered grace to everyone. He offered enough grace, in fact, that every human being actually had the capacity to respond to God's offer with faith, the capacity to cooperate with grace and be saved.[77]

But every human being was not saved. This lamentable situation resulted, thought Arminius, because some human beings, even though they had the capacity, refused to respond to God's generous offer, refused to believe. God foresaw that this would happen, and the result was predictable: those whom God foresaw would believe were saved; those whom God foresaw would not believe were left to perish eternally.[78] God willed the salvation of all, but he saved only some. He offered sufficient grace to everyone, but that grace was efficacious only to those that respond to it with faith.[79]

Although it may come as a surprise to some, Arminius had a full-blown doctrine of predestination.[80] Like Perkins, Arminius assumed that God chose those human beings whom he intended to save before they were born. His difference with Perkins came over the nature of that eternal choice. Perkins taught that God predestined before he foresaw who would believe; predestination was *ante prævisam fidem*. Arminius taught the contrary: God "looked" into the future, foresaw who would believe, and predestined those believers. Predestination was *post prævisam fidem*.[81]

---

qui motus liberi arbitrii liberam consensum non modo non tollat, set stabiliat etiam, Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera, 755, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:487; [*voluntas Dei*] *non utatur omnipotente & irresistibili motione ad fidem ingenerandam hominibus, sed leni suasione & accommodata ad movendam voluntatem hominis pro modo libertatis ipsius. Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera*, 757, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:491.

77. *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera*, 665–66, 769, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:334–37, 511.

78. *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera*, 653, 675, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:314–15, 351.

79. *Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera*, 665–66, 769, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:335–36, 511.

80. *Declaratio Sententiae, Opera*, 119–21, *Declaration of Sentiments, Works*, 1:247–51; *Disp. priv.* XL, *Opera*, 389–91, *Private Disputations, Works*, 2:99–101; *Disp. pub.* XV, *Opera*, 283–86, *Public Disputations, Works*, 1:565–69.

81. *Apologia* Art. IV, *Opera*, 138, *Apology, Works*, 1:285; *fides prævisa prior est Electione, Quæstiones numero nonum, Opera*, 184, *Nine Questions, Works*, 1:380; see also *Declaratio*

But Arminius was careful not to imagine a Semipelagian God who simply responded to what he foresaw that humans would do. God actively predestined some to salvation and others to eternal punishment. Able to imagine an infinite number of possible worlds, he would also imagine how each human being would respond to offers of grace in each of those worlds. The decision to bring one possible world into being rather than any of the others would in practice determine who would believe and who would not.

In other words, God would use his *scientia media* to provide him with the information upon which he could base his eternal decree. To find an alternative to the terrifying God of Perkins, Beza, and Calvin, Arminius had turned to the Jesuits. It should not therefore be unexpected that he had copies of Molina's *Concordia*, various treatises by Bellarmine and Suarez, and the *Capitum doctrinae Jesuitae* in his library.[82]

To repeat, depending upon the circumstances that existed in each of the infinite number of hypothetical worlds that God might create, individual human beings would react in different ways to God's offer of grace. In one hypothetical world a given human being would respond with faith, in another the same human being would fail to believe. By choosing one particular world to bring into being, God determined which human beings would respond with faith and which would fail to respond. God still elected *post prævisam fidem*, but using his *scientia media*, he chose to create a world in which some individuals would certainly believe and others certainly would not. He elected the former and not the latter based on foreseen faith, but by creating one world rather than another he actively predestined the fate of both elect and reprobate.

In effect, Arminius had taken Molina's scheme and adapted it to a Protestant theological context. Arminius's use of the *scientia media* to combine predestination, foreknowledge, and human free will mimicked Molina's, and Arminius even understood the *concursus divinus* as Molina had: God acted alongside ["ran with"] his human creatures, but not in such a way that he could be imagined as the author of sin. Arminius's most perceptive interpreter, Richard Muller, argues that Arminius adopted a "consistent Molinism"

Sententiae, Opera, 119–21, *Declaration of Sentiments, Works*, 1:247–51; Muller, *Thought of Arminius*, 163. For a useful brief summary of Arminius's doctrine of predestination, see Muller, 280.

82. *Dicunt insuper Scolastici scientiam Dei aliam esse naturalem & necessariam, aliam liberam, aliam mediam ... Mediam qua novit, si hoc sit, illud futurum. Illa præcedit omnem liberum voluntatis divinæ actum. Ista actum voluntatis liberum sequitur. Hæc postrema actum quidem voluntatis liberum præcedit, sed ex hypothesi illius aliquid futurum videt. Disp. pub. IV.xliii, Opera, 223, Public Disputations, Works, 1:448; mediam illam intervenire necesse sit in rebus, quæ à libertate*

and that the *scientia media* was "the heart and soul" of the Arminian position.[83] The Franeker Professor Johannes Maccovius, remembered today for taking issue with William Ames on the nature of preparation for conversion, took for granted that the Arminian *scientia media* was the same as that of the Counter-Reformation Catholics.[84]

At bottom, then, Arminianism "Protestantized" Molinism. God's *præscientia* looked for faith rather than merit, but in other respects Arminius followed the Jesuits. Muller concludes that "Arminius, by moving away from [Perkins's] position toward the teachings of Suarez and Molina, turned from the Augustinian tendencies of the Reformed, just as Suarez and Molina rejected the strict Augustinianism of Baius and the Augustinian language of grace resident in Bañez's Thomism."[85]

The Synod of Dort (1618–19) was convening just as Hooker was preparing to find employment beyond Cambridge. It would condemn Arminius's positions and endorse positions similar to—though less rigorous than—those of Perkins. Like any interested follower of theological trends in the Church of England, Hooker was certainly aware of its deliberations. But there are almost no explicit references to the Arminian controversy in his surviving English sermons.

Several explanations are possible. Like the Pope, King James had forbidden public discussion of, and publication about, issues surrounding the doctrine of predestination. Hooker may have respected the king's wishes and censored

---

arbitrij creati pendent. Ibid. IV.xlv, *Opera*, 223, *Public Disputations, Works*, 1:449, see also ibid. IV.xxxiv, *Opera*, 222, *Public Disputations, Works*, 1:446, *Disp. priv.* XVII.xi, xii, *Opera*, 337, *Private Disputations, Works*, 2:38; discussed by Muller, *Thought of Arminius*, 155–56, 255. For Arminius's library, see Muller, 46.

83. *Permitit enim Deus arbitrio secundæ causæ* libera *dispensationem* influxus proprii *in actum aliquem, & ubi causa secunda est in ipso momento & instanti influxionis secuturæ, jungit Deus* libere *& pro arbitratu suo* influxum *& concursum suum* universalem *influxui creaturæ, sciens citra influxum suum* actum *produci nec posse nec productum iri. Examen modestum libelli Perkinsiani, Opera*, 732, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:448; see also ibid., *Opera*, 731–34, *Examination of the Treatise of Perkins, Works*, 3:447–51; *Disp. pub.* X.ix, *Opera*, 258, *Public Disputations, Works,* 1:517. These passages are discussed by Muller, *Thought of Arminius*, 264.

84. See Willem J. van Asselt, "On the Maccovius Affair," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 217–41, at 232–33.

85. Muller, *Thought of Arminius*, 154, 158–64, 255, 264; cf. Muller, "Grace, Election, and Contingent Choice: Arminius's Gambit and the Reformed Response," in *The Grace of God and the Bondage of the Will*, ed. Thomas Schreiner and Bruce Ware (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1995), 251–78, at 258, 265, 266, 273. In his eagerness to locate the original source of Arminius's positions in Molina's *Concordia*, Muller has very likely paid too little

himself, just as he did in avoiding issues of church government in his surviving English sermons. His publishers, who were printing his sermons without his permission, might also have excised controversial material. Ecclesiastical censors may have cut some of what Hooker had preached.[86]

But any admirer of Perkins would have recognized a kindred spirit in Hooker. Although his printed sermons avoid non-biblical citations, Hooker did cite Perkins, and he built the thesis of an entire sermon series on Perkins's notion of "saving desire."[87] Hints of a developed Augustinian theology surfaced often. Hooker's English hearers learned, for example, that before the beginning of time "God and Christ made a compact, or a covenant together."[88] In this special compact, known in orthodox Reformed circles as the "Covenant of Redemption," the Father gave the Son the charge to redeem those persons whom God had already predestined to salvation.

> God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ made a mutuall decree and purpose, that so many should beleeve, they should bee saved: And they did not only purpose this, but they did make a mutuall agreement between themselves, that the Lord Jesus Christ should take the care of those soules to make them beleeve, and to save them by beleeving, and the Lord Jesus Christ undertooke the worke according to their compact, God the Father said, *I will have these children saved*, and Christ saith, *I will take the care of them: Iohn* 10.14, 15, 16.[89]

Included in this primordial covenant, concluded before any human being had been created, was the name of every elect person:

> God the Father gives all the names of all the faithfull from the begin-
> ning of the world to the end of it; and saith, all these are my children,
> there is a poore creature in such a blinde corner of the countrie which
> I must have saved, and in another place there is another base drunkard
> which I must have saved, that I may make the world to wonder at it;
> the foundation of the Lord standeth sure, and hath this seale, the Lord
> knoweth who are his, the Lord hath elected and called them, thats his
> marke; and therefore our Saviour Christ undertakes the care of them,
> and God the Father looks that all those that are committed to the care
> of Christ, should bee saved;[90]

Our hearer could also have detected extreme Augustinian theology in Hooker's assumption that God's name was glorified in the degradation of potential converts: "For herein is the glory of his Name greatly exalted, that hee makes a poore wretch to come, and creepe, and crawle before him, and beg for mercy at his hands, and to be at his dispose"; "he will make thee lie in the dust, and wait for mercy, & come groveling for his grace." How could a listener have failed to imagine God's taking pleasure in the damnation of the reprobate when Hooker thundered that God "shall laugh at [a damned man's] confusion, and shall rejoyce when hee executes his judgements upon this man to his everlasting destruction," or that "the Lord will laugh at [the reprobates'] destruction, and mocke when their feare commeth."[91]

Without compromising his justice, thought Hooker, God could exact what-ever torments he pleased on his human creatures. "If we had dropped out of our mothers wombe into hell, and there been roaring … it had been just." Hooker's God had deliberately made the reprobate immortal so he could increase their suffering: "the Lord by death takes away a poor creature, and drags him down to hell … and saith, Thou hast sinned and deserved wrath, and thou canst not beare any wrath here; therefore thou shalt die and be made immortall, that thou maist beare it for evermore." As had Perkins, Hooker insisted that the just destruction of the damned magnified God's glory. "A God

---

90. Ibid., 171. This covenant had become a commonplace by the end of the seventeenth century, e.g., in Samuel Willard, *Complete Body of Divinity* (Boston: B. Green and S. Kneeland, 1726), lecture 133, June 6, 1699: "the covenant of redemption, in which are written the names of all those that are appointed to be made heirs of glory."

91. SH 88; SP 216; UP 183; SH 206.

holy and just … if I had perished and beene damned, might have tooke glory by my destruction." Even Jesus would join in the torment. "The Lord is comming to execute judgement upon all that worke wickednesse, and those that have spoken against him. So that when the Church of Christ, and the Angels in heaven, and the divells in hell have conspired to torment a man, then also the Lord Jesus will come to torment him."[92]

In the farewell sermon later published as *The Danger of Desertion*, Hooker's rhetoric reached a fever pitch:

> Thou shalt one day be deprived of his presence, and shut up with the haters of God and goodnesse in the blacke Tophet, where the worme never dyes, nor the fire never goes out, then thy crying will doe thee no good. God will be God in thy destruction, he will spurne thousands, and ten thousands such as thou art downe to hell, where thou shalt be an everlasting object of his never dying wrath. [93]

On occasion, Hooker could even conclude a sermon by referring to his hearers as elect themselves: "as you are the Elect people of God to put on the bowels of mercy and compassion towards your brethren … you that are the Elect people of God, if ever God shewed any goodnesse unto you, shew the same goodnesse, mercy, and compassion to your fellow brethren." He revealed his approval of the extreme Augustinian position on the perseverance of the saints when he preached that God "cannot take away his mercy from a faithful soule."[94]

Hooker also shared Perkins's Augustinian understanding of human depravity. When Samuel Stone called the unconverted "skins filled with Adam's blood," he perfectly described the way Hooker saw the majority of his hearers. What St. Paul had called "flesh" was no other than Augustinian "original sin." Perkins had summarized the plight of the unconverted succinctly with reference to Genesis 8:21. *The frame of mans heart* (saith the Lord) *is euill from his childhood*. That text meant, said Perkins, that "the *disposition* of the vnderstanding, will, affections, with all that the heart of man deuiseth, frameth, or imagineth, is wholly euill." Hooker's term for this Perkinsian disposition was "unframeableness." "By *flesh* is meant originall *corruption*, or that unframeableness of the body and soul, which hath taken possession of the whole man." An unbeliever resisted the minister's efforts to change her

---

92. PP 202; SEx 234; UP *36; SImp 242.

93. DD 12.

94. UP *104; SEC 421.

heart's "frame," her will's orientation to want what furthered her own impor-
tance. Only when her heart was rightly framed would faith be possible; only
when her heart was rightly framed could she come to terms with the terrify-
ing God; only when her heart was rightly framed could her behavior meet the
standards of the church. Because no one completely achieved such a frame of
heart this side of heaven, conversion—"reframing"—was necessarily an ongo-
ing, never-ending activity.[95] Hooker urged his hearers to pay less attention to
what had happened to them in the past than to what they were like in the
present. It might be useful if they could recall the first moments when they
thought they felt grace working upon their souls, but the most glorious experi-
ence was worthless if it had no staying power.

As had Augustine and Luther, Hooker believed that every human will
would be "framed"—ordered, disposed, structured—toward either God or
the devil. The morally neutral will, able to choose dispassionately between
good and evil, was a Jesuitical fiction.[96] Without grace, the human heart would
inevitably be framed toward sin. Conversion would then involve God's refram-
ing the heart for himself and his Rule. "Conversion is nothing else," Hooker
explained in an early set of sermons, "but a setting of the soule for God, as is
plaine in all the phrases of Scripture." Later in that same group of sermons,
Hooker added that "beleeving and converting are all one in Scripture," mean-
ing that faith—the act of going outside oneself to rely on another's grace—
could exist only where the heart had been properly framed in conversion.[97]

Applying his doctrine more closely to the lives of his hearers, Hooker made
it clear that what separated the godly from the worldly was the orientation of
their will. Worldly people did not want grace and the godly program:

> [worldly] men say, wee will not reforme our families, nor wee will not
> pray with them, wee will not keepe the Sabbaths, nor wee will not leave
> our swearing and our swaggering, our pride and our covetousnesse;
> no, all the Ministers under heaven shall not perswade us, wee will take

---

95. Perkins, *A Reformed Catholike, Works*, 1:559; emphasis added; SPos 63–64. Hooker made
it clear, for example, that godly sorrow or "contrition," one of the marks of the initial phase
of conversion, "ought to bee continually in such as have this love of Christ." All Christians,
thought Hooker, had "need of a continuall sorrow, as well as of continuall believing." SImp
261–62, see also TCL 259, SEC 58. In her study of godly relations of conversion, Patricia
Caldwell correctly recognized this sense of sorrow but attributed it to disappointed expecta-
tions rather than something ministers worked hard to induce. *Puritan Conversion Narrative*,
31–33.

96. FGT 39; UP 127, 132.

97. SEC 427, 521.

up our owne lewd and wicked courses, we will bee prophane still, and wee will sweare still, wee will not amend our lives, nor reforme our families, in what a miserable accursed damnable estate are those men, they will not leave and forsake their lewd practices, and therefore they cannot will grace, and if they cannot will it, then we may certainely conclude, they shall never obtaine it.[98]

Had English circumstances been more propitious, Hooker might well have laid out a developed predestinarian theology in Chelmsford, but a discerning hearer could quite easily have deduced his position from his many discussions of conversion. "It is not in our owne will to beget ourselves, as the Pelagians dreamed," he argued, "it is not in our will to dispose of our hearts, to take Christ when we will, to let him stand at doore so long as we see fit, and take him in when we see fit." In a sermon tacked on to the end of *The Christians Two Chiefe Lessons*, he cited Augustine in referring to those predestinated but not yet called, "sonnes in regard of God, but not in regard of us." In laying out the text of John 6:45, "No man comes to me unless the Father draws him," Hooker made the characteristic distinction between the "morall kind of drawing" commonly associated with Jesuits and Arminians, that is, "an outward or an externall kind of drawing," and "an internall kind of drawing." External drawing, which alone would be ineffectual, consisted of "nothing but objects offered, and arguments propounded to perswade the soule to the love and liking of the thing offered." In internal drawing, by contrast, God was, "pleased to put a new power into the soule of a sinner … pleased, not only to offer Christ and salvation, but to work effectually upon the heart, and make it able to give entertainment to Christ."[99]

Hooker commonly compared God's internal, effectual drawing to a workman's repairing the wheel of a clock "that is turned aside, and by some contrary poyse set the wrong way." The workman would not only "take away the contrary poyse" but also "put the wheele the right way." Just so the Lord, in drawing an errant sinner to himself, had to "overpower those sinnes and corruptions which harbour in the soule, and have dominion over the soule"; only thereafter would he draw the sinner to himself. The person being drawn was no more active in this process, he argued, than the clock wheel being repaired; both were "sufferers" being acted upon by irresistible forces. "The Lord will force his mercy on us, and hee will save us whether we will or no."[100]

---

98. UP 47.

99. SEX 536; CTCL 298.

100. UP *20–26, 74.

Augustine had spoken of God's "framing" the soul; the metaphor became Hooker's conventional way of describing God's gracious activity. Explaining that in converting a reluctant sinner "the Spirit doth forcibly soke in the rellish of that grace into the heart, and by the over-piercing worke, doth leave some dint of supernaturall and spirituall vertue on the heart," he elaborated that "an impression and disposition [was] left upon the soule, that it is framed and disposed … a kind of impression, frame, and print, which the heart retaineth."[101]

Hearers got the message, and some of them found his predestinarian doctrine anything but comfortable. At least one of them (prompted by Satan, Hooker thought) concluded she was predestined to damnation: "If I bee elected, then I shall bee saved; but I am not elected, I have injoyed Gods ordinances, and lived under the precious means of grace and salvation, and they have not wrought upon my heart; I perceive that God intends to doe no good unto my soule, therefore all my labor is in vain, when I have done what I can, I shall perish."[102]

Once safely in Hartford, Hooker took the opportunity to proclaim his position fully. His Wednesday afternoon lectures from 1638 to 1641 (subsequently published in *The Application of Redemption*) returned to many of the biblical texts he had preached on in England, but Hooker deliberately added extended discussions of his extreme Augustinian theology.[103] The word "Arminian," for example, does not occur at all in his extant English sermons.[104] It appears ten times in *The Application of Redemption*, always in the midst of a detailed confutation of Jesuit and Arminian positions.

Hooker understood "Arminianism" as a Protestantization—and a degradation—of the Jesuit positions on divine foreknowledge, predestination, and human free will. Not only was "that hæretical doctrine of the Arminians … deeply dangerous to the salvation of mens souls" and "exceedingly derogatory to the integrity of Gods free grace in Christ," but it was also "so gross that the

---

101. SP 45, 47.

102. SEC 566. Could Hooker have had his experience with Joanna Drake in mind?

103. Because the very first sentence of *The Application of Redemption* speaks of "the Application of the rich Redemption … made good to the hearts, of those who belong to the Election of grace"; it is difficult to understand how scholars of the generation of Samuel Eliot Morison could have confidently denied "that the New England Puritans were predestinarian Calvinists." *The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England*, 2nd. ed. (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 11.

104. Robert Keayne's sermon notes from June 1627 to June 1628 indicate that some London ministers were referring disparagingly to Arminianism, "Sermon Notes," e.g., 30, 54, 292–93. Those who brought Hooker's English sermons to the press may have excised Arminian references from the printed versions.

Popish school wil not abide by it, and the most ingenuous of the Jesuits them-selves do professedly oppose and condemn [it]." In another lecture he insisted that "the proper Opinion of the Arminians" was "somwhat more gross than the Jesuits themselves wil own." Despite what Arminius himself had written, Hooker contended that Arminians had revived the medieval notion of *facienti quod est in se*—maintaining that "if we do what we can and improve the natural abilities we have, and the means we do enjoy God will not deny to give us the grace supernatural we want"; they had regressed beyond Semipelagianism to Pelagianism itself. Both Pelagians and Arminians were said to require "no more to the conversion of a sinner, but meer perswasion, the Promises of Grace must be pressed, the excellency and glory of Christ discovered, and that say they is all that is needful, lay but these before a man, and he hath power to embrace and receive them if he will."[105]

To clarify the difference between his "orthodox" position and that of the Arminians, Hooker recalled Peter and Judas. "Suppose," he argued,

> that all outward means have been used and improved by providence upon Two Persons indifferently, in the same place enjoying the same helps, say *Judas* and *Peter*, who were both trained up under the wing of Christ, and received the droppings of his daily counsels alike, their minds both so far enlightened, and their Consciences convinced of the things of God and Grace, that they see what the will of God is, and what their way is to Happiness, by Beleeving in Christ.

Given the virtual identity of their circumstances, how could the difference in their final fates be explained?

The Arminians would answer, Hooker argued, that "it was in the Liberty of their own Wills, and *Peter* would close with Christ, *Judas* would refuse him." Divine grace had been offered both; each had had the ability to accept it; and each was given the proper reward or punishment for his free choice. To Hooker, extreme Augustinian that he was, such an answer was utterly unbiblical; the final fate of both Peter and Judas had to be in divine hands. "Orthodox Divines," he proclaimed, answer that "the *Lord gives a heart of flesh* to Peter, and enables him: which he denies unto *Judas*, as he justly may, and *Judas* hath justly deserved he should."[106]

---

105. AR 10:299–300; 8:412; 2:135; see also SSCD 1:a2ʳ.

106. AR 8:412–13; see also CCLP 213, AR 10:303; 1:60.

Hooker's Hartford lectures carefully spelled out every important tenet of an extreme, Perkinsian Augustinianism. The same Covenant of Redemption—the Father's primordial agreement with the Son to save the elect—that Hooker had preached in England was reiterated in Connecticut, now joined with explicit assertions that Christ had died "for none but the Elect." "I never prayed for you, I never dyed for you," Christ would say to the reprobate.[107] The distinction between *gratia sufficiens* and *gratia efficax*, dear to the Jesuits and Arminians, was utterly rejected. "Where ever there is Sufficiency of exciting and preventing Grace, put forth by the Lord, for the Drawing, and Converting of the Sinner; there is also the Efficacy of that Grace which never fails to attain success."[108] The alternative was unthinkable: "if Christ be no otherwise a Savior than only to merit so much for them, and to offer so much grace unto them, that they may receive it if they will, and refuse it if they list, then the execution of God's Decrees, our Saviors Purpose in Dying, and the Fruit and Success of his Death, is lastly resolved into the Will of man, and meerly depends thereupon; so that if all men would, our Savior might have died in vain, and prayed in vain, and no man ever attained salvation thereby."[109]

He had equally little use for the *scientia media*. "The Brain of the Jesuites is the Womb that bare it, and their Forgery gave it its first being; a Brat of their Brain, a Conceit which they Forged and Anvilled out of the Froth of their own imaginations." But even in the midst of the Connecticut wilderness, Hooker treated his Hartford hearers to a full description of the Jesuit position:

When God (say they) who made al Creatures, and so the Will of man, by his Wisdom and foreknowledge fully understood, what each Creature and so the Will of man would do in every event, condition, and occasion that could betide it: He also foresaw when the Will of man was set in such a Condition, so Disposed, so Suited with several Circumstances,

---

107. AR 2:77; 1:12; 2:73, 74; 1:58; CGO 2–3. David Como argues that John Cotton took a more moderate position on the extent of Christ's atonement, close to the hypothetical universalism of John Preston, James Ussher, and John Davenant. "Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2000), 64–87, at 76. *Pace* Miller, Hooker was thus a stricter "Calvinist" than his Boston counterpart.

108. AR 8:428. Richard Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, insists that Reformed theologians accepted the traditional distinction between the sufficiency of Christ's death for everyone, but its efficacy only for the elect (*sufficienter pro omnibus, efficienter pro electis*). Here Hooker's verb "put forth" refers to the actual *applicatio* of Christ's redeeming death to elect individuals. The *gratia sufficiens* offered to them will then invariably be *efficiens*.

109. AR 1:19–20; see also CCLP 213; for an extended discussion, see AR 8:427–31.

and Conveniences, when his Perswasions would find the greatest Congruity and Agreeabl[e]ness with his Disposition: And then presents such Arguments that suit his Disposition, and so undoubtedly prevails.. .. He that God at such a time, in such a manner, by such means presseth, as carry a congruous, a suitable, and answerable agreeableness to his disposition, he is converted. He that hath not such hints taken to hit his Disposition, he is not Converted.[110]

A sinner's initial movement toward God could likewise never be imagined as a *concursus* with grace, as Arminius and the Jesuits had done. To say that "there is a concurrence of our will by a power of its own with the power of Grace at the same instant to this work of consent," "an ability in the will to begin its work, and to meet and concur with Grace . .. so that Grace concurs with the power of the will to this motion, [but] doth not give power and principle whereby it moves" was "heretical and Pelagianism." "The Arminians som of their [the Pelagians'] successors have licked up that loathsom heresy of theirs at this day." Hooker's position was dramatically opposite:

It's necessary that the Lord should not only concur with the work of a sinner to lead or draw forth the act thereof which he hath ability to express, but he must let in an influence of the spiritual power & virtue into the faculty of the wil, whereby it may be enabled to put forth an act unto which it formerly it [sic] had no power of it self;[111]

Just as no one could turn to God unless God had first infused a new power into her soul, so that power, once offered, would inevitably be effective. God's converting work was a "power whereof nothing can oppose"; it was simply "irresistible."[112]

Hooker used a number of terms for the Jesuit/Arminian notion of God's converting work: "congruous perswasion," "congruity of moral perswasion," "moral swasion," and most typically "moral persuasion."[113] All were heretical. God invariably worked by "physical" drawing, as an "efficient cause properly so-called." In his personal notes he termed God's working a "physical determination of the will." The critical point, on which he insisted over and over,

---

110. AR 8:416–17.

111. AR 10:394–95, 387; see also 2:128, 8:410–12.

112. AR 2:78; see also 2:135, 10:389–95; 8:426, 432.

113. E.g., AR 8:351; 418, 421–22; 2:135.

could not have been clearer: God's converting work was "done upon us, but not by us," "in us without us." During the initial work, a person's will could only be described as "a meer Patient," a "sufferer" who did not act but was "acted upon."[114]

In all this, Hooker was merely repeating what he had preached less technically in England: "There is an old phrase, which Saint Austin propounded in his time," he told his Chelmsford hearers, "that God of an unwilling will, doth make a willing will." Without divine intervention, people had free will, but in practice it was only "free will to sinne." "God brings willingnesse out of unwillingnesse," he continued; "he must conquer that resistance against the Spirit which is in the soule, before he can make it plyable and frameable to his owne will and pleasure." Hooker was completely convinced that in some mysterious and inexplicable fashion, God could do this "without any prejudice to any Liberty that the Lord hath put into the will." He simply asserted that "the will may be forced to suffer even against it's [sic] will, without any wrong to the liberty thereof." The will would "act and consent" to God's work in such a way "that this consent is not from ourselves, though not without our selves." The all important principle remained intact: hearers could not "be the beginners of our own [saving] work, by any thing we have in our selves."[115]

One wonders how recent scholars (not his seventeenth-century contemporaries), who have so often accused Hooker of closet Arminianism, can have overlooked his unwavering attacks—both in England and during his Hartford lectures—on what he identified as the defining mark of Arminianism: God's limiting his activity during the process of conversion to "moral persuasion."[116] Particularly during his Hartford lectures, Hooker explicitly described and painstakingly refuted every characteristic position of the Molinists and Congruists, the Jesuit roots from which, he was convinced, the Arminian position had grown. His New England hearers were exposed to a full array of the scholastic terms—*gratia operans* (AR 8:432), *gratia excitans* (AR 10:394), *gratia præveniens* (AR:8:432), *præmotio physica* (AR 8:353; see also Miscellanea 393), *gratia sufficiens* and *gratia efficax* (AR 1:19–20; 8:427–431; CCLP 213), and *concursus dei* (AR 10:387) characteristic of theological debates. One must conclude

---

114. AR 8:409, 432; 10:369.

115. UP * 68–69; TGS 29; AR 10:392, 396.

116. E.g., R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, see Richard Muller's critical review in "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy," and also Muller, "*Fides* and *Cognitio* in Relation to the Problem of Intellect and Will in the Theology of John Calvin," in Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 159–73, 255–62, at 172.

that he went to such pains because he assumed that many of the members his congregation cared about these issues. He wanted to leave them in no doubt that he had completely rejected the Arminian position.[117]

The twenty-first-century reader of Hooker's sermons cannot help but sense in his intense opposition to the Arminians the same hostility that Augustine expressed toward Pelagius and Julian. Arminianism insulted God; it was an affront to divine control. Commenting on the Roman Catholic doctrine on which Arminius had drawn, Hooker judged it "needlesse and derogatorie to Jesus Christ, as if men should come after and adde any thing to what he hath done, as if the redemption of Christ were not perfect, as if Christs giving of himself were not enough to redeem us from all iniquitie."[118] By insisting that "it's not in Gods hand to dispose of his own mercy, but it is in my hand, and left in my choice," Arminianism cut "the very sinews of the Covenant of Grace" and returned helpless sinners "into the Covenant of Works," where they would lose all possibility of salvation. "Whereas in the Covenant of Grace, all is firstly, freely, wholly, and only in the hand of the Lord to dispose, to whom he wil, what, when, and after what manner he wil."[119]

Jean Delumeau has argued that the basic tactic of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Catholic preachers was *surculpabilisation*, the creation of an intense feeling of guilt.[120] Even if people lived outwardly moral lives, they had to be convinced that they were supremely guilty in God's eyes and subject at any moment to his anger. Their only recourse was repentance and submission to the program of the Church. Although they would not have recognized the term, Perkins and Hooker took up the banner of *surculpabilisation* with a vengeance. It was Hooker's mission to inform his Chelmsford hearers "what they shall doe to be saved, and how they may bee delivered from the wrath of God," how "to escape the vengeance of God." They needed to recognize that they were "worthless worms," "so vile, so unthankful, and unworthy,"

---

117. I trust that this long and—for many readers—tedious description of the theological options open to Hooker will lay to rest any suspicion that he secretly intended to undermine the unconditional election of Beza, Perkins, and other supralapsarian predestinarians of his day. In the Congruism of the Jesuits he had available a far more sophisticated technique than "preparation for salvation" to allow some human initiative into the conversion process. *Scientia media* was not off-limits, reserved to "heretical" Catholics and Arminians; it had become a staple of Lutheran theology. Had he been genuinely interested in trying to preserve human initiative, Hooker could have tried to adopt some version of it. Instead, he rejected it unambiguously.

118. SDD 40.

119. AR 10:301–2.

120. *Sin and Fear*, op. cit.

who had broken God's law "in every part and parcell of it," were "guilty of all the curses therein, even of death and damnation," and were "liable to all the plagues denounced against sinne and sinners, even the wrath of the Almighty, and the gnawing of hell, which never have an end."[121]

And just as had Augustine's and Perkins's, Hooker's extreme positions generated incredulity and disgust from those who could not accept his doctrine.[122] "You pale in the precious Redemption of Christ, into such a narrow compass," said his detractors, that "you make the Reprobates in as desperate a condition as the Devils themselves, being wholly voyd of al help and hope of Salvation, either in themselves or any other; they cannot save themselves and the Lord wil not save them." Similarly, if Hooker's God chose to offer the grace necessary for belief only to the elect, "why then are Reprobates commanded to Beleeve, and punished for not Beleeving?"[123] One can hear the voices of Julian of Eclanum and Samuel Harsnett in these objections.

In view of Hooker's relentless efforts to discredit Arminianism, it is ironic that Miller and those who find his interpretations convincing champion Hooker as the chief proponent of what they described as "preparationism," an unsophisticated version of the very Jesuit/Arminian doctrine that Hooker despised. Any notion that people by their own initiative could somehow dispose God to look upon them favorably was repugnant to Hooker. The "orthodox" Reformed tradition in which Hooker chose to stand had led him to endorse extreme Augustinian positions which might better be termed "Perkinsian."

A twenty-first-century reader, most likely distant from the controversies that so consumed Hooker and his colleagues, will recognize another problem for such an absolutist theology: its tendency to force God into a box. God's regard for his own glory and holiness put limits on his freedom of action: "God cannot shew thee mercie," Hooker warned the sinners in his congregation, "unlesse he will deny himselfe, and crosse his holinesse." "Hee is holy and blessed, and of pure eyes that cannot endure to behold any polluted or uncleane thing." "None of all the attributes of God can ever interfeere or crosse one another, it cannot be, for then God should not procure nor maintaine his owne glory, for when hee should procure the glory of his justice, hee

---

121. SS 5–6, 16; CCLP 440–41.

122. In Augustine's case, the "incredulity and disgust" came not from hearers of his sermons, which largely avoid hellfire and damnation, but from readers of his treatises such as Julian of Eclanum. I lack the expertise to explain the origins of what I call the homiletics of terror in western Christianity; interpreters like Delumeau, *Le Péché et la peur*, trace it to social factors and find an upsurge beginning in the thirteenth century.

123. AR 1:60, 62.

should wrong the glory of his mercy, and when he should procure the glory of his mercy, hee should wrong the glory of his justice." That God's actions might be more subtle, or even, as in Luther's emblematic *simul iustus ac peccator*, paradoxical, seemed impossible to Hooker's logic.[124]

It was not the Pastor's role in Hooker's Hartford to explain doctrine systematically. That role fell to the Teacher. While attending the Hartford lectures during this same 1638–1641 period, Henry Wolcott sometimes found "Mr. Stone" rather than "Mr. Hooker" in the pulpit. From Wolcott's shorthand notes, one can see that those lectures were covering the same topics that Stone eventually drew together into *The Whole Body of Divinity*. Stone's manuscript *Whole Body* contains a thorough discussion of God's activity before the creation of the world, so the student of religion in early Hartford can look there for the more systematic explanations that are only suggested in Hooker's lectures.

In the beginning, according to Stone, was an act of God's will: God the Father chose to manifest his glory by showing mercy to a certain number of individual human beings. Because God's "special glory" shone out in "his morall Vertues, and perfections of his Will," he chose "to be just and righteous, kind and gracious" to a select group of "the choicest and noblest of all his creatures," human beings.[125]

Once the Father's will had chosen the individual human beings through whom he intended to demonstrate his mercy, the Father's intellect took on the task of figuring out "the best way for the accomplishment of this designe: how his Infinite Mercy and Justice might be reconciled." How, in other words, could God be merciful without compromising his commitment to absolute justice? Stone made it clear that "Divine Justice and mercy must both shine out in their glory." God would certainly have ample opportunity to demonstrate his justice through the punishment of those human beings whose misfortune it was not to be among God's chosen. But confining attention for the moment to the Father's special interest in those who had been chosen, one finds at this stage that the Father's intellect determined that God the Son was "the fittest person, the best means, and the most absolute way that can be devised, for the accomplishment of this great designe … the subject of his Plot and Counsell." The Father therefore resolved that the Son should be "the person employed in the designe."[126]

---

124. SEC 131; SEx 300, 286. For more on this, see the next chapter.

125. WB 182, 241.

126. WB 245, 182.

As noted above, theologians imagined these primordial divine decisions as a series of logical steps or *signa rationis*.[127] Stone understood that these *signa* were a human construct, "God doth not purpose or determine one thing in order before or after an other: he decrees all things at once by one Simple, Immutable act of willing, at one instant." Yet "in respect of our manner of apprehending or conceiving … the Divine decree seems to be divided into parts." "Wee intend one thing for the sake of another," he continued, "and therefore one thing first, and another for that, and so we conceive of God as a cause by counsel … he intends his own glory first, and other things after that by a IId. Intention."[128] Conceiving of God's decree in logical steps was simply a human way of conceiving something that occurred simultaneously in God. But it was nevertheless the only way mere humans could make any sense of the divine decree.

To this point in the *signa rationis*, Stone imagined decisions occurring entirely in God the Father. The Father elected a set number of individual human beings; he concluded that mercy and justice could best be reconciled by involving God the Son in the redemption of those human beings, and he determined to involve God the Son.

Only then did Stone imagine that the Son entered the picture. The Father explained his "deep project" to the Son, gave him authority to carry it out, and promised him ultimate success. This was the Son's "Commission" or "Ordination," which the Son freely accepted. Stone repeatedly insisted that as part of this Commission, the Father gave the Son "a list of the names of those that are to be redeemed." Christ died only for these.[129]

Like Hooker and other extreme Augustinians in the Reformed tradition, Stone conceived of this divine conversation as a "compact and agreement" which the Father concluded with the Son. Remember that the Father had already elected specific individuals before bringing the Son into his confidence, that the decree of election was conceived to precede even the Son's decision to become incarnate, and that no foreknowledge preceded election. Stone was certain that the decision to elect "doth not presume the Existence of the Creature, or Prevision of Creation." God imagined each elect person

---

127. Stone used the term *signum rationis* in WB 352, but his most extensive discussions of the concept are at WB 182–83 and 241–45; see also Hooker, AR 3:146, *Miscellanea* 395.

128. WB 242, 243.

129. WB 182–83, see also 237, 240, 247; WB 238. Richard Muller argues that Perkins made a point of including the Son in God's initial decision to predestine; here Stone differs from Perkins. Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 143.

as "*Ens Possibile*," only a "possible" being. "Election doth not presuppose the foresight of the Existence of the creature."[130]

The very first step of God's *signa rationis*, then, was a "divine decree." By this decree, logically prior to every other act, God had determined to manifest his glory by choosing or "electing" certain human beings to be redeemed. Like Perkins, Stone was a supralapsarian who imagined God's singling out individual human beings before considering their actual creation and fall.[131] Creation, the fall of Adam and Eve, and the incarnation of the Son were imagined to come into God's mind only after the decree of election; they were simply means to bring about God's true intent: the manifestation of his glory through his mercy and justice in individual human beings. Stone referred frequently to the dictum, "That which is first in intention, is last in execution, (*quod primum est in intentione, ultimum est in executione*), meaning that the manifestation of mercy in the salvation of the elect would come at the very end of history but would express the intention that had been in the mind of God from the very beginning.[132]

But the manifestation of mercy in the salvation of the elect was only part of God's ultimate intention. God also intended to manifest his justice in the damnation of the reprobate. For to Stone, as to Hooker, that which was first in God's intention was a "double decree." "Divine Justice and mercy must both shine out. … there must therefore be vessels and Subjects of both these." Stone's description of the "means" by which God would bring his elect to salvation is instructive:

> Creation of these men in innocency, his confederation with them in Adam, by which all the whole Creation of men were in a capacity and possibility to live well and be happy; *but that was only a meanes to bring Gods decree to passe*. Permission of their fall. Their fall into Sin and misery. The Redemption of them by his Son. The Application of that Redemption by his Spirit; in Vocation, Justification, &c.[133]

---

130. WB 240, 244–45, 248; see also 334: "God has chosen these to be in him, before he thought of the creation of the World, according to our manner of conceivings; for the World is framed as a means to bring this plot about." On the "covenant of redemption" in Reformed theology, see Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, entry "*pactum salutis*," 217.

131. For God's decree to damn the reprobate before their creation, see WB 249: "Reprobation does not presume the Decree of Creation, but is Antecedent to it."

132. E.g., WB 243.

133. WB 245, 247; emphasis added.

In Stone's mind, God's creation of Adam and Eve in the Garden was no more than a clever device to spread original sin to all their progeny, enabling God to manifest his justice in the eternal punishment of the majority and his mercy in the salvation of those few whom he had arbitrarily chosen. God's plot therefore required that there also be a parallel "purpose of God to permit some to fall into Sin, and to damne them for Sin." Once again, the decree preceded any foreknowledge of individual human behavior. "God doth not Elect any man because he loves him, nor reprobate any because he hates him: but he loves some because he hath Elected them, &c: his love and hatred follows Election, and Reprobation." And just as God had predestined the exact means by which the elect would be saved, so, too, the reprobate were "Predestined to all those means, serving to that end [manifesting God's glory through his justice], as creation, permission of the fall, Bondage, and continuance in it, Sin, & damnation for Sin."[134]

One can see why the extreme Augustinian God (as Stone imagined him), whose "glory" required that his "moral virtue" be demonstrated in the damnation of those who had been created precisely for that purpose, so offended Molina and Bellarmine (as well as Archbishop Laud). Although both Jesuits agreed that God had made a deliberate decision to elect Peter and not Judas, they had struggled to find a way of conceiving God's actions so that Judas's own failure to respond to God's call had been responsible for his reprobation. In the Jesuit conception, God had determined to offer sufficient grace to both Peter and Judas, even as he knew through the *scientia media* that under the actual conditions of the world he was about to create, only Peter would respond to his offer. Judas had had the ability to cooperate with the grace God offered, had he chosen to do so. God knew through *scientia media* that Judas would not do so, but Judas nevertheless possessed the ability. Had he exercised it, Judas would have been among the elect rather than the reprobate.

Stone's conception of God's activity was completely different. "God hath chosen Peter to be a vessel of mercy, therefore he intends to redeem him by his Son ... God reprobated or refused Judas, and therefore intended to permit him to fall into Sin, and leave him in it, and damn him for it." The divine decree preceded and superseded any consideration of human deserving; nothing that Judas might have done could have had the slightest influence on God's decision. The decision to choose Peter rather than Judas had no rationale outside of God's own mind; "Mercy did no more move God to Elect Peter than Judas, for it might have bin equally manifested in him." "Election hath

---

134. WB 246, 248.

no dependence upon Prevision, of any gracious Qualifications, good workes, and grace, faith, or any good in the creatures, all these are fruits & effects of Election."[135]

In this theology, reprobation took its place as a full partner to election. Like election, reprobation had its own last end—"the glory of divine revenging Justice"—and its own means—"creation, permission of the fall, Bondage, and continuance in it, Sin, & damnation for Sin." Some theologians (Lutherans like Andreae, for example) avoided the full consequences of this scheme by arguing that Reprobation should be conceived as an "act of Preterition." By this they meant that reprobate humans were simply left out of God's decree of election. God had made a positive decision only about the elect; by being left out or passed over (*præteritio* = passing over), the reprobate were simply left to rely on their own abilities, which would be insufficient to earn them salvation. Stone would have none of such equivocation. "Reprobation is not an act of Preterition, but a positive designation of men to the glory of Divine Justice."[136]

This doctrine had enormous implications for preaching. Everything depended on whether God had singled out the individual hearer for election or reprobation, a decision over which the individual had absolutely no control. Since nothing could be done about the fateful decision itself, a hearer's most urgent energy would inevitably focus on finding out what God had decided. Told that it was impossible to penetrate directly into the mind of God to discover his ultimate intention, hearers could only hope to find themselves included in the "means" of election rather than reprobation.[137] Was one called and justified? Then one certainly belonged among God's elect. Had one turned against God and given oneself over to sin? If so (unless that situation were to change), all indications pointed to a place among the reprobate.

But there were other fateful implications. As with Perkins, Christ's loving concern for humanity was confined in this system entirely to the elect. The Father did not even enter into his covenant with the Son until the critical decision regarding every human being had already been made. Christ came to the reprobate as a wrathful judge, a role which would take full form at the end of time when he would return to earth to judge the living and the dead.[138] Christ's ministry, his promises of God's love and grace, could never extend to reprobate human beings. The Father engaged the Son only to carry out his

---

135. WB 246, 248.

136. WB 249.

137. E.g., AR 2:81.

138. WB 233.

intentions for the elect; Christ lived and died only for them. Any individual who heard Hooker and Stone preach might yearn for the "good news" of the Gospel, but none could overlook the likelihood that for some in the congregation, that preaching meant "bad news": the fearful possibility that the promises of the Gospel had never been intended for them. "The Lord Jesus sees sin and Satan have thee in their power," said Hooker to an imaginary reprobate sinner in Hartford, "hurrying down to Hell with them, and he passeth by, and saith, Let them alone, they belong not to me, I will not rescue them nor save them, my Word and Spirit shall not convince them nor work upon them."[139]

What message did Hooker and Stone then have for the reprobate? Divine revenging justice. To the reprobate, preaching at Hartford was terror and wrath. The idea of divine reprobation had always troubled theologians. Even as he insisted it be included in the way God's plan for human beings should be described, Calvin had called it a *decretum horribile*. But Hooker and Stone described reprobation with a resoluteness that startles the modern reader. Stone's *Whole Body* exalted God's just damnation of most of the human beings he had created. All unrepentant sinners, he argued, "are subject to everlasting missery; & God leavs the greatest part of man-kind in this Estate for the glory of his Justice." At the day of judgment, Stone explained at another point, "God will shew the Reason of his Proceedings: why he punisheth all mankind excepting a few in comparison, with everlasting burnings." God's perfect, absolute holiness most clearly appeared "when he gave men up to hardness and blindness, which is the most dreadful plague that can be inflicted." Describing Christ's role as mediator of the divine decree, Stone imagined him charged to convince sinners to "say God is righteous, though he should trample upon them, and never shew them one smile or good looke."[140]

Preachers all over Europe were using terror as a conscious tactic to drive sinners to amendment of life, and Hooker's sermons in both England and New England take full advantage of that tactic. Sinners had to feel "the severity of God's justice," "the horror of God's revenging hand."[141] Hooker told his Chelmsford congregation of the sinner who "lookes about, and conceives God is angry, and his sinnes are hainous, and hell is gaping for him; and the Lord tells him, there is your portion, thither you will goe one day, either you must be another man, or else an accursed man."[142] A hearer's own conscience (John

139. AR 6:296.

140. WB 110, 233, 124, 155.

141. AR 10:585, 587.

142. SEC, 523–24.

Stachniewski would call it her "persecutory imagination") would accuse her in a "marvellous awfull, terrible, and fearefull" manner." In Hartford Hooker imagined that conscience condemning a sinner:

> thou shalt perish, and there is no Remedy: with that Conscience delivers him up into the hands of the tormentors; take him ye damned spirits, depart from hence to thy grave, and from thence to the place of Execution. He would not forsake his evil, let him perish in it, he would not be reformed, let him be for ever accursed: So that the sinner conceives himself past hope and help, looks every hour and moment to be turned off the Ladder. … the sinner being under the arrest of Conscience . . . . conceives himself in the possession of the Devil really, and irrecoverably in Hell. Lo, saies the sinner, The Devil, the Devil; there he is, he is come for me. When he lies panting upon his sick-bed, if he do but close his eyes together to sleep, his dreams terrifie him, his thoughts perplex him, and he awakens gastered and distracted, as though he were posting down to the pit, he rises up and Raves. . .. I must go to Hell, Satan is sent from God to fetch me.[143]

There would be no escape from this terror. "The soule would faine have driven away this feare," explained Hooker, "but the Lord will not let him, but saith, these curses shall kindle upon thee, and shall continue for ever to thy perdition." To increase the hearers's horror, "the Lord lets in some veine of his vengeance, and some secret displeasure of his, and makes sinne to stabbe the soule, and then the curse lyeth upon him, and the Lord as it were kindles the fire of his wrath upon him." The effect would be electric: "the soule seeth flashes of hell and Gods wrath upon the soule, and the terrours of hell lay hold upon the heart." One's own conscience would convey divine judgment: "conscience saith, Doest not thou know that thou art one of them that have had pleasure in unrighteousnesse, therefore away thou must goe, and thou shalt be damned. . .. the wrath of God followeth him wheresoever he goeth."[144] As Hooker summarized in another sermon, "the fiercenesse of the furie of the Lord breakes in upon the sinner, and the Lord lets in the veines of vengeance, and his heavie displeasure upon the conscience . . . and the wrath of God saith, come away to Hell … goe downe to everlasting destruction."[145]

---

143. UP *42; AR 8:370–71. This is the larger context of the quotation at the beginning of chapter 1.

144. SP 141, 142, 145.

145. SG 46.

Stone's preaching was probably no less frightening. When he wrote of the method God the Father used when he was ready to separate the elect from the reprobate, he spoke specifically and only of wrath: "He [God the Father] frees them out of the World, and drives them out of the residue of men, by the Scalding beams of his wrath, makes their standing in the world too hot for them."[146]

From Julian of Eclanum through Erasmus, Molina, Harsnett, Arminius, and Lutherans like Andreae and Hemmingsen, opponents found the extreme Augustinian God arbitrary, cruel, and even the actual author of sin. Thomas Hooker built his distinctive style of preaching on an "absolutist" theology based on this very way of imagining God. But before we turn to examine that preaching style, we must take a careful look at another critical element that shaped the thought of both Hooker and Stone, the Ramist logic that they learned from Alexander Richardson. The following chapter describes Ramism as another critical piece of the intellectual heritage that shaped both Hartford preachers.

---

146. WB 237.

7

Richardsonian Ramism

THE MEMBERS OF Thomas Hooker's company grounded their faith on the Bible. When they engaged in godly conversation, they understood that they would need to support their arguments with appropriate scriptural passages. So a preacher like Hooker could never simply impose his personal imagination of God on his hearers. Whatever he preached about God and God's will for the world had to be firmly rooted in the written words of the Scriptures.

Theologians have a term for the assumptions and principles which inform their efforts to make out the Bible's meaning: "hermeneutics." To understand how Hooker and Stone made God and God's will present to their hearers, one must first understand the hermeneutical principles that guided their interpretation of Scripture. Those hermeneutical principles were overwhelmingly Ramist.

It was Perry Miller who first drew attention to the importance of the French philosopher and rhetorician Peter Ramus (Pierre de la Ramée, 1515–72). To this day, when historians presume that the ministers of early New England had begun to break away from the debilitating influence of "Calvinism," they are often recalling Perry Miller's descriptions of those ministers' Ramism.[1] In the first two chapters of his masterful *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, Miller had shown how the self-regarding Augustinian God always retained a potential to act arbitrarily, to break through any reasonable limits on his behavior. In the rest of the book, Miller described the techniques New Englanders used to fence God in. Along with covenant theology and "preparationism," Miller believed, early New England's "adoption of the Ramist system" allowed its intellectuals to slide out from under the debilitating influence of "Calvinism" and contributed to "the emergence of the modern era." His

---

1. A good recent example is E. Brooks Holifield, *Theology in America*, 32–33.

famous conclusion—that "in Puritan thought the intellectual heritage was finally more decisive than the piety"—followed immediately from a discussion of Ramism.[2] This chapter examines the powerful influence of Ramism on both Hooker and Stone. It was through Ramist lenses that they saw not only Scripture but also the entire natural world. Against Miller's argument that Ramism constrained the "absolutist" proclivities of extreme Augustinianism, however, we will see how Ramism reinforced them.

It was Miller's genius to recognize the central importance of Ramism. But as was often his habit, he burrowed so deeply into the details of Ramist logic and rhetoric that the forest risked being lost for the trees. Fortunately, one can cut to the heart of Ramist influence on Hartford theology by recognizing how that theology revolved around the concept of "rule."

Once one begins to look for it, the language of rule appears everywhere in Thomas Hooker's sermons and controversial theology. "Let Gods command rule us," he advised at his Chelmsford lecture. "The whole rule of God is to be attended," he argued against the English Baptist John Spilsbury. Submit to "the guidance of his wisdom in the Rule," he told his Hartford hearers. Christians became confused, he explained, because "we see not the Rule that should guide us."[3]

The twenty-first-century reader is in unfamiliar territory. What was this "Rule"? Where was it to be found? And what is one to make of statements like the following, where Hooker describes the Rule as if it were an object of worship:

> The Rule is one, like it self accompanied with stability and rest; if once we go astray from that, there is neither end nor quiet in error, but restlessness and emptiness. ... Our imaginations are like the vast Sea, while we eye the Rule, and are ordered by the authority of it, we know our compass; but once go off, and we know not whither we shal go, or where we shal stay.

Hooker may well have been alluding to Augustine's well-known prayer at the opening of the *Confessions*: "You have made us for yourself, and our hearts are

---

2. Miller, *New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, 330. Chapters 5, 6, 11, and 12 are largely devoted to Ramism. Miller's understanding of covenant theology and "preparationism" have been broadly critiqued, but his belief that Ramism hastened a retreat from Reformed theology has not to my knowledge been called into question.

3. CTCL 64; CGO 62; AR 10:156, 236. At the sermon he preached at the conclusion of the Antinomian Synod in 1636, John Davenport chose as his text Phil. 3:16: "Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing."

restless [*inquieta*] until they rest in you [*requiescat in te*]." If so, the ministers and even some of the lay-people in attendance at his Wednesday Hartford lecture could have caught the reference. But in place of Augustine's God stood Hooker's Rule.[4]

When Augustine thought of his heart "resting" in God, he had in mind an order of nature in which each object sought its own place (*locus*). When it reached that place, it found rest (*requies*). "Our rest is our place," he wrote, *Requies nostra, locus noster*. Each object had a particular "weight" or gravity which drove it downward or upward toward its proper place in the universe: "Fire tends upward; a stone tends downward. They are driven by their own weight; they seek their own places." Like electrons temporarily knocked out of orbit, they would be "restless" (*inquieta*) outside their proper location and "at rest" once they regained it. "If they are out of order, they are restless; when their order is restored, they are at rest."

Unlike stones or fire, rational creatures were driven by what they desired or loved. *Pondus meum amor meus*, wrote Augustine in a memorable passage: "my love is my weight." The desires of a selfish will would carry a person away from God, but the redeemed will of Augustine and his fellow Christians, enkindled (*accendimur*) by grace, would be carried upward (*sursum ferimur*) to rest in God. "We go up," he concluded," to the peace of Jerusalem."[5]

What could an Augustinian like Hooker have meant by identifying the "Rule" with "stability and rest"? Everyone knew that monks lived by a rule, but what weight had a "rule" for laypeople in early seventeenth-century England?

The British historian Christopher Marsh has recently drawn attention to the way people in early modern England used the term "order" for a number of interlocking purposes. "'Order' was an extraordinarily versatile term," explains Marsh, "referring variously to the entire hierarchy, to any single rank upon it, to a proper sequence, to fitting behavior, to peace, and to a command. The use of a single word to convey all of these meanings had the effect of tying them together, so that to stay in one's proper rank or to obey an injunction or to behave in an upright fashion would also be to promote peace in the cosmos and freedom from that terrifying alternative, 'disorder.'"[6]

---

4. AR 10:237; cf. Augustine, *Confessiones*, I.1, *P.L.* 32:661, English translation *The Confessions*, trans. Maria Boulding, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, vol. I/1 (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1997), 39; cf. WB 397ff.

5. *Confessiones*, XIII.ix.10, *P.L.* 32:828–29, *Confessions*, 348.

6. Christopher Marsh, "Order and Place in England, 1580–1640: The View from the Pew," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 3–26, at 3.

Just so, "rule" assumed similarly varied but mutually reinforcing meanings. Paul Slack has noted how "rule" and "order" could be easily blended in early modern English parlance, as could "unruliness" and "disorder."[7] A "rule" could be a guide to appropriate behavior (e.g., the "Golden Rule"), and so Hooker could speak of "the Rules of the Gospel," of the saints' having a "Rule to guide them," or as those who "walk by such a strict rule."[8] "Rule" in this sense also carried the connotation of a yardstick or "ruler," the device which could measure how closely one had adhered to a rule of behavior. "Rules" were the principles by which a person lived his life. Hooker mockingly imagined that even worldly people, the "loose, vaine, joviall company" whom the godly were urged to shun, lived by rules:

> There are rules of their revaldry set downe, they thrust and put away the day of the Lord farre from them; that is the first law they make, the first statute they enact, thinke not of sinne now, and meditate not of judgement now, but come (say they) cast care away, fling away and casheer those melancholly imaginations: we have many failings, let us not therefore be pondering of them, and make ourselves so much the more miserable, this day shall be as yesterday, and to morrow as to day, no sorrow nor judgement, no sinne now considered.

On occasion Hooker could use the term "Rule" to refer to one particular standard of behavior, but he more commonly used it as the inclusive term for the whole set of individual standards: hearers were to follow "the rule of the law in each command of it"; the Scribes in Jesus's time "made Traditions the Rule."[9]

As a verb, "rule" conveyed authority. A king ruled his subjects; a master ruled his servants; a parent ruled her children; all because early modern people believed that they had legitimate authority to do so. God could expect the faithful to obey his Rule because he "onely hath right and authority to command us." Speaking of the Christian's need to submit himself to "the truth" as contained in the "Word" of the Bible, Hooker combined the notions of government and authority when he said that a godly person needed to be "under the authority of the truth, and to submit himselfe to the government of that good

7. Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 303–4. The title of the final (1666) set of plague regulations was labeled *Rules and Orders*.

8. CGO 64; CTCL 27, 30.

9. SP 96; AR 10:55; CTCL 38.

Word."[10] Nothing distinguished the godly more clearly from the world than their willingness to order their lives around the one authentic rule, "the rule of righteousness, which is that homage and obedience we owe unto God."[11]

Once one is attuned to its importance, a reader notices rule language everywhere in Hooker: "the rule of reason and love," "the rule of reason and Religion," "the rule of the Gospel," "the rule of the word," "the rule of rationall charity," "the rule according to which the Church ought to walk." Often the noun will be plural, as in "the rules of Christ" or "the rules of Religion."[12] In addition to having created one all-encompassing "Rule," God apparently also intended that specific parts of the creation—Religion, for example, or the Church—behave according to rules particular to them. All rules had one thing in common, however. As divine precepts, they were to be obeyed. In every case, a rule was something to which Hooker's hearers were expected to submit.

As Pastor, Hooker did not see it as his task to provide a systematic explanation of the Rule. That responsibility fell to the Teacher. "To him it appertaines," wrote Hooker, "to lay down a *Platforme of wholsome words*, and to deliver the fundamentall points of Christian Faith, the principles of Religion, as the maine pillars of truth, which may under-prop our apprehensions."[13] Teacher Samuel Stone would more than meet those expectations. Hooker did presume, however, that the *Platforme* which the Teacher laid out would follow a particular method.

At the beginning of his most ambitious polemical work, *The Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline*, Hooker laid out what a twenty-first-century reader would call his methodology. He divided Religion, "the whole work of the Gospel," into two parts: Faith and Order. Church Discipline was included under Order, which he described as *"the right positure of things in their proper places and ranks*, when they are marshalled by the rule of *Method*."[14] The division into two parts and, especially, the concept of a "rule of Method" reveal that Hooker was a Ramist. In particular, he was a "Richardsonian" Ramist, shaped by the thought of Alexander Richardson.

---

10. PP 353–54, see also 359; SDD 145. In his *Theology of the Old Testament*, 183. Walter Brueggemann explains that Israel is charged "to bring every aspect of its life under the direct rule of Yahweh."

11. TGS 5.

12. CGO 19; SSCD II:31; SG 134; PHH, 15; CGO 19; SSCD II:27; SSCD II:80; CGO 39.

13. SSCD 2, 21–22.

14. SSCD 1:2.

Cotton Mather once wrote of a teacher whose influence on his student was so pervasive that, as the student developed, he became a virtual copy of the teacher. That student was Thomas Hooker, and his teacher was Alexander Richardson. Even for one so given to hyperbole as Mather, the account in *Piscator Evangelicus* of Hooker's debt to Richardson is extraordinary: "so far as *Metempsychosis* was attainable, the *Soul* of him [Richardson], I mean the Notions, the Accomplishments, the Dispositions of that Great SOUL, Transmigrated into our most *Richardsonian Hooker*."[15] A generation later, Samuel Stone also studied with Richardson and was deeply influenced by his theological system. Stone's *Whole Body of Divinity* is based entirely on "the methodicall Tables of A. R.," as Richardson's theological theses were described by another of his students.[16] The (eventual) Boston pastor John Wilson was a Richardson student. Just who was this extraordinarily influential figure, a luminary of whom Hooker "would sometimes say, That *next to converting Grace, he blessed God for his Acquaintance with the Principles and Writings of that Learned Man,* Mr. *Alexander Richardson*"?[17]

A generation older than Hooker, Richardson matriculated at Queens College, Cambridge, as a pensioner in 1579 and received his B.A. in 1584. The following year the Fellows of Queens elected Richardson to join their number. But pressure from Elizabeth's court voided the election, presumably because someone thought that Richardson was too closely associated with those ministers who were agitating for further reformation of the Church of England. On his way to an M.A. in 1587, he came under the influence of Perkins, who

---

15. *Piscator Evangelicus* 43 {*Magnalia* 336–37}.

16. John Yates, *A Short and Briefe Svmme of saving Knowledge; … made as a profitable Introduction to the larger Art of Divinitie, composed by the methodicall Tables of A.R.* (London, 1621), *NSTC* 26088; William Ames, *Medulla S.S. Theologiae* (London, 1629), *NSTC* 556.5; and Yates, *A Modell of Divinitie* (London, 1622), *NSTC* 26085, are also based on these tables. On Yates, see Keith Sprunger, "John Yates of Norfolk: The Radical Puritan Preacher as Ramist Philosopher," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37 (1976): 697–706; and Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents*, 104–7, 120–26. Yates was Hooker's contemporary as a Fellow at Emmanuel.

17. Mather, *Magnalia* 3:10 (letter of Increase Mather). Increase Mather cites another Hooker encomium to Richardson in a preface "To the Reader" in James Fitch, *The First Principles of the Doctrine of Christ* (Boston: 1679), 5. According to Hooker's contemporary Giles Firmin, Richardson was a mentor "whom Dr. Ames and Mr. Hooker, honoured much, and follow much." *Separation Examined* (London, 1652), *Wing* F964, 80, cited by Susan Hardman Moore, "Arguing for Peace: Giles Firmin on New England and Godly Unity," in *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1996), 251–61, at 257. Miller's discussions of Ramism in *New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, chapters 5–7, drew attention to the importance of Richardson. Mather's biography of Wilson does not mention Richardson.

held a position as Fellow at Christ's College from 1584 to 1595. After leaving Cambridge, Richardson found employment as a tutor to the children of the MP Thomas Fanshawe, whose will (Fanshawe died in 1601) left money to Richardson.[18]

It was Fanshawe's bequest that almost certainly gave Richardson the resources he needed to set up a school in Barking, Essex, where he offered instruction to graduates preparing for their M.A. examinations. The school soon became known as a seminary for "godly" future pastors. The godly minister George Walker testified to Richardson's "singular learning in Divinity, and all other learned Arts" as well as his "excellent knowledge in the originall tongues of holy Scripture." "Divers studious young men did resort from *Cambridge* to his dwelling in the parish of *Barking* in *Essex*," Walker continued, "to be directed in their study of Divinity, and other arts." In addition to Hooker, Stone, and Wilson, William Ames, John Yates, and the future Harvard President Charles Chauncy, were among those who studied with Richardson.[19] Richardson's lectures on dialectic and the arts circulated in manuscript until 1629, when they appeared as *The Logicians School-Master*. A subsequent 1657 edition included notes on "Physicks, Ethicks, Astronomy, Medicine, and Opticks" as well as additional material on grammar and rhetoric.[20]

Well into the early eighteenth century, Harvard students routinely bought thick blank books into which they made handwritten copies of manuscript textbooks provided by their tutors. If conscientiously undertaken, the transcription process would not only provide a student with a personal copy for

---

18. Fanshawe, Queen's remembrancer of the Exchequer, also used his influence in 1592 to secure a license to preach in the diocese of London for Richard Greenham. See Eric Josef Carlson, " 'Practical Divinity': Richard Greenham's Ministry in Elizabethan England," in *Religion and the English People 1500–1640. New Voices, New Perspectives,* ed. Eric Josef Carlson (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1998), 147–98, at 187–89.

19. George Walker, *A True Relation of the chiefe passages betweene Mr.* Anthony Wooten, *and Mr.* George Walker … (London, 1642), *Wing* W3676. On Richardson, see Roland Hall, "Richardson, Alexander (d. in or before 1629)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); John Adams, "Alexander Richardson's Philosophy of Art and the Sources of the Puritan Social Ethic," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50 (1989): 227–47; Rick Kennedy and Thomas Knoles, "Increase Mather's 'Cathechismus Logicus': A Translation and an Analysis of the Role of a Ramist Catechism at Harvard," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 109 (1999): 145–233, at 153–58; and Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 29–30.

20. *The Logicians School-Master: or, A Comment upon Ramus Logicke* (London, 1629), *NSTC* 21012; 2nd ed. (London, 1657), *Wing* R1378. Scholars at Emmanuel College were expected "to have redd through Ramus Logick," and prospective Fellows were examined on their skill in Rhetoric and Dialectic, Stubbings, *Statutes for Emmanuel*, 101, 52, 55. Almost from its founding, Emmanuel under Chaderton "became the primary stronghold of Ramism in Cambridge." Rolph, "Emmanuel College," 361.

subsequent study but also help him master—and even memorize—what the text had to say. Recent research by Rick Kennedy and Thomas and Lucia Knoles on these "student-transcribed texts" has uncovered a notable "quantity and variety" of student notebooks containing Ramist texts. But while recognizing "Ramism's intellectual authority" throughout the seventeenth-century, Kennedy and Thomas Knoles have concluded that the continuing influence of Ramist logic "may actually have had more to do with the work of Richardson," a "creative and eclectic thinker" who "criticized, adjusted, and explained Ramism in the context of Renaissance logic in general." The future Harvard President Leonard Hoar advised his freshman nephew in 1661 to organize his notes "in the method of the incomparable P. Ramus," but to let "Mr Alexander Richardson's Tables . . . be as an Ariadne's thre[a]d to you" as the nephew actually organized material under the Ramist heads.[21]

Recognizing the pervasiveness of Ramism is one thing; seeing how it affected the way early New Englanders actually looked at the world has generally been quite another. Although scholars recognized that Ramus designed his system to be intensely practical, they tend to present it as abstract and highly technical. We are told how intellectuals used Ramism to organize the curriculum, for example, or to address academic problems, but we read considerably less about how it affected everyday behavior or the way New Englanders heard the Bible preached.[22] Lisa Gordis's otherwise insightful *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* passes over "Ramism" entirely.[23] This chapter aims to correct this situation by describing how Thomas Hooker and Samuel Stone came to understand not only Scripture but also the entire natural world though the dualistic, polarizing lenses of Ramist logic and rhetoric.

---

21. Knoles and Knoles, " '*In Usum Pupillorum*': Student-Transcribed Texts at Harvard College before 1740," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 109 (1999): 333–414, at 390; Kennedy and Knoles, "Mather's '*Catechismus Logicus*,' " 154–55, "Letter of Leonard Hoar to his freshman nephew, Josiah Flynt, [London] March 27,1661," printed in Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936), 2:640–44, at 640; Thomas Knoles, "Student-Transcribed Texts at Harvard College before 1740: A Checklist," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 109 (1999): 415–72.

22. E.g., Norman S. Fiering, "President Samuel Johnson and the Circle of Knowledge," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. Ser., 28 (1971): 199–236; *William Ames: Technometry*, ed. Lee Gibbs (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979). A notable exception would be Donald McKim, "William Perkins' Use of Ramism as an Exegetical Tool," in William Perkins, *A Commentary on Hebrews 11 (1609 Edition)*, ed. John H. Augustine (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1991), 32–45.

23. Gordis, *Opening Scripture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

Following Ramus's lead, Richardson taught that there were universal "rules" which existed eternally in the mind of God. These were known to the learned as the "arts," and it was the arts which formed the core of the college curriculum. Upon completion of that curriculum, a seventeenth-century scholar would achieve the distinction of becoming a "Bachelor" of Arts. Further study enabled one to become a "Master" of Arts, licensed to teach the arts to others.

Arts could be either "special" or "general." The rules of the "special" arts, such as Music or Astronomy, applied only to their specific subjects, but the rules of the "general" arts—Logic, Grammar, and Rhetoric—held true for everything in creation. Richardson's student John Yates explained the rule of Logic like this: "God hath given man his *reason* … for some end, this end is *bene disserere*, to reason well: now for this end the facultie must exercise it selfe; and that the facultie may exercise it selfe, God hath stamped upon mans reason the rule of *Logick*, or discerning wel of euery thing that God hath made . . . so that Logicke concurring with my reason, is able to make me produce any act, directly carried unto his ende."[24]

The rules governing musical sounds, on the other hand, were specific to music; they did not apply to the movement of the heavenly bodies. But God had used the same logical principles in organizing musical sounds as in establishing the motions of the sun, moon, and stars. Through careful study, the Ramist could discover these logical principles in every part of the created world. Ramists had a particular technique for doing this, the same "rule of Method" referred to by Hooker. The rule of Method, which became the defining mark of the Ramist system, taught the investigator to analyze any subject by breaking it down into its component parts.

Ramists were confident that no object could be understood until the student had learned the rules of the art by which God had created it, and they were further convinced that these rules could still be perceived in the object. God had deliberately implanted the imprint of the rules of art in the very fabric of creation, in fact, precisely so that his rational creatures would perceive those rules. In the process of conscientiously investigating the nature of the creation, the diligent Ramist would gain some small access to the mind of the Creator.

---

24. *God's Arraignement*, 99. In Hartford, Hooker mimicked Richardson's terminology in explaining the relationship among the various arts: "*all Arts* are thus *compleat* in their *kinde*, and have a compleat sufficiency in themselves to attaine their owne end; and *yet* are truly said to be *subordinate* each to the other in their workes." SSCD II:80.

What kind of creative process did the rule of Method uncover? Richardsonian Ramists found, and preached with confident assurance, that the art of Logic had led God to create a binary reality. In bringing the world into being, God's almost unvarying tactic had been to form more complex things from just two simpler parts. The rule of Method taught students to reverse the logic of God's creative process by "dichotomizing": breaking a complex subject down into two simpler component parts, breaking those simpler parts into two yet simpler component parts, and so forth until no further dichotomy was possible. When every part had been broken down to indivisible components, the process that Richardsonian Ramists called analysis was complete. So enamored was Thomas Hooker of this process that he could assume that Jesus himself would use Ramist tools to undo the works of Satan. Christ would "analise and unravel, and undo as it were, and take in pieces that frame of wickedness which Satan had set up in the heart, and turn it up-side-down." Patrick Collinson imagines Ramist analysis proceeding "like a modern computer through a relentless series of binary division and choices." Emmanuel College students conventionally progressed through a year of rhetoric and two years of logic before turning to the study of philosophy in the fourth year.[25]

Since William Perkins, like Richardson, was a thoroughgoing Ramist, one can see the rule of Method in practice in Perkins's best-known treatise, the *Armilla Aurea*. The anonymous translator who turned the *Armilla* into the *Golden Chaine* chose not to highlight Perkin's Ramism, but a reader of the original Latin treatise will immediately see that is was carefully laid out in good Ramist fashion. Perkins's discussion of the sacraments, to take one example, proceeds to divide the subject into two parts, and those two into two, and so forth until analysis can go no further:

> Sacramenti partes sunt Symbolum, **&** Res sacramenti. Symbolum est, Materia sensibilis; **vel** Actio circa eandem. … Res Sacramenti est, **vel** Christus, & illius pro nobis gratiæ; **vel** actio circa eundem. … Actio circa Christum est Spiritualis; estque **vel** Dei, **vel** fidei. Actio Dei est, **vel** Oblatio, **vel** Applicatio Christi, & gratiarum eius fidelibus.[26]

---

25. AR 8:401; Collinson, *A History of Emmanuel College*, 75, 71.

26. *Armilla*, 213–14, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:71–72: "The parts of a Sacrament are, the signe, **and** the thing of a Sacrament. The signe, is **either** the matter sensible, **or** the action conuersant about the same. … The thing of the Sacrament, is **either** Christ and his graces which concerne our saluation, **or** the action conuersant about Christ. … The action about Christ is spirituall, and is **either** the action of God, **or** of faith. The action of God, is **either** the offering, **or** the application of Christ and his graces to the faithfull." bolding mine. In *A Godly*

Richardson claimed that the "rule of Method" allowed anyone who had mastered it to discover what today might be called the taxonomy of creation: how God had fit everything together in an orderly universe. Ramist logic removed the mystery from things by demonstrating how and for what purpose they had been made.[27] Because in the original act of creation God had moved progressively from the simple to the complex (Richardson called this genesis), it was possible by analysis to retrace God's footsteps by moving backwards from the complex to the fundamental. Analysis simply reversed the process of God's genesis.[28]

Although Ramists boasted of having improved upon the traditional logic of Aristotle, they did not abandon syllogisms. One of Samuel Stone's many arguments for infant baptism provides a typical example:

> Either Infants must be baptized, or they are Inferiour in Priveledge and dignity to the children of the faithfull in former times. *at non, Ergo. Major.* Because the seale of admission is a great dignity and Priveledge. Rom. 3.1. Eph. 2.11. Col. 2.11, 12, 13. *Minor.* Jer. 30.20. Deut. 30.6. they are in the same church and Kingdome for substance. Math. 8.11, 12. 21.43. Joh. 10.16. Eph. 3.6. Rom. 11.17, 18, 24. Isa. 61.11.[mss. 61.19.] the children of the Jewes were no losers, nor shall be losers at their returne. Mark. 10.13, 14, 16. and it is a better covenant.[29]

---

and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works, 3:28–29, 95, 241, Perkins called God's will the "Rule of goodness," urged his hearers to study the Rules of Art, especially Logic, and explained that a minister's challenge in dealing with Scripture was "diuiding the same aright." For a similar endorsement of the study of Rhetoric, see *A Clowd of Faithfvll Witnesses, Works*, 3:*93.

27. Peter Lake writes of "the inversion-ridden, dichotomizing, providence-drenched puritan world-view," *Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, 472.

28. *Logicians School-Master* (1629), 23–26. Richard A. Muller explains that "Ramus argued the ascent of the mind from the sensible to the intelligible order and from thence, by means of the divine light that shines through intelligible things, toward the divine mind itself. This ascent is accomplished by the art of dialectic which, as the one, unitary method for grasping the whole of reality and as the art of arts, serves, in effect, to draw or retrace all of the arts toward theology. The unity of all knowledge is to be found, by means of dialectic, in the ultimate source of all knowledge, God." *Thought of Jacob Arminius*, 58. Less charitably, Walter Ong calls the Ramist textbooks of the arts a genre "that proceeded by cold-blooded definition and divisions leading to still further definitions and more divisions, until every last particle of the subject had been dissected and disposed of. … If you defined and divided in the proper way, everything in the art was completely self-evident and the art itself was complete and self-contained." *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (New York: Methuen, 1982), 134.

29. WB 537.

Stone lays out the argument, states that the children of Christian parents of his day are not "inferiour in Priveledge and dignity" (*at non*), identifies the major and minor premises, reaches (*Ergo*) his conclusion, and provides supporting biblical references. Such syllogisms occur throughout his work, as they do in Hooker's polemical writing.

Because it was far simpler to keep track of the stages of dichotomizing with some kind of visual aid, Ramists used charts to assist readers in following their taxonomy. The presence of a dichotomizing chart—one which broke the treatise's subject by two's into ever smaller parts—at the beginning of a treatise is an almost certain indication that the writer was a Ramist.[30]

But it would be misleading to presume that a Ramist's primary goal was either theoretical knowledge of the creation or even worshipful penetration into the mind of the Creator. The rules of art were practical. Once God had formed one of his creatures according to specific rules, God intended the creature to live by those rules.

Rules were practical because they governed everyday behavior. Richardsonian Ramists used an anglicized noun derived from the Greek eupraxis, "well doing," and spoke of the "eupraxy" of every creature. A creature's eupraxy was the way of living that would enable it to reach its full potential. For humans, "well doing" was the secret to happiness. "Their Eupraxy, well acting and working," said Samuel Stone, "is their felicity." Stone traced the notion back through Richardson and Ramus to Aristotle. "The Philosopher saith," he wrote, "that happinesse is the operation of the best Vertues of the Reasonable Soule."[31] Each of the arts also had its eupraxy, "well-speaking" for rhetoric, for example, or "well-dissecting" (i.e., analyzing) for logic or "dialectic." Only by respecting that eupraxy could a student "practice" an art successfully.

The highest, most exalted art in the Ramist system would then be the one whose rules enabled God's noblest creatures, men and women, not simply to speak well, or to reason well, but to live well, to achieve their eupraxy. That art

---

30. See the larger chart at the beginning of SSCD, as well as the smaller charts, which occur periodically within the text. There are Ramist charts in Miscellanea 389, 390, 391, 405. Ames's *Medulla* contains such a chart; had Stone's *Whole Body* been published, it would surely have been prefaced by a Ramist chart as well. Dudley Fenner's early Ramist *Sacra Theologia* (n. p., 1585), *NSTC* 10773.5, does not contain an opening chart, but graphic representations of Ramist dichotomies appear on nearly every page. Walter Ong finds "a drive toward thinking not only of the universe but of thought itself in terms of spatial models apprehended by sight" to be a defining characteristic of Ramist logic. Walter J. Ong, S.J., *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958), 9.

31. WB 371–72, see also 17.

was Divinity (*Theologia*). As John Yates explained it, "God hath given man a will, this wil of man is for an end, this end is *to please his Creator*; that he may please his creator, he must be doing of *good*, & that he may do good, he must attend unto *diuinity*, the rule that God hath giuen him to bring him to this ende." Samuel Stone began his *Whole Body* by describing Divinity not only as "the Rule whereby a man is to be guided to his last end" but also as a "platform of *living well*, which hath bin in the mind of God from all Eternity."

Just as all arts by their nature were comprised of a body of basic precepts from which concrete applications could be derived, Divinity consisted of "a body of Divine and truest Principles, from whence; all other truths are derived, and those derived Truths are true, so far forth as they agree with these Principals and fundamentals." Just as one succeeded at Logic and Rhetoric by learning and following their basic precepts, so humans achieved their highest purpose *in life*, by "holding correspondence ... [in] acting and working" to "this Divine Art."[32]

As if to emphasize the fundamentally practical nature of the Rule of Divinity, Richardsonian Ramists stressed that it made its demands on the human will. Given their respect for logic, one might imagine that they would have expected God to appeal primarily to human reason, the faculty then known as the "understanding." The understanding was critical to Richardson's system; reason had truth as its proper goal and logic as its proper art. Without reason, none of the other arts could be apprehended or understood.

But truth was never the highest human goal, and it was well-known that devils often used reason for corrupt purposes. No, since God was the proper goal of the Rule of Divinity, its "principal subject" could only be that human faculty which had the good as its proper goal: the will. In fact, both Hooker and Stone considered the will the "noblest" human faculty, the "Queen" of the intellect and the affections, the "first mover" of all human works.[33] In a typical Ramist progression, Stone could explain that all other creatures existed for the sake of humans; the human body existed for the soul (home of understanding and will); the understanding existed for the will, and the will existed for God. It was not enough to know and understand the Rule. The will, "the noblest faculty, the most sovereign faculty, that hath the casting voice," had to choose to obey it.

---

32. Yates, *Gods Arraignement*, 99, WB 1; emphasis added.

33. For the primacy of will over understanding, WB 392: "The will of man is the great wheele, the first mover and commander of all the faculties." "SP 31: "The understanding is like the counselors, and the will is the Queene." Cf. SP 123; CTCL 11; UP *57. "A man may Reason well for a corrupt end," explained Stone, WB 3.

To live well, to follow the Rule of Divinity, was to "will the will of God." As Stone taught, with appropriate scriptural citations, the human will had to "own" the will of God, "suit with it, approve it, and consent to it, as most suitable for itself"; "chuse it"; "subordinate all … other ends to this end"; "apply itself to it; and set all the other faculties on worke to do it." To live well was to will what God had set down in the Rule of Divinity: to "own" the Rule by a deliberate choice as appropriate for one's life, to subordinate all other goals it, and to apply oneself to follow it.[34]

In twenty-first-century language, the ultimate challenge posed by Divinity was not to discover the purpose of life. God had already made that purpose plain. As Thomas Hooker said of the scribes and Pharisees, "the way of life was chalked out before them."[35] The challenge was to choose, to "will," what one already knew to be good, to live by following the "Body of divine and truest principles" in the Rule. God had made his will known in the "Rules of highest Wisdom." "When a man acts according to these Rules, he imitates God, and pleaseth him." Extreme Augustinians saw the will as the principal battleground between selfish pride and submission to God; Ramism reinforced Augustinianism.

If God had made his purpose plain in the Rule of Divinity, how did human beings come to know it? In the first days of creation, in the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve had known it. They had each been given an inherent capacity to learn the arts, and they could have perfected their inborn knowledge by repeated observation. But Adam and Eve had chosen to disobey God's Rule and had fallen from their original nobility. After the "Fall," the principles of the art of Divinity had been "oblitterated and blotted out." Humans could no longer learn Divinity on their own; they would need divine guidance. "God only" was able "to teach this art"; Divinity's precepts would have to be revealed.[36] In heaven, the saints would recover all of Adam's lost knowledge. "The saints shall discern all the Rules of Inferiour Arts, and all the Rules of Divinity conteined in Scripture, in a most perfect manner, without the least Errour or doubting."[37]

One might assume that Hooker and Stone, as good Protestants, would at this point in their argument simply have pointed to the Bible as the place where God taught Christians the rules by which to live. Hooker and Stone

34. WB 2, 3, 36, 370, 373, 392, 436; see also UP *56, 57; Miscellanea 387.

35. TGS 29, see also 136.

36. WB 1; see also CCLP 398.

37. WB 368, 382; see also 385.

were good Protestants; they did look for God's will in the Bible; and they certainly believed that the Rule of Divinity was revealed in its pages. Was the "Rule" then simply a synonym for the "Law," that portion of the body of legal precepts contained in the Old and New Testaments that remained binding on Christians?

The two concepts certainly overlapped, to the point that Stone could describe the Law as "a Rule of closing with God as the Chiefest good."[38] The coming of the Messiah had made precepts governing dietary practices and temple ceremonies null and void, but the many "moral" commandments in the Hebrew Scriptures remained very much in effect, and to them could be added any number of precepts from the New Testament writers. All these were conventionally grouped together in expansive treatments of the obligations represented by the Ten Commandments. Hooker and Stone certainly believed that the Bible contained that "Body of Divine and truest principles" that together constituted Divinity, and they had no hesitation in directing to those commandments anyone seeking to learn how to live.

But the Rule of Divinity was by no means identical to the Scriptures. As an "idea," a "platform," a "pattern, a "plot" in the mind of God, the Rule of Divinity predated the written word.[39] Before the Fall and long before the Bible, Adam had had the capacity to discern and follow the Rule. God's Church, organized according to God's Rule, existed well before the written Scriptures. Theologians erred, argued Stone, when they began Divinity with a discussion of the written word of God, because the Rule antedated the Scriptures.[40]

This meant that logically as well as chronologically, the Scriptures were derivative. Their concrete data were totally reliable, but theologians still needed to use the art of logic to "progress" from that data to the general principles implied by them. To take an example, in a discussion of the work of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of sinners, Stone drew out the implications of a text in the following manner:

> God the Father presents Christ in the Gospell as sent from himself; he saves poor Sinners. Joh. 12.44, 45. *which commission implies.*
>
> 1. That Christ is the subject of his plot . . .
>
> 2. That God the Father is the fountain, and first mover of Christ . . .

---

38. WB 339.

39. WB 31, 278, 283, 291; see also Yates, *Gods Arraignement,* 109: "in God there is first of all the *Idea* and plat-forme of all things. … and these may well be called *Gods plots,* which he hath formed and fashioned in himselfe."

40. WB 96–97, 392, 284, 291.

3. That he hath received instructions from the Father to call sinners, sick of Sin . . .

4. That God the Father is exceeding willing to embrace him [the sinner], and that he should close with Christ. . . . Because it is his own plot, and makes exceedingly for his glory, he delights in Christ the subject of his plot, above all other things.[41]

None of these deductions is absurd, and several were buttressed with other scriptural texts, but the fact remains that Stone used the "rule of Logick" to discover implications that took him beyond the literal meaning of his original text. Richardson had recognized that one contribution of analysis could be "*hermineutica*, or *interpretativa*," and here and in many other instances Stone used Ramist deduction as a hermeneutical method that was anything but biblical literalism. "In the word," said Hooker, "a thing may be said to be found two wayes: either in the letter, or included in the sense." By "included in the sense," Hooker meant "what ever by the strength of the Rule, or rationall inference can be brought out of the Scripture by necessary circumstance." Similarly, Stone explained that "Syllogisticall Judgement" was the process "whereby the understanding draws conclusions from Principles, and one truth from another."[42] Evidence to support a "truth" need not come from an explicit biblical text so long as it could be deduced logically from a biblical "Principle." Undergirding the Bible lay its foundation, the Rule.

Further, both Hooker and Stone confidently described divine activities which the Bible did not contain. For example, the Bible was largely silent about God's state of mind before the creation. But in their discussions of predestination, Stone, Hooker, and their contemporaries believed it was possible to deduce the very logic which God had used to formulate the entire plot for the drama of creation. They hotly debated the *signa rationis*, the logical stages through which God's thinking must have passed. Had God first created human beings and only then determined to redeem them, or was the plot first fully formed and the world only then "framed to bring this plot about?" The latter. Did God's decision to become incarnate occur only after God had decreed to predestine some humans to salvation? Yes.[43] Part of God's plot included a pact between the Father and the Son—the Covenant of Redemption—that was nowhere explicitly described in the Bible. "Logicke" appeared to require that such a covenant have

---

41. WB 346; emphasis added.

42. CGO 63, see also 74; WB 379.

43. WB 352, see also 243–44; WB 334; see also 346; WB, 183.

taken place before anything was created: the Father chose to save some—but not all—of the humans he was about to create; the Son agreed to carry out that decision.[44]

In this as in other instances, Stone read the written words of the Bible through the glasses of the Ramist "rule of Method." Alexander Richardson had argued that in every art there was a progression from the simple to the complex. "Naturall Philosophy," for example, began "first … with simple natures, then with composites, first with those that are without life, then those that live, first a simple life, secondly those that live a composite life."[45] As a human being, Richardson himself was constructed this way: "as to make up me, there goes a soule and a body, and of the formes of the foure elements [earth, air, fire, water] is the forme of my body made, and of their matter the matter of my bodie made: now the elements are firstly there, as making my body, and secondly my body in me, as a part in me." So, too, in the creation of the world, God was bound to follow the principles of his own art: "first he made a first matter, then the first formes, and then mists that had their complements, and did differ from one another, then they had names, and were ranked under generall heads, as a part to a whole, &c."[46]

Since God had had no choice but to follow the principles of his own art, Stone simply used the "Rule of Method" to make those principles explicit. His long account of creation begins with the four elements, then simple natures, then composites, then moves from inanimate to living objects, and then through progressively more complex forms of life until humans culminate the process. Ramist philosophy elucidated scriptural truth. To give one example of countless others from the *Whole Body*, here is Stone's description of the "higher elements" of fire and air (as opposed to the "lower elements" of earth and water).

Q. What are the Hygher Elements?	**Superiora sunt quorum**
A. Those Elements whose	**formae activæ.**
formes are most active,	**1o. Subtiliores**
which are enclined to ascend.	**2o. Largiores**
Gen. 1.3, to 19. Am. 9.6.	**3o. Leviores.**

---

44. WB 182–83; SDD 30; see also SEx 249, 257, 287; SEC 332; PP 5.

45. *Logicians School-Master*, 24.

46. Ibid., 64.

Expl: These have more noble and active formes then the other; and therefore are more active, operative, and shining then the other, which are more dull: God here proceeds from things more perfect to things lesse perfect. Hence it is that these are.

1. More Subtle, the matter being extended by the forme.

2. More large and capacious.

3. More light and enclined to ascend upwards towards heaven, therefore called Ascents, Am. 9.6.[47]

Stone cites Amos in support of his Ramist contention that fire and air are "more perfect" than earth and water and "inclined to ascend upwards," conclusions that might have surprised the prophet.

As had Hooker, Stone used terms that sound almost mystical to describe what he believed to be the ultimate purpose of human life: submission to God's Rule. At times Stone could speak of the Rule as almost indistinguishable from God himself: "He that is joyned to the Rule, and God, whose heart is made one with him, he is of a distance from sin, and an Enemy to it, as God is." At other times Rule/Law appears as the bridge between finite humans and their infinite creator. Through "Obedience to the Law," he explained, a Christian "closeth with the Infinite fullness of goodness in God, or with goodness itselfe." The obedient person would be "carried above all created finite goodness, to the Infinite Son of Increated goodness in God, which is the object of Gods own love." "The vast boundless desires of the soule were made for him as their end," he continued, "and when the whole streame of our desires is carried in this channel, and stay not till they come at the sea and ocean of all goodness, and rest there, that is obedience to the Law." A person reached her "felicity, without which heaven itself could not make anyone happy," when the will met with God "in every act of obedience." "They who obey," he concluded, "have their conversation in heaven, they live by the same rule by which the saints live in heaven, Math. 6. and

---

47. Stone's creation account occupies pages 37 to 100 of the *Whole Body*. This example occurs on pages 63–64. Richard Muller explains that "the Reformed orthodox understood the text of Scripture as providing *prinicipia* or *axiomata* from which conclusions could be deduced," " 'Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy," *Calvin Theological Journal* 30 (1995): 345–75 and 31 (1996): 125–60, at 368.

apply themselves to the God of Heaven in every act."[48] Just as God's glory was more perfectly expressed in morality than beauty, so his human creatures would achieve happiness through perfect submission to God's Rule.

The conviction that an eternal Rule lay behind the written words of the Bible, so that Stone read the written words of the Bible through the glasses of the Ramist "rule of Method," had an enormous impact on Ramist hermeneutics. In discussing "the Speciall helpes to be used for the Interpretation of Scriptures," Stone explained that conscientious attention to the sense of the words would not suffice. Those who wished to understand the Bible's meaning first needed to be "grounded in the great articles of faith, and pillar principles of Divinity." As they read, he and his colleagues would have had to have "a sight and Idea of the briefe heads of Divinity before our Eyes." Just as merchants had "severall boxes, or holes wherein they put their severall sorts of money," interpreters of Scripture needed to keep "the great heads or Rules of Art" in mind. "The right understanding of those heads," Stone asserted, would be "a speciall help, to the understanding and Judging of the meaning of scripture." As an interpreter came upon what appeared to be a specific "rule," she would determine "what head they are to be referred to, in what box they are conteined." The idea that biblical passages ought to be sorted into various "boxes" could lead one to conclude that Stone privileged the logic of theology over biblical narrative. The conclusion would appear to be justified. At the end of this discussion Stone made his assumptions explicit: an interpretation that "crosseth any of the great Principles of Divinity must not be admitted."[49]

Stone believed that he was simply following the example of the Apostle Paul. "In clearing the depths of the Gospell," Stone explained, "the Apostles Reason concludes syllogistically." When Paul wrote (Rom. 3:28) "therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," he used

---

48. WB 366; 397–98.

49. WB 311. In his discussion of Perkins's Ramism, Donald McKim concludes that "the [Ramist] system was more than just classificatory logic when applied to biblical interpretation. It was an attempt to perceive the logical plan in the mind of God that expressed itself through the flow of the scriptural material. If this plan were to be uncovered, it could therefore also reveal the true hermeneutics for scriptural interpretation. The exact meaning of a text could be ascertained if the procedure used was able to uncover the mind of God behind the text." "William Perkins' Use of Ramism as an Exegetical Tool," 40. See also McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins' Theology* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987). Patrick Collinson writes that for Perkins and others in the post-Calvin generation, the Bible was "not so much a collection of salvation stories as a technical handbook to be interpreted with the aid of the schematic tools provided by the French logician Peter Ramus." *The Reformation: A History*, 138.

the Greek word *logidzómetha* to mean, "wee conclude by Reason and argument, inferring one thing out of another."[50]

How did such a hermeneutical principle work in practice? In *A Clowd of Faithfull Witnesses*, his commentary on Hebrews 11, William Perkins offered a striking example. Verse 32 presented a list of faithful Hebrews: Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah (Iephte in Perkins's Bible), David, Samuel, and the Prophets. In discussing Jephthah, Perkins referred to the well-known story of Jephthah's daughter in Judges 11:30–40. Jephthah vowed that should the Lord grant him victory over the Ammonites, "whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me . . . shall surely be the LORD's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering." Horrifically, that first thing was his daughter. After wandering "up and down the mountains" for a two-month period of mourning, "she returned unto her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed."

Despite what seemed the clear intent of the text, Perkins was sure that "their opinion is not true, who hold that *Iephte* sacrificed and killed his owne daughter." The God Perkins knew through the Ramist rule of Method "would neuer accept of such a vowe." Had Jephthah done such a terrible thing, the author of the Letter to the Hebrews would never have commended him for his faith. Aware of this, a conscientious interpreter would retranslate the passage in Judges to mean that Jephthah offered his daughter to the Lord to live as a Nazarite. "This may no way bee admitted," concluded Perkins, "that beleeuing and godly *Iephte* should aduisedly kill his own daughter."[51] A twenty-first-century reader may admire Perkins's compassion while questioning his hermeneutical principles. Theological categories have trumped the biblical narrative. The rough edge of the biblical witness has been sanded down.[52]

---

50. WB 366.

51. *Works*, 3:*174. Stone followed Perkins's logic. "Wee must not think that . . . Jeptha did sacrifice his daughter, but rather gave her to the Lord, consecrated her to perpetual Virginity." WB 311. For the way other contemporaries understood Jephthah's daughter see Nicholas Cranfield, "Moral Tales at the Hearth: Jephthah's Daughter in the Seventeenth Century," in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, ed. Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 58–73. Cranfield focuses on a social pattern of a male-dominated hierarchy in which the woman is punished for daring to come out of the house without the due permission of her father, 58–59. Later Jewish tradition took for granted that Jephthah had sacrificed his daughter, see Phyllis Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 93–116.

52. Without referring directly to Ramism, Peter Lake notes how religious and social authorities were "unable to conceive of or talk about change or conflict except in terms of the simple

Syllogisms were vital in meditation as well as biblical interpretation. In taking stock of one's own behavior, one would discover the "truth" of one's behavior, how it measured up to God's expectations, by "syllogismes" that measured particular actions against general standards. "Examination stands," wrote Stone, "in taking the rule, and making application."[53]

Ramist insistence that all reality could be dichotomized could easily lead to oversimplification. Among the many syllogisms in his private commonplace book, Thomas Hooker included the following:

> In the first work of conversion the sinner is merely patient, he is drawn . . .
>
> but in believing he is not a mere patient he goes, or comes to Christ,
>
> ergo faythe is not the first work of conversion. Ergo some work not belonging to a reprobate before faith,
>
> 1. That a naturall man is wholly possessed by infidelity, & swayed with it
>
> 2 That infidelity and faith are contraryes
>
> 3 It's the nature of contraryes . . . that both cannot at once be attributed to the subject. . . . Whence:
>
> If infidelity must be removed in order of nature before faith be infused: then ther is a preparation made before faith be infused but infidelity must in order of nature be removed: ergo.[54]

Hooker was to build his preaching career on these simple syllogisms, developing a concept of "preparation" before faith that puzzled some of his godly contemporaries. Yet a twenty-first-century reader can be forgiven for wondering if there might not be some grey between the black and white. Did Hooker's logic allow room for the father of the demon-possessed child, who "cried out, and said with tears, 'Lord, I believe; help thou my unbelief' "? (Mark 9:24) Would Luther's *simul justus ac peccator* have been amenable to such syllogisms? Ramist logic even constrained God himself. Near the end of his life,

---

binary oppositions between order and disorder, vice and virtue, Christ and Antichrist, orthodoxy and heresy, loyalty and treason, and the denunciatory language of sin and disorder, moral decline and divine punishment that those binaries inevitably trailed in their wake." *Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, xxvi.

53. WB 366. Stone characterized the ungodly person, on the contrary, as "not willing the truth should appear and go to the bottom of it, but is afraid to dispute with his superiours, he is afraid of syllogismes." "Superiours" would presumably include the godly minister.

54. *Miscellanea*, 393–94.

Hooker told his Hartford congregation that "the rule of right reason is a beam of Gods blessed Wisdom, which he can no more Cross, then in truth he can be Cross or contrary to himself."[55]

Far from placing limits on extreme Augustinianism, Richardsonian Ramism reinforced it. It gave its adherents breathtaking epistemological confidence that they could delve into the mind of God. Not only could they recover the logic that God had used in creation, but they could also probe to a point before creation to understand the nature of his decree to elect and to reprobate. God's decision to divide the human race in two fit trimly in a binary world. Since biblical narrative had to be understood through "the great Principles of Divinity," any passage that appeared to question God's eternal double decree could be reinterpreted to support it. If God's division of the human race into elect and reprobate seemed arbitrary, Hooker could assert that "His own will is the Rule of all this, and there is no other Reason to be rendered."[56]

Lutheran critics would even question whether Richardsonian Ramists did not inadvertently denigrate the very Gospel they were claiming to uphold. If it was "Obedience to the Law ... whereby a man closeth with the Infinite full-ness or goodness in God," did the Christ and the Gospel become little more than a device to mend a tear in the Law? Did submission to the Law remain the primary route to salvation? Hooker and Stone took for granted that the obedience of the saints would remain imperfect: "a godly man hath something in him crosse to every Rule of the Law of God." On earth, one would never outgrow the need for divine forgiveness. But it could still be asked whether Christ had actually displaced the Law in their system, or whether he merely helped penitent sinners get back on the only real road to God, obedience to his Rule?[57] When Anne Hutchinson accused John Wilson, her Pastor in Boston's

---

55. CCLP 399.

56. AR 4:230. Walter Ong wrote of Ramism's "curiously amateurish cast," which did "not repress the crude conceptualizing tendencies which more astutely controlled philosophies block or disguise." *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*, 8. It would be interesting to explore whether Ramism intensified the Manichean tendencies which Julian of Eclanum claimed to see in extreme Augustinianism.

57. WB 365, see also Perkins, *A Graine of Musterd-seede, Works*, 1:641: "if men endeauour to please God in all things, God will not iudge their doings by the rigour of his law: but will accept their little and weake endeauour, to doe that which they can doe by his grace, as if they had perfectly fulfilled the law." Lutherans in particular would find statements such as these confirming their suspicions that Reformed theologians often subordinated the Gospel to the Law. In a book designed for a popular audience, the Lutheran scholar Gerhard O. Forde satirizes this position as follows: "We begin by assuming the law is a ladder to heaven. Then we go on to say, 'Of course, no one can climb the ladder, because we are all weakened by sin. We are all therefore guilty and lost'. And this is where 'the gospel' is to enter the picture. What

First Church, of preaching a "covenant of works," might she have been detecting Wilson's Richardsonian Ramist hermeneutics?

No one approaches a text with an absolutely blank brain; preconceived notions of human (and in the case of the Bible, divine) behavior cannot help but influence what that text means to any individual reader. But by making it a virtue to fit scriptural texts into well-defined theological categories, Ramist hermeneutics virtually guaranteed that preaching in early Hartford would reinforce, not challenge, the extreme Augustinianism of Reformed orthodoxy.

---

we need is someone to pay our debt to God and to climb the ladder for us. This, supposedly, is what Jesus has done. As our 'substitute' he has paid off God and climbed the ladder for us. All we have to do now is 'believe' it. But what have we done when we understand the gospel in this way? We have, in fact, interpreted the gospel merely as something that makes the ladder scheme work. The gospel comes to make up for the deficiencies of the law. The gospel does not come as anything really new. It is not the breaking in of a radically new age with an entirely new outlook. It is simply "a repair job.' It merely fixes up the old where it had broken down." *Where God Meets Man: Luther's Down-to-Earth Approach to the Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 10–11.

8

Preaching the Gospel in Chelmsford and Hartford

THE LAST THREE chapters have explored how the Augustinian tradition, informed by Richardsonian Ramism, shaped the doctrine of Hooker and Stone. But how did it shape their preaching? Augustine had taught that a fallen human being would want to do God's will only after God had "framed" or "prepared" her heart. But how did God frame the heart? How, in their own life histories, did individual human beings find their wills changed? How did they come to believe God's good intentions for them? If individuals were powerless to prepare themselves, what "means" did God use to prepare them? What was the preacher's role in that framing?

Hooker and Stone certainly imagined that God could do whatever God wanted, but they were also sure that in the vast majority of cases the "means" of preparation was preaching. As Perkins had put it, "The onely ordinarie means to attaine faith by, is the word preached."[1] Preachers were God's human agents; preachers prepared hearts through spoken words from the pulpit.

Much attention has recently been directed to the early modern English sermon as a particular "genre" (*Form*) with its own particular "life-setting" (*Sitz im Leben*).[2] To understand Hooker's preaching, one must first remember that

---

1. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:363, see also 256. Perkins did allow that in extreme circumstances, the Holy Spirit might touch the heart when the Gospel was merely read aloud: *Evangelium narratum, & recitatum, eiusque percepto vel sono extra ordinem efficax est ope spiritus sancti, Armilla Aurea* 210, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:71.

2. The terms derive from biblical *Formgeschichte*. From the growing literature on early modern English preaching, I would single out Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*

his sermons were not academic lectures. Although he often included a "use of instruction" toward the end of a sermon, conveying information was never his primary goal. Scholars who attempt to construct a "morphology of conversion" from the printed versions of his successive lectures tend to overlook the fact that many hearers, in town for market day, would not have been present for an entire lecture series.[3] Let us imagine the "life-setting" for one of Hooker's lectures.

Just as the town fathers of Chelmsford had hoped, a Thomas Hooker lecture drew a crowd to St. Mary's church. The curious and skeptical took their seats alongside the godly, everyone eager to see and hear him in action. Once inside the church, most hearers fell under the spell of his rhetoric.[4] According to Cotton Mather, Hooker's friend William Ames remarked that "though he had been acquainted with many scholars of divers nations, yet he never met with Mr. *Hooker's* equal, either for preaching or for disputing." Perry Miller, no fan of evangelical preaching, knew good prose when he read it; in Miller's judgment, Hooker's "literary genius" could stand alongside that of John Donne.[5]

So imagine yourself transported back to the England of the late 1620s, back to St. Mary's Church at Chelmsford. Hooker is in the pulpit. His voice darkens as he nears the end of his description of the fate of an unrepentant sinner.

> when conscience hath done this last work, and performed his office of execution,
> when he hath condemned a soule, and delivered a sinner into the hand of the
> executioner,
> then it is thus with this sinner;
> after all mercies and cords of love will do no good,
> after the commands and accusations will not prevaile,

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Ian Green, "Orality, Script and Print: The Case of the English Sermon c. 1530–1700," in *Religion and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700*, ed. Heinz Schilling and Istvan Gyorgy Toth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 236–55; and the contributions in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

3. Following Edmund Morgan's lead, Norman Pettit was among the first to construct such a morphology in *The Heart Prepared*.

4. Apart from a few cryptic sermon notes from the Windsor, Connecticut, Congregational Church records, now in the New York Historical Society, and the notes Henry Wolcott took when Stone was lecturing on the topics in his *Whole Body*, I have found no text of a sermon by Samuel Stone.

5. *Piscator Evangelicus* 21 {*Magnalia* 1:308}; Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*, 335.

> *then conscience sayes, come damned ghosts, take away this drunkard,*
>   *this blasphemer,*
>   *this adulterer,*
>   *this contemner of my word,*
> *and throw him headlong into the pit of everlasting destruction;*
> *he would not be amended, let him be condemned;*
> *he would not be humbled, let him therefore he damned.*[6]

Perhaps his audience reacts with stunned silence, perhaps with groans. Perhaps men and women cry aloud, as we know they did at some of his other sermons. What was he trying to accomplish?

In his lectures to Cambridge students on the Apostles' Creed, William Perkins had boiled the goal of godly preaching down to a single sentence: "Every minister of Gods word, and every one that intendeth to take upon him that Calling, must propound unto himselfe principally this end, to single out man from man, and gather out of this world such as belong to the Church of Christ."[7]

It was during sermons, Perkins knew, that God's eternal decree broke into human history. With this in mind, Hooker could preach on a text like Revelation 3.20—"Behold I stand at the doore and knocke, if any man heare my voyce, and open the doore, I will come in to him"—by explaining that "the Lord knockes this day, and will come and knocke againe the next Sabbath, and the next, the next Lecture, and the next opportunity, *when the minister comes God comes, when he perswades God perswades, when hee threatens God threatens, when he reprooves God reprooves.*"[8] God spoke through the minister's speech,

---

6. UP *54–55; see also SDD 244. I have reformatted the text but preserved the words in the order that Hooker probably spoke them.

7. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:256; see also *A Treatise of Gods Free Grace, Works,* 1:727; and *Of the Calling of the Ministerie, Two Treatises, Works,* 3:*442, 453–54. Eamon Duffy contends that the core preoccupation of godly ministers in Stuart England was "the urgent necessity of saving the multitude" and "awakening the sinner to his need for grace and conversion." "The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the Multitude," in *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800,* ed. Nicholas Tyacke (London: UCL Press, 1997), 33–70, at 41–42. Perkins's most important discussion of preaching was his *Prophetica, sive de Sacra et Unica Ratione Concionandi Tractatus* (London, 1592), *NSTC* 19735. The fact that this extraordinarily influential treatise was not translated into English until 1607 (by Thomas Tuke as *The Arte of Prophecying: or a Treatise concerning the sacred and onely true manner and methode of Preaching, NSTC* 19735.4) reminds us that divinity students learned Latin and communicated in it with colleagues all over Europe well into the seventeenth century. Tuke's translation is in *Works,* 2:646–73.

8. UP 27; emphasis added.

and each auditor responded. Each person's response, over time, would make God's ultimate will toward him or her known. Granted that the division of the human race into elect and reprobate had occurred before time began, it was still the case that only as hearers responded to sermons would the effects of God's eternal decree be revealed. Occasionally in an instant, but much more commonly over repeated hearings, God used the medium of the preached word to soften or harden the hearts of those who heard it.[9]

As scholars devote sustained attention to the genre of preaching, they discover that an effective sermon is meant to draw its hearers into a countercultural world, one that challenges the taken-for-grantedness of the world those hearers ordinarily inhabit. Like compelling drama, a sermon will entice hearers into a way of being in which their common-sense assumptions about human behavior may not always apply. But unlike a play, which the audience knows to be "fiction" even if its deepest insights are felt to be fundamentally true, the sermon claims to set aside the apparent reality of quotidian existence and to present the world as it will prove to be when hearers cease to "see through a glass darkly."

As good Protestants, Perkins and Hooker knew that the "real world" was laid out in the pages of scripture. Every time he stepped into the pulpit, the preacher faced the challenge of presenting that biblical world so clearly and compellingly that a hearer could "both comprehend it and shape his life in accordance with it."[10] As Hooker preached, he brought into being a world created by that "external word," a world that stood over against what his hearers took for granted.

What else can be said about the "life-setting" of Hooker's preaching? We know that his lectures were not homilies delivered during the Sunday morning services of *The Book of Common Prayer*; they were distinct presentations given on lecture days (originally the "fair days" of May 1 and November 1 and the first Friday of the other ten months).[11] No liturgy set his message in a

---

9. See Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 168. In Hartford, Hooker opined that it was "a shrewd suspicion" that God would send "down to Hell" anyone exposed to "a plain and powerful Ministery" for half a dozen years or longer without profit, AR 3:219–20. Perkins had told his students that "howsoeuer we may not iudge of any mans person, yet this may be said, that if men refuse to heare the worde of God when they may, or if in hearing they will not obey, it is a fearefull signe that God will at length destroy them." *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:274.

10. The phrases are Hans Frei's, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 3, 24.

11. Grieve, *Chelmsford*, 2:37. Hooker's appointment included the responsibility to serve as curate to the rector, John Michaelson, but he was not prepared to preside at the worship

broader context. A century earlier, visual imagery—a rood (crucifixion) screen surmounted by a sculpture of the rood, walls painted with biblical scenes such as the Last Judgment—might have reinforced his message, but that imagery had long ago been ripped down, whitewashed, or burned by Edwardian and Elizabethan reformers.[12] In the final years of his life, Hooker would preach inside the bare walls of the Hartford meeting house.

Most important, godly hearers were convinced that the minister was not alone in his pulpit. If they listened carefully, they could sense God's presence in the preacher's speech. William Perkins had a term for this: *demonstratio spiritus*. Hearers could not only imagine God speaking to their minds and hearts through the preached word, they could actually sense the Spirit working, "soaking in" the preacher's words.[13] In less theologically freighted language, one could say that it was the preacher's role to create the medium through which God's "voice" could be heard.

In a world in transition from an oral culture to a culture of print, spoken words were thought to have a power that lasted well beyond their utterance. Hateful speech was believed to cause physical harm; court records are full of accounts of townspeople dragging their neighbors into court for name-calling and slander. So it was not difficult for godly preachers to convince their hearers that the words of their sermons brought God himself—not just God's message—into their hearts, just as did the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. Nor was it difficult, as they pondered those words "all the weeke after," for hearers to imagine the Holy Spirit working through the remembered words to reorient their lives.

If God had so wished, Hooker and his colleagues assumed, he could have given every elect man and woman a direct, personal, "immediate"

---

services of *The Book of Common Prayer*. It was his lecture-series, based on single texts, that found their way into print.

12. St. Mary's was not entirely bereft of iconography. Most likely because the parish had not wanted to take on the cost of the reglazing, its stained glass windows had survived. While Hooker preached, his hearers would have gazed behind him to the great east window, painted with the history of Christ from his conception to his ascension and decorated with the arms of local noble and gentry families. "Untouched from the first foundation of the church," the window would last another decade before being smashed by iconoclasts in 1641. For the survival of stained glass till the 1640s, see Walsham, *Reformation of the Landscape*, 113. For the smashing of St. Mary's windows, see John Walter, "'Abolishing Superstition with Sedition'? The Politics of Popular Iconoclasm in England, 1640–1642," *Past and Present* 183 (2004): 79–123, at 79.

13. *Demonstratio spiritus est, quùm minister verbi inter concionandum ita se gerit, ut noti tam eum, quàm Spiritum Dei in eo, & per eum loqui, omnes etiam idiotæ & infideles judicent. Prophetica*, 113, *Works*, 2:670. Godly writers also spoke of God's "setting in" the message on

communication of his decision to save them. By the mid-eighteenth century, many evangelical Protestants had come to believe that the Holy Spirit would do exactly that.[14] Even in Hooker's day there were "enthusiasts" who imagined such "immediate" revelations.

But Hooker's God would do no such thing. He had chosen to communicate "mediately," through the medium of the spoken word.[15] "In every promise of God," said Hooker, "there is the spirit of grace truly and constantly, accompanying the same." When a believer could "close" with the promise, she "closeth also with the grace in the promise." By "laying hold upon the *promises*," he explained, "we close with the *Spirit*."[16]

This meant that the words of the Bible, and the preacher's expounding of them, were the "means" through which people heard God's voice. "The language of the Spirit" was "nothing else but the tenour of those gracious promises, which God hath made to poor humbled sinners."[17] When God wished to speak to his people, he would do so through the words of his canonical scriptures as expounded in sermons. "Whatsoever any faithful Minister shall speak out of the Word, that is also the voice of Christ. … That which the Ministers of God speak, the God of Heaven himself speaks." If God had a message for a particular hearer, he would convey it to her inmost self by driving home what the preacher said. The Spirit worked like a hearing aid, amplifying and intensifying the preachers' sermon. "Looke for no strange

---

a hearer's mind and heart; during a sermon John Rogers of Dedham preached at a marriage ceremony, Oliver Heywood related how "God did so set in with the word." *Life of Angier*, 6.

14. For an exploratory attempt to differentiate the expectations for conversion of Puritans like Hooker and Stone from later Pietists, see Baird Tipson, "How Can the Religious Experience of the Part Be Recovered? The Examples of Puritanism and Pietism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 43 (1975): 695–707.

15. I write here of the communication of intellectual content. If one were to include emotional content, one would immediately broaden the means of communication to include "conference with fellow Christians; public worship, in particular receiving the Lord s Supper; and domestic or private prayer and meditation." See Alec Ryrie, "Hearing God s Voice in the English and Scottish Reformations, "*Reformation* 17 (2012): 49–74, at 51; and *Being Protestant*, chs. 5–10, 13–14. Godly preachers were of more than one mind about whether the Spirit might first "speak" through the word read privately rather than heard publically. Stone's emphasis on the Rule existing before and in some sense "above" the Scriptures appears to have led him to be more open to God's taking initial action outside of preaching, but both Stone and Hooker assumed that sermons would be the ordinary means through which God would initiate conversion. David Parnham discusses the importance of God's communication through the word in "Redeeming Free Grace," 942.

16. SPos 36–37; see also SEC 642.

17. SEC 106, see also 217. On preaching as a means of grace, see UP 162.

dreames and visions," warned Hooker, "the Lord always speaketh by the Ministry of the Word."[18]

It is hard to exaggerate the importance of this point. Hooker and his hearers simply did not expect God to speak to them apart from the Scriptures, most commonly as expounded in a sermon. Perkins explained unequivocally:

> God doth not speak to men particularly, Beleeue thou, and thou shalt be saued. But yet doth he that which is answerable hereunto, in that he giueth a generall promise, with a commaundement to applie the same: and hath ordained the holy ministerie of the word to applie the same to the persons of the hearers in his own name: and that is as much as if the Lord himself should speake to men particularly. To speake more plainely, in the Scripture the promises of saluation be indefinitely propounded; it saith not any where, if Iohn will beleeue he shall be saued, or if Peter will beleeue he shall be saued; but whosoeuer beleeueth shall be saued. Now then comes the minister of the word, who standing in the roome of God, and in the stead of Christ himselfe, takes the indefinite promises of the Gospell, and laies them to the hearts of euery particular man: and this in effect is as much as if Christ himselfe should say, Cornelius beleeue thou, and thou shalt be saued; Peter beleeue thou, and thou shalt be saued.[19]

In his *Armilla Aurea*, Perkins summarized the process succinctly: As the men and women in the congregation listened to and reflected upon the preacher's exposition of God's promises, the Holy Spirit worked within them

---

18. SDD 135, see also 198; SEC 213; SImp 192–93. Toward the end of his life, Luther spoke of the kingdom of Christ as a "hearing kingdom, not a seeing kingdom": *Und ist Christi Reich en hör Reich, nicht ein sehe Reich. Denn die augen leiten und füren uns nicht dahin, da wir Christum finden und kennen lernen, sondern die ohren müssen das thun.* "Predigt, in Merseburg gehalten, 6. August 1545," *W.A.* 51:11–22, at 11.

19. *A Reformed Catholic, Works,* 1:563. Luther famously asserted that "God never has dealt, and never does deal, with mankind at any time otherwise than by the word of promise. Neither can we, on our part, ever have to do with God otherwise than through faith in His word and promise." *Neque enim deus … aliter cum hominibus unquam egit aut agit quam verbo promissionis. Rursus, nec nos cum deo unquam agere aliter possumus quam fide in verbum promissionis eius. De captivitate Baylonica ecclesiae praeludium, W.A.* 6:516, *The Pagan Servitude of the Church* in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings,* ed. John Dillenberger and trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Doubleday, 1961), 249–359, at 277 and his assertion seventeen years later that "God gives no one his Spirit or grace except through or with the external word which comes before (*on durch oder mit dem vorgehend eusserlichen wort*)." *Die Schmalkaldishen Artikel, W.A.* 50:245, in *The Book of Concord,* 312, cited by zur Mühlen, *Nos extra nos,* 263.

to incline their wills and minds to assent to and rest in those promises. This led to their conviction that they were among God's children.[20] Like many of his godly colleagues, Hooker did not hesitate to use sacramental imagery to explain how God worked through the preached word. Christ's seemingly shocking words [John 6:51–59] about eating his flesh and drinking his blood, for example, actually referred to communication through the preached promise:

> this is the meaning of that phrase, *Iohn* 6.56. our Saviour presseth this hard upon the Disciples, and saith, *My flesh is meat indeed, and my bloud is drinke indeed, hee that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud, dwelleth in mee, and I in him*; then they begun to wonder at it, and to say, *How can this be?* and yet Christ saith, what if you see the Sonne of man carrying the body of his flesh into heaven, you will thinke it more hard to eat my flesh then, yet you must eat my flesh then too; how? *it is the Spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I speak, they are spirit and life*; as if he had said, my good Spirit is in the word and promise, close you with my Spirit, and then you draw my Spirit, my flesh and my blood downe into your whole natures; the words that I speake, they are Spirit and Life, that is, my Spirit is in the Word of the promise, though my body be gone up into heaven; therefore close you with my Spirit in the promise, and then you close with my flesh spiritually.

When Christians could "close," by faith, with the Spirit accompanying the promises of the Gospel, they drew Christ's flesh and blood "downe into [their] whole natures … spiritually."[21] It was the heavy responsibility of the godly preacher to speak the words which brought Christ into his hearers' hearts.

---

20. *Nam cum audimus promissiones Dei & cogitamus: Spiritus sanctus mentem & voluntatem mouet per easdem promissiones: & movendo facit vt iis assentiamur, & in iis acquiescamus. Vnde nascitur specialis certitudo de adoptione & gratia Dei. Armilla Aurea*, 328, *Works*, 1:104. Hooker famously preached a sermon in which he imagined that "God hath told me this night that he will destroy England, and lay it waste." But a careful reading of his rhetoric suggests that he was using a John Rogers-type theatrical tactic (for which see below in this chapter), not that he was claiming an immediate revelation. DD 14.

21. SEx 39. Luther, too, took John 6 to refer to a "spiritual" eating and drinking by faith rather than to the Eucharist. *Auslegung D. Martin Luthers uber das Sechste, Siebende und Achte Capitel des Euangelisten Joannis, W.A.* 33:167–242, *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John Chapter 6–8,* trans. Martin Bertram, LW 23:109–55. So did Calvin: *Neque enim de coena habetur concio, sed de perpetua communicatione, quae extra coenae usum nobis constat. Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis 6:53,* in *Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia* (Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke & Son, 1892), 47:154, *Calvin's Commentaries: The Gospel according to St. John 1–10,* trans.

Admittedly, the godly preacher had allies in the pews. Chelmsford's godly community would be well represented in Hooker's congregation, ready to welcome into their number those who appeared touched by his rhetoric. Once drawn into the company of the godly, a hearer would find ample reinforcement for the alternate world given life by Hooker's preaching. The well-developed set of practices already described—family prayer, fasting, conferences at which sermons were discussed and critiqued, Bible-reading, self-examination, and meditation—would assist in her socialization.[22] When John Winthrop referred to a group of recent immigrants to New England as "Mr. Hooker's company," he took all this for granted.

But important as these reinforcing practices were, the core of the godly experience would always be preaching.[23] Stone used homelier metaphors to make the same point. Preachers were "Ambassadours of state from Heaven." As they opened and applied the Scripture, they were "the mouth of God to the people." Just as "the sun is the great Light of the world, but windowes are a medium to let it into the house, so the word is the great light, but ministers are windows"[24] Writing generally about the effects of canonical texts on receptive hearers, George Lindbeck argues that "no world is more real than the ones they create. A scriptural world is thus able to absorb the universe. It supplies the interpretive framework within which believers seek to live their lives and understand reality."[25] In a world of electronic media, we can scarcely imagine the importance of godly preaching to those who had few other ways of interpreting the world. Perry Miller's famous assessment of early New England probably exaggerates only slightly:

T. H. L. Parker (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1959), 169. On the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35), the risen Christ first becomes present to his companions as their hearts burn during his exposition of the scriptures and then immediately afterward in the breaking of bread.

22. SPos 134.

23. In his analysis of Stephen Denison, whose understanding of preaching was similar to Hooker's, Peter Lake writes, "preaching lay at the centre of his vision of the church and of the godly community; it was preaching that spread the gospel, preaching that denounced and controlled sin, preaching that converted sinners and saved souls, preaching that called together and sustained the community of the godly." "Order, Orthodoxy and Resistance: The Ambiguous Legacy of English Puritanism, or Just How Moderate Was Stephen Denison," in *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Michael J. Braddick and John Walter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 206–26, 297–301, at 213.

24. WB 424.

25. *Nature of Doctrine*, 117.

Puritan life, in the New England theory, was centered upon a corporate and communal ceremony, upon the oral delivery of a lecture, and the effort of the Massachusetts Bay Company to set up a due form of government both civil and ecclesiastical came ultimately to the one purpose of gathering men and women together in orderly congregations that they might sit under a "powerful" and a literate ministry, that they might hear the Word of God as well as read it, and hear it not as it was written in revelation, but as it was expounded by that ministry, refashioned into doctrines, reasons, and uses.[26]

Twenty-first-century readers, generally less ready to appeal to supernatural forces to explain events, may be inclined to attribute the impact of Hooker's sermons entirely to the power of his rhetoric. Hooker would not necessarily have disagreed: apart from the words he preached, no supernatural communication was occurring. Not separately from, but "in, with, and under" his words, he believed that the divine was touching the human.

Who Taught Hooker How To Preach?

Hooker was constantly exposed to the influence of Perkins during his tenure at Cambridge. But Perkins had died two years before his arrival, so it is entirely possible that Hooker never actually heard him preach. Fortunately, other godly preachers were active within easy reach of Cambridge, and Hooker had frequent opportunity to observe their preaching styles. One style stood out. One preacher became, in Hooker's estimation, *"The Prince of all the Preachers in England."* That preacher was John Rogers of Dedham. It was Rogers's preaching style, suggests Cotton Mather, upon which Hooker chose to model his own.[27]

Rogers had left Emmanuel College shortly before Hooker arrived, taking a post as Lecturer at Dedham which he held for thirty years. After a "wild" beginning at Cambridge, Rogers learned to hone his wildness into a flamboyant method of preaching that captivated his audiences.

---

26. Miller, *Seventeenth-Century Mind*, 298.

27. Arnold Hunt judges Rogers "the best-known exponent" of dramatic and emotional preaching but does not mention Roger's colleague Hooker. *The Art of Hearing*, 88–89. On characteristically Puritan styles of preaching, see Francis J. Bremer and Ellen Rydell, "Performance Art? Puritans in the Pulpit," *History Today* 45 (Sept. 1995): 50–54.

He was born into one of the great godly preaching families. An uncle was Richard Rogers, author of the widely used *Seven Treatises*.[28] Family stories about John Rogers abounded, and Richard Rogers's wife liked to tell her grandson, Giles Firmin, one story in particular:

> Mr. *Richard Rogers* did send and help to maintain Mr. *John Rogers* (being his Kinsman) in *Cambridge*; it seems, he proved so bad, that he sold his Books and spent the money; my Grandmother moved her Husband to buy him some Books, and send him to *Cambridge* again; she being a prudent Woman prevailed: Mr. *John Rogers* spent his Books again; Mr. *Richard Rogers* then would cast him off utterly; but my Grandmother renews her request once more, and at last prevails, to send him again; then he held: that he was wild enough I conclude from a speech of his own, which I mention not, and by a speech of Mr. *Richard Rogers*, which he often used, when he saw what God had done for his Kinsman, *I will never despair of a man for* John Rogers *sake*; it seems then he was bad enough. God intended this man to make him of great use, and a choice Instrument he was in Gods hand for conversion of many Souls, few men like him; but God handled him accordingly, bruised him to purpose; he would get under bushes in fields, pray and cry; became an experimental Preacher of legal workings, making good what Bishop (then Master) *Brownrig* said of him to my Father *Ward*, which was this, *John Rogers will do more good with his wild Note, then we shall do with our set Musick*: Those that knew his manner of preaching, and actings in preaching, well knew what the Bishop meant by the *wild Note*; but it was very true, though such actions and speeches in other men would have been ridiculous, yet in him, being a man so holy, grave, and reverend, they went off with as much aw, upon a very great and reverent Auditory.[29]

Rogers's "actings in preaching," the "wild note," that "in other men would have been ridiculous," could hold the attention of an audience in an austere, unheated space. While more formal hearers may have condescended to his theatrical preaching style, Rogers's ability to fill the Dedham church to

28. Rogers, *Seven Treatises* (London, 1603), *NSTC* 21215.

29. Giles Firmin, *The Real Christian, or a Treatise of Effectual Calling* (London, 1670), *Wing* F963, 75–76, see also sig. F1ᵛ.

overflowing gained him an unparalleled reputation among the godly. Stories about his preaching often arose in conversation.[30]

Thomas Goodwin, a future editor of Hooker's sermons, was a still a student when he recalled hearing about Rogers's preaching. Curious, he left Cambridge early and rode to Dedham "to hear him preach on his lecture day." Goodwin knew that Rogers's lecture would be "so strangely thronged and frequented, that to those that come not very early there was no possibility getting room in that very spacious large church." He found Rogers in typical dramatic form, playing the role of God about to take back the Bible from his ungrateful English subjects:

> he personates God to the people, telling them, "Well, I have trusted you so long with my Bible: you have slighted it; it lies in such and such houses all covered with dust and cobwebs. You care not to look into it. Do you use my Bible so? Well, you shall have my Bible no longer." And he takes up the Bible from his cushion, and seemed as if he were going away with it, and carrying it from them; but immediately turns again, and personates the people to God, falls down on his knees, cries and pleads most earnestly, "Lord, whatsoever thou dost to us, take not thy Bible from us; kill our children, burn our houses, destroy our goods; only spare us thy Bible, only take not away thy Bible." And then he personates God again to the people: "Say you so? Well, I will try you a while longer; and here is my Bible for you, I will see how you will use it, whether you will love it more, whether you will value it more, whether you will observe it more, whether you will practice it more, and live more according to it." But by these actions … he [Rogers] put all the congregation into so strange a posture that he [Goodwin] never saw any congregation in his life; the place was a mere Bochim, the people generally (as it were) deluged with their own tears.

Goodwin left the building so overcome with emotion that he was unable "to take horse again to be gone." Instead, he "was fain to hang a quarter of an hour upon the neck of his horse weeping, before he had power to mount, so strange

30. Writing later in the century, Oliver Heywood admitted that "some expressions and gestures he used, would now seem indecent," *A Narrative of the Holy Life, and Happy Death, of that Reverend, Faithful and Zealous Man of God, and Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Mr John Angier* (London, 1683), *Wing* H1772, 5–6.

an impression was there upon him, and generally upon the people, upon having been thus expostulated with for the neglect of the Bible."[31]

Besides what he had heard from his grandmother, Giles Firmin had personal recollections of how Rogers skirted theatrically with nonconformity. For it was Rogers who had converted Firmin. Edmund Calamy, the historian of Dissent, recounts that on his death bed, Firmin "told those about him, how he had been Converted when he was a School Boy, by Mr. *John Rogers* of *Dedham*. He went late on a Lecture-day, and Crowded to get in: Mr. *Rogers* taking Notice of his Earnestness, with a Youth or Two more, for Room, with his Usual Freedom, cry'd out, 'Here are some Young ones come for a Christ: will nothing serve you but you must have a Christ? Then you shall have him, &c.' Which Sermon made such an Impression upon him, that he thence Dated his Conversion." Firmin wrote of Rogers, "I never saw him wear a Surplice, nor heard him use but a few prayers, and those I think he said *Memoriter*, not read them; but this he would do in his Preaching, draw his finger about his throat and say, *Let them take me and hang me up, so they will remove these stumbling-blocks out of the Church*."[32] Although he would later be critical of his old mentor's theology, Firmin continued to turn to John Rogers for advice.[33] He remembered Roger's commenting, in good Augustinian fashion, on Revelation 22:17[b]—"let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely"—that "if *will* be come home, the bargain is done."[34] In a brief account of "that great man, John Rogers of Dedham," Calamy writes that "his great Gift lay in a peculiar Gesture, Action, and Behavior in the Delivery of what solid Matter he had prepar'd; so as few heard him without Trembling at the Word of God."[35]

In his preface to Rogers's commentary on 1 Peter, Sidrach Simpson offered a third glimpse of what it was like to hear Rogers preach:

> As the Thunder shaketh the Pillars of the Earth, overthroweth the Rocky Mountains, causeth the wilde and savage Beasts to fear; and

31. Robert Halley, "Memoir of Thomas Goodwin, D. D.," 2:vii–xlviii, xvii–xviii. Collingwood, *Thomas Hooker*, 256, contains a picture of that "spacious large church," the parish church of St. Mary, Dedham.

32. In other words, Rogers was ignoring the set prayers from *The Book of Common Prayer* and suggesting that parts of its fixed worship were stumbling-blocks to faith.

33. Calamy, *An Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of His Life and Times* (London, 1702), 245; Firmin, *The Real Christian*, 68.

34. Firmin, *The Real Christian*, 68, 7. *The Questions between the Conformist and Nonconformist* (London, 1681), *Wing* F962, sig. A4ᵛ, later related by Cotton Mather, *Magnalia* 3:113.

35. Calamy, *Life of Baxter*, 242.

as the Lightning powerfully insinuates itself, breaking the bones, but not the flesh: So was it the pleasure of the Lord to bring down by his Ministry, the high and stout hearts of many rebellious ones, and to lead them in subjection to his wil though Christ:[36]

Such dramatic flair was not the sole property of godly Protestant preachers. Faced with the same challenge of creating a countercultural world through their preaching, Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, and members of other Catholic religious orders on the continent were using similar techniques to draw peasants to the sacrament of penance.[37] They drew on a repertoire of visual and theatrical techniques—pounding nails into the cross, preaching at night, or holding a skull as they spoke, for example—to supplement their preaching. Based on his reading of numerous late medieval sermons, Richard Wunderli describes how the mendicant friars were adept at preaching in a "popular" style, using "down-home imagery and language, charming little stories (*exempla*) to make a moral point and change the pace of the sermon, and humor and enthusiastic delivery to hold their audiences."[38]

Thomas Hooker knew that Rogers reached many who were otherwise unmoved by the set liturgy of the Prayer Book.[39] He determined to adopt and adapt his style. Eager to continue a close association after he left Emmanuel, he tried to secure a position at nearby Colchester with a view, Mather tells us,

---

36. "To the Reader," in Rogers, *A Godly & Fruitful Exposition upon All the First Epistle of Peter* (London: John Field, 1650), *Wing* R1808, sig. A2ᵛ.

37. John O'Malley describes how the early members of the Society of Jesus understood the goal of their preaching as "to 'move' people at times to quite specific actions. … They especially wanted their sermons to bring people to the sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist." *The First Jesuits*, 96.

38. Jean Delumeau, "Prescription and Reality," 148. See also Delumeau, *Catholicism between Luther and Voltaire*, 192–93; Delumeau, *La Peur en Occident*, 257; and Louis Châtellier, *The Religion of the Poor: Rural Missions in Europe and the Formation of Modern Catholicism, c. 1500–c. 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Wunderli, *Peasant Fires: The Drummer of Niklashausen* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 39. The early Jesuit Juan Alfonso de Polanco described how six Jesuits walked through the streets barefooted at Valencia during Carnival in 1552 carrying crucifixes and with ropes hanging from their necks. They stopped at certain locations to preach about "death, judgment, the vanity of the world, and the good fruit of repentance." *Vita Ignatii Loiolae et rerum Societatis Jesu historica* {= *Chronicon*}, 2:651, cited in O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, 94. Carlos Eire offers more Jesuit examples in *A Very Brief History of Eternity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 160–65.

39. This statement should not be taken to minimize the powerful impact of repeated exposure to Prayer Book language on many English worshippers. Referring to the generality of English men and women, Eamon Duffy writes that "Cranmer's sombrely magnificent prose, read week by week, entered and possessed their minds, and became the fabric of

to "enjoy the *Labours* & *Lectures* of Mr. *Rogers.*" He failed to get the Colchester job, but Mather reports that he succeeded in copying Rogers's theatrical style.

Mather claimed that he generally found theatrical preaching artificial. "The *Ready* and *Noisy* performances of many Preachers, when they are as *Plato* speaks, THEATROU MESTOI, or *Full of the Theatre*, Acting to the Height in the Publick for their Applause" resulted in his opinion from mere "*Mechanical Principles.*" Hooker, preaching extempore, was different.

> the Distinct *Images* of Things would come so *nimbly*, and yet so *fitly* into his mind, that he could utter them with fluent Expressions, as the old Orators would usually Ascribe unto a *special Assistance* of Heaven … and counted that men did therein THEIOS LEGEIN, or *Speak Divinely*; but the Rise of this Fluency in him, was the *Divine Relish* which he had of the things to be spoken, the *Sacred Panting* of his holy Soul after the Glorious Objects of the Invisible World, and the true *zeal* of *Religion* giving *Fire* to his Discourses. … the *vigour* in the Ministry of our Hooker, being Raised by a *Coal from the Altar* of a most Real Devotion, touching his *Heart*; it would be a wrong unto the Good *Spirit* of our God, if *He* should not be Acknowledged the Author of it.[40]

In Connecticut, Hooker explained that powerful ministry required "an inward spiritual heat of heart, and holy affection … answerable and suitable to the matter, which is to be communicated." Conveying such emotion would "adde great life and force to the delivery of the truth." Under the "mauling blowes" of a sermon, "the sinner dyes and faints away … in the very place where he sits." Or, rather than swooning, he "sometimes roars out as one that hath received his deaths wound in his bosom, and that he hath heard his doom, and was delivered up into the hands of the Devil ready to drop into the dungeon, and to be carried post to the bottomless pit."[41] Such could be the impact of the preaching style Mather admired.

Not everyone was enamored of such celebrity preaching, as the references to "railing" and "bawling" Hooker testify. A quarter-century before Thomas Hooker began his public ministry, Richard Hooker (no relation) questioned

---

their prayer, the utterance of their most solemn and vulnerable moments." *Stripping of the Altars*, 593.

40. *Piscator Evangelicus* 8, 23–24 {*Magnalia* 1:334, 337}.

41. AR 10:213, 372. The Reverend John Ward of Stratford-upon-Avon recalled in his diary that as Hooker's one-time sizar, Simeon Ashe, stepped into the pulpit, Hooker had encouraged

the assumption that the value of a sermon should depend on the histrionics of the preacher. If the words of a sermon had no efficacy of themselves,

> it must of necessitie followe, that the vigor and vitall efficacie of sermons doth grow from certaine accidentes which are not in them but in theire maker; his virtue, his gesture, his countenance, his zeale, the motion of his bodie, and the inflection of his voice who first uttereth them as his own, is that which giveth them the forme, the nature, the verie essence of instruments availeable to eternall life.[42]

Richard Hooker was skeptical that God would chose to communicate through such unrehearsed human performances.

Thomas Hooker's voice has been silent for nearly four centuries, but a twenty-first-century reader can gain some sense of the theatricality which so struck his hearers from the printed versions of his sermons.[43] Scholars trying to gain some inkling of the *mentalité* of Hooker's lay hearers will be grateful that Hooker's dramatic instincts also led him to include their questions, observations, and doubts in his lectures. Filtered as they inevitably were through Hooker's own agenda, the voices of those in his congregation fill the pages of his printed sermons. At least indirectly, Prayer Book Protestants, anxious Christians, true believers, doubters, "hypocrites" in various guises, skeptics, and mockers all play roles in Hooker's theatrical preaching.[44] Often their "objections" to his doctrines are presented in the first person, allowing a reader to imagine that he "personated" the role of an objector as he preached. The "answer" which followed was also delivered in the first person, so that, as Goodwin had observed in John Rogers's preaching, hearers could experience Hooker in dialogue with himself:

---

him, "Sym, let itt be hot." *Diary of the Rev. John Ward*, ed. Charles Severn (London: H. Colburn, 1839), 131, cited in Williams, "Life of Hooker," 3.

42. Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, ed. W. Speed Hill, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 2:108, cited in Targoff, *Common Prayer*, 49.

43. Through a close reading of Roger Haynes's conversion narrative, Charles Cohen tries to re-create how one of Hooker's sermons impacted one individual hearer, see *God's Caress*, 177–79.

44. While he does not look specifically at Hooker's sermons, Christopher Haigh in *The Plainman's Pathway to Heaven* finds that court records suggest the essential accuracy of most ministers' characterizations of their audience. Speaking of the likelihood that texts like Hooker's sermons might provide unexpected insight, Peter Brown encourages us to "sift these texts, again and again, for hitherto unconsidered scraps of evidence, for hints of

[*Object.*] But you will say, So many are the sinnes that lye upon mee, my corruptions like clouds, come in upon mee, all my oaths and drunkennesse, all pride, and loosenesse, and vanitie, and earthly mindednesse, all my corruptions come in upon mee, and the guilt remaines, and they are not pardoned: their horror remaines, and I cannot get my soule pacified in the assurance of the forgivenesse of them: that pride, and adultery, and drunkennesse, army after army, Legion after Legion of sinnes, presse in upon mee.

[*Answ.*] Are your soules thus perplexed with miseries? why, I beseech you, consider what I say: art thou humbled thou polluted heart? art thou oppressed with thy corruptions? doth thy soule say, it is the greatest burthen I have, the greatest wound I feele; if my heart were but rid of my sinnes, my soule should be quiet, and my heart pacified; why then, if the Lord seeth thee humbled, hee will never see thee corrupted, hee will come suddenly; let all thy corruptions come accusing, let all thy sinnes rise up at armes against thee: yet if thy heart be broken for these, and humbled in the consideration of these, and resolved to forsake them, the Lord will come suddenly, and then mercy will come to pardon all, to subdue all these cursed distempers that hang upon thee:

[*Object.*] But you will say, What, will the Lord come into my soule, this wretched soule, these mud-walls, this abhominable heart; what to mee, will the Lord come to my temple? such hideous sinnes have I committed, and the Lord come into such a rotten cottage, and such a base cursed heart as mine?

[*Answ.*] Aye, marke what the text saith, *I stand at the doore and knock; if any man will open, I will come in.* Hee knocks at the doore of every proud person, and adulterer, and drunkard: if any adulterous person will open, the Lord will come and sanctifie him: if any uncleane wretch will open, the Lord will come and release him from all abhomination: what a comfort is this then? let Satan accuse us, and sinne condemne us, if the Lord will comfort us, who can discourage us? if the Lord will save us, who can condemne us?[45]

---

unresolved anomalies and of alternative voices lurking on the very margins of the evidence." *A Life of Learning* (New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2003), 19.

45. SIng 23–24.

Occasionally the printed text gives a glimpse of Hooker's playing two roles in his own dramatic script (and even provides some stage directions). Here a weak believer tries to resist Satan's attempts to destroy his faith:

SATAN. What, dost thou not yet see what wants thou hast, and how many failings, how unfit for service, and how weak in service?

<div align="center">Answer.</div>

POORE SOULE. It is true, but it is written, *Prov.* 28.13. *he that confesseth, and forsaketh his sinnes, shall finde mercie*; though I be weake, and feeble, and unfit, yet I confesse and forsake my sinnes, therefore I shall finde mercie.

SATAN. Aye, saith Satan, that you doe indeed, doest thou not apprehend, and doth not thy conscience witnesse, that thy heart is averse, and untoward to dutie, unwilling to come thereunto, wearie therein, and desirous to be free there-from?

<div align="center">Keep still to the point, and answer;</div>

POORE SOULE. I have ma[n]y sinnes and many failings, it is true, but yet it is as true, *hee that confesseth, and &c.* but I confesse, and forsake, therefore I shall finde mercie.

SATAN. Aye, but saith Satan, are you tampering with Gods privie counsell? doe you know to whom mercie belongs? secret things belong to God, he must give his mercie to whom he please, and his goodnesse to whom he sees fit.

<div align="center">Keepe still to the point, and say,</div>

POORE SOULE. I know not what Gods secret will is, but I know what the word saith, and what the Lord saith, and what conscience saith: I know, I confesse, and forsake, therefore I, &c.

<div align="center">But Satan replies;</div>

SATAN. Many couzen themselves, mercie is a rare gift, few have it, and many dreame of it, that shall never share therein, nor partake thereof, and why may not you be one of those?

<div align="center">Keep still to the point, and answer;</div>

POORE SOULE. It is true, I may couzen my selfe, and my heart may be deceived; but the Lord will not couzen me, and the Word cannot deceive mee, and the Lord and the Word say, *He that confesseth, &c.* but I confesse, &c.

SATAN. How doe you know that you doe apply the Word aright? may you not be deceived in that? the Word is true and certaine: but how doe you know that you doe fitly apply this Word?

Answer.

POORE SOULE. I know it not but by the Word, and I repaire thither, that
    I may know it, and the Lord knowes all, and the Word informes mee,
    that *whosoever confesseth and forsakes his sinnes, shall have mercie*; and my
    conscience knowes, that I doe confesse and forsake, therefore I, &c. and
    Satan, if you will shew mee any other text contrarie to this, I will yeeld
    but otherwise I will never yeeld while the world stands.[46]

Such was Hooker's preaching style.[47] Small wonder that the Chelmsford city
fathers had recruited him to draw crowds.

Polarizing Preaching

It must not be forgotten that many of his hearers had not yet responded,
or would never respond, to his message. Just as Hooker's call required him
to depict sin "in its colours," so he would pull aside the curtain of wishful
thinking and describe "worldly" people as they looked to God. His Ramist
tendency to dichotomize drove him to imagine them as the polar opposite
of the saints. If the saints, despite their failings, were children of God, their
detractors, despite their apparent respectability, were the children of Satan.
For godly preachers like Perkins and Hooker designed their sermons to
repel as well as to attract. All human beings were either elect or reprobate,
some destined to be called and adopted as God's children; others to remain
captive to sin.

That meant that the reprobate, denied the special divine assistance neces-
sary for salvation, would sooner or later become adamant in their resistance.
Their failure to respond would justify God's abandoning them to the devil's
clutches. "Hands off thou hard hearted wretch," Hooker warned one member
of his audience at the Hartford lecture. "There is good newes from heaven …
but no good to thee." The sword of the spirit would always be two-edged: for
some a word of life, for others a message of eternal death. As Hooker explained
in Hartford, "a spiritual and powerful ministry … either humbles or hardens,
converts or condemns those that live under the stroak thereof. … It is the
savor of life unto life, but then and to those only to whom the Lord will bless

---

46. SEC 593–94. Hooker is here dealing directly with predestination in a popular sermon.

47. In his study of the London preacher Stephen Denison, Peter Lake characterizes Denison's
religiosity (which was very much like Hooker's) as a species of popular religion, designed
to bring the insights of predestinarian piety to bear on the lives of people. *The Boxmaker's
Revenge*, 393, 35.

the same; and the savor of death unto death, then and unto those when such a blessing is denied."[48]

Perkins had also described godly preaching as a "two-edged sword" that "either cureth vnto life by working repentance, and other graces of saluation; or woundeth vnto death them that receiue it not." Such a process of sorting occurred in part because a godly preacher would use his rhetorical powers to polarize his hearers, to depict the enormous chasm that separated those who lived by God's rule from those who lived by Satan's. "For the offering of grace doth not only serue for the conversion of a sinner, but also to be an occasion by mens fault of blinding the minde and hardening the hearte."[49] Hooker was quite candid in explaining that he intended his preaching to polarize his hearers, to drive them to one extreme or the other. "The word of God is like a sword … when a man strikes a full blow at a man, it either wounds or puts him to his fence [i.e. he wards it off]: so the application of the word is like the striking with the sword, it will worke one way or other." Either people "would be reformed by it, or else their consciences would be troubled and desperately provoked to oppose God and his ordinances." "The power of the truth will by force presse in upon them, and make them either better or worse."[50]

In other words, demonizing the other was never an afterthought for Hooker. Polarizing was essential to his program. His hearers would never recognize the danger they were in until they recognized how their fellow English men and women, regular church-goers as well as notorious sinners, were headed for hell.

His hearers would not have been startled at the notion that there were reprobates in their midst. Conventional opinion lumped thieves, beggars, prostitutes, and drunkards into one group and "respectable" people into the other. What made Hooker's message unnerving was not that the sword cut. It was where it cut. Only the visibly godly, the exact, precise saints, would remain

---

48. AR 10:433, 3:215. The implied reference is to 2 Cor. 2:16. Perkins compared hardhearted hearers to a blacksmith's "stithie": "the more it is beaten the harder it is made: and commonly the heartes of men, the more they are beaten with the hammer of Gods worde, the more dull, secure, and senslesse they are," *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:289.

49. *A Godly and Learned Exposition or Commentarie vpon the Three First Chapters of the Revelation, Works,* 3:*252, *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:297, see also 192. Describing the effect of the preaching of Richard Blackerby, Samuel Stone's mentor, Samuel Clarke, wrote, "Indeed the Word of God in his Lips. … *was very quick and powerful,* and men soon became, either Converts to it, or flyers from it; or with all their might fighters against it"; *Lives of Eminent Persons,* 59.

50. SP 67, see also 41; AR 2:216; SEC 278; Webster, *Godly Clergy,* 99. John Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemics,* 19, sees "a distinction that runs like a fault line" between ministerial depictions of godly and worldly people. Peter Lake argues that the godly assault on the

on God's side. The "Protestant at large," the parishioner who conscientiously attended Sunday worship, followed the liturgy of the *Book of Common Prayer*, tried her best to be a good citizen and a good neighbor, and placed her trust in a merciful God, had more in common with a prostitute than with the godly saint who lived next door.[51] Despite her wishful thinking, she needed to be forced to recognize that the sword would cut her out. Unless she repented, she was a child of Satan.

The God of Hooker's imagining was simply not going to be appeased by half-hearted religion: "You that thinke that Christ is made all of mercy; it is a God of your owne imagination, and your owne devising." "Poore ignorant people" might plead that "he is a very merciful God, and full of compassion," but Hooker would have none of it. "It is true," he would reply, "hee is mercifull indeed, but know this also to thy terrour, that God is strict and precisely righteous." It was the height of foolishness "to put off God with a few good words and lazy wishes, and with a Lord have mercy upon us." He designed his preaching to confound "the carnall confidence of those Professors, that living in the bosome of the Church, place all their hopes and assurance of being saved upon this bottome: because they have been baptized, and come to Church, and hear the Word, and receive the Sacrament, therefore of necessity (they presume) they must be accepted of God." "It is ten to one," he concluded, "that many that heare the word of God this day, and many that live in the bosome of the Church, want faith."[52]

At least since the publication of William Haller's *The Rise of Puritanism* in 1938, it has been assumed that the godly agenda changed from political to pietistic after the Marprelate controversies late in Elizabeth's realm.[53] Abandoning public attacks on the bishops, preachers went underground, concentrating their efforts on changing the hearts and minds of their parishioners. While it is true that most godly preachers made a reluctant peace with episcopal polity, it is easy to underestimate the impact of their determined attempts to undermine the kind of national church that Elizabeth and her successors were committed to uphold. By consigning most English men and

---

popular theatre, for example, was deliberately intended "to create rather than merely to reflect or describe the social and cultural divisions and oppositions" between the saints and the wicked world, *Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, 438.

51. FC 24.

52. SEC 378–79; SJ 243; PP 301; SEC 446.

53. Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570–1643* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938).

women to Satan's army, godly preachers like Hooker were challenging the basic assumptions of *The Book of Common Prayer* and striking at the heart of the religion of the Church of England. Determined as they were to preserve a Church governed by bishops, Elizabeth, James, and Charles were equally determined to define the religion of that Church as adherence to the liturgy of the Prayer Book. It is useful to take a close look at that liturgy to see how Hooker called it deeply into question.[54]

As had earlier editions, the 1559 Prayer Book made the assumption that infants were spiritually "reborn" during the sacrament of baptism. Baptism was not only a rite of initiation; it was also of a rite of regeneration. The celebrating priest asked God that the infants "receive baptism of their sins by spiritual regeneration," prayed that God would "Give thy holy Spirit to these infants, that they may be born again, and made heirs of everlasting salvation," and beseeched God to "grant that all thy servants which shall be baptized in this water … ever *remain* in the number of thy faithful and elect children." At the conclusion of the service, the priest thanked God "that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant" and reminded the congregation "that these children be regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's congregation."[55] Every baptized member of the Church of England had good reason to assume that the sacrament had granted her membership among God's children.

Similar assumptions were made at the celebration of the Lords' Supper. The Supreme Governors and their bishops expected every English man and woman to receive the bread and wine of the Eucharist "at the least three times in the year: of which Easter to be one"; in practice most parishioners communed only annually at the Easter "housel."[56] To take part in communion services—which parish churches often held on Easter Monday and Tuesday as well as Easter Sunday to accommodate all who wished to partake—parishioners in good standing would often purchase wooden communion tokens, which

---

54. Laudian polemicists recognized this. In his study of Peter Heylyn, Anthony Milton explains how they accused Puritans of "instilling in the people through lectureships a dislike of church government, *liturgy*, and established doctrine." *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, 67–68; emphasis added. Recall that given the opportunity in John Forbes's Holland congregation, Hooker had deliberately discarded the baptism liturgy.

55. "The Ministration of Baptism," in *The Book of Common Prayer 1559, in Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth,* ed. William K. Clay (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847), 199–205, at 200, 201, 203, 204; emphasis added.

56. *The Book of Common Prayer 1559,* 198; Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 91–130. 1603 records from the dioceses of Ely and London led Margaret Spufford to propose that 2% or fewer of the overall adult population failed to commune at least annually. "Can We Count the 'Godly' and the 'Conformable' in the Seventeenth Century," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*

they would redeem at the service. Joining with one's neighbors in this annual ritual was a recognition of community solidarity as well as a religious obligation.[57]

As the celebrant distributed the consecrated bread and wine, he would say to each communicant, "the body of Christ which was given for you" and "the blood of Christ, shed for you." Once everyone had communed, the celebrant would assure them that they now enjoyed God's favor. By feeding the participants with "the most precious body and blood of thy son our Savior Jesus Christ," God "dost assure us thereby," said the celebrant, of his "favour and goodness toward us, and that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and be also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom." Although heirs of the kingdom only "through hope," at the moment of communion they enjoyed God's favor and were members of the mystical body of Christ. By their baptism, their participation in the communion, and by extension their regular participation in the life of the parish, participants could take comfort that they were "faithful people" who enjoyed God's blessing.[58]

Hooker dashed that comfort. He made a direct attack on the foundation on which the Prayer Book rested. "I beseech you be not deceived, trust not to these lying words, and vain hopes, *The Sacrament of the Lord, and the Church*." "Outward" participation in the public worship of the Church of England would not suffice. A hearer would need "to look inward, to see what the heart saith."[59] "A people may be in the bosome of the Church, live under the means of grace, and partake of the Ordinances of God, and yet notwithstanding all this, be void of the saving knowledge of God." "What difference is there between a

---

36 (1985): 428–38, at 435–36. See also J. P. Boulton, "The Limits of Formal Religion: The Administration of Holy Communion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England," *London Journal* 10 (1984): 135–54.

57. Arnold Hunt, "The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 161 (1998): 39–83, 43; Haigh, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven*, 44.

58. "The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion," in *The Book of Common Prayer 1559*, 180–98, at 195–96. On Cranmer's decision to assume that the hearers of the Homilies—and by extension participants in Prayer Book services—were elect, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 375. At the York House Conference in 1626, Francis White argued that statements like "the body of Christ which was given for you" constituted a *prima facie* case against the kind of limited atonement preached by ministers like Perkins and Hooker. Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 131; Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 223 n. 26.

59. SDD 159, 161; SDD 194; SP 41. Once in New England, and able to control access to the sacrament, Hooker would take a different position on whether people could take comfort from the Lord's Supper.

man that goes to hell for open rebellion, and a man that goes to hell for civill profession"?

Such attacks on those who confined their religiosity to the observation of outward forms of worship had been a godly commonplace since the days of William Perkins. In Perkins's judgment, far too many English men and women imagined that their obligation to God began and ended with Sunday worship. "They place their whole religion," he explained, "in the obseruation of certain ceremonies." So long as they came to their parish church and conscientiously recited the appropriate passages from the *Book of Common Prayer*, the majority of worshippers seemed to believe that they had fulfilled their Christian duty. Over and over in his university lectures, Perkins challenged those who seemed satisfied with the "outward duties of religion" to take their Christianity to heart. "The manner of most men is to come to the place of assemblies, where God is worshipped," he continued, "and there mumble vp the Lords prayer, the commaundements, and the beliefe [creed] in stead of prayers, which being done, God is well serued thinke they." In between Sunday services "they neglect to learne and practice such things as are taught them for their saluation by the ministers of Gods word." "We must knowe," he concluded, "that there is no soundness of religion, but grosse hypocrisie in all such men: they worshippe God with their lippes, but there is no power of godliness in their hearts."[60]

Could a conscientious worshipper still take some comfort from participation in the liturgy? Could at least the majority of "Prayer Book Protestants" expect to gain God's favor? Not in Hooker's opinion. "Most" that "live in the bosome of the Church ... manifest a want of desire of the knowledge of the wayes of God" and "have not their hearts carried in any love of God." "Few" among "those that thinke themselves some body in the bosome of the Church . . . shall be saved." So long as every English man and woman was assumed to be a member of the Church of England and was expected to attend its services of worship, simple participation in the liturgies of *The Book of Common Prayer*, and even in its service of communion, could guarantee nothing. "Carnal reason" might assume that only notorious sinners needed to fear God's anger, but Hooker reminded his congregation that even minor transgressions from God's commandments would deserve damnation.

The least vaine thought you ever imagined, the least idle word that ever you uttered, are weight enough to presse your soules downe into

---

60. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:209.

everlasting perdition. … all our thoughts, words, and actions, all of them have beene sinnes able to sinke our soules to the bottome of hell.[61]

Anyone familiar with the liturgy of the Prayer Book, a category which would have included virtually all of Hooker's hearers, would have recognized its characteristic phrases in the "carnal gospel" he condemned. Although a reader of his published sermons will catch the occasional veiled reference to ceremonial innovations, Hooker's English sermons do not seem overly concerned with Laudianism, which was only just making an appearance in the area around London.[62] His target was the ordinary "formal" worship of the English parish church, done according to *The Book of Common Prayer* and taken as an end in itself rather than as a means to the inward, exact religion that alone could please Hooker's God. His sermons are filled with disparaging references to well-known Prayer Book phrases. "It is not: O Lord be mercifull unto us, and so be gone." "It is not a *Lord have mercy upon me*, and *God forgive me* will serve the turne."[63] A hypocrite would be "delighted" when he heard "there is abundance of mercy in Christ, and Christ came to save sinners," but he would be no closer to heaven. "Whats that to thee," Hooker berated his unresponsive hearers, "to heare that the Lord Christ came to save sinners, and to know that there is mercie enough in him, and yet never partake of it?"[64] "You thinke to put off God with a few good words and lazy wishes, and with a Lord have mercy upon us." "It is an easie matter to be such [a Christian] as you be, to patter over a few prayers, which a childe of five or six yeers old may doe." Hooker laid into such "formalists" with a vengeance: "all the priviledges thou hast, all the meanes, ordinances thou enjoyest, unlesse thy heart be humbled, and thy soule brought to Christ, all these will fall with thee, and thou wilt goe to hell."

61. SDD 198; SEC 263 = SImp 208; SP 257, see also 196; SP 99, 105–6, see also 141, AR 10:372, 693–96.

62. E.g., "the bowing at the word, the syllable is Idolatry," DD 18/249; "heresie in doctrine, … superstition, and Idolatry, and false worship as … hath invaded the Church," SF 53. Anthony Milton provides a first-rate description of the onset of "Laudianism" in his "The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach," in *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell*, ed. Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake (Cambridge, 2002): 162–84; and *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, chs. 1–3.

63. SP 132, 157; a reference to the Kyrie at the beginning of the service of communion.

64. SEC 96, 462; the reference is to the passage from 1 Timothy read after the confession of sins: "This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."

It was imperative that worshippers understand that prayer, the Lord's Supper, and even preaching were nothing more than "means" through which God worked to create trust in his promises. "You would have grace out of the means of grace, why grace never grew there. The Sacrament saith, grace is not in me; Prayer saith, grace is not in me; hearing saith, grace is not in me: we indeed convey grace, but it is not originally in us." Without inward faith, and the change of life that it provoked, outward participation in formal liturgies would gain worshippers nothing. "Doe not goe to prayer onely, doe not goe to hearing onely, doe not goe to the Sacraments onely and barely; but oh see a Christ, and looke upon a promise."[65]

These attacks on "Prayer Book Protestantism" were as prominent in Hooker's lectures as attacks on wicked behavior. Any theologically sophisticated hearer would soon have concluded that he was denying the validity of the sacraments of the Church of England. Under those circumstances, one can only assume that a micromanager like Archbishop Laud was just waiting for his chance to strike. That chance came after Charles prorogued Parliament in 1629. Despite godly protestations, Hooker was hardly the undeserving victim of Laud's anger. By openly and persistently undermining the foundations on which the Church of England rested, Hooker provoked Laud's efforts to suspend him.[66]

Just as Luther had polarized humanity by claiming that everyone was being ridden either by Christ or the devil, Hooker would portray the mass of humankind as children of Satan. What most people saw as the broad middle ground between the precise and exact ones who were bound for heaven and the rest of the population was a deception deliberately created by the devil. There was no middle ground. No matter how outwardly moral, worldly men and women were bound for hell unless they repented and placed their trust in God.

Social historians find a wide spectrum of human behavior in early modern English towns like Chelmsford.[67] Within the limits of the parish would dwell

---

65. SJ 243; CTCL 49; SEC 128; SBU 101, 109.

66. Tom Webster makes a similar point more generally and from a different direction when he writes of "Puritanism as a set of priorities that could dissolve restraints of authority and deference in circumstances that appeared to threaten the *sine qua non* of a true church: godly preaching." *Godly Clergy*, 89.

67. E.g., Paul Griffiths, *Youth and Authority*, 233: "there was a large gap between these opposite poles of utter profanity and piety—an extensive middle territory in which people blended orthodoxy with their own assumptions about authority, piety, work, time, youth, conviviality, and play." In *Plain Mans Pathways,* Christopher Haigh deliberately oversimplifies this complexity to imagine five ideal types: godly preachers, godly hearers, "ordinary Christians," those who scorned the godly, and Catholics.

scrupulous saints, "prayer-book Protestants" who conscientiously attended the services of the Church of England, "good neighbors" who worshipped largely out of habit, boisterous apprentices and servants who frequented the alehouse and often "railed" against the godly and their exactness, habitual thieves and other criminals, and even a few recusant Catholics or clandestine members of the Family of Love. In Hooker's polarized alternative life-world there was no such spectrum, only the same two deeply antagonistic "societies" that had been identified by Perkins. The nature of unconverted people, no matter how upstanding in the eyes of their neighbors, was "exceeding opposite to the doctrine of Christ and the Gospel."[68]

Even in supposedly godly Hartford, Hooker continued to talk about a complete opposition between "men naturally" and men in grace. Anyone who was "not willing and contented, constantly to take up a Christian course, to walk according to the rule of Gods word, to abstain from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, to live in all holiness of life and conversation, to studie and indeavour to keep a good conscience in all things both towards God, and towards men" was in reality a "child of the Devill." No less than thieves and prostitutes, civil believers and carnal gospelers were in desperate need of conversion. Once he had convinced them of that, Hooker would use terror to scare civil professors into recognizing the danger they were in, spurring them on to begin the long and tedious process of coming to faith.

To polarize his hearers, Hooker reminded them of texts like Revelation 3:16, where God condemned the lukewarmness of the Laodiceans. "*I would thou wert either hot or cold, because thou art neither, therefore I will spew thee out of my mouth.*" Hooker drove his hearers to one extreme or the other. "Appear in your colours," he said, "either a *Saint* that may be saved, or else a *Devil* that may be damned; otherwise the Lord will vomit you out of his mouth." Another apposite text was 1 John 3:8: "*Hee that committeth sinne, is of the Devill.*" "But he that beleeves," added Hooker, "is not the childe of the Devill, all the world knowes that." If "all the world" accepted this dichotomy, then hearers would be faced with a simple proposition: "if thou trade thus in sinne, thou art the childe of the Devill, and therefore never hadst faith."

Did one need to be the local prostitute or the town drunk to "trade in sin"? Not at all. As he told his congregation in New England, committing even one

68. SDD 105. On the polarizing effect of godly preaching, see Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, 230–31, *et passim*; and especially David Underdown, *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). Christopher Haigh argues that in spite of the rhetoric, the godly and the profane "usually managed to get along with each other." *Plain Mans Pathways*, 140.

sin would condemn the sinner to the Devil's camp: "The keeping of one sin keeps possession for Satan, and his right unto the soul."[69]

Christopher Marsh has argued convincingly that godly preaching often clashed with deep-seated commitments to a "neighborliness" that cherished communal ties. Early modern English men and women were inclined to resist preaching that threatened to separate neighbor from neighbor. Hooker clearly encountered such commitments in Chelmsford. "Many ungodly persons in the bosome of the Church," he preached, "muse not of their sinfull wayes … they cry, *peace, peace*, let the minister speake what he can, and denounce what judgement he will, they promise themselves peace, & quietness."

For the most part, civil professors understood the general outlines of the gospel promises. In Hooker's faculty psychology, their problem was not with the understanding but with the will. "This judicious man, hee hath a generall apprehension of the truths of the Gospell; but as for that speciall working upon the will, and to enter in upon the promises of God, and to have the sap and sweet of these, and to goe out to Christ, and to take all from Christ, he is a stranger to this, and it goes beyond all his booke learning." Their dealings with their neighbors might be praiseworthy. A "Protestant at large" might "deale honestly with men, and pay them their due, and at their day." "The world" might esteem such a person "as a sincere, honest, upright hearted man," but unless he strove to "walke … according to Gods commandments," he was no better than a "close hearted Hypocrite" who hid his secret sins from his neighbors. A woman might appear upright, but appearances could deceive. To know whether she was exact in obeying the rule, Hooker would ask her "whether you make conscience of private prayer, and humbling your soul in secret? Whether you make conscience of your stubbornnesse to your husband; of your peevishnesse and untowardnesse? … whether you did ever performe that God hath required of you … that you should pray, read, be sober, humble, meeke, dutiful to your husband."[70]

Anyone on the road to heaven needed to be constantly alert to overcome, by force of will, every inclination to disobey God's rule. "The power [of godliness] is to subdue inward lusts, secret corruptions, base thoughts that rise in the minde. This is not to be found in the most; therefore they are but Hypocrites and false hearted." Such people had deceived themselves by imagining that "a man may have the substance, … that is, Christ and religion," and not "trouble themselves about lesser matters; but the Lord Christ saith, hee

---

69. AR 3:161–64; SEC 278; AR 10:589; SEC 452, 382; PP 107; see also FLGT 89, 91.

70. Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth-Century England: Holding Their Peace* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); SP 93–94; SEC 458; FC 24, 33, 35.

that is unfaithfull in the least, is unfaithfull in much, and hee that makes not conscience of the smaller circumstances, will not make conscience of the substance." "If a mans exactnesse in a Christian course be sincere, then he will be exact in all things; but if his exactnesse may give way to some sinne, then it is but hypocrisie." In his final lectures, Hooker would go so far as to assert that such people worshipped a different God, "a Fancy of thine own devising … not the Father of Christ," not the exacting God of extreme Augustinianism.[71]

"Prayer Book Protestants" resented Hooker's efforts to characterize their piety as formal and lukewarm. They found his demands absurd. They would "scoffe at the exactnesse of a blessed course" and ask their neighbors, "will you be ruled by these precise fellowes, and have your head under their girdle?" "Did the Minister say, that your consciences must be awakened, and your hearts must be humbled, or else you should perish?" "You shall not die," they reassured their fellows, "your conversation is holy enough, and you need not take so strict a course in this kind." A common charge was that Hooker and his godly colleagues "draw men up to too high a pitch." "Will you be one of our tender conscienced people? … will you be such a foole to shake at the word of a teacher?" Skeptics, Hooker said in Hartford, assumed that his "threatnings" were "nothing but a kind of policy" to "aw[e] others" and so would "take off the edge" of his preaching. He warned his godly hearers to expect their less exact neighbors to "grow strange, and looke afarre off." Not only would the godly experience "disgraces and reproaches," but in extreme cases they might find that their fellow citizens would refuse to live near them.[72]

A Homiletics of Fear

Hooker's preaching used many tactics to convince unconverted hearers that they were on the road to hell and needed to change their lives. Sermon after sermon tried to drive sinners to the godly side of his Ramist taxonomy. But, as we saw in chapter 6, his core technique, the one to which he constantly returned, was fear: he would reprove his hearers for their sinfulness and then terrify them with threats of divine punishment.[73] What Peter Brown aptly

---

71. FC 33-36/213–16; SEC 495, 505; CCLP 406. See the now classic treatment, Bozeman, *The Precisionist Strain.*

72. SPos 122–23; UP* 87; SDD 176; UP* 83; AR 6:289; SImp 23; see Rom. 8:7: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

73. Peter Iver Kaufman has argued that godly preachers "encouraged Christians to intensify their experiences of misery … if they wanted to improved their chances for finding

characterized as the Augustinian God's "awesome blood-feud" against the descendents of Adam was never far from Hooker's mind, and he made sure that his hearers knew themselves as the objects of that blood-feud. They would be constantly exposed to the fearful wrath of this God and to the endless and unbearable punishments that this God had in store for those who failed to repent.[74] The "Truths" he was preaching would "carry dread with them to the Conscience, rack the heart of the sinner in restless horror and perplexity," work "like the bitterest Pils, and the sharpest Corrosives." If he could find a way to hold the attention of his hearers, he was certain that God would use his words to frighten some of them into abandoning their ungodly habits. Perkins had reserved fear tactics to those hearers who resisted his initial efforts to draw them "with mercie and compassion"; only the otherwise incurable were to be "terrified, affrighted, and so saued by terrour and feare." But before he began his public ministry, Hooker had become convinced that God generally chose to change human wills through fear, and he learned to deliver his sermons with "terror and power."[75]

The Holy Spirit would begin his work, Hooker imagined, just as the Spirit had during his own wrath experience, with "gastering." While listening to a preacher's sermon, a hearer would feel "a sudden blow upon the heart," that brought home the gravity of his sinful life. "The Lord usually lets in a kind of amazement into the mind of a sinner, and a kind of gastering." The term is now obsolete, but in Hooker's day to "gast" meant to frighten or terrify, often suddenly.[76]

So Hooker's preached words would "not only warm and affect the heart a little slightly, but scorch a man's Conscience with the terror." The awakened conscience would bring the hearer up short with its "marvellous awfull,

---

the surest tokens of their election." *Prayer, Despair, and Drama: Elizabethan Introspection* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 21. This sort of preaching would presume a "converted" audience. Many decades ago, Edmund Morgan recognized that Hooker "spoke his words to sinners rather than saints" and judged his preaching to be "a magnificent exception" to the common clerical practice of focusing energy primarily upon those who were already believers. *The Puritan Family*, 175. As a result, Hooker's emphasis on terrifying the ungodly fits uneasily into Kaufman's analysis.

74. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 393, op. cit.

75. AR 10:408, 87. Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition vpon the Whole Epistle of Iude, Works*, 3*:587. Recall that Cotton Mather reported that although Hooker was capable of using other tactics, he often worked on his hearers "with fear, pulling them out of the fire." *Piscator* 32 {*Magnalia* 1:346}.

76. SP 136, see also AR 10:363. So *King Lear* II. i. 57: "Or whether gasted by the noyse I made, Full sodainely he fled." For a full account of the nature of Hooker's conversion preaching, see chapter 10.

terrible, and fearefull" warnings, and if God intended to work on his soul, the man would be unable to free himself from "the terrour of conscience." "The Lord lets in horror, and anguish, and vexation into the conscience," he continued, "and sets the very flashes of hell fire upon his face."[77] Hooker could say derisively of someone who only imagined that he believed that "he never felt the burthen of his sinnes, nor the wrath of God against him for his sins." As he later explained to his Hartford congregation, Hooker deliberately designed his preaching to be the medium through which God could let loose "the dreadful terrors of the Almighty, which overwhelm the soul of a sinner with unsupportable horrors." A hearer's heart would be "awakened with horrors and fears, and [his] heart startled with the terrors of the Almighty." Through the labors of his preachers, God would put men and women "into the furnace of his fierce wrath, scorching their Consciences."[78]

It they made a half-hearted effort to mend their ways, some hearers might find these terrors short-lived. For it might be that God intended only to "civilize" those people, not to convert them. But for those God had elected from eternity, terror could be prolonged. Hooker was convinced that "if God intends to doe good to a man, he will not let him goe thus, and fall to a civil course." Once a hearer had begun to meditate on her condition, the secret work of the Spirit would make fear her constant companion. "Labor to possess thy heart aright with a dreadful fear of thy sinful and desperate condition," he exhorted his Hartford hearers, for fear would "keep thy Meditation alive also, and mightily prevailing." The terrors would continue until his preaching had emptied a hearer of all hope that her own efforts could prevent God's fearful judgment.[79]

Once brought to faith, hearers were still subject to the terror of Hooker's preaching. Along with "mercies to encourage us," they were told to learn "to heare curses to terrifie us from sinnes." "A thousand threatnings are too little for such wretches as we are," he continued. "Carnall persons" might imagine that "Ministers ought not to speak such terrible things," but Hooker knew better. Even the wills of the godly were "overcharged with strong distempers, and clogged with venome and malice." "The flood gates of sinne within" godly hearts, let alone "abundance of bad examples without," demanded a perpetual homiletics of terror. "That onely is true faith," Hooker concluded when listing

---

77. AR 10:185; UP *42, 45, 83; see also AR 10:325, 428: "scorched with the fury of the Almighty" 564: "batterred all to pouder."

78. SEC 477; AR 10:331, 425, 446.

79. SP 139–44; AR 10:277.

the "markes of true faith," that "is assaulted with feare within, and terrours without."[80]

Hooker told his Chelmsford congregation that "the maine end" of preaching was actually twofold: to reprove the false pride of sinners, and, only after their repentance, to comfort faithful souls in those times when they doubted that they had gained God's favor.

But despite the reputation Hooker later gained from the frequent reprinting of *The Poore Doubting Christian*, comfort seemed woefully slow in coming. As he explained to his hearers, "The stubborn hearts of men need this specially, *reproving*, and therefore doing this, is ... the maine end for which the word serves. *Sharp reproofes make sound Christians.*"[81]

A decade and a half later, near the end of an illustrious career in the pulpit, he explained more specifically what "reproof" involved. The "Pastors work" was "to lay open the lothsome nature of sinne, and to let in the terror of the Lord upon the conscience."[82] As Hooker's lectures moved toward their conclusion, his audience would often endure a "Use of Reproof" or even a "Use of Terror." He gained a reputation among his ministerial colleagues for the ferociousness of his reproofs. In his obituary verses, Samuel Stone drew the reader's attention to this quality of Hooker's preaching, writing that "in reproof he was a sonne of Thunder." The editor of a volume of his Chelmsford sermons warned readers that "if thou be yet in thy *unregenerate* estate, he will prove a *Boanerges*, a son of *Thunder*, in shewing the *danger* of *Non-proficiencie* under the means of grace and knowledge, and in *wilfull* hardness against *admonition*, and reproof."[83]

Prayer Book Protestants might imagine a neighborly God upon whom they could call to preside benevolently over baptism, marriages, and funerals; Hooker forced them to confront *le dieu terrible*. It was his calling, he told his hearers, to fling "hell fire in your face." "The Lord hath revealed his will and sent his ministers to discover your sins, and terrifie your hearts."[84] Because men and women were so attached to their sin by nature, God had no choice but to use fear tactics. "Unlesse the Lord should thus wound and vexe the soule," Hooker explained, "the heart that prizeth corruption as a God (as every

---

80. PP 255–57; CTCL 252.

81. SP 72.

82. SSCD II, p. 19.

83. SSCD I, C3ʳ; see also SDD A2ʳ–A2ᵛ.

84. SP 125, SP 86, see also 55; SDD 214–15.

naturall man doth) would never be severed from it." "God is forced to make us feele this," he continued, "that we may be severed from our sinnes, and be subject to him in all obedience." "The dreadful wrath of the Eternal, like the mighty waves of the Sea," would "overwhelm and sink the soul of the sinner."[85]

Anyone who resisted Hooker's message would be threatened. "Thou art under the bondage of sinne, and Satan, and thy evill conscience is like a hangman, that every day hath the noose about thy neck; and if the ladder by death be once turned, then thou art hanged in endlesse, and easeless torments for ever, never to be comforted, never to be refreshed." Saints were expected to accept the "sharpest reproofs" even if delivered "after the most unsavory and disorderly manner"; to be "perversely tetchy" was the mark of a "painted Hypocrite."[86]

Even his messages to the godly were the stuff of nightmares. He might, for example, paint a verbal picture of the fate that they desperately hoped to have avoided: "When you see hell flaming, and the devils roaring, and the damned yelling and crying out; looke backe I say and see this ditch out of which you escaped."[87] His hearers would leave the lecture recalling not only that "the minister hath flung hell fire in your face" but also that he had exhorted them to throw similar hellfire in the faces of their unconverted neighbors and family members. "If there be any [unconverted] in your families, or amongst *your* neighbours, throw this in their faces, and if they will goe downe to hell, let them goe with paine, *that all they might be damned* (saith the text,) *which beleeved not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousnesse.* ... you must either buckle and mourne for sinne, or else burne for ever."[88] In Hartford he pleaded with his congregation to take his sermons to heart, painting a picture of a recalcitrant hearer in hell, finally recognizing the importance of the sermons he had disdained. Now, beyond all hope, the damned man "reads over all the Sermons he heard, by the flames of hell." He warned the unconverted children of godly parents that they might "see thy Parents going to heaven and thou damned."[89] He forced his hearers to imagine how they might fare at the last judgment:

---

85. SP 129–30; AR 10:367.

86. UP* 11; see also SP 108, 145; AR 10:411.

87. SBU 129; see also SDD 217–45.

88. SP 192, 193, see also 125; SDD 244.

89. AR 4:249–50; CGO 85; see also SEC 496.

suppose I heard the voice of the *Archangell* crying; *Arise yee dead and come to Iudgement*; and the last trumpet sounding, and the Lord Jesus comming in the heavens with his glorious Angells and did see the *Goats* standing *on the left hand*, and the *Saints on the right hand*, and with that I did heare the terrible sound, *Depart ye cursed*: would you be content to heare that sentence passe against your soules? Oh what lamentation and woe your poor soules would make in those dayes, and therefore consider it well, and say that I doe that in sinning which the Lord will doe in the day of Judgement.[90]

As had the young Luther, Hooker constantly reminded his listeners that God was furious at their sinfulness.

the wrath of the Lord shall smok against your soules, & he shal blot your names out of the book of life, the wrath of the Lord shall follow thee into all places, and upon all occasions, whatever thou dost, or whither-soever thou goest, the wrath of God shall follow thee to the Ale-house, and the Brothel-house, and to the Taverne; God shall follow thee and pluck thee out to thy shame here, & to thy confusion hereafter.[91]

Reading some of his Chelmsford sermons, one can easily imagine Hooker's voice rising with each sentence as he asked his congregation to imagine the nightmares of a sinner under conviction:

the thoughts of Hell astonish my heart; me thinkes I see a little peep-hole downe into hell, and the devils roaring there, being reserved in chaines under darknesse, untill the judgement of the great day; and me thinkes I see the damned flaming, and *Iudas* and all the wicked of the world, and they of Sodome and Gomorah: there they be roaring, and damnation takes hold upon them, and the wrath of God sinks them downe to hell: Now I have sinned, and therefore why should not I be damned, and why should not the wrath of God be executed against mee?[92]

---

90. SP 19–20; see also AR 10:61, 189–90.

91. UP* 45.

92. SP 301; see also AR 10:253.

Here was extreme Augustinianism in practice. One could hardly find a better example of what Jean Delumeau terms *surculpabilisation*: the clergy's creation of an extreme sense of guilt in lay hearers, designed to drive them to conversion. Taking his lead from John Rogers, Hooker became a master at instilling fear and guilt.

The Threat of Plague and Spanish Invasion

But some hearers had grown immune to threats of hellfire; they came to Hooker's lectures only to be entertained by his theatrical preaching. Hooker had other ways to terrify such complacent hearers. If the horrors of hell were too remote, he was more than ready to terrify them with horrors nearer home. People in early modern England were only too used to horrors. In his classic *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, Keith Thomas began with the proposition that Christianity tried—and often failed—to speak to the fragility of life in early modern England.[93] Sickness, disease, and death had an immediacy that modern people, largely insulated by insurance and comprehensive health-care systems, can scarcely imagine. Almost in passing, Hooker could compare the plight of a humbled sinner thirsting for grace to that of a condemned felon "hanged alive in chains."[94] He assumed that his Chelmsford hearers had seen, or known from reports of others, a form of public execution so gruesome that a twenty-first-century reader can only try to put it out of mind: the state demonstrating its power by suspending a human being in the air in full view of the town below and slowly allowing him to die from starvation and exposure. In his account of the village of Morebath during the English Reformation, Eamon Duffy describes how the vicar of St. Thomas Church near Exeter was punished for his part in the 1549 rebellion against the new Prayer Book. "A gallows was erected on the tower of his church," writes Duffy, "and he was left to die from exposure dangling from it by a chain around his waist." An eyewitness commented that he hung there a long time and "made a verie small or no confession but verie patientlie toke his dethe." "Spectators who watched his corpse stiffen above his church in its mass-vestments and beads," concludes Duffy, knew that "his terrible end was designed to send a strong and clear message" about the determination of the regime to stamp out the remnants of Catholic opposition to the Edwardian reformation.[95]

---

93. Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971).

94. ST 13.

95. Duffy, *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 134. A missionary priest, John Payne, after being

State-instigated terror was horrifying enough, but what if terrifying events were messages from God, sent to teach his creatures a lesson? Englishmen and women of all persuasions took for granted that everything that happened was part of God's providential will. If events had a moral, people expected a good preacher to be able to explain it.

For the most part, preachers taught that God used disasters to punish the people of England for their sinful behavior. Just as they used fear of punishment to help drive sinners to repentance and faith, so they imagined God's doing the same, terrifying his people with nightmares of divine retribution.[96] On the evidence of his surviving sermons, Hooker's hearers were constantly afraid of the possibility of events like fire, famine, bankruptcy, and sudden death. But two events that many saw on the horizon in the mid-1620s were especially terrifying: the recurrence of the plague, and a Roman Catholic conquest of England. Hooker played expertly on those fears.

Pandemic bubonic plague recurred with depressing frequency in early modern England, but no one knew when or where an episode would next break out. Epidemics of the plague in 1603 and again in 1625 killed 20 percent of London's population and forced both James I and Charles I to postpone their coronations. Plague closed the Globe Theatre for sixteen months in 1608–9, shutting out Shakespeare and his company; the King's Players were granted £40 as "rewarde for their private practice in time of infection." The Statutes for Emmanuel College stipulated that "if plague or any other contagious infection shall arise within the College," it was permissible for the Master and Fellows "to betake them to some other place." The statute was invoked when the College was closed in 1630, 1638, and 1665.[97] Any individual village or town might be spared for extended periods, but the disease was rarely absent from England in the centuries between 1485 and 1685. Daniel Defoe, recalling his boyhood experience in the terrible 1665 plague in London, wrote that "sorrow and sadness sat upon every face, and though some part [of

---

tortured in the Tower of London, had been drawn on the traitor's hurdle to a place of execution just outside of Chelmsford and hanged in 1582.

96. Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Lake with Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, 351.

97. Stephen Porter, *Lord Have Mercy upon Us: London's Plague Years* (Stroud: Tempus, 2005), 141; *pestis aut infectio ulla contagiosa*, Stubbings, ed., *Statutes for Emmanuel College*, 65, 135. A hundred years earlier, Luther's lectures on Genesis, which will figure in the next chapter, were threatened on two occasions by outbreaks of the plague in Wittenberg, once in 1535, when the plague forced the transfer of the entire university to Jena, and again in 1539. *Genesisvorlesung, W.A.* 42:vii, 43:200–201, 211, *Lectures on Genesis*, trans. George W. Schick and Paul D. Pahl, LW 1–8, 1:ix, 4:91, 105.

London] were not yet overwhelmed, yet all looked deeply concerned; and as we saw it apparently coming on, so everyone looked on himself, and his family, as in the utmost danger."[98]

There were two decades, though, when the entire country was free from plague: between 1612 and 1624 and between 1654 and 1664.[99] After so long an absence, the plague's sudden recurrence would have been especially terrifying, and those dwelling in the place where it first broke out would be desperate for an explanation. In 1624, plague broke out in Chelmsford. Confronted by such an "inherently contingent, formally meaningless and threateningly open-ended" outbreak, writes Peter Lake, "ordinary Christians, who habitually, as the preachers were only too aware, tuned out the godly, came back within the ambit of perfect Protestant preaching."[100] Came to hear the lectures of the newly installed Thomas Hooker.

Hooker seized his opportunity. Since plagues and "dearths" (famines) were conventionally assumed to be a deliberate warning from God, Hooker explained to his desperate audience that God had a particular purpose in allowing plagues to descend upon his helpless people.[101] "The Lord" had "sent many plagues into this country, and into this towne," he told his Chelmsford hearers. "Here is one dying and there another is taken away by the destroying Angell of the Lord." Generally he followed conventional godly wisdom: Plague was brought on by human sinfulness; the only effective remedy would be repentance and future obedience to the Rule.

But to keep fear of the plague alive in his hearers' minds, he often reminded them of their behavior during the plague. "A man that hath the plague tokens, we say, *The Lord have mercy upon him*, and we give him over for dead, and the bell tolles for him." "In plague time," he recalled on another occasion, "when the aire is infected, we get Antidotes to keep us from the infection of the ayre."

His explanations could also be imaginative and pointed. If plague was retribution for sin, one could think of sin as a kind of plague. "It is in this case with sinne," he explained, "as it is with the plague of the body, he that will be clere of it, the old rule is, flye farre enough, flye soon enough; hee that is

---

98. Defoe, *A Journal of the Plague Year* (1722; reprint, New York: Modern Library, 2001), 17, cited in Francis Bremer, *John Davenport*, 73.

99. Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, paperback ed. (Oxford, 1990), 14, 26, 67–68; Porter, *London's Plague Years*, 79–144.

100. *Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, 473.

101. E.g., Perkins, *Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:126: "say God sendes a grieuous dearth and famine of bread among vs, or the plague of pestilence, as he hath done sundrie times," see also 190.

with those that are infected, likely he shall be infected." From a denunciation of sin in general he could move quickly to the particular sins he wished to condemn. Just as they avoided anyone with plague sores, so the godly were to flee the sores of blasphemy, drunkenness, and sexual promiscuity. "Hee that hath a plague sore blossoming, hee that hath a tongue belching forth his venome against the Lord of hosts: he that hath a plague sore of drunkennesse, a plague sore of adultery, if ever you would be preserved, then goe farre enough, flie soone enough." Eventually the arrow hit Hooker's favorite target: "the Alehouse is the Pest-house where the plague is; the drunkards are the persons infected."[102]

The threat of plague could also be brought to bear on godly men and women who had begun to slide back. Householders would have remembered only too well their panic when they found that plague had infected neighbors in nearby houses; would it soon strike their own dwellings? "When you begin to be carelesse of the Sabbath," Hooker warned, "and cold, and luke-warme, and dull; call upon one another and say, You know the plague was neere at hand, husband at such a time, but the Lord kept it from us. For Gods sake husband, let us take heed that we doe not bring the curse upon our Family."[103] Hooker's God could direct the plague to individual families, and he was prepared to do so if they ignored his commandments.

As terrifying to Hooker and his godly hearers, and as effective as a surrogate for the flames of hell, was the threat of invasion and conquest by a Roman Catholic power. Spain had attempted full-scale invasion in 1588, and it still held territories in the Low Countries just a few miles across the Channel from Hooker's Essex. At the beginning of Hooker's tenure in Chelmsford, everyone in England was aware that Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham had recently sailed to Spain to create a "Spanish Match" between the Prince and the Infanta. As the marriage had begun to look more and more likely, a "sense of impending doom," in the words of Michael Questier, "gripped some of the more Protestant members of the Establishment." Would such a marriage lead to Charles's conversion to Catholicism and the persecution of godly Protestants? War on the continent was going badly; both Prague and Heidelberg had fallen to Catholic armies, and many in England feared what

---

102. FLT 51; CTCL 85–86, 7; FLT 79–80.

103. FC 21. In late sixteenth-century Nuremberg, Magdalena Behaim wrote her husband Balthasar Paumgartner that she "was terrified when pestilence broke out in three houses on our street up by the baker's and five people died." Steven Ozment, *Magdalena and Balthasar: An Intimate Portrait of Life in 16th-Century Europe Revealed in the Letters of a Nuremberg Husband & Wife* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), 42.

Thomas Cogswell has called "the seventeenth-century equivalent of the 'domino theory' ": that continued Catholic victories would lead eventually to the overthrow of the United Provinces and England. Jesuit and seminary priests operated clandestinely throughout the country, and godly politicians played on fears of a Catholic fifth-column.[104]

Negotiations over the Spanish Match ultimately failed, but the fear of a Spanish invasion remained. Since the Essex coast would be the natural target of such an invasion, rumors swirled around the county that a Spanish fleet would soon set sail from Dunkirk. On August 26, 1625, three thousand members of the Essex trained bands were mustered for the defense of the coast.[105]

Hooker shared these fears, and he did his best to pass them on to his hearers. "The deluge of miseries hath overspread other countreys," he told them, "and it is neere us." "If Popery should come, prepare for a Crosse."[106] His disdain for the Jesuits extended to the entire Roman Catholic hierarchy. The Pope was the "Antichrist," he said in Hartford, who had enslaved his followers to false doctrine and "tortured their consciences upon a continual rack, held their souls smoking over the *mouth of the bottomless* pit, put them into hell, and plucked them out at his pleasure."[107]

If fires of anxiety about Catholic takeover were already smoldering in the hearts of his hearers, Hooker intended his sermons to stoke them. Just before his flight to the Netherlands, he preached a sermon that could only have sent chills down the spines of his audience. Describing the devastation of formerly Protestant countries on the continent by the Count of Tilly's Catholic army,

---

104. Cogswell, "England and the Spanish Match," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–1642*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), 107–33; Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Questier, "John Gee, Archbishop Abbot, and the Use of Converts from Rome in Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," *Recusant History* 21 (1993): 347–60, at 349. Three years after the failed Spanish invasion of 1588, for example, William Cecil shepherded through a proclamation claiming that "many thousands" of English Catholics were prepared to assist an invading Spanish army. Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow: Persecution, Martyrdom and the Politics of Sanctity in Elizabethan England* (London: Continuum, 2011), 129–30. "T.V.," the translator of Bartholomäus Keckermann's *Ouranognosia* into English, imagined the disguised priests as "swarmes of … Locusts" blown into England by the Pope; "sitting theeuishly in the blind corners of our streets they entrap the simple folk, and lurking in their secret dens of darknesse they ensnare the poor and wauering minded." *Ouranognosia. Heauenly knowledge A manuduction to theologie* (London, 1622), *NSTC* 14896, "The Preface," sig. A5ᵛ.

105. Hunt, *Puritan Moment*, 189–90.

106. CTCL 48–49, 76.

107. SSCD I:A3ᵛ. Was the pot calling the kettle black?

and the persecution of Protestants that followed, he forced his audience to imagine a similar fate for themselves:

> Goe to Bohemia, from thence to the Palatinate, and so to Denmarke. Imagine you were there, what shall you see, nothing else but as Travellers say, Churches made heaps of stones, and those Bethels wherin Gods name was called upon, are made defiled Temples for Satan and superstition to raigne in. You cannot goe two or three steps, but you shall see the heads of dead men, goe a little further, and you shall see their hearts picked out by the fowles of the ayre, whereupon you are ready to conclude that Tilly hath been there: Those churches are become desolate, and why not England? Goe into the Cities and Townes, and there you shall see many compassed about with the chaines of captivity, and every man bemoaning himselfe. Doe but cast your eyes abroad, and there you shall see poore fatherlesse children sending forth their breathes, with feare, crying to their poore helplesse mothers. Step but a little farther, and you shall see the sad wife bemoaning her husband, and that is her misery, that she cannot dye soone enough, and withall she makes funerall Sermons of her children within her selfe, for that the Spaniard may get her little ones, and bring them up in Popery and superstition; and then she weeps and considers with her selfe: If my husband be dead, it is well, happily he is upon the racke, or put to some cruell tortures, and then she makes funerall Sermons, and dyes a hundred times before she can dye. Cast your eyes afar off, set your soules in their soules stead, and imagine it were your owne condition, why may not England be thus, who knowes but it may be my wife, when he heares of some in torments?[108]

Descriptions of hellfire could scarcely have been more terrifying. "Would you have your children, your deare ones," he said later in the same sermon, "to be throwne upon the pikes, and dashed against the wals, or would you have them brought up in idolatry?" A hearer might bravely boast that he would die before he would "become a Papist," but Hooker scornfully predicted that "thou wilt not beare the crosse when it comes to the tryall." Imagining the future after the invasion, Hooker described a traveler passing through a devastated England and observing the "townes burnt up," "houses burnt up, and the Churches burnt."[109]

---

108. DD 5–6; see also FLT 115–16.

109. DD 14; CTCL 92; FC 4 {192}.

What would be the meaning of this destruction? Children would be saying, "I remember my father said thus it would be, for the Land forsooke the Covenant of the Lord; and the Minister told us of this stubbornnesse and rebellion against the Lord, that this would be the end of it." The Minister's message held the only key to survival. If the people of Chelmsford would just take Hooker's warning to heart, repent of their sins, and order their behavior according to the Rule, they could avoid such a fate. If they ignored him, the "fierce wrath of the Lord" would strike through the instrument of a Spanish invasion. "Take heed that the Lord doth not say to us, O *England*, how often would I, but you would not!"[110]

Hooker never let his hearers forget that the extreme Augustinian God would have a definite purpose if he chose to visit plagues and Roman Catholic invasions upon a sinful England. Only when "the Famine hath beene threatned, the plague inflicted and the Sword is comming" would there be "howling and taking notice of the abomination that harbours among you." When people would not "be bettered by Gods corrections, hee will breake them in peeces." Just as the justice of that God had required him to damn the reprobate, so his justice would force him to send plagues and threaten famine and the Sword. "If the Lord should not proceed after this manner, God could not maintaine his owne glory and Iustice." Those who dared "scoffe at the corrections of the Lord" and would say "let God plague us," would find to their sorrow that God would "knocke them to peeces and consume them." Only "when we shall see the streets runne with the bloud of drunkards and loose persons" would scoffers admit that "had the hand of the Lord wrought upon us, it would not now have beene thus with us."[111]

Not every imaginable disaster was grist for Hooker's mill. Contrary to what a twenty-first-century reader might expect, Hooker chose not to make apocalyptic predictions about the coming end of time.[112] Godly preachers often warned hearers that they were in the "last age of the world" and that "the end can not be farre off."[113] When Catholic armies overran Bohemia and the Palatinate, for example, Thomas Gataker proclaimed that "the last houre is now running. And we are those on whom the end of the world are fallen."[114]

---

110. FC 4, see also 8 {192, see also 195}; PP 307 (the reference, of course, is to Matt. 23:37).

111. FLT 151–54.

112. Although David Hall, *A Reforming People*, 108, speaks of Hooker's "apocalypticism," I would term the texts to which Hall refers "eschatological" rather than "apocalyptic."

113. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:259, 261.

114. Cited in Cogswell, "Spanish Match," 120.

Hooker certainly took for granted that the course of history was nearing its close. Looking at the first five verses of the third chapter of 2 Timothy, where the Apostle foresaw that "in the last dayes shall come perilous times, for men shall bee lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, &c. disobedient to parents, unthankefull, unholy, having a shew of godliness, but denying the power of it," Hooker saw the Apostle's prediction borne out. "This is our times right," he explained, "having toyes, and trifles, and deny the power of godlinesse, it is made good in our eares, and in our eyes this day … in this last age of the world."[115] Hooker reminded his hearers that the Apostle Paul had foreseen "the rejection of the Jewes, and that God would throw them away for sixteen hundred yeeres together." That sixteen hundred years was about to come to an end. Both in Old and New England, Hooker told his hearers that they were living "in the last Age of the world."[116]

But the apocalyptic imagery of the Book of Revelation, with its impending battles between Christ and Antichrist, Gog and Magog, played little role in his preaching. Here he was again following Perkins, who had written a treatise in 1588 against those who had predicted the end of the world. "The latter dayes or last houre" was in fact "the whole space of time from the comming of Christ vnto the ende of the world." Even if he and his contemporaries were living in the latter days, Perkins continued, "the world may for all that continue an hundred yeares, or two hundred yeares longer, for any thing we know."[117]

Particular Application

Hooker did make full use of a preaching technique that contemporaries generally associated with a godly ministry; he prided himself on "particular application." As a shepherd would care individually for each of his sheep, "search them and dress them according to their several ayls," so a faithful minister would deal with hearers "in their particular evils, and follow them with application of special helps." "A speciall application of particular sinnes," he explained, was "a chief means to bring people to a sight of their sinnes and to a true sorrow for them."[118] Particular application meant drawing attention to

---

115. SEC 438–39; see also CTCL 232.

116. SJ 223; SEC 512; SU 50; SJ 181 (Old England); CCLP 24, 343 (New England).

117. *A Fruitfvll Dialogve Concerning the Ende of she World, Works* 3:*470. John Cotton, by contrast, made much of the coming end of the world, see Holifield, *Theology in America*, 48–50.

118. AR 10:195–96; SP 64. Arnold Hunt discusses "particular preaching" in *The Art of Hearing*, 251–53.

the specific sins that at least some members of his congregation were actually committing. Ideally, each member of the congregation would perceive a section of the preacher's sermon as if God had intended that section especially for him. "The word of the Lord commeth like a sword," said Hooker; "the Lord seemes to aime at a sinner, that he saith it is my sinne that is now discovered." Godly hearers were asked to expect and to welcome the minister's speaking particularly to their situation: "When you come into the congregation, and see the minister giving and parting to every one his doale; reproofe here, and instruction there; looke up to heaven and labour to get some thing to thy owne particular."[119]

Particular application was intended to work something like this: "When a minister makes application of sin in particular … [he] saith, O all you drunkards and adulterers, this is your portion, and let this be as venome in your hearts to purge out your lusts." Any drunkard or adulterer among his hearers would naturally feel as if the minister were speaking particularly to him. Cotton Mather relates that before the godly preacher John Wilson left England for the new world, a notorious thief happened to drop in on his Sudbury lecture. Wilson was preaching on Ephesians 4:28: "Let him that stole, Steal no more." Not surprisingly, the thief found the sermon "as it were, particularly Directed unto himself" and became a changed man.[120] At its most penetrating, the effects of such preaching could be dramatic. When one of Hooker's particular applications struck home, he reported, "sometimes the sinner cries out in the congregation."[121]

Hooker assumed that the impact of his message would linger; he told his hearers to "labour to maintaine the power of it upon your hearts all the weeke after." A hearer affected by his preaching might in fact ponder his words for some time. "Me thinkes he aymed at me," Hooker hoped that hearer would think as he reflected. "He intended me … I heare the word still sounding in mine eares." "When the minister hath done his sermon," he instructed his hearers, "then your worke beginnes, you must heare all the weeke long."[122] The more compelling the preacher's continual re-creation of God's countercultural expectations for his human creatures, the more persistent would be its impact on the imaginations of his hearers.

---

119. TGS 31; SP 77.

120. *Memoria Wilsonia*, in *Johannes in Eremo*, separate pagination, 11.

121. SP 66, 149.

122. SP 203, 81, 128.

Perkins had warned his readers about how hearers might react to the preacher's drawing attention to their particular sins. If the preacher were to reprove "the sinne of swearing, or drunkennes[s], or any such sinne: then some one guiltie hereof, doth not onely surmise, but also break forth into this speech, *Now the preacher meanes mee; hee speakes this of mee; he censures my facts and speeches*; hereupon followes spite and malice against the person of the minister, and also rash censuring and condemning of his ministerie." Perhaps even more likely, hearers would assume that the preacher's reproofs were directed at a fellow hearer, hinting that "now the preacher meanes such a man; now he speakes against such a man."[123]

None of the printed versions of Hooker's surviving sermons contains evidence that he singled anyone out by name.[124] In a close-knit community, though, it is hard to imagine that many members of his audience would not have known whose sins he was reproving in a passage like the following:

> Doe you see a light-headed and a wanton-hearted woman wandring out of her owne house at nine or tenne a clocke at night, using unseasonable houres, like Toades that alwayes crawle from their holes when it is darke; what doth this woman provide for? Doth shee provide for holinesse, modesty & mercy? Nay, that would make her stay at home in her own house; if it were for Religion, she would not be abroad at that time; she provides for nothing else but whoredome and drunkennesse.[125]

Given such preaching, it is hardly surprising that a hearer might accuse Hooker after the sermon, "You speak against me, I know you meane me."[126]

Particular application was risky. Anyone who felt publicly singled out was likely to resent it. The godly Richard Bernard, whose 1607 *Faithful Shepherd* rivaled Perkins's *Prophetica* as a guide for pastors, was denounced to the diocesan court by a parishioner who asserted "that the said Mr Bernard's method of preaching is to speak in particular against his parishioners, and especially against him." Bernard defended his practice with the argument that "if a

---

123. Perkins, *Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 1:196.

124. Here is an instance, however, when printed versions may deceive; one can imagine that those who took Hooker's sermons down in shorthand, or those who printed them without his authorization, might have chosen not to include accusations directed toward individual persons. Hooker termed Peter's charge in Acts 2:36 that his hearers had crucified Christ a "particular application," AR 10:18.

125. SPos 121–22.

126. TGS 74–75; see also SP 8.

minister do see a man to live in some notorious sin and so privately reprove him for it, and the party offending do yet continue in his wicked course of life, then if the minster do afterwards preach against such a sin the party will be ready to say that it was spoken of him."[127] Hooker explained that "if a minister comes in for a witness against [a hearer], and begins to arraigne him, and to indite him, for his pride, and malice, and covetousness, and to convince him of them, and to lay him flat before the Lord, & his conscience, Oh then he is not able to beare it." The challenge to a minister's courage was especially daunting "if a great man be present, or a patron that we looke for a living from" and the man's "sinnes be so grosse that all the Congregation would cry shame, if he did not reprove them." Speaking from the safety of Hartford about "the Country whence we came," Hooker reported that "many a formal wretch hath been at great cost and charges, laid out himself and estate to bring a faithful preacher to a place." But "when the soul-saving dispensation of the Word hath either discovered his fals[e]ness, and laid open the cursed haunts of a carnal heart. … He that had the greatest hand to bring the means and Ministry unto the place, if he cannot cunningly undermine the man, he would rather leave the place, than live under the Ministry that would take away his lusts." Hooker ashamedly confided that he himself had sometimes failed to measure up to his own standard: "I blame my selfe so farre as my base feare possesseth me."[128]

Since one goal of Hooker's preaching was to polarize his hearers into distinct groups of sheep and goats, Hooker insisted that once someone's heart had been "broken" by his preaching, she was bound to avoid "loose, vaine, joviall company." Further association with worldly people would inevitably be "a marvelous impediment, and hindrance to those that indeavor to walke uprightly before God in any measure." One prominent "marke of a sound Christian" was a willingness to "hate and avoid wicked and dissolute men."[129]

The Chelmsford godly did not separate from the world. As John Eliot explained to Richard Baxter, they remained part of the larger parish community. But to become the new, exact, submissive saints that God and the minister expected, they needed to identify clearly with the godly camp.[130]

---

127. The charges against Bernard are discussed in Haigh, *Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven,* 23–24.

128. SP 68–69; AR 10:421; SP 71. Did Hooker have a particular "formal wretch" in mind?

129. SP 95–96; PP 386.

130. Eliot to Baxter, October 7, 1657, 159–60. Patrick Collinson, "The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful," in *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England,* ed. Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke

Even after reaching the presumably godly plantation of Hartford, Hooker continued to polarize his hearers. "There is no reconciliation between such as be of the World, and such as be of God, to be hoped for," he insisted. "Because these are Contraries, their very Being and Constitution is Dissention; and therefore they must cease to be, if they cease to oppose." Students who imagine Hooker's Connecticut as a holy commonwealth will be brought up short by passages like the following:

> Walk from one Plantation to another, from one Society to another; nay, which is yet a further misery, from one Assembly to another, *all the Earth sits still, and is at rest*; there is no stirring, no trading in Christianity; men cheapen not, enquire not after the purchase of the precious things of the Gospel, what shall I do to be quit of my self? what shall I do to be severed from my sins which have pestered me so long? prejudiced my peace so much, and if it continue, wil be my ruin? As though Christ were taking the Charter of the Gospel from the present Generation, and were removing the Markes, there is no stirring, Trade is dead, men come dead, and sit so, and return so unto their Habitations, there is deep silence, you shal not hear a word.[131]

Laying out God's expectations, said Hooker near the end of his life, "sets men in greatest opposition, and crossness one to another. It cals men into Light, and therefore darkness cannot accord with it. It makes men Righteous, and ther[e]fore Unrighteousness cannot agree therewith."[132]

Finally the Gospel

Although threats of eternal punishment for violation of God's law sometimes seem to dominate Hooker's message, he did reserve a place for the gospel. Once he sensed that reproof had achieved its objective—driving a hearer to recognize herself as one who had offended God, deserved God's disfavor, and was sorry for the offense, causing her first to doubt and then utterly renounce her own ability to win God's favor and avert God's wrath—Hooker was eager to extend the promises of the Gospel and recruit her into the godly community.

(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 51–76, describes the challenge of being godly but not separating from the parish or the world.

131. CCLP 413; AR 10:565.

132. CCLP 123, see also 67–68, 80; 408, 413, 416.

On one level he was simply following the tradition of his godly predecessors, for Perkins had written that until the hearts of those who resisted the preacher's message were pierced, he was to threaten them with the curse of the law. But no sooner had the preacher detected the beginnings of compunction (*initium compunctionis*) than he was to bring out the comforting message of the Gospel.[133]

As Hooker expressed it near the end of his life, from a denouncer of sin and a threatener of punishment, the pastor became a comforter, holding out the Gospel's promise of eternal life to all who believed. As it had been with Joanna Drake at the beginning of his ministry, his charge became "to answer all those feares, and to scatter all the clouds of discouraging objections, that the soul may see the path plain and safe to come to the promise, and to receive power and comfort to walk with God therein."[134]

Did the switch from law to gospel soften Hooker's fierce rhetoric? Once broken-hearted, humbled, and accepted into the community of the godly, was a hearer finally free from the preacher's threats of the wrath of the extreme Augustinian God? Hardly. Hooker simply shifted the object of his threatening from the sinner to her remaining sin, sin about which, in her broken-hearted condition, she was all too aware. To provoke the fuller humility that God demanded in his converts, Hooker saw no option but to continue his homiletics of terror. Hoping to have escaped from eternal damnation, the contrite sinner would still feel God's anger, focused now on her inevitable misdeeds. Perkins imagined God as the head of a household, regularly threatening his sons with the instruments he habitually used to beat his servants:

> While the curse of the law ought not to be pressed on a person who is righteous and holy in the sight of God, yet it is to be pressed on the person's remaining sins. Just as a father often places the iron rods he uses on the servants before the eyes of his sons, in order to terrify them (*ut terreantur*): so the faithful themselves ought to be encouraged constantly to meditate on the curse, lest they should abuse the mercy of God by licencious living, and that they may be more fully humbled (*ut pleniòr humiliantur*).[135]

---

133. *maledictio legis interminanda. … evanglio … solandi. Prophetica*, 95, *Works*, 2:666.

134. SSCD 2:20; the reference is to Acts 14:22.

135. *Prophetica*, 98, *Works*, 2:667; see also WB 458, 468, where Stone instructs the parent in correcting children: "if words prevaile not, they must have stripes," and the master in correcting his servants: "if words will not do, he may lay on stripes." As was true for Luther in his description of *Anfectungen,* comparing God to a parent playing games with beloved children ran the risk of creating an image of God's playing "mind games" with his elect.

As will become clearer in the next two chapters, concepts such as "contrition," "humiliation," "preparation," and "conversion" were never meant to be confined to a liminal event through which one passed on the way to an anxiety-free sainthood. They described both the entrance and the lifelong continuation of the "exact," "tedious" behavior of the regenerate. The same terrible God who made sinners grovel would continue to find ways to induce fear in converts. Just as it was far riskier to offer comfort too soon, on too easy terms, than to withhold it, so comfort would always be leavened with anxiety, lest God's mercy be abused.[136]

If we accept George Lindbeck's contention that religions are "comprehensive interpretive schemes, usually embodied in myths or narratives and heavily ritualized, which structure human experience and understanding of self and world," then we can conclude that for Hooker, preaching was the primary technique through which he imposed his particular notion of religion on his hearers.[137] At the center of Christianity as Hooker understood it was the godly preacher, whose message touched every aspect of the day-to-day life of his godly hearers. The benign country parson, indispensable chiefly at rites of passage and a few important dates of the ritual year, was nowhere to be seen. The elect, on the other hand, were those who accepted the religion Hooker imposed and organized their lives accordingly.

Before turning specifically to Hooker's techniques for inducing conversion, it may be useful to leave the reader with a final impression of Hooker's homiletics of terror. A sinner has just been condemned to hell and understands too late what Hooker's preaching has been about:

> Now when a poore damned creature seeth that the sentence is gone,
> and seeth the good wil[l] of God pass'd upon him, and the power of his

---

136. Hooker warned ministers against offering hearers quick relief from their awareness of God's anger at their sinfulness. "*Be not too hasty to heal the wound.* More hast[e] than good speed draws here desperate inconveniences with it and may be hazards their comforts while they live. Old and deep sores as they have been long in gathering corrupt humors, so they must have a time to wast and wear them away, which wil not be done in a moment; old stayns must lye long in soak, and have many fresh lavers before in reason they can be clensed. So old distempers which have taken strong possession, and are of long continuance, happily if the cure be too hasty, it wil hazard our comforts: …. AR 10:355–56. Hooker's decision to use terror to scare his hearers out of their complacency must at least qualify E. Brooks Holifield's otherwise insightful descriptions of the "rationalism" of the first-generation New England ministry. *Theology in America*, 25–55. Thoroughly committed to Ramist logic and known for his ability to dispute, Hooker nonetheless believed that unless God changed the inclination of the will—through the terrifying preaching of his ministers—arguments to the understanding would prove fruitless.

137. Lindbeck, *Nature of Doctrine*, 32.

wrath now to bee exprest to the full against him, and he apprehends the will of God now fulfild never to be crost more, and the decree of God is now exprest never to bee altered more, and hee seeth the gates of hell now sealed upon him, and that the Lord hath cast upon him the tombstone of his wrath, and that he is buried under the power of the second death, and now he seeth the time is gone, and the justice of God can never bee satisfied more, and this power of the Lords wrath can never be removed: Oh the time was, that I had the word and the power of it to quicken me, and to informe me, and the Spirit of God to strive with me, and there was some hope, but now the decree of God is made unrevokable, and this wrath I shall never beare, nor never remove. There is now no word, no praying, no hearing, no conference, no mercy, nor salvation to bee hoped for, and so the soule lookes no more for any good, because the Lord hath so peremptorily set downe his decree, thus the soule breaks under the wrath of God, and is not able to satisfie, and the wrath of God can never be removed, the fire will ever burne, and the worme will ever gnaw, and now the soule casts off all hope,[138]

However this message may sound to twenty-first-century ears, it continued to draw eager audiences to his Chelmsford lectures.

---

138. SJ 229–30.

9

Learning How to
Imagine Conversion

HALF A CENTURY ago, Alan Simpson began an influential series of lectures by contending that "the essence of Puritanism" was "an experience of conversion which separates the Puritan from the mass of mankind and endows him with the privileges and duties of the elect. The root of the matter," he continued, was "always a new birth."[1] Simpson's assumption that "Puritanism" was a discrete entity with its own "essence" no longer commands wide scholarly acceptance, but just about everyone allows that godly people in early modern England were almost obsessively interested in what they thought of as their "conversion." Thomas Hooker's sermons certainly seem preoccupied with conversion; Samuel Stone's *Whole Body* discusses conversion for many pages.

But did godly religion stem from personal experience, as Simpson believed? Does the powerful impact of an "experience of conversion" explain what is distinctive about the beliefs, piety, and behavior of men like Hooker and Stone? Conventional wisdom would seem to think so, but how in fact did Hooker and Stone understand "conversion"? How did they try to induce it in their hearers? The next two chapters will address these questions (concentrating primarily on Hooker because there are few sources for Stone's conversion preaching). This chapter will look carefully at the traditions on which Hooker drew and at the relationship between those traditions and his personal experience. The next chapter will take a close look at the specific techniques Hooker used to bring his hearers into the godly fellowship.

But we must first face a fundamental question about "experiences of conversion." Are they in fact the foundation of religion, the "root" (as Simpson assumed)

---

1. *Puritanism in Old and New England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), 2.

from which religious traditions—liturgy, doctrine, piety, and behavior—take form? Or, conversely, can a convert make sense of her experience only through the categories that her religious tradition has already provided? In the simplest terms, is experience prior to culture, or the other way around?

It has become almost a commonplace to think of conversion as transition: a convert abandons one way of living and takes up another. Someone's "conversion" will then be the process during which she moves from the old way to the new. Once settled in the new way, her conversion is over. She is "converted."[2]

Scholars who imagine conversion as the transition from one mode of life to another often lean on the work of two influential anthropologists, Arnold van Gennep and Victor Turner. In their studies of preliterate cultures, van Gennep and Turner thought about the rituals in which individuals, particularly adolescent males, were initiated into adulthood. Van Gennep called these rituals "rites of passage." Turner was especially interested in describing the time "in-between" an initiate's previous form of existence and the new existence he was about to take on. Turner called such "in-between" experiences "liminal," from the Latin *limen*: threshold or doorway.[3]

To many Christians, such interpretive categories seem tailor-made: conversion can be understood as a transition from a self-centered, sinful way of life to one which subordinates the self to God's will. Likewise, students of early seventeenth-century England might imagine godly conversion as a transition from sin to grace, from unbelief to belief, from damnation to salvation. A conversion would begin while the future convert was still in a state of sin and be finished when she had irrevocably achieved the state of grace. As a newly converted Christian, she would look back on her "experience of conversion" as something completed. During the period of her conversion, she would be in a "liminal" state, a kind of existence unlike anything that occurred in her everyday, quotidian life.

However self-evident such an understanding of conversion might seem today, Hooker did not share it. Had the terms been explained to him, he would have denied that conversion was "liminal" in Turner's sense or that it

---

2. Arthur Darby Nock classically described conversion as "the reorientation of the soul of an individual, his deliberate turning from indifference or from an earlier form of piety to another, a turning which implies a consciousness that a great change is involved, that the old was wrong and the new is right." *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 7.

3. van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960); Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Chicago: Aldine, 1969).

was a "rite of passage" in van Gennep's. As Hooker described it, conversion was never complete, never something one had passed beyond. It defined the day-to-day experience of every Christian and continued throughout her lifetime.[4] Rather than a rite of passage into a new way of life, it was that new way of life, not "over" until the hour of her death. Never a single event or experience, conversion was a daily discipline of consciously, deliberately, and continuously realigning one's behavior to the strictures of a rigorous standard of godly behavior. Conversion was achieving and sustaining a "habitual disposition of the heart for well-doing," a habitual submission to the Rule.[5] Writing on Christian conversion in the twelfth century, Karl Morrison concludes that "rather than a single, transforming event," conversion was understood as a "continuous process of transition," a "way of life." "All of life, rightly lived, was conversion."[6] Hooker would have agreed.

The existence of two such distinct understandings of "conversion" ought to call into question the assumption that religious conversion is a generic human experience, a possibility latent in every human being that can be brought into being by the right external stimuli. If one brushes against the plant *Toxicodendron radicans*, for instance, regardless of one's geographical, cultural, or historical circumstances, the substance urushiol comes in contact with the skin. If one is among those disposed to react (not everyone does), one develops the itching rash known as "urushiol-induced contact dermatitis": poison ivy. Once the body's immune system detects the urushiol, physiological reactions occur which automatically create the rash. The urushiol ceases to play any further role; the physiological reaction proceeds along a predictable and well-documented course.

---

4. As expressed in the first of Luther's famous "95 Theses": "When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ said, 'Repent', he willed the entire life of believers to be one of repentance (*omnem vitam fidelium penitentiam esse voluit*)." *Disputatio pro declaratione virtutis indulgentiarum. 1517. W.A.* 1:229, *Ninety-Five Theses*, trans. C. M. Jacobs and Harold Grimm, LW 31:25. Hooker advised his Hartford hearers to "renew and act over daily" the initial work of the Spirit. AR 10:377, see also 571.

5. CTCL 275–76.

6. Morrison, *Understanding Conversion* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992), 147, xii. For a similar observation from a twenty-first-century practitioner, see the judgment of Frank Honeycutt, pastor of Ebenezer Lutheran Church in Columbia, South Carolina: "Conversion is always a lifelong process. It is never finished for any of us." "Growing Christians," *Christian Century*, February 22, 2011, 34. In his exhaustive study of New England Puritan conversion, Charles Cohen contends that "the new birth was a prolonged process that began years before one joined a congregation and whose impact resonated throughout a believer's life." *God's Caress*, 14–15.

Conversion has too often been assumed to occur in a similar manner, as if exposure to godly preaching eventually triggered in a predisposed subset of hearers—regardless of their time and place—a generic psychological reaction, one whose symptoms would be similar from convert to convert and whose progress could be predicted and monitored. Just as the rash appears a day or two after contact with the leaves, followed by blisters, followed eventually by healing of the skin and blessed freedom from itching, so conversion is imagined to follow a well-known path from contrition to justification to sanctification.[7]

But what if conversion is not like poison ivy? If "God" has been imagined variously by particular people in particular times and place, what if the meaning of "conversion" will also depend on where and by whom it is defined? Is there an interpretive framework that can help twenty-first-century people understand "conversion" as it was understood in particular historical situations without assuming that conversion is a generic human experience?

In his *Nature of Doctrine*, George Lindbeck proposed such a framework. In what has been called a "post-liberal manifesto," Lindbeck drew on cultural insights from Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Émile Durkheim, as well as on Ludwig Wittgenstein's philosophical observations about language, to argue for what he called a "cultural-linguistic" interpretive model for the study of religion. The conventional "experiential-expressive" model assumed that an individual's experience could exist apart from the culture in which she lived. Lindbeck challenged that assumption. "Human experience," he argued, "is shaped, molded, and in a sense constituted by cultural and linguistic forms." Instead of deriving external features of a religion from inner experience," as was ordinarily done, Lindbeck proposed that "it is the inner experiences which are viewed as derivative." Our ability to make sense of what was happening to us would depend on the cultural atmosphere that we breathed. In Lindbeck's words:

> We cannot identify, describe, or recognize experience qua experience
> without the use of signs and symbols. These are necessary even for what

---

7. Edmund Morgan famously explained that Puritan writers "wished to trace a natural history of conversion" and eventually established a "morphology of conversion, in which each stage could be distinguished from the next." *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1965), 66. Morgan's student Norman Pettit made a similar assumption in *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966). Even Charles Cohen, who recognizes that religious experience defied "exact reckoning," assumes that "considered in the abstract conversion could be charted precisely, its steps checked off in logical order." *God's Caress*, 13.

the depth psychologist speaks of as "unconscious" or "subconscious" experiences, or for what the phenomenologist describes as prereflective ones. In short, it is necessary to have the means for expressing an experience in order to have it, and the richer our expressive or linguistic system, the more subtle, varied, and differentiated can be our experience.

Applying this model specifically to religious experiences such as conversion, Lindbeck argued that "first comes the objectivities of the religion, its language, doctrines, liturgies, and modes of action, and it is through these that passions are shaped into various kinds of what is called religious experience." Simply stated, "Religions are producers of experience."[8]

Lindbeck's cultural-linguistic model provides a useful corrective against the tendency to posit a normative "conversion experience" against which any individual's experience can be measured. Once this has been done, it is difficult to resist the temptation to take the next step: passing judgment on whether individual experiences were or were not "genuine."[9] Because they shared theological assumptions about what constituted a "genuine" conversion, early seventeenth-century ministers and laypeople believed they could pass such judgments. Four centuries later, scholars would be wise to resist this temptation. They face a different interpretative challenge: to explain how the godly culture expected "conversion" to occur and to understand how ministers helped people to interpret what happened to them along the lines that the godly culture expected.

One must even beware of the assumption that conversions are invariably "religious experiences," marked by a perceptible intrusion of the supernatural and therefore different from anything "secular."[10] Making such an assumption

---

8. Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 20, 32–39, 30, *et passim*. Coming at this issue from a specific examination of the "conversions" of Paul and Augustine, Paula Fredriksen writes "To see a content-filled moment of conversion is to have constructed a narrative whereby that moment emerges retrospectively as the origin of (and justification for) one's present. And the more articulate the tradition for expressing this change, the more likely the convert's experience will conform to the traditional paradigm." "Paul and Augustine: Conversion Narratives, Orthodox Traditions, and the Retrospective Self," *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 37 (1986): 3–34, at 33.

9. In her otherwise insightful study of conversion in New England, Patricia Caldwell can conclude that Nathaniel Sparrowhawk was describing "what seems to have been a genuine religious experience" or that Roger Clap related "what sounds like a genuine religious experience." *The Puritan Conversion Narrative*, 33, 165. Michael Winship asserts that Hooker and his son-in-law Thomas Shepard shared "an inability to intuitively experience grace." *Making Heretics*, 70.

10. Some recent research has proposed that "religious experiences" are triggered in the limbic system of the brain's temporal lobes, see Barbara Bradley Hagerty, *Fingerprints of*

can result in insulating "conversion experiences" from any secular explanation. While it is true that Christians almost universally perceive the hand of God in their coming to faith, that perception often occurs only upon reflection, in retrospect. It is by no means the case that any given person's experience of what she comes to understand as her conversion will be immediately self-authenticating.[11]

The experience of the godly minister John Angier, whose conversion was shaped in no small part by the preaching of Thomas Hooker's mentor John Rogers, provides a helpful seventeenth-century example. According to his biographer, Angier as a young man was reasonably certain that he had been "converted" but not at all sure when that conversion had first begun. "He had many thoughts of heart concerning the work of conversion upon his Soul, from what time he must date it, whether before his falls [i.e., moral failures] at the University, or after." Eventually he opened his heart to an experienced minister, a Dr. White, describing "the circumstances of both" possible times for its occurrence. Dr. White fit Angier's descriptions into the conventional godly pattern of what "conversions" should be like and determined that "the first work of God upon Angier's heart at Twelve years of age, was a saving-work, notwithstanding his after miscarriages, and that God might have gracious ends in permitting such backslidings, for his further humiliation, and preparation for further service."[12] Once he had heard Angier's own somewhat disorganized recollections, in other words, Dr. White could slot them into a generally accepted pattern, and only thereafter did Angier "know" what had happened to him.

Hooker's sermons did not imagine conversion as a "religious experience" that involved extraordinary communication from the supernatural. In

---

God: The Search for the Science of Spirituality (New York: Riverhead, 2009). Those with temporal lobe epilepsy are particularly prone. The limbic region is sometimes referred to as the "reptilian brain."

11. An evangelical pastor, Jeff Pearson, described his own conversion to me in these words: "God made a change; I didn't understand it, didn't embrace it till much later." For an intriguing argument that for some contemporary evangelical Christians, conversion is anything but uniquely "religious," see Peter Stromberg, *Language and Self-Transformation: A Study of the Christian Conversion Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). Stromberg understands conversion narratives not as accounts of past experience but as activities in the present that enable the narrator to acknowledge and incorporate previously unacceptable desires in a "canonical" Christian language. Deborah Shuger writes that for John Donne, "God's presence is not a datum of consciousness but a reconstruction of an experience that could be constructed differently." "Absolutist Theology: The Sermons of John Donne," in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600–1750*, ed. Lori Anne Forrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 115–35, at 130.

12. Heywood, *Life of Angier*, 12.

fact, Hooker was suspicious of anyone who imagined conversion in that way. He certainly believed that God was active in bringing a person to faith, but he expected that activity to be sensed indirectly. The work of grace would be "mediated," not "immediate," an intensification of ordinary human experience rather than something entirely distinct.

Precisely because an interpretative framework of conversion was pervasive within the early seventeenth-century godly community, I believe that it is not fruitful—and probably not even possible—for twenty-first-century scholars to try to get behind that interpretive framework to the "experience itself." Wiser to be agnostic, in other words, about what "actually happened" to early seventeenth-century converts.[13]

Following Lindbeck, I would be the last to deny that godly preaching produced sensations like fear, doubt, anxiety, and comfort in hearers, but I would contend that the same preaching also imposed an interpretive framework on those sensations. Hearers learned to understand their sensations in the way that the ministers intended. That means that in their sermons, ministers like Hooker and Stone were not only describing the kind of conversion they wanted their hearers to experience, they were also using the rhetorical techniques at their disposal to induce and shape that conversion. At a minimum, one must be open to the possibility that the ministers not only provoked but actually "created" the experience that they called "conversion" in susceptible hearers.

Hooker's understanding of conversion was not entirely different from Turner's and van Gennep's. He would not have disagreed that conversion involved passing from one state to another. He would also have concurred that there would come a point—in his theological parlance, "regeneration"—where the passing was irrevocable; one could never again return to the state of damnation. But as will become clear, for Hooker conversion had only begun when one reached the moment of regeneration. At its core, conversion involved a "change of heart," a convert's changing how she desired to live and what she desired to do. It involved an Augustinian reorienting of the core disposition of the human will. A convert simply no longer wanted what she had wanted before—things that led to her own self-importance—and began to want things that furthered God's plan. As in the punch line of the notorious joke, you need only one therapist to change a light bulb, but the light bulb genuinely has to want to change. A converted person had come to want to change. What distinguished that person, wrote Stone, was "a disposition of will to close with the

---

13. Morrison, *Understanding Conversion*, shares these assumptions. For an example of how experience was conceived in early New England, see Baird Tipson, "The Routinized Piety of Thomas Shepard's Diary," *Early American Literature* 13 (1978): 64–80.

Divine Law."[14] To Hooker, conversion meant acquiring and maintaining a new "frame of heart." Such a redirecting of the heart required constant effort and could only be partially completed in this life.

Before looking at Hooker's sermons to see how he went about provoking conversions in his hearers (the subject of the next chapter), then, it is helpful to take a long and careful look at the understandings of conversion that he had available to him. The reader has seen how Hooker looked primarily to William Perkins for his grasp of Christian doctrine, to Alexander Richardson for his sense of how the world was organized, and to John Rogers for the style of his preaching. This chapter will examine three distinct understandings of conversion, one inherited from Perkins and the extreme Augustinian tradition, a second arising from his interactions with Rogers, and a third stemming from Hooker's own experience. All three proved influential.

William Perkins's Understanding of Conversion

Hooker's long tenure at Cambridge gave him a thorough grounding in extreme Augustinianism. During his tenure at Emmanuel he read widely in godly treatises and biblical commentaries and was continually exposed to godly preaching. By the time he settled in Chelmsford, he had amassed a large library on which his younger colleagues regularly drew.[15] As we have seen, he stood firmly in a theological tradition that is most conveniently represented in the ubiquitous writings of William Perkins. Particularly in the *Prophetica*, his manual of advice for godly preachers, Perkins had carefully described how conversion ought to occur. To understand the relationship of Hooker's preaching to the tradition he inherited, one needs to know what that tradition had to say.

As a good Protestant, Perkins believed that God led people to become his followers through a process that began with their exposure to godly preaching. A minister's eloquence could never be the cause of conversion; God reserved that role to himself. But as we saw in the previous chapter, hearing sermons was the *occasio pœnitentiæ*, the opportunity for conversion to begin if God so intended. The preached words were the medium through which the Holy

---

14. WB 125.

15. Samuel Collins to Dr. Arthur Duck, PRO, SP 142, 113, op. cit. We know less than we would like about Hooker's library, but one can gain some sense of its contents from the citations in works like SSCD.

Spirit had chosen to work. "When we hear the promises of God and think about them," he wrote, "the Holy Spirit works through those promises to move the mind and will so that we assent to them and that we rest in them."[16]

Preaching for conversion began when the minister selected his text. Some of the scriptural passages on which a minister might base a sermon were "legal," others "evangelical." Galatians 3:10, for example, pronounced the "judgment of the Law" (*Legalis sententia*): "So many as are of the works of Law, are under the curse; for it is written, cursed is he whosoever abideth not in all things, which are written in the booke of the Law to doe them." A minister laying out this text would "preach the law" by skillfully describing God's impossibly high standards and the terrible punishment in store for anyone who failed to live up to them. John 3:16, on the other hand—"So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish but have everlasting life"—offered the promise of the Gospel.[17]

Perkins's Ramism led him to see binary divisions wherever he looked, and conversion would have two parts as well: the first defined by the Law and the second by the Gospel. When preaching to unconverted hearers, ministers were instructed to concentrate on threats of God's punishment for sin and to withhold any promises from the Gospel. At the outset, conversion preaching would be entirely "legal."

In a nutshell, legal preaching was intended to cause hearers to recognize the danger they were in if they did not change their ways. They would come to understand that, as unbelievers, they lived under the "rule" of the law. Recognizing that they would never be able to meet its demands, they would come to be terrified by the law's threats of punishment.[18] Seeing the extent of God's anger, they would come to despair of their ability to extricate themselves from their predicament (Perkins called this *desperatio de propriis viribus*) and begin to dread the eternal torments that God would have in store. Perkins termed this state "legal" or "worldly" sorrow (*dolor mundi*), because as yet a hearer mourned "not for sin as sin, but for the punishment of sin."[19] "There is

---

16. *Armilla Aurea*, 231, *Golden Chaine, Works* 1:77; *Armilla Aurea*, 328, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:104: *cum audimus promissiones Dei & cogitamus: Spiritus sanctus mentem & voluntatem mouet per easdem promissiones: & movendo facit vt iis assentiamur, & in iis acquiescamus*. See the preceding chapter.

17. *Prophetica*, 86, *Arte of Prophesying, Works*, 2:664.

18. *Sententia legis … minando, & terrendo regnat in hominibus, Armilla Aurea*, 140, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:69.

19. *Lugeat, non de peccato quatenus peccatum sed de poena peccati,* ibid; *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of Galatians, Works*, 2:213.

a *Legall sorrow*, which is a sorrow for sinne, in respect of the punishment: this is no grace, and it is wrought by the law." When Pharaoh confessed to Moses and Aaron in Exodus 9:27 that he had sinned, for example, Perkins explained that his confession could not be called a good work because "it proceeded not of loue to God, but of feare of punishment." Anyone could fear punishment; only one whom God had chosen would avoid sin out of concern that it might disrupt a loving relationship to God.[20]

The relationship between "legal" and "godly" sorrow had had a long and complex history in the western Christian church. Throughout the medieval period, theologians had insisted that the process by which God forgave sin began with a legal sorrow, stemming from the sinner's fear of the punishment that she deserved for disobeying God's commandments. But because God expected more than a purely legal sorrow, sinners needed to turn to the sacrament of penance in order to receive the additional grace needed to gain God's forgiveness.

The medieval Church assumed that the sacrament of baptism brought people into God's favor, into a "state of grace." But by the commission of a grave sin, a person who had once enjoyed God's favor and the promise of salvation could lose that favor, could "fall from grace," until she repented. Her repentance occurred through the sacrament of penance, where she could confess having sinned, agree to perform an act of penance, and receive the absolution from a priest that allowed her to enjoy God's "good graces" once more.

Sinners would be driven to the sacrament of penance in large part, it was believed, by their eagerness to avoid punishment. Scholastic casuists called this "slavish" or "servile" fear (*timor servilis*) because it resembled a slave's fear for having offended his master.[21] Just as the slave dreaded the punishment he knew he would receive for his offense, so the sinner dreaded God's retribution. It was this fear, scholastics believed, that led to the sorrow of attrition.

But the Scriptures also saw fear in a more positive light, as in the well-known verse, "the feare of the Lord is the beginning of wisedome" (Ps. 111:10; cf. Job 28:28). Scholastics termed this more constructive fear "initial" (*timor initialis*) because it would eventually produce a genuine change of heart. Initial fear led one to see that sin was an evil that God had every right to punish. Offending a just God was good reason for sorrow, so one should make every effort to avoid causing God any more pain by avoiding any more sinning. Fear remained,

---

20. *Treatise on Free Grace, Works*, 1:732.

21. Augustine described *timor servilis* in *de spiritu et littera*, XXXII.lvi, *P.L.* 44:236–37, *The Spirit and the Letter, Answer to the Pelagians*, 1:188.

as did the sorrow it produced, but its essential character had changed; one grieved for the "suffering" that one had caused God as well as for one's own future suffering as punishment for sin. One hated sin, not the God who justly punished sinners. Initial fear led to the sorrow of "contrition," sorrow for the displeasure one's sin had caused God.[22]

It was believed that the grace available through the sacrament of penance changed the character of fear. It converted servile fear to initial fear and enabled attrition to become contrition. No one expected this to be a once-for-all time event. A medieval Christian was expected to have at least annual recourse to the sacrament.[23]

As the reader looks forward to Thomas Hooker's understanding of "preparation," it is important to keep the medieval sacrament of penance in mind. In practice, a medieval Christian was expected to bring something—her attrition—to the sacrament, something though which she could regain God's favor. Her "preparation" was what she brought; working through the priest, God could supplement her meager contribution and restore her to favor. So it was only natural for medieval Christians to imagine "preparation" as a human activity.

Along with his Protestant contemporaries, Perkins rejected the sacrament of penance as well as the notion that God expected some contribution from sinful human beings before granting them his favor. But Perkins did retain the assumption that conversion began with legal fear. During the legal phase of his preaching, the better a minister could induce legal sorrow in a hearer, the more likely that hearer was to come to a state of despair over her own ability to satisfy God's expectations. A hearer's heart needed to be "bruised in pieces"; her conscience needed to be wracked by terror and panic. Legal preaching used fear to "prepare the mind to be teachable," for Perkins was convinced that no adult could come to faith without first having recognized the seriousness of her sin and having despaired of her ability to achieve

---

22. The primary scriptural basis for the distinction was 2 Cor. 7:9–10: "Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death."

23. This is a superficial description of a much more complex position; for something better see Thomas Tentler, *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977). Alister McGrath provides a useful account of the development of the relationship between contrition, attrition, and the sacrament of penance in *Iustitia Dei*, 1:91–100. Perkins discussed the way Catholics understood how a fear of God's wrath (*timor iræ Dei*) would lead to hatred of sin and then to a *dispositio de congruo* in *Armilla Aurea*, 29, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:96.

salvation on her own power. "No man can heartily say, I beleeue Iesus Christ to be my Sauiour, before hee feele, that in himselfe hee is vtterly lost and cast away without his helpe." Perkins termed those who found themselves in this condition "humbled" (*humiliates*).[24]

During this first phase, Perkins explained, unbelieving hearers were in a state of "needing to be prepared" (*præparandi*). It was up to the preacher to deliver the needed "preparation" (*præparatio*), offering God the opportunity to work on the hearers' hearts through preached words. So the first phase of conversion could be called "preparatory" as well as "legal." During it, hearers remained completely passive.[25]

This critical point bears repetition. For Hooker as for Perkins, "preparation" will be the activity by which the preacher, as God's instrument, breaks down a hearer's resistance. He would first expose her utter inability to satisfy his standard and then threaten her with the punishment she deserved for her failure. Far from involving any initiative on her part, preparation beat down her self-confidence and left her utterly dependent on something outside herself.

Then it was time for the Gospel. To provide the occasion for the Holy Spirit to move his hearers from this preparatory "worldly sorrow" to "godly sorrow" (*dolor secundum Deum*)—the scholastic "contrition of heart" (*contritio cordis*) that mourned for sin because it offended God—the preacher offered hope to his desperate hearers. Those hearers would now be ready, explained Perkins, to listen attentively as the preacher laid out the Gospel's promise: salvation to anyone who could believe that she was included in Christ's saving work. Everyone in the congregation would hear the Gospel's promise preached, but only those whom God had previously chosen would respond to the preacher's exhortation to believe it. Working secretly within, the Holy Spirit would cause these chosen persons to hear Christ's voice in the Scriptures.[26]

For Perkins, the critical transition from legal to godly sorrow (from attrition to contrition in scholastic terminology) occurred as the humiliated hearer grasped desperately for the possibility that the Gospel promise applied

---

24. *cor ... penitùs conterendum est. ... pavores conscientiæ ... animus ad docilitatem præparetur Armilla Aurea*, 231–37, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:78–81; *Prophetica*, 85, 93–97, *Arte of Prophesying, Works*, 2:664, 666–67; *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:167.

25. *Prophetica*, 87–88, *Arte of Prophesying, Works*, 2:667.

26. *Electi habentes spiritum Dei, primò discernunt vocem Christi in Scripturis loquentis, Prophetica*, 15, *Arte of Prophesying, Works*, 2:649. "by this [the secret work of the Holy Spirit convincing a hearer that "the promise of saluation belongs vnto him"], the promise which is generall is applied particularly to one subiect." *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:124.

particularly to her. Where Hooker would insist that no one could reach out to Christ unless she had already achieved a state of contrition, Perkins saw the achievement of contrition not as a precondition for faith but as occurring alongside faith's coming into existence.[27]

Would an elect hearer respond to the Gospel promise with a robust faith? Not at first. The hearer whom God intended to save would experience no more than a "hungring and powerful" desire for the grace which Christ might offer, a desire which would prompt her to confess her sins and crave pardon for them.[28] This desire for grace was a sign that the Holy Spirit, working through the preached word, was secretly creating and strengthening her growing conviction that the Gospel promises had been intended from eternity particularly for her.[29] "He regenerates vs not against our wils," explained Perkins, "yet so, as the willingnesse to be regenerate is not of vs, but of God."[30]

This was the decisive Augustinian moment, the moment when an unwilling will became willing. Would the Holy Spirit's persuasion be perceived by a hearer as intrusive? Not at all. As he did in every good human work, God would "inwardly incline" the hearer's will.[31] Terrified by the wrath of God and all too aware of the consequences of a life of sin, elect hearers would be eager for relief. They would be ready to want God but unable to believe that God wanted them. As the minister explained how Christ had made satisfaction for sin and promised forgiveness to those who believed in him, the Spirit would bring the words home to an elect hearer's heart and overcome her doubt. She would know that pardon was possible, and in her despair she would grasp at the hope that it might be intended for her.

Since this hungering desire for pardon could only have arisen because the Holy Spirit had worked on a hearer's heart to provoke it, argued Perkins, its presence was a sign that the hearer believed and was regenerate. The first stirrings of faith would be so faint that a hearer might well be unaware of them;

---

27. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:285. Hooker described the transition from dreading the punishment for sin to hating the "filth of it," entirely before the onset of faith, in AR 10:367–69, see also 284–85.

28. *Esuries & vehemens expetitio gratiæ, Armilla Aurea,* 239, *Works,* 1:79.

29. *specialis persuasio cordi à S. sancto impressa, qua promissiones evangelicas quisque sibi speciatim applicat, Armilla Aurea,* 241, *Golden Chaine, Works,* 1:80.

30. *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works,* 1:734.

31. *intrinsecus inclinat voluntatem, De Prædestinationis Modo,* 69; see also 61–62, *Treatise of Predestination, Works,* 2:621, see also 619; *Treatise on God's Free Grace, Works,* 1:723: "mildly incline."

Perkins called these first stirrings "implicite or vnexpressed faith."[32] A hearer would know only that she wanted to believe.

As a good Protestant, Perkins insisted that God took the initiative, through the preacher's rhetorical gifts, to overcome the resistance of the hearer's will by the preaching of the Law. The hearer would not be inert. Fearful and desperate, she would seek any escape from the terrible wrath of God. But she could not contribute to her salvation. She could only hope for the confidence to trust in Christ's mercy—and both the hope and the confidence would have to be provoked by the inward work of the Spirit.

Perkins frequently used Augustinian language to describe how God took the initiative. During the initial stages of conversion, right up to the point when a hearer was regenerated, grace was "preuenting."[33] Only after having received the gift of regeneration and the capacity to believe God's promises could a hearer be understood to cooperate with the Spirit's work.

Far from wishing to lose readers in technicalities, Perkins was actually trying to stay as close as possible to conversion as he understood it. In his exhaustive commentary on the 11th chapter of the Book of Hebrews, for example, he boiled down his view of conversion to a single sentence: "humiliation for sinne, and desire of reconciliation: these two is the summe of religion."[34] First preach the Law, then the Gospel, and trust that the Holy Spirit would drive the message home to the heart.

Because he recognized that his readers might assume that it was the desiring person's "experience" of God's mercy that led to her special persuasion of God's favor, Perkins made sure to insist that this was not the case. Such special persuasion, he explained, "both is and ought to be before that experience." Ordinarily, people expected to verify something through sense impressions before concluding it to be true, as for example one concluded that water was warm by putting one's hand into it. But it was just the opposite in the practice of faith. The act of will by which one included oneself in God's promises of pardon came first; any "experience and sense of comfort" would come later. Those who allowed themselves to doubt God's pardon because they did not sense any signs of God's activity in themselves, argued Perkins, acted "badly."[35]

---

32. *A Reformed Catholike, Works*, 1:604.

33. *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of Galatians, Works*, 2:178.

34. *A Cloud of Faithful Witnesses, Works*, 3:*15.

35. *Hæc persuasio, & est & esse debet etiam ante experientiam. ... In exercitiis fidei contrarium est: Primùm, assensio præbenda verbo Dei & resistendum dubitationi ac diffidentiæ; & postea sequetur experientia, & sensus laetitæ. ... Male ergo faciunt, qui indulgent dubitationi, quia in seipsis nondum sentiunt insignes motus divinos, Armilla Aurea*, 241–42, *Golden Chaine, Works*,

But how could Perkins argue that the moment of regeneration had occurred if a hearer felt only a "hungring desire" for pardon? At the heart of Protestantism had always been the conviction that God would "justify" a person, would include that person in Christ's redeeming work, only through "faith," through her trust in Christ's promise of salvation. Could a desire for pardon actually be the equivalent of that faith? If so, could a faith whose secret presence led to no more than a mere desire to believe and a hope of pardon be firm enough to sustain a Christian life in constant tension with worldly "common sense"?

Perkins's responses became normative for a generation of godly preachers. Like most everything else in the Ramist universe, he explained, faith could be divided in two. Initially, one's faith would be "weak," the "little faith" (*oligopistia*) that characterized Peter's failed attempt to walk on the water (Matt. 14:31). This was faith like a grain of mustard seed (Matt. 17:20), like smoking flax (Matt. 12:20, citing Isa. 42:3). A serious endeavor to believe, a desire to obtain grace, was the "seed of faith being born" and a sign that the Holy Spirit had begun its saving work. Moved by the Spirit, the weak believer would struggle with doubt and distrust and try to assent to the Gospel promises and to apply them "firmly" to herself.[36]

If the initial stages of faith were so feeble, might they be mistaken for wishful thinking? Was there any reliable way to know whether a desire for faith was serious? There was. If one's faith were authentic, one would be always struggling to increase it. One would persistently crave pardon for sin, and by meditating throughout the week on what the minister had preached, by a regimen of family and private prayer, and by numerous other practices of faith, "weak faith" would slowly be strengthened.[37] Because the process of strengthening

---

1:79–80; see also *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:224, 240–41. If, as Barbara Hagerty suggests, activity in the limbic system of the brain enables some people to sense God's favor, Perkins (and Hooker) would argue that authentic faith would precede, and not need to depend on, such a sense.

36. *Serium credendi studium & desiderium obtinendae gratiae, nascentis fidei semen est, Armilla Aurea*, 243, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:80; see also *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:125–26: "God accepts the wil and desire to repent and beleeue, for repenting and beleeuing indeed." See as well *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:734: "to will to be regenerate, is the effect & testimony of regeneration begun"; and *Clowd of Faithfull Witnesses, Works*, 3:*85–86, as well as *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of Galatians, Works*, 2:213, 219. Giles Firmin believed that the notion of degrees of faith had originated with Richard Rogers's *Seven Treatises* (London, 1603), 71. He argued against it in *The Real Christian*, 190–91.

37. *cum perseverantia . . . . fides exuscitanda est meditatione verbi; & ardenti precatione, atque cæteris fidei exercitiis, Armilla Aurea*, 240, 244, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:79, 80; see also *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:227.

one's faith would never be complete; a Christian's life was "conversion" up to the moment of death.

Only after long and sustained efforts would a weak believer's faith approach the *fiducia* usually associated with Protestantism: a robust "full assurance of faith."[38] This was the highest degree of faith, a full persuasion of the heart that certified to the Christian that God loved her and had chosen her eternally by name to receive Christ and all his graces. If weak faith arose before the first experience of feeling God's favor, full assurance came only after many such experiences.[39] One did not attain strong faith in a matter of weeks or months; "this degree of faith is proper to him that beginnes to bee a tall man, and of ripe yeares in Christ. And it comes not at the first calling of a man vnto grace: and if any shall thinke that he can haue it at the first, he deceiueth himselfe."

Nor did it result from a special "religious experience." It was the outcome of careful reflection over a long period of time: "this assurance ariseth from many experiences of Gods favour and loue in the course of his life by mani-fold preseruations and other blessings, *which being deepely and duly consid-ered*, bring a man to be fully perswaded that God is his God."[40] Perkins always spoke of conversion (as opposed to regeneration, which happened as soon as the Spirit inspired a desire for grace in the heart) as "not wrought in one moment, but by lit[t]le and little, in processe of time," from the first inklings of weak faith to the full assurance of the mature Christian.[41]

Perkins distinguished carefully between faith—the work of the Holy Spirit, drawing the sinner's hope and desire toward God—and the aware-ness, the conscious perception, of faith. "Faith standeth not in the feeling of God's mercie, but in the apprehending of it, which apprehending may be when there is no feeling."[42] Initially, a hearer would not know that she believed, only that she wished she could believe. She would only begin to become aware that she believed when she observed changes in her behav-ior, her "conversion" or "repentance" (Perkins's translators rendered both

---

38. The *plērophoria tēs pisteōs* of Abraham in Romans 4:21.

39. *plena persuasio cordis, qua statuit Christianus deum amare se & velle sibi speciatim Christum eiusque gratias omnes, ad salutem pertinentes dare. . .. post sensum, observationem, experientiam habitam de amore Dei; Armilla Aurea*, 244; Perkins's translator rendered *experientia* as "long experience," *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:81.

40. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:127; emphasis added; see also *Clowd of Faithfull Witnesses, Works*, 3:*173.

41. *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of Galatians, Works*, 2:294.

42. *A Treatise Tending unto a declaration, Works*, 1:411.

conversio and *resipiscentia* with the English word "repentance"). Although "in order of nature," an imperceptible weak faith had preceded it, repentance was felt first.[43] Perkins could even speak of a hearer's "converting herself to God," purposing, wanting, desiring, and trying to relinquish past sins and lead a new life. But he made it plain that these acts of the will occurred after regeneration and could take place even then only because the hearer was "acted by the Holy Spirit." "Conversion" in this sense was thereby distinguished from the regeneration wrought secretly upon the hearer's heart. "Conversion" was the main ongoing business of godly men and women.

It was the imperceptibility of an initial weak faith that drew Perkins to emphasize repeatedly the difference between faith and the "feeling" or awareness of faith. "Religion doth not stand in feeling but in faith: which faith wee must haue in Christ, though we haue no feeling at all." Sounding very much like Luther, Perkins explained to Cambridge students that faith was trust despite all evidence to the contrary: "It is one thing to beleeue in Christ, and another to haue feeling and experience: and that euen then when wee haue no sense or experience we must beleeue." "The ground of our religion stands in this," he summarized, "to beleeue thinges neither seene nor felt, to hope aboue all hope, & without hope: in extremitie of affliction to beleeue that God loueth vs, when he seemeth to be our enemy, and to perseuere in the same to the end."[44]

Once on the arduous path from weak faith to full assurance, new believers were encouraged to take comfort from the fact that God would measure their progress not by their actual accomplishments but by their continued willingness to try. In a characteristic phrase, Perkins explained that obedience to God would be measured *affectu potius, quàm effectu*: by a Christian's affection or desire rather than by the actual result of her efforts. In support he cited Augustine's dictum that God measured a Christian's deeds by what she willed, not by what she was able to accomplish.[45] A "willing will," rather than great achievement, characterized godly behavior.

---

43. *Resipiscentia est, quando quis convertit se ad Deum; quando quispiam actus à spiritu sancto, statuit, vult, desiderat, conatur peccata sua relinquere, & vitam novam agere*, Armilla Aurea, 260, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:85; *vtcunque primùm [resipiscentia] in conversis appareat: tamen fidem & sanctificationem quoad naturæ ordinem sequitur*; ibid. 259. *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:85. See Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 198. William Ames takes a similar position, *Medulla ss. theologiae* (London, 1630), I.xxvi, 34, *The Marrow of Divinity*, trans. John D. Eusden (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1968), 160: "Repentance is likely to be known before faith." As Muller comments, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 235: "the order of the various aspects of union with Christ is not primarily chronological but causal."

44. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:212, 224, see also 240–41.

45. *Obedientiam Deo debitam affectu potius, quàm effectu æstimandam esse*; Armilla Aurea, 270, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:87; *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:286: "esteeming things done

Perkins described the life of a regenerate Christian, what he called a "Christian conversation" (*Christiana conversatio*) as one of obedience, subjection, and submission, the same elements that the preaching of the law was first intended to provoke.[46] "We are to loue and embrace the word of God preached, and taught vnto us by the Ministers of the Gospel: and withall submitting our selues vnto it, and suffering the Lord to humble vs thereby." The "excellencie" of the Church, the totality of Christian believers, was her "subiection & obedience vnto the wil and word of her spouse and head, Christ Iesus."[47]

By attributing the beginnings of faith entirely to the influence of the Holy Spirit, working through the preached word to convert an unwilling will to one that began to desire grace, Perkins was convinced that he had protected himself from the mistakes of the Jesuits. No fallen human creature, he said, could "do works that would constitute preparation for justification." In true Augustinian fashion, he insisted that an unconverted person possessed free will only to do evil, not to do good. She was simply incapable of willing her own faith and conversion.[48] Strictly following Augustine's distinctions, Perkins explained that grace worked in five ways. By means of the preaching of the promise of the Gospel, *gratia præveniens* inspired a desire for Christ's benefits in someone about to be converted. *Gratia præparans* readied the will to accept God's promise. *Gratia operans* imparted the power to obey God's commandments. The hearer herself was passive during these three gracious activities: "this is the intire or meere worke of God, in vs, and vpon us; and we in it are *meerely passiue not actiue*."[49] Whenever Perkins spoke of "preparation," it was always the Spirit who prepared (working generally though the medium of godly preaching), not the hearer about to be

---

not by the effect & absolute doing of them, but by the affection of the doer. (*Si quod vis non potes deus factum computat.* Aug.)"; see also 135, *Clowd of Faithfull Witnesses, Works*, 3:*111.

46. *Armilla Aurea*, 260, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:85.

47. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:289, 303.

48. *Posse … operari præparationem ad iustificationem. . . . . Homo non renatus habet liberum arbitrium ad malum tantùm non ad bonum. Non potest velle fidem suam & conversionen non conuersus; Armilla Aurea*, 310, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:99; see also *A Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:733–34.

49. *Gratia præveniens est, quâ deus inspirit in animum convertendi peccatoris bonas cogitationes, bonum propositum, desiderium boni supernaturalis. . .. Gratia præparans est, quâ datur consentire deo offerenti gratiam: siue, quâ præparantur mens & voluntas, vt assentiantur & obsequantur spiritui sancto. . . . Gratia operans est, quâ liberamur à regno peccati, & renovamur mente, voluntate, affectu: accepta facultate obediendi Deo. De prædestinationis Modo*, 142–43, *Treatise of Predestination, Works*, 2:637; *Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works*, 1:736.

converted.[50] Lest anyone should misunderstand, Perkins summarized his position in lectures given toward the end of his life: "in the conuersion of a sinner, God hath the whole and sole work: true it is, that a man willeth his conuersion in the act thereof, but yet it is God that worketh that will in him, it is not of himselfe.[51]

Once God began to "work" the will, his activity became *gratia co-operans*; it "worked together" with the renewed will. God's final activity, the *donum perseverandi*, would enable the new Christian to persevere in God's favor till death.

Perkins hoped that his position would be welcome to anxious Christians. "This doctrine ministers true comfort to all true seruants of God. For, if when they vse the good means of saluation, the word, praier, sacraments, the wil lie not dead, but begin to oppose it self against vnbeleefe, & other corruptions, & withall, doe but so much as will to beleeue, will to repent, will to be turned to God, they haue begun to turne vnto God, and God hath begunne to regenerate them."[52] But rather than assume, as interpreters have often done, that what we might call "delayed assurance" arose to address a pastoral crisis, one should be prepared to understand it as reflecting the experience of countless Christians who discovered that the onset of a strong and settled faith did not occur instantaneously.[53]

---

50. *Gratia cooperans est, quâ Deus acceptam renouationis gratiam conseruat & perficit. . .. Donum perseuerandi est, quo post acceptam renouationis gratiam, accipimus etiam velle constanter perseuerare in bono, quod possumus, De prædestinationis Modo,* 143–44, *Treatise of Predestination, Works,* 2:637. E.g., *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of Galatians, Works,* 2:210: "there is excluded from iustification ... all meritorious workes of preparation wrought by vs," ibid. 2:327: "there are no such works, whereby a man may prepare himselfe to his owne iustification."

51. *A Godly and Learned Exposition ... upon the three first chapters of the Revelation, Works,* 1:345.

52. *Treatise on God's Free Grace, Works,* 1:733–39.

53. In an otherwise compelling article, Michael Winship writes that "Perkins deemed earlier ministers to have linked assurance and faith 'at so high a reach, as few can attaine unto it'." "Weak Christians," 473. Winship argues that Perkins, by contrast, systematically organized assurance and faith around the weak Christian. But, in fact, recognition that "strong faith" was the exception rather than the norm was a commonplace by the late middle ages if not before. Explaining the doctrine of the late medieval casuist Sylvester Prierias Mazzolini's *Summa summarum, quæ Sylvestrina dicitur* (1514), Thomas Tentler finds that the penitent, "really only needs to want to be displeased with sin and to want to gain the grace of God" in order to receive absolution in the sacrament of penance. *Sin and Confession,* 271. Calvin, too, recognized that faith would often be weak, and that confidence in the strength of one's faith was misguided. Alister McGrath, drawing on *Intitutio* III.II.xvii, describes Calvin's position as: "You do not trust in the intensity of your faith, but in the commitment of God to his promises." *Spirituality in an Age of Change: Rediscovering the Spirit of the Reformers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994), 115. Similarly, Luther wrote that "even if my faith is weak, I still have exactly the same treasure and the same Christ as others. . .. the Christ who you and I own is

Godly preaching necessarily encouraged literacy: a hearer's ability to meditate on the preacher's sermon was vastly improved if the hearer could study scriptural texts on her own. But a godly life did not require literacy. Perkins believed strongly that even those who were "not booke-learned," even "olde simple, plaine, dull Countrey-men" could be apt subjects for conversion:

> Let such men learne but one promise of God out of the holy Scripture, as this; *Seeke first the Kingdome of God, and all things else shall be giuen vnto you*, Matt. 6.33. or this; *Cast all your care on him, for he careth for you*, I. Pet. 5.7. or this; *He that commeth vnto me, I cast him not away*, John 6.37. or but this: *Aske and yee shall haue, seeke and ye shall find*, Mat. 7.7. Let them learne but one of these, and when they haue learned it, beleeue it, and let their soules daily feede on that faith; and they shall see what wil followe: euen a wonderfull blessing upon that poore beginning. This their faith, will so content and please their hearts, that it wil vrge them forward to get more, and will make them both desirous, and capable of more knowledge and grace; and will make them euen hunger and thirst after knowledge and grace.[54]

For all his technical theological vocabulary, Perkins understood someone's coming to faith as her hearing a promise from God, conveyed by a minister in a sermon, believing that it applied to her, and proceeding to live her life as if the promise were trustworthy. This was the tradition Hooker imbibed at Emmanuel College.

---

one and the same, irrespective of the strength or weakness of your faith or mine" (*ob gleich ich oder du sterker oder schwecher gleuben an Christum*). *Die Predigten über Joh. 6–8, W.A.* 33:37, *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John: Chapters 6–8*, trans. Martin H. Bertram, LW 23:28. In his *Vorlesungen über I. Mose von 1535–45, W.A.* 44:398, Luther quotes a favorite Puritan text: "In use and practice, however, faith totters and trembles pitiably (*labascit fides et trepidat miserabiliter*). Accordingly, it is a great favor on God's part that He has shown us this consolation: 'A dimly burning wick I will not quench' (Is. 42:3)." *Lectures on Genesis Chapters 38 to 44*, trans. Paul D. Pahl, [here 41:1–7], LW 7:135. This is precisely Perkins's position, e.g., *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:185: "no man is saued by his faith, because it is perfect without doubting, but because thereby he layeth hold on Gods mercie in Christ: now a weake faith may doe this truly, though not so perfectly and with such comfort as a strong faith doth." See also *A Treatise Tending unto a declaration, Works*, 1:386.

54. *Clowd of Faithfull Witnesses, Works*, 3:*88. As will be seen below, following his "storm of soul," Hooker used a similar practice throughout the remainder of his life.

The *"Saving" Preparation of John Rogers*

But Hooker was no passive recipient of tradition. Surviving private notes reveal that he strained this extreme Augustinian tradition though the filter of his own logic. On the evidence of these notes, as well as from the published versions of his subsequent sermons, one can see that he rethought the nature of how God "prepared" those he meant to save. God's nature was such, Hooker concluded, that God could not accept anything "impure" into a salvific relationship with himself. Before adopting a sinner as his child, God had to separate her from her impurity. In the sermons later published as *the Pattern of Perfection*, Hooker explained that before the will could close with a "heavenly God," there must be a "wholesome constitution" put into it, something he also called a "heavenly frame" or "a spiritual frame of holiness."[55] Such a degree of separation from sinfulness would require a deeper and more traumatic preparation than anything Perkins had envisioned.

At least by 1620 and possibly a good deal earlier, Hooker's mentor John Rogers had arrived at a similarly heightened understanding of preparation. Given the frequency of their conversations, it cannot be known with certainty whether Hooker took this understanding from Rogers, whether the two men worked it out together, or whether, conceivably, it originated in Hooker's own mind. Its first appearance in Hooker's writings occurs in a notebook of his private theological reflections now known as his *Miscellanea*. What appears to be the most recent entry in the notebook bears the date May 16, 1623, the period during which he was ministering to the Drakes and just before he embarked on a public ministry. It is likely, then, that the earlier entries date from his time at Emmanuel, since students conventionally kept a commonplace book of reflections on passages from scripture and important works of theology. In those entries, without any explicit reference to Rogers, Hooker laid out the logical structure of what would become his own particular understanding of conversion.

The notes show him wrestling with the central issue of his extreme Augustinian tradition: how to explain to himself and to a congregation "that old Sentence of *Austine*" that "God makes of an unwilling will a willing will."[56]

He first recast the two sides of the Augustinian paradox in his own characteristically direct language. On the one hand, "its we not he that do will." On the other, "its he not we, who doth work to will."[57] How did God "work" on

---

55. PP 63–65.

56. The language is from a Hartford sermon, AR 8:384, recycling UP *68.

57. *Miscellanea*, sig. 36. The following citations are from signature 24b and 31–36.

the human will in such a way that it could and would "will" to believe God's promise and obey his Rule?

Hooker began by making the usual extreme Augustinian assumptions: "man by nature is dead in synnes," could "do no spirituall good," and lacked even the *"proxima potentia"* to receive grace. "Before the frame of faith [could] be infused," God would have to "dispose" or "prepare" the human will to make it capable of faith. An unprepared will simply could not believe.

This disposing, preparing, or framing was entirely God's work. "I am a mere patient in it, it is only wrought by the spirit in me." It was "not my action, but the act of the Spirit alone." "I do not do it, but its only done in me."[58]

Hooker decisively rejected what he would later identify as the characteristic position of the Arminians. The Spirit drew a person being prepared not by "moral perswasion" but by a "physical determination of the will." God did not simply present outwardly convincing arguments to a human actor who was fully capable of acting upon them. He worked internally on the human will to change its orientation from evil to good. The instrument through which the Spirit worked internally was the sermon, the human words spoken by a preacher to elucidate God's "word" as written in the Bible. "The Spirit will not work it," said Hooker of preparation, "but in his word."

Following passages of Scripture like Isaiah 57:15, where God says "I dwell in the high and holy place: with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to reuiue the spirit of the humble, and to reuiue the heart of the contrite ones" and the Prayer Book version of Psalm 51:17, "A sorrowful spirit is a Sacrifice to God: despise not, O Lord, humble and contrite hearts," Hooker wrote that preparation consisted of "contrition" and "humiliation." In describing how the Holy Spirit prepared the will of a person whom the Spirit meant to convert, Hooker explained that the Spirit "cuts it of[f] by contrition" and "pares it by humiliation." Once preparation had been "fully wrought," those who had been prepared would be ready to "resign up themselves unto the Lord & to submit to his dispose," and faith would be "certainly and undoubtedly infused." The previously passive will was ready to be active, ready for "the first act of Faith, to wit the going out of the soule to Christ."[59]

Then Hooker's logic forced him beyond Perkins. Because God's preparation was invariably effective, only those whom God had previously chosen

---

58. In Hartford, Hooker would describe those Jews who were "pricked in their hearts" while listening to Peter's words at Pentecost (Acts 2:37) as "Patients." AR 10:359.

59. "Service of Morning Prayer," *The Book of Common Prayer 1559*, in *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1847), 53.

would be prepared. The "preparative work of the spirit" could "be in no reprobate." Although it occurred before a person actually believed—"there is a preparation made before faith be infused"—preparation was nonetheless in some sense "saving." As a good Protestant, Hooker knew that justification and salvation came "by faith," so he insisted that God would not prepare a person's will unless he intended to keep that person alive until the moment he believed. "He that is prepared for faith, cannot dye without faith."

Hooker was driven by more than logic. He deplored what theologians today might term "cheap faith," the kind of taken-for-granted faith that he saw everywhere in English parishes. Three hundred years later, Dietrich Bonhoeffer would write against "cheap grace." Too many German Lutheran preachers, in Bonhoeffer's judgment, were circulating the notion that one could gain God's favor without struggle and significant change of life.[60] Hooker was equally convinced that "Prayer Book Protestants" came to what they called "faith" too easily. Authentic faith could arise only after long, agonizing recognition of one's sinfulness led to despair over one's inability to change on one's own. The "framing" or "preparing" that would eventually allow faith to arise certainly seemed to precede it in time. The same Spirit that would eventually provoke faith was doing the "preparing," and the first stirrings of actual faith might go unrecognized amid the sorrow and self-denial. But rather than imagine faith as arising in an instant and entirely unprovoked, Hooker saw the Holy Spirit at work through his preaching, eventually softening an elect soul's resistance before the onset of trust in the promise.

At least by 1619 or 1620, John Rogers had begun preaching saving preparation to his Dedham hearers in a lecture series later published as *The Doctrine of Faith*.[61] In that volume (to which Hooker would write a prefatory letter), Rogers taught that if a preacher began exposing his hearers to the promises of the gospel, as well as to the threats of punishment in the law, the sorrow of those hearers might become so profound that it would inevitably be "saving." Before the gospel promises would provoke actual faith, they would act as a kind of catalyst to accelerate the transition from a purely "legal sorrow" to the sort of contrition or "godly sorrow" achievable only by the elect. Even though a

---

60. "*Billige Gnade*," *Nachfolge* (1937), *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Werke* (Munich: Kaiser Verlag), 1989), 4:29, *et passim, The Cost of Discipleship*, trans. R. H. Fuller (New York: Macmillan, 1953), 37, *et passim*.

61. In his letter "To the Reader" in the first edition of *The Doctrine of Faith* (London, 1627), sig. A4ʳ, Rogers writes that "these things that thou findest in this little Treatise of Faith, were the summe of sundry Sermons preacht in my ordinary weeke-day Lecture, seven or eight years agoe." Hooker wrote his own epistle "To the Reader" in the 2nd, 1629 edition.

hearer who had reached this state was not yet justified and regenerated, she had passed the point of no return and would inevitably become so. Not yet a believer, not yet justified and born again, she had nevertheless reached a point where faith, justification, and regeneration would infallibly occur in the future.

In Rogers's words, saving contrition was only "wrought in the heart of those, that yet be not actually the children of God, yet certainly shall be." "Whosoever shall have [saving contrition] wrought in them," he insisted, "shall surely have faith."[62] In effect, the person who had reached the state of saving contrition had achieved a kind of intermediate state between condemnation and salvation. God would surely regenerate her—she had a disposition in her beyond anything possible in a reprobate person—but God had not regenerated her yet.

Rogers's innovation startled and troubled his godly contemporaries.[63] In practice, Rogers seemed to have introduced a kind of "salvation by contrition" in place of the core Protestant doctrine of salvation by faith. They resisted the notion that anyone could be effectively separated from the unregenerate before regeneration itself, the notion that "saving" works of the Holy Spirit could precede faith.

Since the *Miscellanea* entries are undated, it cannot be known with certainty whether Rogers influenced Hooker, whether the two came upon the position independently, or whether, conceivably, Hooker influenced Rogers. (Given Hooker's admiration for Rogers, the first possibility is the most likely.) What can be known is that Hooker remained faithful to the understanding described by his colleague and mentor. He continued to assert that, even before they believed, elect persons would reach a depth of contrition and humiliation that "cannot be in any reprobate."[64] In his Chelmsford sermons,

---

62. Rogers, *Doctrine of Faith*, 2nd ed. (1629), 125, 117, 127.

63. Samuel Hartlib's friend "Mr. Pouller," for example, "found fault" with *The Doctrine of Faith* "for making some sanctifying Graces not to bee saving graces." "Euphemerides 1634 (late)," *The Hartlib Papers* 29/2/49A. Thomas Goodwin went so far as to tell Hartlib that Hooker's position was "erroneous," such that Goodwin "would not have it come abroad." In Goodwin's opinion, Hooker called something "not true grace which indeed it is." *Hartlib Papers* 29/2/55B.

64. See Answers (Hooker's 1631 responses to a set of questions by the skeptical John Paget), 290. Hooker there identified William Chibald along with Rogers as a person who shared his views on saving preparation. (Chibald is misidentified as Sibbald in the footnotes.) Chibald did in fact teach saving work of the Holy Spirit before faith, but he argued (unlike Hooker) that if a person who was the recipient of such work were to die before she actually believed, she would not be saved. Chibald appealed to Perkins as his chief nonscriptural authority. See *A Trial of Faith* (London, 1622), 219–94, especially 231–35, and *An Apology for A Trial of Faith* (London, 1624), where Chibald cites John Rogers in his defense. Peter Lake discusses Chibald's position and his relationship to Hooker in *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy,"*

Hooker argued (as he had in his preface to *The Doctrine of Faith*) that an elect person would reach a state even before regeneration that was unachievable to the reprobate. In preparing an elect hearer for faith, the Holy Spirit working "in, with, and under" the preacher's words would induce a degree of sorrow and self-denial that could legitimately be termed "saving" because it infallibly led to faith, justification, and regeneration.[65]

That meant that the salvation determined for her in God's eternal decree would break into history before she believed. Because he was certain that during this period the hearer was only the passive recipient of the Spirit's work—"the soule is patient and the Lord by the almighty hand of his spirit breaks in upon a soul"—Hooker believed he had protected his doctrine against the charge that a person could somehow initiate her own conversion.[66]

Most of Hooker's English contemporaries remained unconvinced that any intermediate state existed between sin and grace. When Hooker reiterated his position in Hartford, he had to meet two objections which summarized their reservations.

"Imagine a man in this preparative work should die," went the first objection, "whither should he go?" If Hooker were to answer, "to heaven," he would have had to concede that a person could be saved without faith, a seriously uncomfortable position for any Protestant. But he could not answer, "to hell" without denying his point: that someone who had achieved a state of saving contrition would inevitably be saved. Hooker could only meet the objection by asserting that such a situation would never occur. God would not allow a savingly contrite person to die before she believed. Since such a person was "in a state of salvation preparatively," said Hooker; she would "certainly possess it."[67]

This was a remarkable assertion, likely to lead Hooker into all kinds of theological trouble. For just a few months earlier Hooker had preached that "manie a Saint of God can say that the Lord hath been wrastling with him from the time of his childhood." "All along in the places where he lived," he continued, such a person would experience "somtimes strange horrors and strokes of conscience, and strange sins that he fell into somtimes and then strange

---

"Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), 191–213.

65. If there is a "liminal" state in Hooker's understanding of conversion, it would occur during this "saving preparation."

66. SP 165–70.

67. Hooker had made the same assertion in Chelmsford, SP 166: "it is impossible that he which is thus prepared for Christ and grace, but he shall have them before he die."

humiliation and abasement for them. Grace is not wrought yet thats true, but its working, the soveraigne vertue of the blood of Christ is now at work, and will never leave the Soul for which Christ died until there be a full and effectuall application of all saving good."[68] Since Christ had died only for the elect, such an assertion would mean that God had begun "saving" work within the person's heart long before the moment of regeneration. In fact, the activity of saving preparation might last many years, a good part of a young person's lifetime. Well before their regeneration and active faith, God would be extending special graces to his elect—graces that set them apart from their reprobate neighbors—preparing, framing, and shaping them to be his followers.

The second objection forced Hooker to an equally daring position. "If there be any saving preparation before the infusion of faith," it asked, "then the soul brings forth good fruit and is a good tree without faith." Hooker's response was characteristic: because the Holy Spirit worked saving contrition without any contribution from the individual in whom it took place, it was God who brought forth good fruit, not the prospective convert.

But good fruit there undoubtedly was.[69] Once again, the conundrum at the heart of his understanding of conversion was exposed: the individual felt sorrow, felt shame, felt desire change from self-will to submission, but she was nevertheless "passive," not a "worker" but "worked" by God. Small wonder that many colleagues were skeptical.

Hooker was prepared to admit that "if any paths of [Gods] Providence in an ordinary course are beyond our ken, and past finding out, I suppose his complyings with the consciences and hearts of men in their Conversion, are some of the chief."[70] But his confidence in the soundness of his reasoning overcame any reluctance to explore God's activity. To the end of his life, in both England and New England, Thomas Hooker continued to preach and defend the notion of a "saving preparation." As he would put it in more technical language, an "aversion from sin," worked entirely by the Spirit soaking in the words of his godly ministers, had to precede any "habit of grace" in the person being converted: *"this first Aversion from sin, and the Creature, is not wrought by any gracious habit that is put into the soul by the Lord."*[71]

---

68. AR 2:79.

69. AR 3:150–53. Another way of expressing this point was to say that the "good fruit" was "no work of a habit" in the person being prepared. AR 10:379. Grace was "Actual," not "Habitual." AR 10:389.

70. AR 10:380.

71. AR 10:674–75.

But why the need for such a complete aversion from sin before regeneration? Was it not a fundamental Protestant principle that God justified the ungodly, that he saved people while they were still sinners? Had not Luther famously argued that a Christian was *simul iustus ac peccator*, a sinner who was simultaneously righteous in God's eyes because of Christ's sacrifice?

Hooker simply did not follow Luther here. Presumably without realizing his affinity with the medieval Catholic tradition he abhorred, he took it as axiomatic that God and a human person had to be like each other if they were ever to be at one with each other.[72] Unlike Luther's, Hooker's God was "of pure eyes that cannot endure to behold any polluted or uncleane thing." God would not simply impute Christ's righteousness to sinners; through their contrition and humiliation he would actually separate them from their sin before he inclined them to believe.

Hooker seemed to be demanding the very perfect contrition that Luther had despaired of achieving. "You cannot be safe if your sins be safe," Hooker preached confidently in 1641. "Christ will not save you and your sins too, if you wil save them he wil not save you." Until a would-be Christian had not only renounced her sins but also could no longer take pleasure in sinning, contrition was incomplete and justification could not occur.

Luther's God forgave the sins of the unclean; Hooker's God insisted that the sinner first be purified. "It is impossible that grace and corruption should lodge in the same bosome."[73] When he argued that God must put "an wholesome constitution," a "heavenly frame," or "a spiritual frame of holiness," was he not reintroducing the same early medieval doctrine of an infused grace that both Luther and his *via moderna* teachers had long rejected?[74] Would Luther have preached, as Hooker did in Hartford, that "The Spirit of God never gives in immediate Evidence of any right we have to, or that we are made partakers of any benefit from Christ without respect to some Qualification, gracious Disposition, or Condition in the Soul"?[75]

Hooker's Personal Experience

Such an idiosyncratic notion of saving preparation, coupled with the extreme Augustinian tradition mediated through the writings of Perkins, goes a long

---

72. Steven Ozment calls this assumption the "theological cornerstone" of the Catholic late Middle Ages, *Age of Reform*, 243.

73. SEx 300; AR 10:691–92; UP 95.

74. PP 63–65, op cit.

75. AR 1:34.

way toward explaining the preconceptions Hooker brought to any experience of conversion. But what about the influence of his own experience? Did that not affect how he understood the way conversion should occur?

In a noteworthy article, and later in his influential short biography of Hooker, George Williams proposed that Hooker did in fact learn most of what he later preached about conversion from personal experience. But it was not Hooker's own experience that affected him so strongly, as Williams saw things, but rather his encounter at the outset of his career with the experience of Joanna Drake. Living in the Drake household at Esher, and using his best efforts to bring Mrs. Drake's troubled soul to the assurance that she enjoyed God's favor, Hooker was given an invaluable opportunity, over an extended period of time, to observe "the moral phenomena antecedent to, or attendant upon, conversion." Joanna Drake's spiritual struggles then served as the "unconscious model" for Hooker's subsequent understanding of conversion.[76]

Williams's argument has been widely accepted. It might seem to provide good evidence for an "experiential-expressive" model in which doctrine arises from personal experience. But there are two serious problems with it. First, Joanna Drake was no typical convert. While we can take for granted that Hooker, like any preacher, would draw on his experience with a memorable lay hearer, Joanna Drake was suicidal during much of the period of her spiritual unrest. She made a number of attempts on her life and had to be constantly watched. Exposed to extreme Augustinian theology, her unstable psyche had become convinced not only that she was a reprobate but also that she had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, a sin that could never be forgiven. The next chapter will demonstrate that Hooker demanded an unusual degree of humiliation from his converts, but he never expected that they imagine that they had sinned against the Holy Ghost. Stemming from "designed malice" against Christ and the Gospel, the sin against the Holy Ghost was so heinous that it could only be committed by someone whom God had predestined to eternal damnation.[77] Joanna Drake's experience could hardly be normative for Hooker.

---

76. George H. Williams, "Called by Thy Name, Leave Us Not: The Case of Mrs. Joan Drake, A Formative Episode in the Pastoral Career of Thomas Hooker in England," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 16 (1968): 111–28, 278–300, at 128, 111. Amanda Porterfield accepts Drake's importance, "Women's Attraction to Puritanism," *Church History* 60 (1991): 196–209, at 198; and *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 54.

77. *Trodden Down Strength*, 30–31. On the sin against the Holy Spirit, see Baird Tipson, "A Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism: The Sin against the Holy Spirit," *Harvard Theological Review* 77 (1984): 301–30.

Second, and more even damaging to Williams's argument, Joanna Drake's godly advisors had concluded that she was already "converted" before Hooker arrived at Esher. John Dod had told her to her face "that she must now be considered of in the lower form of the schoole amongst the babes in Christ." In Dod's judgment, the godly duties that she was performing were being "done in a weak and true faith."[78] As noted above, Perkins and his followers recognized that initial faith was nearly always "weak" but nonetheless "true." Its presence was sufficient to number anyone who held it among the saved.

By the time Hooker arrived to minister to Joanna Drake, then, his challenge was not to bring her to faith. It was to convince her that she already had faith. In other words, Hooker was observing not a "conversion experience" but a struggle to achieve an awareness that conversion had already begun. In the vocabulary of his time, he was assisting her to gain "assurance" of her salvation by helping her to "reflect" on her situation. As one who had himself despaired of his future in the hands of an angry Augustinian God, Hooker ought to have been uniquely suited to bring her through to that assurance.

Trodden Down Strength, the most detailed surviving account of Joanna Drake's spiritual struggles, describes a Hooker who succeeded in moving Mrs. Drake along the path to assurance. But it also makes plain that he did not succeed in getting her to reach it. Even though he was summoned (alongside John Dod and John Preston) back to Esher in Joanna Drake's final days to fast and pray for her soul, he had left the Drakes' employ well before she finally reached the "well-grounded Perswasions" of God's favor that had been the goal of his ministry with her.[79] Rather than serving as an unconscious model for Hooker's subsequent understanding of conversion, then, Joanna Drake's inner turmoil and final assurance are better understood as analogous to the dramatic conversions in the murder pamphlets so insightfully studied by Peter Lake. Her notorious struggles presented an opportunity for the kind of spectacular intervention that could make a godly minister's reputation.[80]

---

78. *Trodden Down Strength*, 74–75.

79. Ibid., 126–27, 160.

80. Lake, "Deeds against Nature: Cheap Print Protestantism and Murder in Early Seventeenth-Century England," in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 257–83, 361–67; "Popular Form, Puritan Content? Two Puritan Appropriations of the Murder Pamphlet from Mid-Seventeenth-Century London," in *Religion, Culture, and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, ed. Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 313–34; Peter Lake with Michael C. Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation*

If it must be doubted that Hooker's experience with Joanna Drake provided the "unconscious model" for his understanding of how conversion should occur, how might his own experience of conversion have influenced his preaching? The editors of the most significant collection of his New England sermons, Thomas Goodwin and Phillip Nye, assumed that those sermons drew primarily on Hooker's recollections of his own spiritual struggles. In their dedicatory letter to Hooker's *The Application of Redemption*, Goodwin and Nye described Hooker as having been "trained up from his Youth, in the Experience and Tryal of God's Dispensations and Workings."[81] Might not Hooker's memories of his own experience be the most likely source for his understanding of how he thought conversion should occur in others?

But this possibility, too, encounters difficulties. If Hooker ever described his own conversion, that description has not come down to us.[82] It is true that Cotton Mather pinpointed Hooker's Emmanuel College "*Storm* of Soul" as his "Experience of a true *Regeneration*," the time of his conversion to true faith in God. But Mather wrote eighty years after the fact, at a time when expectations for "conversion experiences" were quite different than in the 1610s. Even though Hooker's modern biographers have not questioned Mather's identification of Hooker's storm of soul with his conversion, a closer look at the evidence forces a reconsideration.[83]

To begin, it must be recognized that well before his "storm of soul" Hooker would already have been considered a good Christian by the vast majority of the English churchgoers of his time. Everything we know about his religious development, and particularly about his activities at Emmanuel College, leads to the conclusion that he thought of himself, and was considered by others, as "godly." Goodwin and Nye stress that his "Experience … of God's

---

England (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002). Hooker sometimes moralized about condemned criminals at the "place of Execution" who favored onlookers with "the last remembrance of their untimely death, which their distempers have brought about." "Oh beware by my example," they would say, "that you never rebel against Parents, reject the counsel and command of Governors, that was my sin, hath been my bane, and made me rush on headily to mine own ruin and confusion." AR 10:253, 623.

81. AR sig. C3ʳ, probably the basis for Mather's judgment in *Piscator* 33 {*Magnalia* 1:347}.

82. While one cannot read Hooker's sermons without wondering whether one or another of his descriptions of someone in the throes of coming to faith might not be a thinly disguised self-portrait, it is unwise to base arguments on such conjectures.

83. *Piscator* 5 {*Magnalia* 1:333}; modern biographers accepting Mather's assertion: Williams, "Life of Hooker," 3; Frank Shuffleton, *Thomas Hooker*, 21, *et passim*; Norman Pettit, *The Heart Prepared*, 93; R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, 126; Amanda Porterfield, *Female Piety*, 42; Stephen Foster, "Hooker, Thomas (1586–1647)," 130–32.

Dispensations and Workings" took place "from his Youth." He would not have been appointed as a Scholar at Emmanuel unless he had intended "to take up Theology and the sacred ministry." His service as a Fellow further confirms his piety, for election was restricted to those who were not only "professors of pure religion" but also had "conformed their life and manners thereunto."[84] Assuming that he was ordained, as was customary, about the time he received his M.A., he would have been an ordained minister in the Church of England for half a decade before passing through this storm of soul. His behavior, unlike that of well-known godly ministers like his mentors Perkins and Rogers, was not reported to have changed dramatically as a result of his storm of soul. His reputation at Emmanuel College as an enforcer of godly moral standards does not suggest profligate behavior before the storm occurred.

A closer look at what Cotton Mather found in John Eliot's manuscript finds Eliot describing not a conversion but something else:

> It pleased the *Spirit* of God very Powerfully to break into the Soul of this person, with such a Sense of his being Exposed unto the Just **Wrath** of Heaven, as fill'd him with most unusual Degrees of **Horror and Anguish**, which broke not only his *Rest,* but his *Heart* also, and called him to cry out, *While I suffer thy* ***Terrors****, O Lord, I am Distracted*! … he long had a Soul Harassed with such Distresses.

Rather than imagining that he had had a "conversion experience," Hooker (and Eliot) seem to have understood the storm of soul as a kind of "temptation" or "wrath" experience.[85] Such prolonged periods of intense anxiety, which provoked serious Christians to doubt whether they enjoyed God's favor, were not uncommon among godly ministers. Mather himself admitted that "the most *Useful Ministers* use to be, horribly Buffeted with *Temptations*." Sometime after his storm of soul, in fact, Hooker was called upon to assist

---

84. The founding documents define Scholars as *quique sacram Theologiam ac ministerium sanctum proposuerunt sibi*, and Fellows as *quique vitam moresque secundum eam conformaverint*, Stubbings, *Statutes for Emmanuel*, 74, 52.

85. Emphasis added. It cannot be forgotten that there were several layers of communication/ interpretation between this description and what had happened to Hooker. Mather learned from Eliot what Eliot learned/observed from Hooker, who was himself filtering his experience though his expectations of how God would act. Having just inveighed against generic "conversion experiences," I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that there is such a thing as a generic "wrath experience." Extreme Augustinian preaching and thinking both provoked such experiences and provided an interpretive framework through which they could be understood.

another student undergoing a similar temptation. This student (possibly Eliot himself) had found the temptation "almost intolerable" and had repaired to Hooker "in the Distresses and Anguishes of his Mind. … Bemoaning his … overwhelming Fears." In response, Hooker boasted that he could "*compare with any man Living for Fears!*"[86]

Although it is tempting to imagine such a prolonged sensation of divine wrath as the font from which Hooker's later understanding of conversion inevitably flowed, one can better understand it, I think, as a product of the theological culture in which he came to professional maturity. In a trenchant analysis of theological developments between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, Steven Ozment argued that in the classic Protestant understandings—both Lutheran and Reformed—God's freedom and sovereignty transcended his goodness and love. "One approached such a God not with the offerings of good works expecting fairness, but in simple faith and trust hoping for mercy. … Everything in religion hinged on *God's* keeping his word and proving to be as good as the Bible portrayed him."[87]

Ozment finds Martin Luther's experience archetypical. Even when all he could feel was God's indifference or anger, Luther bet everything on God's faithfulness. His descriptions of how Christians often felt God's wrath just when they thought they enjoyed his favor probe the paradox at the heart of his extreme Augustinianism. How could the loving God of the Bible, who promised forgiveness to sinners, be the same God who "passed over" countless human creatures, through no fault of their own, and left them no possible fate but eternal damnation in hell? Who was God? Was he the merciful divine being revealed in Jesus Christ, or was he the tyrant whom Julian of Eclanum castigated for condemning innocent children to eternal flames? Luther's archetypical Protestant descriptions of God's wrath offer a way to understand the experiences of a Thomas Hooker, steeped in the same tradition, who felt that wrath during his own storm of soul.

In his response to Erasmus, Luther had had to concede that God could often seem unjust, arbitrary, and even cruel. Behind the apparently merciful, loving God of the Bible, it was possible to catch glimpses of a quite different God, one who by his "dreadful hidden will" ordained that only an elect few would actually partake of that mercy. Erasmus was not being unreasonable, Luther admitted, when he found fault with the extreme Augustinian God. God's behavior could be paradoxical. He often "concealed" his mercy

---

86. *Piscator* 33, 32 {*Magnalia* 1:347, 346}; bold added.

87. Ozment, *Protestants*, 198–200.

and loving-kindness behind what appeared to be anger, and his righteousness underneath what seemed to be unrighteousness.[88]

Although many Christians would remain unaware of God's "dreadful hidden will," Luther decided that serious students of theology should sooner or later confront the terrifying consequences of divine predestination. In the preface to an edition of his German writings, Luther famously advised students to observe three rules (*drey Regel*): Prayer, Meditation, and Temptation. Temptations, for which he usually used the German word *Anfechtungen*, could be so terrifying that only the strongest believers would be able to withstand them. But they were nevertheless the best way, he argued, for a prospective theologian to come to know the power, sweetness, and comfort of God's word.[89]

As was the case with Hooker, interpreters have often assumed that Luther's personal *Anfechtungen* shaped his theology. But his exegetical work belies such an assumption. Both in his sermons and his university lectures on biblical texts, Luther read the experience of biblical figures undergoing extreme temptation through the glasses of his previously developed theology of the cross.[90]

If one looks at his descriptions of Mary after she had inadvertently abandoned Jesus in the temple, of the Syrophoenician woman whom Jesus compares to a dog, of Jacob's wrestling with God at the brook Jabbok, and of Abraham's decision to sacrifice his son Isaac, one sees believers confronting an angry God, one whose promises they had trusted but who now seemed to be withdrawing his favor.[91] In each case, someone who had previously felt the favor of a loving, merciful God was thrown up against an altogether different kind of deity. They discovered a God who was distant, uncaring, angry, and terrifying. Worse yet, God's promises, on which everything depended,

---

88. See chapter 5.

89. *Oratio, meditatio, tentatio*, "Vorrede zum 1. Bande der Wittenberger Ausgabe u. 1539," *W.A.* 50:657–61, *Career of the Reformer IV*, trans. Robert R. Heitner, LW 34:285–87, *Es gehören gar starcke Geister da zu, solche puffe [Anfechtungen] auszuhalten*, "*Fastenpostille 1525*. Euangelium auff den ersten Sontag nach Epiphanie," *W.A.* 17/2:20, *Sermons on Gospel Texts for Epiphany, Lent, and Easter. Sermons of Martin Luther*, trans. John N. Lenker (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989), 2:37.

90. *Fastenpostille 1525*. "Euangelium auff den ersten Sontag nach Epiphanie," *W.A.* 17/2:16–32, *Sermons of Martin Luther*, 2:32–53; "Auf den andern Sontag der fasten Euangelion. Matthei 15 [21–28]," *W.A.* 17/2:200–204, *Sermons of Martin Luther*, 2:148–54; *Genesisvorlesung, W.A.* 42–44, Cap. 32:21–24b and Cap. 22:1–11, *Lectures on Genesis*, trans. George V. Schick and Paul D. Pahl, LW:1–8, 6:125–38, and 4:91–122.

91. For extended discussion and analysis of these four sermons, see Baird Tipson, "Thomas Hooker, Martin Luther, and the Terror at the Edge of Protestant Faith," *Harvard Theological Review*, forthcoming.

appeared to be unreliable. Behind the gracious God they had always known, they encountered a God who by his "dreadful hidden will" elected only some and left the others to hell. Might their trust in God's promises have been misplaced? Might the "real" God be a tyrant who routinely broke his promises? Might they finally turn out to be among the reprobate?[92] All four felt cast off by a terrifying God.

Whenever he wished, Luther explained, God could take comfort and happiness away from his saints and leave them in extreme despair, terrified that they had lost the very thing that up till then had given them the greatest joy. At such times, believers might feel that God "wants to tear the Lord Christ out of our heart"; Christ would be so hidden that trust in him seemed impossible.[93] Fearing that she had lost Christ entirely, a Christian's conscience would tremble and quake as she felt God's wrath and condemnation. This was "*desertio gratiae*, when a person's heart feels as if God and his grace have left him and no longer wish to be his. Wherever he turns, he sees nothing but wrath and terror."[94]

As Luther described them, then, these "wrath," "temptation," or "rejection" experiences caught a believer by surprise, at a point where she was confident of God's favor. They called into question the most fundamental conviction of Protestantism: that Christians abandon all confidence in their own works and trust entirely to God's promises. But what if those promises proved capricious, untrustworthy? Ozment argues that in asking, "What if God turns out to be a liar? What if he is neither as powerful nor as true as his Word proclaims?" Protestants were actually questioning not just the reliability of God's promises but God's very nature. "What if the seeming

---

92. Steven Ozment would argue that such anxiety about the trustworthiness of God's promises was a particular problem for the followers of William of Ockham. "Ockham created the conditions for a new spiritual anxiety," argues Ozment, "not the possible existence of God, but the suspicion that he might not keep his word; that he could not be depended upon to do as he had promised; that the power behind all things might ultimately prove untrustworthy and unfriendly; that God, in a word, might be a liar." *Age of Reform*, 61–62. Luther was unquestionably influenced by Ockham's nominalistic philosophy.

93. *eben damit zum höhesten schrecken lesst, davon sie jre höheste freude haben. .... er wolle uns den HErrn Christum aus dem Hertzen reissen. . .. Also das unser Gewissen fület, es habe jn verloren, und als denn zappelt und zaget, als sey es eitel zorn und ungnade gegen im ...* W.A. 17/2:20, *Sermons of Martin Luther*, 2:37. See, in particular, B. A. Gerrish, " 'To the Unknown God' Luther and Calvin on the Hiddenness of God," in Gerrish, *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1982), 131–49, 334–45.

94. *anfectung und leiden. ... Welche man pflegt zu nennen* desertionem gratiae. *Da des menschen Hertz nicht anders fület, denn als habe jn Gott mit seiner Grade verlassen und wolle sein nicht mehr. Und wie er sich hin keret, sihet er nichts denn eitel zorn und schrecken.* ibid.

contradictions in his nature that people experience on earth," Ozment imagines them thinking, "prove true also in eternity?"[95] Just as these questions "drove Martin Luther to near despair," so Luther saw them tormenting Mary, Jacob, the Syrophoenician woman, and Abraham. Initially nurturing and benevolent, God suddenly appeared to a believer in a quite different form, as the dreadful hidden God who had only eternal damnation in store for the majority of humankind. This God's promises seemed meant only for others.[96] A Christian might remain in a state of fear, terror, horror, and despair for some period of time. Luther—and Hooker—were thrown back on their faith. Despite what they called "carnal reason," despite all the outward evidence of rejection, God required them to cling to his Word, to trust his promises, to recognize that God had only been "playing" with his elect for a time. Even as they fought with the temptation that God might be unreliable, they bet everything on his promises.

Unfortunately for the historian, Cotton Mather's account provides tantalizingly few details of Hooker's "storm of soul." But what he does provide, combined with what is known of Hooker's life to that point, conforms almost exactly to Luther's characterization of *tentatio*. Hooker appears to have been a widely respected member of his godly college, a serious student of theology who had long considered himself the object of God's love. After serving almost a decade as a Fellow at Emmanuel, he suddenly found himself faced with the possibility that his trust in God had been misplaced. He confronted a wrathful, terrifying God who appeared to have rejected him and intended to consign him to eternal punishment in hell. Horrified, he remained in intense spiritual anguish. Only after a considerable period of time, with the help of his sizar, Simeon Ashe, did Hooker win release from his fears.

Mather was probably quoting John Eliot's manuscript as he described Hooker's struggles:

> in the time of his Agonies, he could Reason himself to the Rule, and conclude that there was no way but Submission to God, and Lying at the Foot of his Mercy in Christ Jesus, and waiting humbly there, till He should please to perswade the Soul of his favour: nevertheless when

---

95. Ozment, *Protestants*, 200.

96. Ozment suggests that "it was popular religious practice, centered on the sacrament of penance and known to Luther from his childhood, and the traditional theology taught at Erfurt [where Luther received his bachelor's and master's degrees], both the dominant Ockhamism and the persisting Thomism, that magnified for him, as it did for so many others, the tension between divine mercy and divine wrath." *Age of Reform*, 227.

he came to apply this Rule unto himself in his own Condition, his Reasoning would fail him, he was able to Do nothing.

Hooker's mind told him that he had no choice but to trust in Christ's mercy, but his heart could find no feeling that Christ would be merciful particularly to him. Only after suffering "a considerable while" in this anguished state did he finally come to realize that he could not wait for a feeling of God's favor before trusting in God's promises. Like Abraham, Jacob, Mary, and the Syrophoenician woman, he had to cling "nakedly" to the biblical promises without any further evidence that they were meant particularly for him.

Later, when others in similar anguish came to Hooker for help, Eliot reported that Hooker told them, "The Promise was the Boat which was to carry a Perishing Sinner over unto the Lord Jesus Christ." From then on, as he lay down to sleep each evening, Hooker would "Single out some certain *Promise* of God, which he would Repeat, and Ponder, and Keep his Heart close unto it." God's biblical word, rather than any sense or feeling, would be the ground of salvation. In his funeral poem, Samuel Stone reported that this gave Hooker an assurance of God's favor that never left him throughout the remaining thirty years of his life. Furthermore, his having endured a "wrath experience" gave him an authority among the godly not unlike that enjoyed by the holy men of late antiquity. In Hartford, he would counsel those in the throes of humiliation to repair to "such who have been most exercised under such tryals" and to avoid at all costs those whose "erroneous Opinions which go under pretence of Free Grace."[97]

Anyone looking to understand Hooker's extreme antipathy toward "Eatonists and Familists" (among whom he numbered Anne Hutchinson and her followers) might keep in mind that his most profound personal experience of God was of God's anger and the apparent *desertio gratiae*. Luther had insisted that a true knowledge of God required *tentatio* as well as *oratio* and *meditatio*. Perkins had described "the ground of our religion" as "to beleeue thinges neither seene nor felt, to hope aboue all hope, & without hope: in extremitie of affliction to beleeue that God loueth vs, when he seemeth to be our enemy."[98] Hooker would remain deeply suspicious of those who knew God only as they felt him nestling them in his comforting arms. Far from

---

97. Samuel Stone's funeral poem, printed in SSCD, sig. C3ᵛ: *The peace he had full thirty years agoe / At death was firm, not touched by the foe.* Peter Brown, *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), 64, *et passim*; AR 10:582.

98. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:224, op. cit.

being peripheral, his disputes with the proponents of "free grace" had to do with what he took to be "the ground of our religion," the nature of faith in the promises of God.[99]

Mather inadvertently conceded that Hooker's storm of soul belonged in a category of experiences that befell those who were already "converted." "The most *Useful Ministers*," he wrote, "use to be, horribly Buffeted with *Temptations*." That such experiences were understood to be common is confirmed by a passage in Samuel Stone's *Whole Body*. Stone not only recognized the frequency of such experiences but even included a description of their physical symptoms:

> The blood, and heat, and spirits return, and fly, and come crowding to the heart, and castle themselves there, and the blood that was in the heart, goes into the most intimate parts of it, and there are crowded and contracted hard together. ... By reason of the flight of the blood, and spirits to the heart, the Externall parts are cold, and the face looks pale. If it be vehement, there is a trepidation, for want of heat, blood and spirits to sustain them.[100]

Such was the result of an encounter with the terrible Augustinian God.

So while it is unlikely that Hooker's storm of soul was a "conversion experience" in the sense Cotton Mather imagined, there is every reason to believe that he used the theological categories of his godly culture to understand it. As he called the elect among his hearers to faith—the main purpose of his professional life—he would use his rhetorical powers to provoke similar experiences of God's wrath in those hearers and then use those same categories to interpret their experiences. Hooker had wrestled like Jacob with the extreme Augustinian God, a God who revealed his arbitrary power before he revealed his love, a God who terrified before he comforted. If authentic faith in God's promises could come only after such an encounter with divine wrath, if a believer had to learn to trust God even when God seemed absent or angry, then Hooker would try to provoke that encounter in every

---

99. *Pace* Winship, *Making Heretics*. For examples of Hooker's antipathy, see SEC 63–65; SSCD, I:a2ᵛ, 2:42, 3:22; AR 1:29, 2:133, 10:581. In Hartford, Hooker said that to give counsel to others in distress, ministers ought to "have experience of trouble and misery in themselves." "He that hath been tossed in the sea wil pity others that have been in the same danger." AR 10:666–67. On the issue, see, in particular, T. D. Bozeman, "The Glory of the 'Third Time': John Eaton as Contra-Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996): 638–54 and *The Precisionist Strain*.

100. WB 421.

prospective convert. If God insisted on frightening sinners into repentance, Hooker would make sure that his hearers knew that fright. If God withdrew all comfort from his saints so that they would cling in desperation to scriptural promises, so would Hooker. He would fill his sermons with strikingly graphic descriptions of God's infinite detestation for sin and hatred for sinners. He would "save with fear."

In rediscovering the way Hooker interpreted his own storm of soul and made it virtually normative for those to whom he preached, have we found the key to understanding what he later preached about conversion? Not entirely. But after exploring the complex of ideas behind his Chelmsford and Hartford sermons, the way he fit his storm of soul into that complex, and the way that storm of soul burned what had been largely book-learning into the deep recesses of his heart, we are enabled to read those sermons more discerningly. The extreme Augustinian tradition in which he stood would continue to act like a solvent on any naive confidence that he or any of his hearers enjoyed God's favor. Understood through the grid of that tradition, the "*Storm of Soul*" reinforced what his intellect had already learned at Cambridge about the anger of the terrible Augustinian God. In his encounters with John Rogers, he worked out the logic of his understanding of "saving preparation." The notion of saving preparation, during which fear led to sorrow and shame and finally to faith, fit neatly into the mixture.

10

Hooker and Stone Preach Conversion

THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS have explored the religious and intellectual environment in which Thomas Hooker preached. His experience at Emmanuel College and in other communities of the godly, the tradition of extreme Augustinian theology mediated through Perkins, Richardsonian Ramism, a theatrical preaching style modeled on that of John Rogers, and the models of conversion discussed in the last chapter all came together in his preaching. We are finally in a position to look closely at the way Hooker directed prospective converts as they struggled toward a godly life.

Although many scholars have assumed otherwise, Hooker never tried to conceal his extreme Augustinian theology. Nor did hearers miss his message. One of them (perhaps incredulous) complained: "You wil tel us it is not in our Preparations, Performances, and Improvements, that our Spiritual good depends, there is nothing we can do can procure it, it depends wholly upon the good pleasure of the Lord." How, this chapter will ask, could such a deterministic theology be consistent with conversionist preaching? In addition, virtually all previous scholarship has assumed that Hooker led prospective converts through successive states of a "morphology of conversion." To see why this assumption, too, is inaccurate, we will look closely at a particularly detailed description of a sinner's conversion that Hooker presented to his Chelmsford audience.[1]

---

1. SP 137–46. The reader should keep in mind that, like Perkins, Hooker rejected the notion that a person could fall in and out of God's favor. Once an elect person had been regenerated, she could never fall away. People might deceive themselves and imagine they believed when in fact they did not, but the transition from unbelief to authentic faith was permanent; it occurred only once.

As had Perkins, Hooker believed that conversion began when a "worldly" citizen was exposed to the preaching of the law. "It may be a poore man drops into the Church, and the Lord lets in a light, and the Lord doth compas him about with some threatnings of the Law, and shews him the nature of sinne, and the damnation that comes by it." Hooker imagined this "poore man" confronted with the demands of God's Law and the consequences of disobeying it. While Hooker assumed that "the Lord" was secretly working through the preacher's words, at this stage the man would simply have felt himself brought up short by a preacher's powerful rhetoric.

Quite understandably, the "poore man" would begin to wonder whether the preacher had assessed his situation accurately. "Thereupon his thoughts beginne to hurry in one upon another, and he retyres home, and thinks thus with himselfe, surely the preacher spake strange things to day, if all be true that he spake, then certainly my condition is naught, surely there is more in sinne then ever I thought of." Distressed by the preacher's words, he would reflect upon his previous way of life: he "thinks thus with himselfe." Introspection—a "reflex act" as Hooker and Stone would call it—allowed a hearer to measure his behavior against the preacher's standards.

Unwilling to rely entirely on his own judgment, the poor man would reach out to others. "He resolves to hear the Minister again, and he fals to reading and conferring with others, to try if it be so as the minister before revealed unto him, and commonly he goeth to heare the same minister againe, and by this meanes what with hearing and reading & conferring, he seeth the thing he doubted of is too certaine, and that the thing he questioned before is without all doubt: the Law is just, the word is plaine, if God be true, this is true, *The wages of sinne is death*." In other words, the poor man would turn to a godly network—printed tracts, experienced Christians, and the minister himself—all ready to explain what was happening to him in the categories they understood. "Conferring" could include a variety of related activities, ranging from consulting a sympathetic neighbor to attending a local conference of godly ministers and laypeople.

One can see at the outset that conversion as Hooker imagined it would not be self-authenticating. Careful attention to the minister's words, serious personal reflection upon his own behavior, and consultation with experienced laypeople would all be required if a potential convert were to learn how to "make sense" of what was going on. Godly people would provide an appropriate interpretive framework.[2]

---

2. So I read Hooker's descriptions of the "conversion experience" as fully compatible with a "cultural/linguistic" paradigm that stresses the priority of culture over unmediated experience.

Now being increasingly drawn into godly company, the poor man would become convinced that his situation was precarious. Hooker's emphasis modulated accordingly. Initially, he had focused on the poor man's "thoughts," his reflecting upon his behavior. Now focus shifted to the will:

> now the sinner beginnes to consider that the condemnation threatned sleepes not and that God hath him in chase, and that punishment that God threatens shall be executed upon him sooner or latter: .... and by this meanes he is surprised with a sudden feare of spirit. ... so much that the soule saith, What if God should damne me, God may doe it: and what if God should execute his vengeance upon me, the soule feareth that the evill discovered will fall upon him, the nature of his feare is this, he knoweth there is cause of feare, and he cannot beare the evill when it is come. ... and thus his heart is full of feare ... God may take me with my meate in my mouth, and call me down into hell fire for ever ... the Lord pursueth the soule, and when the heart cannot be rid of this feare, the Lord beginnes to let fly against the soule of a sinner.

Unlike Arminius, who had taught that conversion was a matter of convincing the intellect, Hooker focused his attention on what needed to be framed: the "heart" or will.[3] In a sermon on Jesus's words in Matthew 16:24, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and follow me," Hooker insisted that "a man must *will* to follow Christ: before he can follow him." "If a man hath a heart that way," he continued, "a will to the businesse, then hee may follow him, then all goes forward cheerefully, this *will* is the greate wheele that turnes all, and the power of the soule, *that workes all in this case.*"[4] Whether the intellect (or "understanding" as Hooker called it) was convinced or not,

---

3. Remember that by "heart," Hooker and his contemporaries meant "not the naturall part of a man which is the middest of the body," but the Augustinian driver of human action, "the will it selfe ... that ability of soule, whereby the heart saith, I will have this, and I will not have that." SP 130; cf. WB 367: "There is a double faculty in the Reasonable Soule, the one guiding, the other moving to worke, these are understanding and Will"; WB 416: "In the scriptures by heart we are to understand both will and affections"; WB 392: "The will of man is the great wheele, the first mover and commander of all the faculties." SP 31: "The understanding is like the counselors, and the will is the Queene." Cf. SP 123; CTCL 11; UP *57.

4. UP 28, emphasis original. So John Rogers would say, "if *will* be come home, the bargain is done," cited by Firmin, *The Real Christian*, 6–7, op cit.

no good act would occur without a resolution of the will. Hooker's experience confirmed this over and over:

> when the Understanding is informed, and the Will is not set[t]led on it, it is only Consultation; but the Will saith, I will not have it thus: A man may be good in Consultation, but not in Resolution: when the Drunkard is convinced, it is an evill to be drunke; and so the Userer, but yet will be so still, and with the Addar turne the deafe eare, and will continue in it still, and the Adulterer is convinced of his sin, when he goes into the Adulteresse, hee shall never returne, here the Understanding is cleare, but the Will comes not off, and so he will have his sinne still: so when the Persecutor is convinced that persecuting Gods Saints is a sinne, and hates it, this is cleare to the Understanding, yet the Will will be malicious still: the heaviest part is the Will. As in a Parliament Consultation, they must propound all to the King, and he must ratifie, and confirme it; now when the Will saith, I will not ratifie that, I will not leave that sinne, nor take up that duty, now all this while it is not ratified, till the Will come off.

As he put it more succinctly in Hartford: "Know that the greatest work of Reformation, Repentance, and the comfort of a mans spiritual condition, it lies mainly in the Will."[5]

Such statements remind us of Hooker's Augustinian voluntarism.[6] Preaching in Hartford, Hooker returned to one of his favorite metaphors, a physician healing a putrefied sore, to make the point:

> The great Fort that must be taken, is the Will, or else all the rest is as good as nothing: he that wil cure a disease must not only skin it over, but must take away the core of it, if he think to heal it throughly, and cure it fully: So here, it is not enough to wash a mans mouth, and to wipe his

---

5. CTCL 10; AR 7:345.

6. Norman Fiering uses the term "Augustinian voluntarism" to mean that in matters of salvation, the will, not the intellect, determines human action. Richard Muller clarifies Fiering's categories by explaining that Perkins, Hooker, and others in their tradition were "philosophical intellectualists," meaning that in ordinary activity the human will followed the direction of the reason or intellect, but "soteriological voluntarists, who placed the will over the intellect in the fallen nature of man." Fiering, "Will and Intellect in the New England Mind," 529–30; Muller, *Thought of Jacob Arminius*, 145. Hooker, explicitly following Perkins, summed up his position this way: "there is a certainty that a man shall have mercy if he can desire it." SEC 49.

hands, but the core of a mans corruptions must be got away, thy soul must be brought off from the *Will of sinning,* as wel as from the Practice of sinning, or else thy soul will never be brought home to God:[7]

As a good Augustinian, Hooker knew all too well that a recalcitrant will could fail to be moved by even the soundest knowledge. "A man may have abilitie to know," he explained, "and understand wisely, and dispute judiciously of Christ and grace, and yet never get a desire after Christ and grace. It is a great matter to know what we should doe, it is harder to doe what wee know, and hardest of all to get a desire to do what we ought." "It is easie to convince a mans understanding, all the difficulty is in the will." For this reason, the best evidence of authentic conversion would be a former sinner's "constant purpose" to obey the commandments. A "settled and a constant purpose flowing from a hatred of sinne, and love of righteousnesse, whereby the heart resolves to repent, to become obedient to God, and to eschew his owne sinfull wayes" could only result from "the proper worke of the spirit" and therefore argued that a hearer was "in the state of grace."

Such a constant purpose of the will was simply beyond the ability of fallen human nature. To the question, "whether a man can will Christ and grace, thus naturally out of the power of nature?" Hooker could only answer, "no." "Thou canst as well make a soule as convert a soule, thou canst as well create thyself as repent; is it in thy power to say, now I will have grace, now I will not? now I will repent, and now I will not? Oh thinke of it, you shall find it a harder taske then you are aware of." Only divine activity could initiate such a change of purpose: "Our wills are lifted up above their naturall condition and ability by a special infusion of grace."[8]

Conversion was therefore a work of the will, or more accurately a work upon the will, and Hooker gave due credit to his theological forebear. "There is an old phrase, which Saint Austin propounded in his time … *that God of an unwilling will, doth make a willing will.*" "God brings willingnesse out of unwillingnesse … he must conquer that resistance against the Spirit which is in the soule, before he can make it plyable and frameable to his owne will and pleasure."[9]

From this point, then, the poore man's heart was "full of feare" and "unable to "be rid of this fear." The "sudden feare of spirit" which had first surprised

7. AR 7:344.

8. SEC 196; PP 120; CTCL 264; UP 40; UP* 107; CTCL 248.

9. UP* 68–69; cf. AR 1:34.

him had now become constant. Through Hooker's preaching, the extreme Augustinian God was terrifying one of his human creatures.

Now, Hooker explained, the poor man's conscience would step forward to reinforce what the poor man had read, what he had learned from godly conferences, and what he had heard the minister preach.

> Now his conscience is all on a flame within him, and he saith to himselfe, Thou hast sinned and offended a just God, and therefore thou must be damned and to hell thou must goe … now the soule seeth flashes of hell and Gods wrath upon the soule, and the terrours of hell lay hold upon the heart … you have filled the Lords eyes and eares with your abominations, and the Lord of heaven shall fill you answerably with his wrath. … Now conscience saith, Doest not thou know that thou art one of them that have had pleasure in unrighteousnesse, therefore away thou must goe, and thou shalt be damned … the wrath of God followeth him wheresoever he goeth.[10]

In Hooker's day as in our own, that activity of the self that reminded a person of her moral standards was her conscience. In the Garden of Eden, explained Samuel Stone in the *Whole Body*, Adam had had "Rule and Law" written in his heart. But after the Fall, "that ancient Inscription or Impression of the Law" was "almost blotted out, and consumed with rust," and humans were "utterly unable to do the least good in a right manner." Remnants of the Law still remained, however, and a person's conscience reflected on her actions and approved or disapproved of them by the standard of those remnants. When someone conformed her behavior to the "Rule of the Law written on the heart," she would have a "good conscience." Conscience was a "reflect act" rather than a separate faculty, "the applying of the law in the heart" to a person's "actions good or Evill."[11]

---

10. SP 137–45.

11. As in so many other instances, the ultimate source for what has been called the "introspective conscience" of Western Christianity was Augustine. See, in particular, the widely influential essay of Krister Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of West," in Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 78–96. Conscience operated by what the theologians called a "practical syllogism," and so John Donne could state simply that *Conscientia est syllogismus practicus, Sermon XXVII, in The Works of John Donne*, ed. Henry Alford, 6 vols. (London: John W. Parker, 1839), 1:569, cited in Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 251. The role of the practical syllogism in certifying someone's status before God is discussed in the next chapter.

Because they were based on the Rule, conscience's judgments would mirror those of God, and it had become conventional to imagine a person's conscience serving as a "witnesse to accuse or excuse before God." "The conscience of every sinner sits within his heart as a little judge," said Perkins, "to tell him that hee is bound before God to punishment." Or he could imagine conscience as "the Lordes Sergeant," charged "to infourme the sinner of the bonde and obligation whereby he is always bound before God." Conscience kept track of a sinner's transgressions; it was "Gods Auditor, and the keeper of his accounts." At the terrible day of judgment, said Stone, God would have "sufficient testimony, not only of other men, but also of thy own conscience."

But conscience would not wait for the day of judgment. It continually accused for every misdeed and reminded a person that actions "contrary to the Law" were "worthy of Death." Hooker thought of conscience as "a warner of the soule" that charged a person "not to meddle with corruptions."[12]

Not content to pass judgment, conscience would intensify the heart's fear with "flashes of hell and God's wrath." Denial would be stripped away, and the poor man would come face-to-face with the anger of the terrible God.

Besides convincing a hearer of the impossibility of meeting God's expectations, then, legal preaching was designed to drive her to reflect upon, and then to pass judgment on, her past behavior. Conversion rested upon introspection. Whether initially in a person's thoughts or subsequently in her conscience, introspection would shape conversion till the moment of death. Hooker's usual term for this introspection was "meditation." A person "meditated" by thoughtfully measuring her behavior against the standards of the Rule as written in the Scriptures or expounded in a sermon.[13]

Meditation might involve no more than remembering the words of a sermon and keeping them in mind. "When the minister hath done his sermon, then your work beginnes, you must heare all the weeke long," "heare the word still sounding in thine eares." "When your soules are wrought upon by any

---

12. WB 393–96; FC 35; UP *41; cf. UP *54, Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:159. Medieval theologians had seen in the conscience "a residue of prefallen and even precreated purity … an inextinguishable spark of goodness" of reason and will (*synteresis rationis et voluntatis*). Ozment, *Age of Reform,* 243.

13. See, for example, Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works,* 3:229. A hundred years later the evangelical Calvinist John Newton described meditation as "the observations we are able to make upon what passes within us and without us." MS Diary, 1751–56, Firestone Library, Princeton, New Jersey, 1, 287, cited in Hindmarsh, *John Newton,* 223. The literary critic Harold Bloom liked to speak of the capacity for self-overhearing, e.g., *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994), 48–49.

reproofs or admonitions, take that truth, and labour to maintain the power of it upon your hearts all the weeke after."[14]

But Hooker also liked to personify it. "Meditation doth toss the soule with vexation"; "meditation leadeth as it were an army of arguments, an army of curses, and miseries, and judgements, against the soule ... and tells the soule, God is against thee wherever thou art, and what ever thou dost."[15] Meditation reminded the poor man how far his behavior fell short of God's expectations in the Law. "Get you home to the Law," commanded Hooker, "and looke into the glasse thereof." "Then you shall see," he said in another place, "the complexion of your sinnes and the vilenesse of your corruptions. ... If a man should thus looke, and view his sinnes, and carry away the glasse with him continually, he would see his life so ugly, and his heart so base, that he could not be able to beare it." "I am a prophane creature," he would find himself forced to conclude, "and my heart is polluted, Conscience defiled, and this soule hardned, and I shal be damned."[16] On occasion, Hooker could even recommend more structured meditative disciplines, disciplines that resembled those of his Jesuit adversaries:

> as you are going home, thinke with your selves, It was my sinnes that had a part in the shedding of the blood of Christ; and when you are at meate let that come into your mind, I have had a hand in the crucifying of the Lord Jesus Christ, and when you goe to bed thinke of it, I am one of those that have embrewed their hands in the blood of the Lord Jesus, that Saviour that is now at the right hand of God, that hath done so much for his servants, that sweat drops of blood, those sweates and drops were for thy sinnes, and is this a matter of merryment and a tricke of youth in the meane time?[17]

Hooker called this kind of reflection "sad," meaning "serious" in the vocabulary of his day but also "sorrowful" and "melancholic" (as the word tends to mean in ours). The melancholy could be prolonged. Even when the preacher's sermon "pierced the heart," faith would not come suddenly. "The saving truth thus set on lyes gnawing and eating at the heart blood of a sinner, (as *aqua fortis* doth in iron.)." Like "strong physic in the bowels," the minister's words would

---

14. [14] SP 128, 81, 202–3.

15. SP 82, 88.

16. [16] SP 105, 90.

17. SP 107; see also AR 3:203–4.

work "day and night" as the sinner gradually came to hate sin as much as the punishment it deserved. A single sermon might awaken fear and sorrow, but the sinner would hear many sermons, and initiate many godly conversations, before "God did conquer the prevailing Dominion of these distempers unto which the heart was subject." "Keepe the soule therefore so troublesome and sorrowful," he urged. "When your heart is thus affected, do not heale it too soone, but hold the soule in that blessed frame and disposition."[18]

There was good reason for detractors to find the godly "mopish" and "melancholy." "Did you never see a soule in distresse of Conscience"? Hooker asked his hearers, "he is all turned to dust and ashes." Even in Hartford, Hooker admitted that "most men in the time and work of conversion have that scorn cast upon them, that they grow melancholy." Effective preaching, he said, "drives the sinner to sad thoughts of heart, and makes him keep an audit in his own soul by serious meditation." He "droops and buckles under his burden, steps into a solitary place and hangs the wing as a soul that is shot." "The word of God is the salve," he summarized, "conviction of Conscience is like the binding on of the salve, meditation is like the binding of it to the sore."[19] Far from being a source of pride, honest meditation ran the risk of increasing a hearer's despair that she could ever escape from her corruption. Hooker warned that

we must not looke too long; the soule distressed and troubled should not sticke too long, and looke too much, and dwell unwarrantably and continually upon the sight and consideration of his owne sinnes, upon his weaknesses and distempers, so farre as to be skared, and altogether discouraged from comming to, and depending upon the riches of Gods free grace. The devill keeps us in our sinnes by poring continually upon our sinnes, when we thinke to have our hearts carried against our corruptions, we are more intangled in our corruptions, by dwelling continually upon them.[20]

---

18. SP 113–14; see also SEC 635–36; AR 10:373–74.

19. SP 135; AR 10:215, 373; SP 89.

20. SEC 552. In Hartford, Hooker warned that "when we pore upon our infirmities and weaknesses we provide for discouragements, and we sit and sink down under them … original corruption; the *old Man*, which in the Saints is dying away, and decaying dayly, but our Meditation puts as it were *Aqua vitæ* into the old mans mouth, adds vigor afresh, and sometimes makes it with violence to prevail." AR 10:166. Alec Ryrie suggests that this sort of meditation "could blur all too easily into an obsessive spiritual hygiene which was never satisfied." *Being Protestant*, 59.

Introspection could easily lead to unhealthy self-absorption, self-absorption which in this instance could induce despair at the persistence of sin.

Pausing at this point, we can see that Hooker's expectations went beyond those of Perkins. If it proved effectual, such a "settled exercise of the heart that meditates on sinnes" would result in something more than the "legal sorrow" that the poor man had felt at first. Serious and sustained meditation could lead a hearer to feel a "sorrow and compunction for sinne" that Hooker termed "godly sorrow" or "contrition." Over and over, Hooker taught that unless a hearer were genuinely contrite, faith could simply not arise. Explaining in Hartford how the Jews to whom Peter preached were "pricked in their hearts (Acts 2:37)," he described how "their souls bled inwardly."[21]

Hooker preserved the traditional distinction between "worldly" and "godly" sorrow; he simply made godly sorrow a precondition for faith. Only someone so moved by godly preaching as to feel "contrition," someone who had moved beyond fear of punishment to a genuine sorrow for having offended God, would in his mind have been sufficiently prepared to take the next critical step: abandoning all hope in her own ability in order to place her trust entirely in God's promise of salvation. This was the same "saving contrition" or "saving preparation" that he had originally discussed with John Rogers.

Hooker's idiosyncratic concept of "saving preparation" went still further.[22] His "storm of soul" while still a fellow at Emmanuel College appears to have convinced him that only after reaching a state of "humiliation" would his hearers be fully aware of their corruption and ready to rely completely on divine mercy. Theologians had written of contrition for more than a millennium, but Hooker expected a degree of self-abnegation that set him apart from almost all of his contemporaries.

It was commonplace for Protestant writers to teach that justification by faith required a Christian to abandon all confidence in her own ability and to trust entirely to God's mercy. Much of Hooker's preaching on this point can therefore appear conventional. As the minister's words penetrated, the hearer would come to recognize the extent of her sinfulness. Confronted with the fearful wrath that sinfulness had provoked from an offended God, and anticipating the unendurable punishment that this God had in store for such wickedness, she would fall into despair. Desperate for pardon, she would finally be ready to "hear" the Gospel promise. If she could isolate the actual

---

21. AR 10:358, see also 373.

22. Michael Winship calls attention to Hooker's (and Thomas Shepard's) "peculiar attitude" toward preparation. *Making Heretics*, 69.

time of her regeneration, it would be the moment when a glimpse of possible pardon, a faint glimmer of possible mercy, pierced the darkness. If faith "hath sprung up from a secure, untroubled, quiet spirit," said Hooker, "we may at no hand dare to relie upon it." Faith would arise only "after a boisterous storme." The unendurable weight of your sins, Hooker told one hearer, would "drive thee, & compel thee to seek unto Christ for mercy."[23] Perkins would not have disagreed.

But Hooker could also describe humiliation in terms that went beyond anything in Perkins. Teaching his congregation how "the Soule stoopes to the condition the Lord will appoint, be it never so hard," he explained that godly people would "trample upon our own respects" and "submit our necks to the block."[24] Most notoriously, Hooker repeatedly preached that a broken-hearted soul would reach the point of ultimate self-denial: accepting eternal damnation if that were God's will. This was the state that theologians called *resignatio ad infernum.* It was not enough for a framed heart to accept "that salvation, and happinesse, and the acceptation of a mans person now, must be no more in a mans owne hands, nor in his owne abilitie." Self-denial should reach such an extreme, said Hooker, that the hearer "fals downe at the throne of grace" and cries out "if the Lord will damne him he may." Hooker called this "desperate discouragement" or "holy despair." A truly framed heart would be "content to beare the estate of damnation; because hee hath brought this misery and damnation upon himselfe."[25]

It would be extraordinarily difficult for a hearer to reach this point: "harsh and tedious, and long it is ere the Soule be thus framed."[26] But Hooker had insisted from the outset that framing the heart for God was completely beyond human power. No one could naturally be capable of such self-abnegation. Only God could break the heart.

Perkins had written that a potential convert who saw the "foulenesse" of his sins and felt the "burthen" of them would be "brought downe, as it were to the very gates of hell," even "heartily acknowledging himselfe to haue deserued not one onely, but even ten thousand damnations in hell fire."[27] But never had

---

23. CTCL 252; SP 116.

24. SDD 168–74; SH 122.

25. SH 108, 112; see also 106–7, 113, 123; SP 156; SImp 191, 168; SH 6, 25.

26. SH 112.

27. *Of the Calling of the Ministerie: Two Treatises, Works,* 3:*434. *A Treatise Tending unto a declaration, Works,* 1:365.

he gone so far as to suggest he would accept damnation if it were God's will. Hooker preached exactly that.

Hooker gained a name for taking self-denial to this extreme. A half-century after Hooker's death, a horrified Cotton Mather claimed that Hooker's position had been "deformedly misrepresented." But Mather was mistaken, for Hooker had in fact insisted over and over that a truly humbled soul would accept even its own damnation if that damnation were God's will.[28] "Bee thou glorified," he expected such a person to pray to God, "though I be damned forever." If other preachers went so far as to imagine a humbled hearer admitting that he deserved "nothing but hell" for his sins, Hooker insisted on more. "The soule despairing of all succour in himselfe, it fals downe at the throne of grace, if the Lord will damne him he may, and if he will save him he may." "[I]f it were possible to be in hell, free from sinne, he were a happy man." "The heart truly abased," Hooker insisted, "is content to beare the estate of damnation."[29]

Many godly contemporaries thought Hooker had gone too far. Thomas Goodwin, whom we last saw weeping after a John Rogers sermon, told Samuel Hartlib privately that Hooker was "a severe and Cruel Man like John Baptist, [who] vrges too much and too farre the Worke of Humiliation."[30] Giles Firmin criticized

---

28. Mather, *Piscator* 34 {*Magnalia* 1:347}: "many wrote after him in *Short-Hand*; and some were so bold, as to Publish many of them, without his consent or Knowledge; whereby his Notions came to be Deformedly misrepresented in multitudes of Passages; among which I will suppose that Crude Passage, which Mr. *Giles Firmin*, in his *Real Christian*, so well confutes, *That if the Soul be rightly Humbled, it is content to bear the State of Damnation.*" Increase Mather made the same argument in a prefatory letter to Solomon Stoddard's *Guide to Christ* (Boston, 1714). David D. Hall, who is nearly always right on these matters, seems to imply that Cotton's assertion is accurate, *Ways of Writing: The Practices and Politics of Text-Making in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 122, although he admits that Mather was a "careless copyist" and that his "memory was unreliable," 70. But a number of references in Hooker's published sermons support Firmin's assertion. Hooker's best nineteenth-century biographer, George Leon Walker, determined (accurately in my judgment): "It is not by any supposition of incorrect short-hand reporting that the tenet can be got out of Hooker's [*Soules*] *Humiliation* or [Thomas] Shepards's *Sincere Convert*. The doctrine is logically and rhetorically woven into the texture of both treatises. It appears and reappears in them. It is prepared for, led up to, stated, enforced, and objections to it answered. There is no accidental and inconsiderate slipping into its utterance. It is accepted with full intelligence, and with clear recognition of its obnoxiousness and its difficulty to the average experience." *History of the First Church in Hartford*, 129–30. *The Application of Redemption*, whose editors claim that Hooker prepared the text with his own hand, states unequivocally that a properly framed soul would be "content that God would fling him into Hell. So he would free him from his sins." AR 10:700. Holifield, *Theology in America*, 43, takes for granted that Hooker expected converts to be willing to accept their own damnation if it were God's will.

29. SImp 168; see also SEC 212, 498; SImp 97; SH 6, 107, 112; SP 159; AR 10:700, see also 10:409.

30. Hartlib, Ephemerides 1634 (late) in *The Hartlib Papers* 29/2/55B.

Hooker and his son-in-law Thomas Shepard for insisting so much upon "dreadful legal terrors, deep sorrow and humblings" that they placed "blocks" before potential converts. Firmin took particular issue with the notion that a true convert had to be "so humbled, as to be content to be damned."[31]

Hooker did not deny that such extreme humiliation took the joy out of life. A tendency toward "melancholic moping" had become a defining mark of the godly, but in Hooker's experience melancholy could become severe (to a point that today would almost certainly be called clinical depression):

> You may see a man sometime in the torment of Conscience, that nature and naturall parts begin to decay; his understanding growes weake, and his memorie failes him, and he growes to bee marveilously distracted, and besides himselfe; so that the partie which was (before) a man of great reach and of able parts, and was admired, and wondred at for his wisedome, and government; *he is now accounted a silly sot, and a mad man*, in regard of the horror of heart that hath possessed him; *in so much that the husband saith, Oh my wife is undone; and the father saith, my child is undone.*[32]

But he was nonetheless convinced that this was the extreme Augustinian God's way of bringing people under his wing.

Revealingly, the young Martin Luther had had similar expectations for those undergoing humiliation. As he lectured early in his academic career, Luther explained that the sorts of *Anfectungen* described in the last chapter "humbled" people. "Humiliation" (*humiliatio*) was the soil from which justifying faith grew. In the words of Alister McGrath, it was "only by being forced into recognizing one's total unworthiness—even to the point of total contempt and hatred of oneself—that justification comes about." Initially, Luther seemed to treat such "humiliation" as a human achievement, something God would reward with grace.

---

31. *The Real Christian, or a Treatise of Effectual Calling* (London, 1670), 1, 5, sigs. G2ʳ–G2ᵛ. Firmin did not deny the necessity of preparation: "preparatory works I did not at all oppose, nay, I maintained them." *Real Christian*, 232. It was Antinomians like John Traske who, in David Como's words, denounced the entire program of suggesting "that a series of preparatory works of humiliation and mortification preceded the onset of faith." Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 351. See also Bozeman, "The Glory of the 'Third Time.' "

32. SH 117; emphasis added. Daniel Defoe describes how the London plague of 1665 terrified citizens "into Idiotism, and foolish Distractions, some into despair and Lunacy; others into melancholy Madness." *Journal of the Plague Year*, 78. For an insightful discussion of the link between melancholy and depression, see Joshua Wolf Shenk, *Lincoln's Melancholy: How Depression Challenged a President and Fueled His Greatness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005).

But by the time of his lectures on Paul's letter to the Romans (1515–16), he had come to a different understanding. Humiliation was a state produced by God over the resistance of the human creature. A favorite text was 1 Samuel 2:6–7: "The Lord kills and makes alive; he brings down to hell and brings back again. The Lord makes poor and makes rich; he humbles and he exalts." To use McGrath's words again, Luther saw God humiliating those human beings he wished to save "through the experience of the wrath of God, the threat of hell and eternal damnation, through *Anfectung* and suffering."[33]

How extreme was the humiliation? Those who truly love God, said Luther in commenting on Romans 9:3, "submit freely to the will of God whatever it may be, even for hell and eternal death, if God should will it." "No one knows whether he loves God with a pure heart," he continued, "unless he experiences in himself that should God want it so, he does not wish to be saved or refuse to be damned."[34] For the young Luther, *humiliatio* explicitly included *resignatio ad infernum*, the willingness to be damned should God so wish!

Hooker's descriptions of humiliation as a "desperate discouragement" and "holy despair," worked by God to allow faith to arise, reveal Hooker as one of Luther's authentic theologians (see the previous chapter) who knew *tentatio* as well as *oratio* and *meditatio*. Total self-abnegation, worked by God, cleared the way for faith and justification. Those who accuse Hooker of preaching a preparation achieved entirely on human power not only misread him but ignore these striking parallels with Luther.[35]

As the subtitle suggests, Shenk argues that those who learn to cope with prolonged melancholia can become unusually productive.

33. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), 123, 154; see also zur Mühlen, *Nos extra nos*, 273.

34. *Tales enim Libere sese offerunt in omnem voluntatem Dei, etiam ad infernum et mortem aeternaliter, si Deus ita Vellet tantum. . .. Nunc autem nemo scit, an Deum pure diligat, Nisi experiatur in se, Quod etiam salutari non cupiat Nec damnari renuat, Si Deo placeret.* Luther, *Diui Pauli apostoli ad Romanos Epistola, W.A.* 56:391, English translation *Luther: Lectures on Romans*, trans. Wilhelm Pauck (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 262; see also *W.A.* 56:388, *Lectures on Romans*, 255.

35. E.g., McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 2:117, following Miller and Norman Pettit: "It is within man's natural powers to be sufficiently contrite to permit God to justify him." Tellingly, Luther's insistence on the primacy of God's promises eventually drove him to reject the notion that *humiliatio* required a *resignatio ad infernum*. Around the dinner table in December 1532, he remarked that his former colleague Andreas Karlstadt had once said about himself that even if he knew God was going to damn him, he would "trot right along into hell." Without admitting that he had once taught the same thing himself, Luther said that Karlstadt had spoken "wickedly." God asked believers to "do and believe what I tell you, and leave the rest to me." It was enough to trust in God's word. *W.A. Tischreden*, I:174–75, no. 403: *Carlstadius*

Everything that Hooker and his God required of converts led to one practical result. A convert's "contrition" meant she was sorry for her failure to follow God's Rule. Her "humiliation" meant she recognized that her own "works" could never gain God's approval and that she needed God's help to change her behavior. By "faith" she had placed all her trust in the Gospel promise of salvation through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In "repentance" she had repudiated her past misbehavior and resolved, with God's help, to do better. From then on, her life would be one of "submission."

For in Hooker's Chelmsford, becoming "godly" meant bringing one's life under the authority of the Rule: God's will as expressed most clearly in the Bible. "When ever you heare the word of the Lord, and the Gospell of God, you must come trembling, and submit to that good word." In practice, a convert's adjusting herself to the requirements of the "alternate world" of the Bible meant subordinating her will to the authority of the minister as God's agent. Perkins had made this plain. "We are to reuerence the ministry of the word, in as much as God signifies his good will vnto vs thereby, & we are in all obedience to subiect our selues to it . .. conforme our selues to it."[36] Ministers were the "guides" to "the straight way that leades to eternal life," and the godly were entreated "without pride and fierceness, to yield subjection and obedience to their ministerie."[37] When someone declined from godly standards, finding herself unmoved by preaching, for example, neglecting the clear standards of the word, or possibly even wandering into errors or doctrine; the remedy was straightforward: "subjection" to the discipline of the ministers and other experienced members of the godly fraternity.[38]

Hooker generally chose to speak of "submission" rather than "subjection," but the effect was the same. "They that beleeve, will *submit* to the Spirit of grace," he instructed his hearers; "faith comes by yeelding and *submitting* to the Spirit in the word." An unbeliever, on the contrary, was "hee that will

---

aliquando dixit: Si scirem, das mich unser Herr Gott wolt verdammen, so wolt ich in die hell hinein treben. Sed est impie dictum. Deus dicit: Thue und glaub, was ich dir sage; das ander las mich machen. So wollen sie es vor wissen sine ad extra verbum. Table Talk, trans. Theodore G. Tappert, LW 54:64. On Luther's change of heart, see Wolfhart Pannenberg, "Der Einfluß der Anfechtungserfahrung auf den Prädestinationsbegriff Luthers," *Kerygma und Dogma* 3 (1957): 109–39, at 126–30. Hooker, on the contrary, never repudiated the doctrine.

36. SEC 70; Perkins, *A Treatise on God's Free Grace, Works,* 1:726.

37. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:283, see also 1:260; *A Treatise on Gods Free Grace, Works,* 1:722.

38. *subjectio, fratrum & ministrorum censuris facienda, Armilla Aurea,* 266, *Golden Chaine, Works,* 1:86.

not obey the Gospel, he that will not *stoope* thereto, nor be framed thereby." "If you will have Christ to be your King, you must not doe what you list, but *submit* to him." "As a man that sailes by a castle, or the like, he must pull downe the top saile in token of *submission*; so we must pull downe our masts." To "obey the Gospel" was to "*stoop* thereto" and be "framed thereby." "Thou must begge of God a *submissive* minde to his will … content to bee framed thereunto."[39]

"Contrition" and "humiliation" as Hooker understood them therefore required more than inwardly acknowledging one's sinfulness and inability to repent without divine help. They required outwardly subordinating one's self-interested activity to the discipline, the "rule" of the minister. "Preparation" replaced self-assertion with submission to an external authority. "Thou must beg of God a submissive minde to his will," Hooker told his hearers. The best evidence of a broken and contrite heart was a willingness "to under goe any reproofe." A godly man would see that "Christ may order him, and his, and all that he hath, to dwell at his command, to be where he will, and be at his becke." Resigning one's will to the authority of the Minister was the way "to give content to the Lord Iesus":

> a gracious loving soule never satisfieth it selfe, but labours to give content to the Lord Iesus, that hee may have his will onely. Therefore such a soule will come to a faithfull *Minister* and aske him, how must I order my family? What shall I doe in regard of my selfe and children? How may I please the Lord better? And how may I entertaine the Lords Spirit better? What duty is to be performed? What service is to be discharged? What course is to bee taken, that I may please Christ? You are acquainted with Christ, you know what will content him; I pray you tell me how I may pray so, and performe duties so that nothing may distaste him, or be offensive unto him.[40]

The antidote to carnal freedom and licentiousness was plain: a convert placed her actions and decisions under the authority of her godly minister. If she found herself rebelling under such discipline, the antidote was simple: repress any feelings of resistance. "Labor we then to stifle and suppress those proud and impatient distempers whereby we repine and quarrel at the

---

39. SPos 13; SEC 451–52; UP *44; TCL 94, 57, 46, 48; SPos 128; emphasis added.

40. SPos 128; SP 237; SEC 500; SEC 247 = SImp 197–98.

Dispensation of Gods dealings with us, if he answers not our Expectation to the full. ... Learn we now to crush and controul those boystrous risings of our Spirits."[41]

It was such a willingness to stoop, to "take shame," to be "humble" and "meek" in the face of God's expectations, that continually set the godly at odds with the world around them. Augustine had the same high regard for humility and the same recognition that pious humility might cause one to lose status in human society. In the city of God, he wrote, humility would enjoy highest esteem (*maxime commendatur humilitas*). It was the earthly city, made up of those doomed to eventual perdition, that looked for its "glory," its reputation, or status, from other people (*ab hominibus gloriam*). Humility or the lack of it would turn out to be the mark that distinguished the citizens of the two cities from each other.[42]

So it should not surprise us that gentlemen, who put great stock in their pride and reputation, had particular difficulty with Hooker's message. His demand for submission and obedience was clearly at odds with the self-promotion that seventeenth-century English society required of its gentry. "If the Gospell besiegeth a man ... the power of the Word flies in the very face of him, and hee must lay downe his owne aimes and ends, and he must lay downe his applause of the world, and his owne credit." Proud men were generally "not able to beare the authority of the truth, to stoope thereunto, and be framed thereby."[43] Although a minister enjoyed high status among his godly followers, things were different in the larger world, and a "great man" would resent submitting to the authority of a minister who was his social inferior. "Shall such a man as I bee at the command of a poore Minister," he might say, "beleeve the Minister of God whatsoever he saith," "buckle to the Minister"? [44]

Hooker also knew that the kind of submissiveness upon which he insisted would appear to his contemporaries as "a womanish and weake kinde of

---

41. AR 4:240. That Puritan ministers thought of rigorous self-control as the most effective weapon against temptation will come as no surprise to scholars of early New England; see, for example, Kathleen Verduin, " 'Our Cursed Natures': Sexuality and the Puritan Conscience," *New England Quarterly* 56 (1983): 220–37, esp. 231.

42. Augustine, *De civ. Dei* XIV.13, *P.L.* 41:420–22, *City of God* 335–43; XIV.28, *P.L.* 41:436, *City of God*, 436; *magna differentia, qua civitas, unde loquimur, utraque discernitur, P.L.* 41:421, *City of God*, 341.

43. In the late Roman Empire, explains Peter Brown, "to be *humilis* was to be, quite bluntly, 'unimportant.' " *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 222.

44. SEC 277; SH 137, 148, 200.

disposition." A proud man would never be "so womannish, as to stoope at every command."[45] Focusing attention on similar usages, scholars of gender relations have pointed out how godly preachers expected male hearers to behave in ways that were conventionally associated with females. Linda Pollock describes how women in early modern England were brought up to "live under obedience" to their fathers or husbands. Stooping to obey was a feminine, not masculine, characteristic, and so a potential source of embarrassment. "Men were to command, exercising judgment and authority; women were to obey, evincing humility and deference. Describing a thought or action as feminine signified that it was illogical or weak." Susan Hardman Moore argues that conversion required men to feel like they imagined women would feel. "When men could be persuaded to adopt feminine affections," she explains, they were able to experience the emotions that often led to conversion. "It is as if men had to shed their masculinity to be saved."[46]

As if to support such an argument, Hooker used what he took to be the proper relationship between husband and wife to explain the relationship between Christ and a Christian. Just as "malapert, saucie, domineering women" wanted their spouses to provide the status and security of marriage but tried "not to be under the rule and authority of them as their husbands," so a "sturdy hypocrite, and malapert heart, would have Christ to be at his becke, that Christ may provide honours, and ease, and pleasure for him, but that Christ may order him … that he will doe by no means." Just as a wife needed to understand that "the man should rule her, and she be obedient to him," so a Christian should submit to the rule of Christ.[47]

---

45. SImp 15; SH 92.

46. Linda Pollock, " 'Teach Her to Live under Obedience': The Making of Women in the Upper Ranks of Early Modern England," *Continuity and Change* 4 (1989): 231–58, at 231; Susan Hardman Moore, "Sexing the Soul: Gender and the Rhetoric of Puritan Piety," in *Gender and Christian Religion*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), 175–86, at 184–85; see also Jacqueline Eales, "Gender Construction in Early Modern England and the Conduct Books of William Whately (1583–1639)," in *Gender and Christian Religion*, 163–74. There is a good discussion of recent scholarship on gendered language in New England in Monica D. Fitzgerald, "Drunkards, Fornicators, and a Great Hen Squabble: Censure Practices and the Gendering of Puritanism," *Church History* 80 (2011): 40–75. After closely examining the "relations" given by prospective members of New England churches, Sarah Rivett makes a different argument: that the normative form of the relation was masculine and "Adamic." Alienated from this form, women's testimonies "register a sense of spiritual and political incompleteness" and are characterized by "patterns of hesitancy and reluctance." *The Science of the Soul in Colonial New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 74–75.

47. SEC 499–500, SEC 173. This sort of submission was also expected of servants and apprentices toward their masters. Paul Griffiths reports on the case of the servant of a London

Skeptical hearers recognized the requirement to submit as a threat to their convivial pleasures, and they resisted. "If we give way to the Minister, and be ruled by him, and hearken to what he preacheth, then adue to all delights, and comforts, and pleasures, and adue to all good fellowship, and farewell our company." A still greater barrier was natural human pride. "Though all sinnes hinder the worke of Faith," said Hooker, "yet, pride hinders it more than anything. You ... thinke it is a brave matter to be proud; and you must not buckle to the Minister; and you must do what you list ... the more pride, the lesse faith." Worldly men, he continued, "think it a matter of disgrace, and a great disparagement for them to be so base ... as to stoop to the lure of a poor Minister, to be at his beck, and stand at his command."[48] In the hierarchical society of early seventeenth-century England, such men understood clearly that Hooker was demanding that they submit themselves to his authority as well as that of his Rule: "Shall the Minister rule us? Doth he thinke to bring us under his girdle, to make us doe what he will, and follow what course he will have us take? Shall he be lord over us?"[49]

Hooker expected that both worldly people and the godly themselves would find this conduct shameful. Among the many properties of an "upright heart," Hooker listed the following: "After his best duties, commonly hee is humbled and ashamed as much as for any thing else, when hee considers how holy God is, & how prophane his owne heart hath been ... this brings him on his knees againe with shame and griefe of heart." Attaining a state of authentic humiliation meant abandoning pride; one became "meek" and content to bear shame. Saints sought "that meekenesse whereby they might moderate, and mortifie their base lusts, and vile thoughts, and affections of anger, griefe, hatred, &c. for meeknesse moderates all these." "Be thou content to be made shame for him," Hooker told his hearers,

> be thou willing to beare the shame, and disgrace, and reproach that comes unto thee for the Name of Christ; be content to be accounted the filth, and off-scouring of the earth ... be not afraid to be seene in a Christian cause, nor to be disgraced for it, goe out boldly and resolutely, harden your faces, and steel your hearts against all such things, and let

---

grocer's "who 'unreverently behaved hymself' towards his master and mistress 'as well in worde and deede,' [and] was ordered to 'humblie' kneel down 'in open courte' and beg the 'good will'" of his master. *Youth and Authority*, 345.

48. SDD 231; SH 200; SDD 231.

49. SDD 233.

the dogs barke, and the winds blow, and the waves roare, goe you out
of the Campe for his honour bearing his reproach comfortably; he hath
borne sinne for thee, beare thou shame for him.[50]

"Taking shame" was the final mark of a sound Christian. "If thou desirest
Christ for his holinesse-sake; which if thou dost, then thou wilt take all that
comes with holinesse, whether it bee shame, or disgrace, or persecution, &c."
In his last set of Connecticut lectures, Hooker connected humility to meek-
ness and identified both as characteristic of the saints: "we should seek a proof
of Christ humbling, of Christ making us patient, and meek, and Zealous."
Should a sin cause harm to others, or should some private transgression inad-
vertently become public, Hooker required a saint to make a public confession
and "take the open shame of the evil." He "looks at shame as his due desert …
and therefore accounts it but reasonable that he should be dishonored and
rejected of others … a heart truly sensible of sin, and turned from it, looks at
this shame as a most loathsom and tedious potion, and could have wished,
and that heartily, he had never need of it, had never so miscarried himself as
to have deserved it."[51]

When necessary, Hooker was even prepared to unleash his ultimate
weapon against those who despised his authority: they were close to commit-
ting the one sin for which there could be no pardon. "We see the haynous
sinne of them that despise the Ministery of the Gospell … take heed, You are
neere to the sin against the Holy Ghost."[52]

The godly minister had no monopoly on explaining the meaning of
Scripture; an experienced lay person, learned in the Scriptures, could and
often did provide guidance and counsel. If "the meanest Saint of GOD" should
warn another godly person that his course was sinful or his practice unlawful,
Hooker expected that person to be "very careful to attend thereunto, and be
advised thereof."[53] But as degreed professional clergy who had apprenticed with
legends like John Rogers and Richard Blackerby, Hooker and Stone constantly
reminded hearers of their special status as men called to proclaim God's will.
In the alternate world laid out in Hooker's Chelmsford sermons, a godly life
began when a layperson submitted herself to the authority of a godly minister.

50. PHH 45; SF 7; SJ 200, 201.

51. PP 392; see also CTCL 279; CCLP 86; AR 10:624, 645, 650–51, 656.

52. TGS 75–76; on the sin against the Holy Ghost, see Tipson, "A Dark Side of
Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism."

53. SPos 125.

Our "poore man" had begun to take the preacher's message to heart, but many others in the congregation that day had not. Did conversion then depend upon each hearer's individual decision? So it might appear, if one imagined that conversion relied entirely upon "moral perswasions." But to Hooker and his godly contemporaries, any explanation of conversion that looked only at the convert's awareness of what was happening was seriously incomplete. Authentic conversion would not occur unless God, operating as the Holy Spirit, was secretly active at every stage.

Reacting against Perry Miller's assumptions about human initiative, some scholars have recognized that preparation was something God did to humans rather than vice versa.[54] But there has been little explanation of how God prepared his elect. As explained in chapter 8, God used ministers as his instruments of preparation. Through the words spoken from the pulpit, God worked "sacramentally"—"in, with, and under" the words that the minister spoke—on the human heart to incline it to faith and obedience to his Rule. Just as the right musical setting can intensify the impact of a text, so the Spirit intensified or "soaked in" the words that struck the hearers' ears.

Initially, in Hooker's conception, God as Holy Spirit acted through the minister's threats of punishment for breaking the law. As "the spirit of bondage," God forced a hearer to recognize that she was in bondage to sin. "Observe the place," Hooker explained, freely quoting Romans 8:15, "*When the spirit of bondage commeth then commeth feare*: The spirit of bondage is said to be the spirit of feare." That meant, he continued, that "the Lord sheweth a man his bondage by the Almighty power of his Spirit, and will make the soule feele it and stoope unto it." When God as the Holy Spirit "doth shew unto man his sinnes, and holds him to his sinnes, that he cannot looke off them, this is the worke of the spirit of bondage." Or in another sermon, "when the Spirit sheweth a man his sinnes, and sheweth him that he is in bondage, and in fetters, lets him get out how he can; this is the spirit of feare and bondage."[55] A hearer took the preacher's words to heart because the Spirit was working secretly to drive their meaning home.

At first, the spirit of bondage kept a hearer's mind on what she had heard the minister preach: the gravity of her wicked behavior and the fearful punishment that awaited her for it in hell. Hooker often found that "when wee lay

54. Beginning with William K. B. Stoever, *'A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven': Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1978) and Charles Cohen, *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

55. SP 125–26; SEC 46.

forth arguments before men, and convince their consciences, that their course is naught, notwithstanding, whatsoever we can speake, they returne to their wicked speeches, and base practices, their lives are as wicked, their tongues as prophane as ever." By itself, in other words, the minister's preaching was not sufficient to change wicked hearts. A hearer's attachment to sin would suppress the promptings of her conscience. "A perverse heart will blind the Judgement, and say, I will have my sinnes, though I be damned for them, and when conscience comes, and saith, I will beare witnesse against you for your pride, and covetousnesse, and prophanenesse. They resist conscience."[56]

In a characteristic analogy, Hooker compared a hearer's conscience to a bailiff and the spirit of bondage to a high sheriff.

> Looke as it is if a Sergeant arrest a man, he may escape his hands, or kill the Sergeant, but if the Sheriffe or the King himself come, & take the prisoner in hand, then he must goe to prison whether he will or no; so it is here, though a corrupt heart can stoppe conscience, stay conscience, yet there is a commanding power of Gods spirit; the spirit of humiliation: And when God comes from heaven to aide his officer, the heart must stoppe, and be governed.

Although "the Lord hath revealed his will and sent his ministers to discover your sins, and terrifie your hearts," explained Hooker, the preacher's efforts alone would never produce the desired result. "It is strange to see what resistance we finde; one scornes to heare, and rebells against the minister."[57]

All Hooker's hearers had a conscience that would pass judgment on their behavior and bring the consequences of misbehavior to mind. But "wicked men" he explained, "have their consciences either blinded or asleep." "If conscience offer to reproove them," he continued, "they presently take him on the mouth, and make him quiet . . . they bind the hands of conscience." The secret work of the spirit of bondage would "awaken conscience," "arme conscience with authority, and put a new commission into the hand of conscience." Once God had "armed" it, "conscience will not put it up as he hath done; howsoever it hath heretofore beene stifled, yet now it gives men a peremptory command upon paine of their everlasting torment, as they love their own soules, to take heed that they meddle not with sin, for if they do, it will cost them everlasting life." "The word by the mouth of the ministery" might settle on a hearer's

56. SEC 100; SP 124.

57. SP 124–25.

conscience, but something more would be required to change a hearer's covetousness, lust, and pride. That something was fear, provided by the spirit of bondage, which "soaked the word in." "However the voice of the minister, or the word, cannot make the blow fall heavy enough for the time, yet if the Lord take the rod into his owne hand, he will make the stoutest stomack stoope, and the hardest heart come in." Once the spirit had armed conscience, Hooker told his hearers, "you shall see your sinnes, and stoope under them."[58]

If a hearer became increasingly terrified as he found himself constantly dwelling on the minister's threats, in other words, it was the work of the spirit of bondage. A hearer in denial about the proddings of his conscience would still find that conscience plaguing him at all hours of the day and night. "Where ever he is, and what ever he doth, the Lord presents his sins to him, when he goeth in the way, he reades his sinnes in the pathes, when he is at meate his sinnes are before him, when he goeth to lie downe, he goeth to read his sinnes on the teaster of his bed, this is thy covetousnesse, and thy pride, and for these thou shalt be plagued. Looke upon these sinnes, they are thine owne, & and thou hast deserved punishments to be inflicted upon thee for them."[59] The more fear, the more likelihood that the Spirit was secretly at work, driving the minister's words home.

Despite the harshness of his rhetoric, Hooker was not suggesting that the Spirit's *prœmotio physica* was perceived as an alien voice, something intruding on the hearer's thought process. Instead, the Spirit intensified the hearer's reflection on the minister's words. As he instructed his hearers:

> take the truths home to your soules, and reason and parly soundly and thoroughly with your owne hearts after this matter: Why, how farre am I from heaven? If the Lord hath not yet opened mine eyes, and humbled my heart, and enlarged my soule; if I never yet had a longing after a Saviour, what not desire heaven; how then can I dreame or thinke that God will shew mercie to my soule in the pardon of my sinnes? If no desire, no Christ; no desire, no Heaven; but I have no desire, therefore no Heaven, no Christ, no happinesse. The Lord settle these things upon your soules, that you may never give quiet to your hearts, nor rest to your soules, till you finde this sound desire wrought in you.[60]

---

58. UP *41–42; SP 123–26.

59. SP 125–26.

60. SEC 182–83.

Distraught hearers would "reason and parly"; the Spirit would "settle" their thoughts and feelings.

Perkins had written of the *desperatio de propriis viribus* that preceded faith, but Hooker's descriptions of this desperation, and the terror that provoked it, go well beyond Perkins's and hark back to Luther. A hearer's conscience, given authority by God, would "teare your flesh for this, and rend your hearts in peeces with horror." To a hearer in the grip of such terror, even sleep offered no refuge. While he was asleep in bed, said Hooker, "conscience awakens him and terrifies him."[61]

Using one of his favorite metaphors, Hooker imagined a King questioning such a person as if he were "a Traytor after his conspiracy is discovered." If the traitor refused to confess, he would be "brought upon the rack, and then one joynt is broken, and then he roares by reason of the extremity of the payne," Should the confession be incomplete, "then he is hoysed upon the rack the second time, and then another joynt is broken, and then he roares againe." The torture could be prolonged, for the King "never leaves racking and tormenting of him, untill he hath discovered and layed open the whole treason."

In just this way a condemning conscience would "bring the soule of a sinner upon the rack" until "he cryes and roares for anguish of spirit." "The Lord lets in horror, and anguish, and vexation into the conscience, and sets the very flashes of hell fire upon his face." In another lecture Hooker spoke of God's coming "to make rackes in the hearts of such as he meanes to doe good unto."[62] The distressed person's conscience would remind her relentlessly of the excruciating tortures that awaited the unrepentant in hell: "endlesse and easelesse torments, which can never be ended, where you shall never be refreshed, never eased, never comforted." In Hartford, Hooker described how God in the work of preparation would hold "a poor wretch whom he hath upon the rack, in his horrors and perplexities" as long as it took for him to recognize the loathsomeness of his sins.[63]

Terror could induce thoughts of suicide. "I know the man," said Hooker, possibly referring to himself, "that in the extremity of horrour of heart and desperate feare, said that hee had sinned against the holy Ghost, and therefore would make away himselfe."[64]

---

61. UP *49.

62. UP *51, 83; SP 27.

63. SP 108; AR 10:370.

64. SEC 583. This extreme situation seems to fit what we know of Joanna Drake's suicidal tendencies.

The Spirit of bondage was no less terrifying in New England. Once "the Lord hath let in horror into the soul of a poor sinner," he said at his Wednesday Hartford lecture, she would be "transported with an insupportable burthen." There, too, especially susceptible hearers had been driven to attempt suicide, had "sought to hang themselves, to do any thing rather than to suffer a little of the vengeance of the Almighty." One such person, said Hooker, was "roaring and yelling, as if he were now in Hell already." Friends would attempt in vain to comfort such people.[65]

Simply stated, the preacher as God's agent saw it as his mission to break the wills of those in his congregation. Over and over again, Hooker insisted that God demanded a "broken heart," a broken will. In Hartford, he compared a minister's breaking a sinner's will to a trainer's breaking a horse: "as it is with an unruly Colt it costs him many a blow first, before he be brought to be at command; so it is with the unruly heart of man, which must have many sad stroaks and blows before it be throughly subdued to the obedience of Gods wil."[66] Hooker's preaching set out to break the wills of his hearers and to bring them to the state of "meekness," dependency, and subjection that God required of those he chose to adopt.

At least in Hartford, Hooker did allow some exceptions. "Children under Parents, and Servants trayned up under good masters" could escape serious terror on their way to faith. If parents and masters taught them obedience to the Rule, "they come on so easily to Christ, & are carryed so gently that they know not what terror means."[67] But most converts passed through a period of fear and self-denial that drew the attention of their neighbors. People obsessed by God's threats were observed to "tremble, and howle, and cry."[68]

Some hearers would imagine that they could seek God's help before experiencing the extremes of Hooker's contrition and humiliation. Neighbors would observe them showing remorse, repenting of their sins, and even beginning to shape their behavior in accordance with God's Rule. Initially, such apparent change might convince the godly community that such hearers deserved a place in their fellowship. But these hearers were actually "hypocrites" who had deceived themselves as well as others. To expose them, Hooker used the same test as had Perkins. The outward symptoms of true and feigned

---

65. AR 10:180–81.

66. AR 10:574.

67. AR 10:192, see also 10:357. These are Hartford sermons; Firmin did not seem to know of such passages in his critique of Hooker in *The Real Christian*.

68. UP *10.

contrition might be similar, he explained, but only true contrition would per-
sist. Hypocritical contrition would wither away. It was "flashy," a bright but
brief exception to otherwise worldly behavior. Hooker had seen "many false
hopes, flashy hopes, leane hopes." Experience had taught him that sooner or
later, feigned desires would eventually be recognized as "flashy, lazy and fee-
ble." They would "come to nothing."[69]

To illustrate his point, Hooker gave the example of a naïve *Book of Common
Prayer* Christian before and during the work of conversion. "Before, a man
thinkes it an easie matter to come to heaven, and judgeth it a foolishnesse in
people to be cast downe and discouraged in the hardnesse and difficultie of
the worke of salvation." Before the onset of contrition and humiliation, such
a man dismissed the minister's message. He assumed that "a man may goe
to heaven, and repent, and get the pardon of his sinnes, it is nothing but con-
fessing his sinnes before God, and craving mercy for the pardon of them, and
is this such a hard matter"? "This man in the dayes of his vanitie," explained
Hooker, "thinkes hee hath heaven in a string, and mercy at command, and
hee can come to heaven, and breake his heart at halfe an houres warning."
Hooker's argument that coming to faith might be difficult, might not even be
something over which he had final control, appeared to this man as no more
than "a foolish conceit in the franticke brain of some precise Ministers."

Once confronted by an accusing conscience, however, this same person
would come to discover that far from arising merely from a simple choice,
coming to faith was "a matter impossible." "When the Lord hath awakened his
conscience, and put him to the triall: when he seeth that after all his prayers
and tears, yet his conscience is not quieted, and his sinnes are not pardoned,
and the guilt still remaines, now he is of another mind. . .. He wonders at
himselfe that he was so deluded." In his distress "he thinkes it a great mercy
of God, that hee is not in hell long agoe; and hee stands and wonders that ever
any man comes to heaven."[70]

To Hooker, "preparation" was never something a hearer could achieve
through her own initiative. Hearers might imagine it this way; Hooker
reported one as saying, "Had I such a measure of humiliation, and so much
grace, if I were so and so fitted, and if my heart were thus disposed, then
I might have some hope to receive [God's favor]." Hooker assured her that
such efforts were wrongheaded. By conceiving of preparation as a condition
they needed to meet, a state they had to reach on their own, hearers would

69. SEC 152, 135.

70. SH 63–64.

simply "keepe out that comfort which they might have."[71] "The Lord, as he requires a condition of thee, so he worketh the condition in thee."[72] The more impossible the condition, the more a hearer would recognize her need to let go of all self-reliance and trust entirely to divine mercy.

We can return to the experience of Hooker's "poore man." "Feare of spirit" had led to a conscience "aflame" as it reminded him of his sin and the eternal punishment it had deserved. "Terrours of hell" would lay hold upon his heart, and his thoughts would be consumed with awareness of the "wrath of God." Only then would he turn desperately to God's promise of eternal life for any-one who trusted that promise.

When that trust finally did arise, it was Perkins's "weak faith." The texts of Hooker's sermons seldom contain explicit references to his theological forebears, but when he came to speak of the beginnings of faith, he not only incorporated Perkins's notion of "weak faith" but even mentioned Perkins by name: "There is a saving desire, by which God brings in and breeds faith in the soule, (It is the speech of judicious Perkins) … there is thirsting before comming, and a desire before faith (for faith is all this while a hatching and breeding)." Striking a heart made ready by the Spirit's preparation, and sink-ing "into the hearts rootes," the preached Gospel promise lit a spark which began to smoke in the hearer's desire for pardon. "This is that faith which is tearmed by the smoaking flaxe; and bruised reede, *Matth.* 12.20." "Strike thou by thy promise one sparke from heaven," a hearer might pray, "that I may have a *smoking* desire after Christ, and a longing desire after grace."[73]

"Smoaking desire," as Hooker called it, was a "supernaturall work," beyond any power a hearer's soul "hath of it selfe." "You must not thinke to bring desire with you to the promise, but receive desire from the promise." Weak at first, it was nonetheless persistent: "when [the Spirit] doth once smoake in a holy desire, the Lord will not let it faile before he brings it to a perfect flame, and before it bee possessed of Christ and mercy which it longs for." "There is a certainty that a man shall have mercy," he concluded, "if he can desire it."[74]

Along with hope, explained Hooker, desire was an "affection which serves the great commandresse of the soule, the *will*," so that an authentic desire for faith indicated a will already beginning to turn toward God and away from sin. This allowed Hooker to say confidently that "be thy weaknesses never

---

71. SEC 660; SH 175.

72. SJ 171; SEC 40.

73. SEC 203; CTCL 249; SEC 290, 201.

74. SEC 49.

so many, and thy temptations never so great, yet if thou canst but finde this smoaking desire, this condition is good." Because "such desires are the grace it selfe desired," an "earnest desire of the pardon of sin" would be accepted as the "obtaining of it," and "an earnest desire to believe" would similarly "be accepted for beliefe it selfe."[75]

As had Perkins, Hooker made it plain that it was a great mistake for a hearer to wait till she consciously believed before fastening on the promise. To hear the promise and want to believe it was the beginning of faith; God had chosen to provoke faith through the power of the preacher's presentation of the promise. One did not need to rely on one's having faith to accept God's promise; faith came through hearing the promise. "Expect power from the promise to make thee able to beleeve the promise ... thou must not first have faith, and then goe to the promise, but thou must first goe to the promise, and from thence receive power to make thee able to beleeve the promise."

John Rogers had reinforced Perkins's teaching. In the Epistle Hooker wrote for the second edition of Rogers's *Doctrine of Faith*, Hooker cited approvingly Rogers's contention that "*in the hungrings & thirstings of the soule there is as it were the spawne of Faith, not yet brought to full perfection, the soule is comming towards God, but not yet come to him to rest so fully and wholly on him, as hereafter it will.*"[76]

Hooker made it plain that desire was not faith. The presence of such desire was simply a sure sign that God was secretly creating faith within: "I may call it the very wheeles of faith, upon which faith is carried, for all this while faith is a sowing into the soule." "Where ever the spirit of *God* is working saving grace in the heart, there must needs be faith; but where ever such a desire so qualified is, there must needs be the spirit of God." As Perkins had taught, Hooker explained that God accepted the will for the deed, for God "measureth obedience not by the effect, but by the affection of the doer."[77]

If one were to ask the same question of Hooker that one had asked of Perkins—how could this "weak faith" be the *fiducia* of Luther and Calvin?— Hooker would have replied that the act of faith did not necessarily include a reflective awareness that one believed. As he stated in one of the many "doctrines" in his Chelmsford lectures, faith arose when "the will of a poore sinner humbled and enlightned, comes to bee effectually perswaded by the Spirit of

---

75. SEC 151–56; CTCL 249; see also SJ 293–94: "faith but as a grain of mustard seed, that thou canst scarcely know whether thou hast faith or no."

76. SEC 306–7, see also Rom. 10:17; SEC 607, DF sig. A11^r–A11^v.

77. SEC 196; CTCL 249, 272, see also *Armilla Aurea*, 270, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:87, op. cit.

the Father, to rest upon the free grace of God in Christ, that it may bee interested therein, and have supply of all Spirituall wants from thence."[78] Although the hearer was not yet aware of it, her sincere desire revealed that she had already begun to rest upon that free grace.

Conversion was in some sense linear; Hooker could encourage godly men and women to look back over the "steps" by which they had come to faith and could speak of their pleasure at finally being able to apprehend the "sweetnesse of God's promises":

> The joy of the elect in the word, is a joy that springs up by certaine steps, arising from the sence of misery, feeling of Gods anger, hungring after grace; for the heart of man humbled with this spirituall wretchednesse, abased and cast downe in the sense of his misery and wants, flies unto the sanctuary of the word, where finding gracious promises, and the loving nature of God described at large, recovereth it selfe; and out of the sweetnesse of Gods promises apprehended by faith, curing the wounds of our distressed soules, doth greatly rejoyce in the same; the word becomes sweeter then the honey and the honey combe.[79]

But this progression was endlessly repeated. Conscientious meditation reminded every godly person that only "spiritual wretchedness"—by which Hooker meant a heart daily humbled by "the sence of misery, feeling of Gods anger, hungring after grace"—would fly unto the sanctuary of God's promises.

We saw above that Thomas Goodwin told Samuel Hartlib that Hooker was "a severe and Cruel man like John Baptist, [who] urges too much and too farre the Worke of Humiliation."[80] Goodwin believed Hooker went "too far" in expecting hearers to accept damnation if it were God's will. But he was also making a judgment that Hooker kept threatening hearers with God's anger at their sin too long, well past the point when most preachers would have turned to God's promise of salvation through faith in Christ. Like Hooker, Goodwin understood "preparation" not as *facienti quod est in se* but as God's using his minister to overcome a hearer's resistance to his message. In Goodwin's mind, Hooker worked so assiduously to break hearers' hearts that the comfort of the Gospel came almost as an afterthought. Hooker expected a degree of "framing"—not something prospective converts would do but something he

---

78. SEC 284.

79. CTCL 237.

80. *Hartlib papers*, 29/2/55B, op. cit.

would do to their wills through his preaching—so high that hearers risked thinking of self-abnegation as the core of the Christian message. Hooker was beating people down long after he should have been lifting them up with the Gospel.

The long tradition of scholarship initiated by Perry Miller, a tradition that argues that focusing on the theology behind Hooker's preaching ignores the way hearers actually took his sermons to heart, should be put to rest. Miller argued that despite Hooker's ostensible predestinarianism, the words he spoke led in a different direction, led to the impression that preparation was something his hearers could do to provoke God's favor.[81] The controlling metaphors that Hooker used in his preaching almost subversively suggested a *facienti quod est in se*. We saw in chapter 8 how John Rogers helped Hooker learn to enliven his sermons with homely metaphors designed to reach the most theologically unsophisticated hearers. Given the pervasiveness of Miller's interpretation, it is entirely possible that some readers may still be convinced that Miller and those who followed him were correct to argue that these "popular" metaphors presented the relationship between divine and human initiative in a different manner than Hooker's theology would have suggested. Rather than prolong an already lengthy argument to the contrary here, I have chosen to examine those metaphors carefully in the Appendix.

As had Augustine and Luther, Hooker believed that every human will would be "framed"—ordered, disposed, structured—toward either God or the devil. The morally neutral will, able to choose dispassionately between good and evil, was a Jesuitical fiction.[82] Without grace, the human heart would inevitably be framed toward sin. Conversion would then involve God's reframing the heart for himself and his Rule. "Conversion is nothing else," Hooker explained in an early set of sermons, "but a setting of the soule for God, as is plaine in all the phrases of Scripture." Later in that same group of sermons, Hooker added that "beleeving and converting are all one in Scripture," meaning that faith—the act of going outside oneself to rely on another's grace—could exist only where the heart had been properly framed in conversion.[83]

What were the characteristics of the heart framed "to looke God-ward"? Over and over again, the same adjectives occur. The heart was to be "pliable," "teachable," "yielding," "willing to be convinced."[84] Most important, the

---

81. Even Hooker's contemporaries could fall into this trap; his Amsterdam opponent John Paget alleged that in his preaching Hooker had "repentance going before faith." *An Answer to the Unjust Complaints of William Best* (Amsterdam: Iohn Fredericksz Stam, 1634), 23.

82. FGT 39; UP 127, 132.

83. SEC 427, 521.

84. SDD 239; UP 131; AR 10:399, 404.

framed heart was willing to submit, to come under the authority of the Rule of God.[85] The framed heart had disciplined itself, circumscribed itself, let itself be confined by the Rule. A major goal of conversion preaching would then be to induce a submissive heart in each hearer, a willingness to look to, learn from, and take moral direction from an authority outside herself. Conversion was the progressive internalization of a set of rules, so that something in the self (the "conscience") would hold those rules in a person's awareness, and the person's will would come to subject her own desires to those rules. Hooker's metaphor of the Christian's "stooping" to be framed, "stooping" to the Rule of God, captures the sense of subordination of self to something external.

Hooker often spoke of a "prepared" heart as a synonym for a "framed" heart. Despite the fact that many interpreters, beguiled by the assumption that conversion must necessarily be a liminal experience, have taken for granted that "preparation" was an activity that led up to conversion and that ceased once conversion had taken place, in Hooker's mind preparation and framing were the same: daily activity that never reached perfection and continued throughout one's life. At bottom, preparation was conversion, just as conversion was the daily challenge of a godly life.

Focusing on contrition and humiliation, as this chapter has done, undervalues the fundamentally evangelical character of Hooker's preaching. Every time he ascended the pulpit, his ultimate goal was to provoke—or strengthen—faith in his hearers. Because no heart could be thoroughly framed to God's Rule unless it first trusted God, hearers had to be brought to *fiducia*, trust in what God had promised. This was the Protestant gospel: God had made a promise, and any hearer who believed and trusted that promise would organize her life—indeed, would risk her life—on the conviction that it was reliable. Perkins had put it plainly: "the principal and maine obiect of this faith is, the sauing promise, *God so loved the world, that he gaue his onely begotten sonne, that whosoeuer beleeues in him, shal not perish, but haue euerlasting life.*"[86] Godly Protestants like Hooker and Stone took for granted that a person's "conversion" involved her acquiring and maintaining this trust in God's promise.

Faced with God's offer of life, Hooker explained, a believer trusted the offer and "reached out" in faith to receive it. Godly preaching made the world of the Gospel uniquely real and laid out the Gospel's promise of salvation. Those hearers that God meant to save would eventually find that the Holy Spirit

---

85. SEC 426; SDD 168–74; CGO 62; CCLP 485; SH 84–85; chapter 8 above discusses submission.

86. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:124, citing John 3:16.

"accompanied" the promise, not as an influence separate from the words of the promise but as an intensification or "soaking in" of its meaning. "In every promise of God," Hooker said, "there is the spirit of grace truly and constantly, accompanying the same." When a believer could "close" with the promise, she "closeth also with the grace in the promise."

That meant that faith was never something a person "had." Faith was "not any part of the spirituall life and soule of a Christian." It would be better, Hooker thought, to understand faith as "a spirituall instrument and engine, whereby the soule goes to God to fetch a soule whereby he may live." Just as in human beings there was "a heavenly heat and a naturall spirit" that "knits the soule and body together," so "the bloud that bindes God and the soule together, is faith." "This is to live the life of faith," Hooker told his hearers, "a going out of a mans selfe, and walking and living by the life of another." Trust required "being emptied of thy selfe." "Relying upon God" meant the soul's "going out of it selfe."[87]

Deliberate submission to the "Rule" was the essence of being "framed," and so the prepared soul was "willing to stoope to [Christ] in all obedience and submission." Acceptance of the continuing importance of God's Law in the life of faith, what theologians called the "third use of the Law," was a mark of orthodox Reformed theology, but Hooker's emphasis on submission was unusual.[88] In his mind, the only appropriate human response to the demands of the terrible Augustinian God was complete subjection.

So thoroughly did Hooker expect the will to submit that he used a metaphor that must startle a twenty-first-century reader: the framed or "humbled" behaved as if it were drugged. In the state of unframeableness, "no word nor commandes will rule a man, but he must have what he will, or else hee will set his mouth against heaven." But once humiliated by the preacher's rhetoric, that same man would be docile and submissive. "This humiliation of heart is like *Opium*," said Hooker; "A little receipt of this *Opium* will quiet all." If a

---

87. SEC 320–21, 324; SS 11–12, 69, 71. In Hartford, Hooker spoke of faith as "an Empty hand to take all from Christ." AR 1:39.

88. E.g., Perkins, *Usus legis in renatis longe est alius; nimirum eos dirigere ad novam obedientiam in omni vita, acceptam quidem eam deo per Christum, Armilla*, 208, translated *Works*, 1:70; Stone, WB 396: "To those in Christ, [the Law] teacheth them how to close with the blessed majesty of God, and to hold blessed correspondence with him." The third use was known as the *usus legis didacticus*; the first two uses were for civil governments to restrain sin (*usus legis politicus*) and to drive unregenerate individuals to conversion (*usus legis pædagogicus*). Later Lutherans also endorsed the third use; see *Formula Concordiae, Epitome VI: De Tertio Usu Legis¸ Bekenntnisschriften der evangelish-lutherishen*, 793–95, *Book of Concord*, 479–81, and *Solida Declaratio VI: De Tertio Usu Legis Divinae*, 962–69, *Book of Concord*, 563–68.

hearer "could but come to see his owne emptinesse and wretchednesse, and get his heart to be at Gods disposing, then his heart would be wonderfully calmed and meekened whatsoever he endured."[89]

In practice, godly submission extended not only to the minister but also to anyone else held to be a social superior.

> Let every servant come in, and say, this is my proud heart, my Master, and my Mistris may not speake, but I give word for word: this is my fault. And you wives reason thus: Now the Lord hath revealed the pride of my heart, and this is my proud reason and will, that would not yield to the command of my husband though never so warrantable. Let the child humble himselfe, and say, when my father counsels mee, I turne my deafe eare; and my mother is but a woman, and therefore I would have my owne will, and walke in my owne way; this is my vaine mind.[90]

Or again, "looke home therefore into your owne hearts, and families: how can you beare the checks and reproofes of a Master or Mistris, when they say, you are idle. And so, you wives, when your husbands reproove you; is not all on a light flame? Oh, this is infinite and intolerable pride." Patrick Collinson has argued that Puritanism was as likely to reinforce social hierarchy as to breed revolution, and he might well have used Hooker's preaching as an example.[91]

It should be plain that Hooker was not waiting for each new convert to describe to him the peculiarities of her own conversion. He had "stylized" conversion, and it was to his paradigm that converts were to conform. Conversion as he imagined it was not, as virtually all scholars have assumed, an *ordo salutis* of discrete events which followed one another in logical sequence. Quite the contrary, it was a mosaic of overlapping states of heart and mind, any one of which could rise to consciousness at a given moment. As he laid out this conversion paradigm in sermon after sermon, it is little wonder that his most attentive hearers found their experience conforming to it.[92]

To summarize, conversion as Hooker's archetypical "poore man" experienced it was precisely the set of reactions Hooker intended to provoke in his

---

89. SH 138.

90. SH 167.

91. SH 194. Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 149–53, *et passim*.

92. Richard Muller suggests that since the term *ordo salutis* did not come into use before the early eighteenth century, it is somewhat anachronistic to describe an *ordo salutis* in thinkers of this period. *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 163.

preaching. An ungodly hearer, suddenly aware that "hell is gaping for him, and the God of justice preparing vengeance for him," "trembles, shakes, and gives in" to "feare." Fear would lead to "sorrow," which "grieves and mournes, and laments under the weight of that evill." Sorrow would lead in turn to "hatred, that carries it selfe with a kind of indignation, and takes up armes against that evill." Fear, sorrow, and hatred were the "three affections" induced in hearers during "contrition" and "humiliation," the components of "preparation."[93] Preparation was never something that a hearer did, not (as it has sometimes been described) "something man could do … to predispose himself for saving grace."[94] Through Hooker's homiletics of fear, preparation created states of mind and heart—the sorrow of contrition, the recognition of human inability leading to shame and self-loathing that defined humiliation—within an elect hearer.

Did Hooker's position compromise the Protestant *sola fide*, justification by faith alone? The frequency with which he addressed this concern suggests that his desire to disabuse Prayer Book Protestants of their confidence in "cheap faith" overrode any reservations about such a compromise. But it is difficult to deny that "saving preparation" did undercut one closely related element of classic Reformation theology.

The theologians of the high middle ages had presumed that in order to save an unworthy sinner, God would have to implant a created habit of grace in her, a habit of grace that he could then reward by taking her into his favor. Late medieval *pactum*-theology was an effort to relieve God of that necessity; his absolute power allowed him to save whomever he choose directly, without needing to change a sinner's being. Luther repudiated much of *pactum*-theology, but he followed it in this respect.

But whether deliberately or not, Hooker and Rogers had come to assume that God, by demanding contrition and humiliation in a sinner, was requiring an ontological change—a change in the sinner's being—just as the Catholic theologians of the high middle ages had done. Luther, following Paul, insisted that God justified the impure. By imputing Christ's righteousness to human beings who were and would remain sinners, God could justify them just as they were. Hooker's God had to separate sinners from their sin before he could impute justification.

Hooker's contemporaries did not seem overly concerned with whether he expected people to be too "active" in "preparing" for justification. They were

---

93. SEC 58–59.

94. Pettit, *The Heart Prepared*, 3.

more inclined to voice a different concern: that Hooker kept people too long in an inactive state while his preaching relentlessly tried to purify them enough to make them worthy of God's favor.[95]

Conversion in Samuel Stone's Whole Body

Hooker's reliance on a homiletics of fear stands out even more sharply when one compares his depictions of conversion to those of his colleague, Samuel Stone. Terror at the prospect of divine wrath is almost completely missing from the *Whole Body*. Stone simply seems far less interested than Hooker to traumatize hearers with descriptions of God's anger and threats of eternal punishment. Despite holding a ferocious doctrine of predestination, Stone described God as attractive, even affectionate, when he initiated a relationship with his elect. The elements that caused Goodwin to call Hooker "cruel" stand out in sharp relief when Hooker's teaching is compared to Stone's.

Stone described the basic outline of conversion as had his senior colleague.[96] Conversion was understood to occur when God, through the medium of preaching, "workes faith in the heart, causing the Soul by believing to receive Christ himself." Speaking through the preacher's sermon, God called "all that live within the sound of the Gospell" to return to him. Or more accurately, God called them "externally," because behind the call stood the eternal divine decree. Only "those whom God intends and purposeth to save" would be called "effectually."

As had Perkins and Hooker, Stone expected God to work in Augustinian fashion: "God enclines the Will, and makes it of Unwilling, Willing." The "enclining" would of course be irresistible: "he presseth in mightily, powerfully and effectually upon their spirits, and invites them so, that they are indeed persuaded to come." In the initial phases of conversion, there would be

---

95. Giles Firmin famously reported that "When Mr. *Hooker* preached those Sermons about the Souls preparation for Christ, and Humiliation, my Father-in-law, Mr. *Nath. Ward*, told him; Mr. *Hooker, you make as good Christians before men are in Christ, as ever they are after*; and wished, *would I were but as good a Christian now, as you make men while they are but preparing for Christ.*" *The Real Christian*, 19. Less well-known is Firmin's following sentence: "But he [Hooker] told him the reason why he thought God let him thus preach, because he saw he had not long to stand, and so should do his work all at once." In other words, "humiliation" was what the Christian life was all about.

96. Stone's discussion of conversion includes "Vocation," WB 333–49, "Union," WB 349–51, "Communion," WB 351–52, "Justification," WB 352–54, "Adoption," WB 354–61, "Sanctification," WB 361–70, and "Glorification," WB 370–89.

nothing gentle about this divine initiative: "the Lord lays violent hands upon the soul of a Sinner, and drags him before his Judgement Seat."

But once conversion was underway, Stone made it plain that the Holy Spirit operated by persuasion as well as coercion. In Stone's presentation, God both "*constrains*" a hearer "to fly to the city of refuge, and so to Christ as his saviour, &c: and *allures* him by the heart blood mercies of the great Saviour." "Alluring" was not to be confused with Arminian moral persuasion. "The Lord in conversion doth not worke merely by moral suasions or propounding arguments, though he makes use of them, but he leaves mighty Physicall Impressions upon the soul, by the operation of his Almighty spirit." "Men when they are converted are dragged, and drawn by main force, as fishes out of the sea."

Conversion began, then, with "the Worke of Preparation," because just "as a vessel filled with foule liquor must have it removed, before faire can be poured into it," so faith could not "be infused before the Soule be a capable Subject." Sounding much like Hooker, Stone explained that the "tough, rugged and hard dispositions" of unconverted people had to be "removed out of their hearts."[97]

But rather than dwell on his hearers' actual sins, as Hooker tended to do, Stone preferred to describe the human condition as mired in the original sin of Adam. Since Adam's fall, humans were "imprisoned," "kept in durance," "shut up in the wide prison of the Evill world." Created to find ultimate satisfaction only in God, they were "shut up in created beings." Just as Augustine had argued, they were defined by what they desired: "they cannot desire any thing but creatures." So Stone understood God's challenge as twofold: not only to free each imprisoned human he had elected from the rule of sin and Satan but also to convince her that she "was not made to rest in the Creatures and Created beauty and goodness." As Stone had explained in the opening questions of the *Whole Body*, God was the "end" wherein each human being had been created to rest. "All things were made for man," he reiterated, "the body for the Soule, the Understanding for the Will, and the Will for the Chiefest good." Conversion would repair and raise her desire to the point where she could "embrace" God's "Increated goodness, beauty and pleasantness." Now the soul would never rest "in any inferiour object, till it meet with the same God from whom it departed in Adam."[98]

The Holy Spirit worked first through the medium of the preaching of the Law, convincing a hearer that God was "infinitely displeased" with her

97. WB 334, 335; emphasis added; see also UP 95–96, cited above.

98. WB 335.

sinfulness. So "Evill" was that sinfulness that it would forever separate her from her "Chiefest good," God. As this knowledge sunk in, her heart became "burdened" with the bitter taste of her sin, "pierced with sorrow" that it separated her from God, and "willing to part with it," willing "that Christ should mortify and destroy it." This was "contrition."[99]

Alongside contrition came "humiliation": "self despair, and self submission." "Those mountains of high conceits, and swelling apprehensions of a mans own worth and Excellency, must be taken down, and brought low." Since Stone understood faith as Hooker had, as "a going out to Christ for life and supply," a hearer had to "be cut off from all confidence in the flesh" and to submit to God's "disposing and framing hand" before faith would be possible.[100]

As did Hooker, Stone believed that authentic contrition required the hearer to be "willing to have Sin as Sin" taken from it, not just the shame of sin or the punishment that sin had deserved. But he pointedly did not require the extreme humiliation that had so bothered Goodwin and Firmin. A prospective convert was told to be willing to yield "to the disposing hand, and good pleasure of God"; to allow God to do with her "what he pleaseth." But nowhere in the *Whole Body* did Stone ask prospective converts to submit to God's will even if that will included their own damnation.

Once having prepared the hearer by replacing her desire for creatures with a desire for the highest good, and having emptied her of all self-confidence, "the spirit of God moving upon the soul as upon the first matter, Gen. 1.2., begets a spirit of faith." Fear was left behind. Like a mother hen, "the spirit, by his blessed and miraculous incubation, and fluttering over the soule, and sitting upon it, doth hatch a spirit of Faith." Then the soul was raised to the status of a bride and "cloathed with conjugall affections to Christ." These affections remained childlike as well as marital, "sucking" at Christ's goodness. "As there is in a babe, as soone as it is borne, by a secret instinct of Nature, an appetite to the breast, so in the soule, as soon as it is borne againe, an affection to the promise before it suckes. . .. moved by a secret supernaturall instinct … wherby the heart is inspired, moved and provoked."[101]

Stone's decision to describe conversion in the larger context of salvation history also led him to be less concerned than Hooker to tie faith tightly to preaching. Because the written scriptures were only a codification in history of the eternal Rule, Stone explained that "1000ds have bin converted without the Scriptures, i.e. before the Rule was written." Even in Stone's own day, many had been "converted

---

99. WB 334–39.

100. WB 340–42.

101. WB 343.

without the publique preaching of the Word" by such means as "conference with Christians" and "the private Instruction of their parents."[102]

Not that the Holy Spirit converted anyone without the Gospel. The Spirit invariably managed to present prospective converts with the Gospel promise, because conversion required "the great and mighty presence of the Holy Ghost in the Gospel . . . attending the word and joining himself with it" in "a speciall, peculiar, and wonderfull manner."[103] "The Spirit in the promises," explained Stone, "lets out a mighty supernatural Vertue from himself." "God the Holy Ghost sits upon the soule of a believer and overshadows it in a wonderful secret manner. . . . with the beames of his light, beauty, glory, &c: those beames come into the house of the soule, into the understanding and will and take up those two roomes." By "acting and letting in Vertue from himself," wrote Stone, the Holy Spirit "allures, drawes, and moves the heart by an attractive motion, to close with Christ, as the Load-stone moves the Iron to itselfe . . . the soule is carried as a shipe when the sailes are filled." "The heart is filled with the Holy Ghost, and by him drawn near near to Christ: the understanding is moved with the light and clearnesse of these Propositions. Hope with the possibility of Christ, desire with the Excellency of his Perfections, & Joy with his pleasantnesse. Love with his sutablenesse, and the Will with the fullness of the seas of Goodness within himselfe." "Carried out of itself," the soul "loseth itself in Christ."[104]

Given such language, it should not be surprising that Stone could describe the resulting union with Christ as "mystical": "Christ rests in the soule, as in his house . . . and the soule in Christ as his habitation, and adheres to him as Iron to the Load-Stone. The word ful of the Holy Ghost is engrafted into the soule . . . and sticks to it, and the soule cleaves to the spirit of Christ in the Word."[105] Hooker's tightly disciplined will recedes into the background as the hearer moves eagerly to Christ. It would be misleading to imply that one can find no hints of such an understanding in Hooker, but Stone's emphasis on the attractiveness of Christ and the soul's eagerness to embrace him contrasts startlingly with Hooker's emphasis on the soul's continued need for brokenness and rigorous self-discipline.[106]

---

102. WB 345.

103. WB 349.

104. WB 350.

105. WB 350–51.

106. E.g., "The first and great want of the soule is this, it is gone away from God, and the Lord is a stranger to it: it was made for God, and to have communication with God," SEC 316.

Stone was also more inclined than Hooker to emphasize that in the promise, God had forever tipped the balance between justice and mercy toward mercy. "By his mercy," Stone argued, God "overcomes and conquers himself." "Divine Justice" toward the faithful was "deposed"; "mercy sits on the throne, and reigns, and is a King against whom there is no rising up." Stone also insisted that when the Holy Spirit "inclined" the will of a "humbled prepared Sinner," when the offer of Christ in the Gospel to prepared hearers became "Speciall, as if God called them by name," the Spirit spoke to the head as well as the heart. God "acts the sutable Excellencies of Christ upon the understanding, and makes it appear to be sutable for us, as clothes to our back"; "those beames of light falling upon the understanding, with their light, warme the heart with their sweetness." "The Holy Ghost exciting & moving the Soul, fills all its sails with his mighty gales, as hope, love, Joy, etc." The hearer had no option but to respond with faith, whose "Speciall nature" was "trusting" Christ and his promise.[107]

As had Perkins and Hooker, Stone divided faith into two degrees: weak and strong. Faith was not "perfect all at once," said Stone; "You never knew a child born with a beard, and all his teeth." "Weake believers" were "full of hesitation, disputing what shall become of them, hung between hope and feare." But so long as they had "a sence and feeling of an absolute need of Christ," "smoaking desires," "thirsting," and were "sensible of their lost estate," they had "some measure and beginning of Faith," because "Desire to believe" was the beginning of faith. "Strong" believers were "fully persuaded," and "able to master doubts, prevaile against fears."[108]

Comparing Pastor Hooker's preaching technique with the doctrine of his Hartford colleague Teacher Stone not only puts a sharper perspective on Hooker's reliance on terror to break his hearers' wills. It also helps a twenty-first-century reader to see how Hooker did not understand his task as simply to describe conversion as a something that his preaching would set in motion. Just as all Christian preaching shares the challenge of making an alternative world more authentic and compelling than the common-sense world in which hearers live, Hooker intended not only to describe his somewhat idiosyncratic version of conversion but also to scare hearers into it.[109]

---

107. WB 346–47.

108. WB 347–49.

109. *Pace* Sargent Bush, who describes Hooker's genius as his ability to provide "the fullest account of the sequence of spiritual stages in the life of the soul produced in [his]

The argument of this and the previous chapter has been designed to challenge the assumption that Hooker's preaching was merely trying to trigger something latent in his hearers, something just waiting to be called into being. Ultimately influenced by Perry Miller, who saw Hooker as "the most exquisite diagnostician of the phases of regeneration," interpreters have too often understood Hooker as diagnosing and describing a psychological process that, once triggered, developed on its own.[110] A diagnostician examines a patient's symptoms and draws on his experience to fit those symptoms to a known pathology. But Hooker's rhetoric brought the symptoms into being. Put another way, hearers attempted to experience what they took to be the Spirit's work in a way that fit Hooker's expectations. Hooker was not a college professor explaining conversion to his hearers. His explanations of conversion were designed not to make sense of "religious experiences" that had occurred independently of his preaching but to produce experiences, experiences which (he had become convinced) God required of his elect.[111] To imagine Hooker as a kind of experienced guide, making sure that his novice hearers touched all the bases of a complicated order of salvation (*ordo salutis*) from first conviction of sin to final glorification, overlooks the fact that William Perkins, whom Hooker followed in this as in most other points, taught that a convert did not "experience" or "feel" conversion in the way that God brought it about.[112]

If faith was not self-authenticating; if God's presence was as likely to be felt as brokenness and inadequacy; if contrition and humiliation were a part of the Christian's life till death; how could anyone be sure that her conversion was not simply a figment of her imagination? How could one be certain that one was one of God's elect saints and be with God for eternity in heaven? How did one reach "assurance" of one's salvation? The next chapter will address this question.

---

generation" "Thomas Hooker," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 27:978–82, based on Bush, *Writings of Thomas Hooker*, or Edmund Morgan, who believed Puritan writers "wished to trace a natural history of conversion." *Visible Saints*, 66.

110. Miller, "Preparation for Salvation," 263.

111. Andrew Cambers, "Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, circa 1580–1720," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007): 796–826, makes a similar argument about godly autobiography and journal-writing: "Self-writing was modeled from the outside, not just written from the inside." 824.

112. It is helpful to keep in mind that the phrase *ordo salutis*, used so casually by many scholars, appears nowhere in Hooker's writings. To imagine the sorrow for sin in "contrition" or the self-denial and submission that constituted "humiliation" as stages of an *ordo salutis*, stages that the convert would eventually pass beyond, overlooks the overwhelming evidence that Hooker intended them to be permanent parts of the godly life.

II

Gaining Assurance of Salvation

HOOKER'S HEARERS WERE told that their initial weak faith must grow slowly into a strong one. Weak faith often arose beneath consciousness; a hearer would be aware only that she wanted to trust the promises that she heard from the pulpit. Not until her faith became strong would she be aware of her trust in the promises and actually become certain of her salvation, certain that she was one of those whom God had elected before the beginning of the world. In the last chapter, we learned that the journey from a weak to a strong faith would often be long and tedious. This chapter explores what godly ministers called the problem of assurance: how would a hearer know when she could finally be certain of her salvation.

In 1597 William Perkins published his *Reformed Catholike*, designed to highlight those points where English Protestants "must for euer depart" from the erroneous teachings of the Church of Rome. Chief among those points was a believer's "certaintie of saluation." Catholics wrongly taught that individual Christians could gain assurance of their salvation only rarely and by special revelation. Not so, said Perkins. Every Christian not only could but must gain that assurance. "Euerie member of the Church," Perkins earlier explained to his Cambridge students, "is bound to beleeue his owne election." "No man can belieue himselfe to be a member of the Church," he continued, "unlesse withal hee beleeue that he is predestinate to life euerlasting."[1]

Thomas Hooker concurred. Gaining assurance that she personally was among the elect should be the main goal of every serious Christian. All godly people ought to be taking pains to "addresse themselves to an exact and diligent enquiry, how the case is with them; whether they be naturall men, or

---

1. *A Reformed Catholike, Works*, 1:562–67; *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:290, 298, see also 282–83, *Armilla* 327–29, translated in *Works*, 1:104–5.

such as are begotten againe to a lively hope." It was the "maine end of that time which the Lord allowes us here, that we should gaine the assurance of another life."[2]

But assurance was not easily gained. Hooker himself had reached the assurance that he enjoyed God's favor only after a long and painful struggle. Joanna Drake's efforts to overcome her doubts about her election, some of which Hooker observed a few years later, lasted almost to her death. In the opinion of both Hartford pastors, the path to assurance would be tedious, painstaking, and too often inconclusive.[3]

In his analysis of Reformation theology, Alister McGrath explains just how gaining assurance of one's salvation could be both obligatory and maddeningly inconclusive. One must distinguish, argues McGrath, between belief in the theological certainty of salvation and the psychological security—or lack of it—felt by any particular believer at any given moment. Using Calvin as his example, McGrath cites the well-known definition of faith from the *Institutes*: "a steady and certain knowledge of the divine benevolence towards us, which is founded upon the truth of the gracious promise of God in Christ, and is both revealed to our minds and sealed in our hearts by the Holy Spirit."[4] Faith trusts that God has promised, revealed, and sealed one's salvation. There can be no uncertainty, according to Calvin, about what God has done.

But later in that same chapter, Calvin explains that although faith may be certain and secure (*certam ac securam*), the certainty is not without doubt and the security not without anxiety. On the contrary, "believers have a perpetual struggle with their own lack of faith."[5]

Hooker's sermons reveal that many of his hearers were experiencing precisely that struggle. They were complaining openly that they were not getting "comfort" from their struggle to be godly. They had accepted his teaching;

---

2. CTCL 282, 284.

3. Sargent Bush offers an entirely different interpretation of Hooker's notion of the Christian's spiritual journey. He finds Hooker describing "the soul's progress from the earliest stirrings of self-awareness to the climax of heavenly glorification" as an "upward ascent through the stages of redemption." *Writings of Hooker*, 165, 246, *et passim*.

4. *Nunc iusta fidei definitio nobis constabit si dicamus esse divanae erga nos benevolentiae firmam certamque cognitionem, quae gratuitae in Christo promissionis veritate fundata, per Spiritum sanctum et revelatur mentibus nostris et cordibus obsignatur*, cited in *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 137–38.

5. *Fidem docemus esse debere certam ac securam, non certitudinem aliquam imaginamur quae nulla tangatur dubitantione, nec securitatem quae nulla sollicitudine impetatur: quin potius dicimus perpetuum esse fidelibus certamen cum sua ipsorum diffidentiae. Institutes* III.ii.17.

they were doing their best to live by it; but they were simply not achieving settled assurance of God's favor. Hearers would "begin to wrangle and to say, how long Lord, when Lord, and why not now Lord, and why not I Lord?" Time and again, Hooker had to address "the want of the sense and feeling, either of Gods favour towards us, or of the present apprehension, to our owne sense, of Gods grace in us." "The Lord never gave me that assurance of his love that such and such have," complained one such person; "God will one day leave mee in the lurch."[6] Another hearer confessed that despite her efforts, faith seemed elusive. "What I, faith? no, I can never thinke it, I suspect I never had it, I doubt I never shall have it; nay, I conclude all is naught for the while." Or again, "Good Lord, was I ever wrought upon, was my heart ever thoroughly broken for these sinnes?" On still another occasion, Hooker imagined hearers saying, "If the Lord be with us, why is all this befalne us ... distempers so violent, corruptions so many, and can the Lord be here? where are those miracles the Saints heretofore have found?" Hooker even asked himself, "Why have not the Saints of God that grace they stand in need of .... " "They seeke and have not, they pray and obtaine not."[7]

If Hooker and his godly hearers were aware of the prevalence of anxiety and doubt, so too were their worldly detractors, who mocked the godly for their lack of assurance. "Swearers and drunkards goe on mer[r]ily laughing and rejoicing," some said derisively, "and these Christians they goe drooping." "For ought I see," the detractors concluded, "they have no more comfort than I have."[8] How had it become so laborious, so painstaking, so fraught with anxiety, for godly Christians to gain assurance of their salvation?[9]

Perkins had tried to show that such an anxious Christian was at least better off than her Roman Catholic counterpart, who except in extraordinary circumstances could never be certain that she might not at some future moment fall from grace and perish in a state of mortal sin. But that counterpart could be certain—through the sacrament of penance—that at the moment she received

---

6. PP 345; SEC 149; Simp 250.

7. SEC 575, cf. 588, 592, 619; SPos 97; SIng 18; SEx100, cf. 102. Wolfhart Pannenberg recognizes that extreme Augustinian teaching on predestination created anxiety in every conscientious hearer, not just in the unusually sensitive: "*Die Prädestinationsangst ist die unvermeidliche Folge eines solchen Verständnisses vom prädestinierenden Gott; sie ist nicht etwa nur Ausdruck einer extremen seelischen Erregbarkeit.*" "Der Einfluß der Anfectungserfahrung," 115–16.

8. SEC 415.

9. A thorough discussion of the context for this problem, and godly efforts to resolve it, can be found in Bozeman, *Precisionist Strain*.

absolution from a priest, her sins were forgiven and she enjoyed God's favor. The anxious Protestant, taught to put her entire trust in God's promises in Scripture, had no such sacramental certainty. Christ's promises might be certain, but had they been intended particularly for her? How could it be otherwise when a predestinating *deus absconditus* lurked behind the *deus revelatus* whose gospel she heard from the pulpit? Joanna Drake's hypersensitivity may have been exceptional, but her anxieties were shared by many of her more stable colleagues. If the faith that saved could result only from a gift of God, and if that gift came only to those predestined to receive it, how might a person know whether she was among the predestined?[10] How could an anxious believer be certain that faith was not wishful thinking?

Hooker began with a warning. Hearers who yearned for overpowering feelings of divine favor were going to be disappointed. His God simply did not deal in ecstatic experiences of comfort. His God demanded a faith grounded in radical self-denial, a faith that clung desperately to his promises and placed no trust in anything else. Brokenness, not feelings of acceptance, hinted at God's favor.[11] While some godly preachers might encourage their congregations to take comfort from their ability to satisfy the conditions of the covenant of grace, Hooker rarely did so. When he did point hearers to "the Covenant of Grace, and the Promises of it," it was to their emptiness—to the fact that God had made them "humble and broken-hearted"—rather than to their achievement that he directed their attention.[12]

But had not Paul written that "the spirit it selfe beareth witnes with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16)? Would not even a weak believer have some sense, some feeling of God's presence? Not necessarily, said Hooker. Following Calvin, his mentor Perkins had explained that God, acting as Holy Spirit, would "seal" each Christian's adoption to her "by begetting a special faith." But, Perkins warned, that sealing should not be imagined as a self-authenticating "feeling" that one possessed apart from an encounter with the preached word. "For when we hear God's promises and ponder them, the Holy Spirit moves the mind and will through those same promises, and as we are moved makes it that we assent to them and rest ourselves in them. From this arises a special assurance of our adoption and of God's grace."[13] The

---

10. I have attempted to address this problem directly in "Thomas Hooker, Martin Luther, and the Terror at the Edge of Protestant Faith," *Harvard Theological Review*, forthcoming.

11. Peter Iver Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama*, emphasizes this point; see, e.g., 60.

12. AR 10:450.

13. *Armilla*, 328, *Works*, 1:104. Perkins's translator underscored the nature of that faith by rendering *gignendo specialem fiduciam* as "by begetting a speciall trust and confidence."

"witness of the Spirit" was not a separate divine communication but the Spirit working mysteriously through godly preaching to create trust and confidence in its promises.

From long experience, Perkins knew that his hearers often did not "feel" the Spirit's activity. "Many deceiue themselves," he wrote, "which thinke they haue no faith because they haue no feeling." Hooker agreed. "A mans sense and feeling, and the judgement that he passeth upon himselfe out of his weaknesse, is not rule to go by in this case." "A poore Saint of God may have Gods Spirit and yet never perceive it." "The strongest faith may stand, where no sense is."

In other words, hearers were mistaken if they imagined that they would surely sense Christ's presence. "Wee also are not able to know when Christ is in us," he explained, "because we judge him by sense, and some extraordinary sweetnesse wee imagine should be in us." Hearers imagined "comfort and sweet refreshment," so they assumed Christ's presence would be self-evident. "Every sinner sets up a fancie in his own imagination, that if Christ comes, strange matters will be wrought. Now framing this fancie in his conceit, he will take no other evidence of Christs coming."[14] But "sense and feeling" could deceive. "We may be in the state of grace," said Hooker, "and yet the same not so appeare to our selves, untill we have made tryall of our selves."[15]

Hooker repeatedly tried to explain that a sense of God's favor was different from faith, which had to cling "nakedly" to God's promises without expecting to "feel" his favor. He reminded them of the Apostle Paul's words to the Romans (Rom. 8:24): "You are saved through hope, and hope that is seene is no hope." "A man doth not hope for a thing that he hath," he explained, "but hope always expects a good that is to come." When a hearer begged for assurance—"may I now have grace, may I now have assurance, may I now have the evidence of Gods love?"—Hooker asked, "where now is hope all this while? you take away the worke of hope, when you would have things present."

Hooker also counseled patience. Those who lacked assurance were like children waiting for an inheritance: "the childe must wait for his portion before hee hath it, so you must stay your time, and be contented with the dealing of the Lord toward you in this kinde." People had to learn to "waite patiently" as they sought assurance of God's favor. "Come into the Assemblies

---

14. Perkins, *Esposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:240–41; PP 370; SEC 185, cf. 314–15; SEx 171; SEC 549–50, cf. SEx 150; SEC 145; SI 16; SH 176. Here the contrast with later evangelicalism is particularly striking.

15. CTCL 208.

of Gods people, to heare Gods word; if thou waite upon God in his ordinances one day, and have not grace granted unto you, nor mercy vouchsafed towards you, if you come the next day and yet have it not, you must still waite and expect because it is a free gift." If they should respond, "shall I come so often, and waite so long, and pray so much, and yet nothing?" Hooker was even willing to go so far as to make their patient waiting a sign of God's favor: "I say, goe home and goe with this comfort in thy heart, God that hath said, *It may bee*, will certainly make it good."[16] Such a message inevitably left many unsatisfied.

Like Perkins, Hooker saw a hearer's desire for grace, and her persistence in seeking it, as the weak, "implicite" faith that evidenced God's secret work. If, Hooker said to a hearer in distress, you can "submit thy neck to the yoake," if you are resigned to "let God doe what hee will," if

> thou art meeke in spirit, thy conscience is tender, and bruised, and sensible of thy former failings; and yet notwithstanding all thy humiliation, and feare of Gods displeasure; all thy sor[r]ow of soule, and shame that thou hast taken to heart; notwithstanding all the care that thou hast taken in the use of the meanes for inward peace, yet little is attained, and thou still tremblest to thinke what will become of that poore soule of thine; . . .

then Hooker was willing to say, in effect, take that as sufficient.[17]

To a layperson searching for bread, it might well have seemed that preachers like Perkins and Hooker were giving her a stone. In no uncertain terms, they insisted that there was no way an anxious hearer could peer into the book of life to see whether her name was written there. "Ascending vp as it were into heauen, there to search the counsel of God" was out of the question. But while Hooker certainly disappointed anyone who expected ravishing experiences of God's favor, he did have something to offer. While godly ministers denied that the works a person did before justification could have any role in meriting her salvation, they taught that the works she did after justification, properly considered, could provide evidence that she was among God's chosen. Properly instructed, anxious hearers might look "into our owne hearts" to search out "signes and testimonies" of God's favor.[18]

---

16. SEC 146; UP 23–24; cf. AR 10:600.

17. SF 85–86.

18. Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:284, cf. AR 10:605, 7:331–32. In other words, one's "feeling" of assurance could never be grounded on the divine decree itself, which was unknowable, but in the temporal effects of the decree in the believer.

Searching one's heart for signs of God's favor involved relying on what several generations of godly ministers had come to call the *syllogismus practicus* or "practical syllogism," a device that allowed would-be saints to "discover the truth of grace by the worke of grace" within them.[19] The syllogism was "practical" because the minor premise had to do with a person's behavior or *praxis*. Its theological rationale was the "golden chain" from Romans 8:30: "Whom [God] did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also iustified: and whom he iustified, them he also glorified." Using the practical syllogism to deduce one's justification from the evidence of one's "sanctified" behavior, one could simply reverse the order: "the Word saith, I am sanctified, therefore I am justified, therefore called, therefore elected."[20]

One well-known godly manual, *A Body of Divinitie*, explained the practical syllogism by distinguishing between "the direct act of faith that justifieth, that whereby I doe beleeve," and awareness of that act, the "reflect act of faith that assures, that whereby I know I doe beleeve." Because it was "one thing to beleeve, and another thing to beleeve that I doe beleeve," a wavering believer would often have the direct act but not the reflect act. "It is one thing for a man to have his salvation certain, and another thing to be certain that it is certain."[21]

Hooker made the same distinction early in his Hartford lectures:

> There is an irresistable light which the Lord lets into the mind at the first call, which makes way for Faith, and is a direct act of Knowledge which turns the eye of the Soul to look to that fulness of power and freeness of mercy, by which the heart is drawn to beleeve, but the reflect act of evidence by which we are assured of what God hath done to us and

---

19. PP 351. Richard Muller argues (*pace* the contention of neo-orthodox theologians like Karl Barth and Wilhelm Niesel) that while he may not have used syllogistic language, "a genuine inward calling and its effects within the believer did function for Calvin as grounds of assurance." *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 255.

20. SU 28. The definitive discussion of origins and use of the practical syllogism is now Richard Muller, "Calvin, Beza, and the Later Reformed on Assurance of Salvation and the 'Practical Syllogism,'" in *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 244–76.

21. *A Body of Divinitie, or The Summe and Substance of Christian Religion* (London: 1645), 199–200. This is Alister McGrath's distinction described above. *A Body of Divinitie* was a compendium of systematic theology, prepared by James Ussher for private use, that had been published without his consent; see Crawford Gribben, "Rhetoric, Fiction and Theology: James Ussher and the Death of Jesus Christ," *The Seventeenth Century* 20 (2005): 53–76, at 64. Samuel Stone spoke of the syllogism as "a reflex act, wherby a man discernes himself, and his own act, sees that he sees, etc. a man returnes in upon himselfe, and perceives how his sanctified faculties are employed, perceives that he sees God and Christ, meets those glorious objects, and what entertainment he gives them: knows that he acts well, and walkes in the light." WB 375.

for us, and whereby we see that we do see, is after this, and implyes the thing done before we see it.[22]

In other words, Hooker knew that the heart could deceive: one might believe without being conscious of it. Often "wee are not able distinctly to apprehend the worke of grace in our selves, but even deeme our selves reprobates when wee are highly in Gods favor."[23] "He that hath a great work of grace," he said in another lecture, "may yet not be able to apprehend that worke." Belief and awareness of belief were not identical. So he explained as did *The Body of Divinitie* that "there is a reflecting act when a man ... doth apprehend that he doth apprehend, when he knowes that he doth know it." "Many of Gods deare children ... never knew they were called, never had any speciall intimation of Gods favour," not because they lacked faith but because "they doe not know that they know."[24]

By using the practical syllogism, Hooker's dissatisfied hearers could "be certain that it is certain," to "see that we do see." Hooker explained, for example, that someone examining her soul for signs of grace could turn to one of the promises of Scripture. "It is written, *Prov.* 28.13, *he that confesseth, and forsaketh his sinnes, shall finde mercie.*" That scriptural promise would constitute the major premise of the syllogism. The minor premise was a person's *praxis* or behavior: "though I be weake, and feeble and unfit. ... my conscience knows, that I doe confesse and forsake my sinnes." The conclusion necessarily followed: "therefore I shall finde mercy." It mattered enormously to Hooker and his colleagues that this was an evidence-based conclusion reached by strict logic, not a "sense" or "feeling." At times, his preaching would go so far as to suggest that grace was quantifiable and that careful meditation could measure it.[25] A conscientious hearer might "plainely perceive what measure of grace hee hath, and whether hee hath any or no." Hooker would even make lists of the "markes" of a sound Christian.[26]

---

22. AR 1:38.

23. CTCL 284, 282, 209.

24. In other words, one might think of settled "awareness" of one's faith as the essential difference between a "strong" and a "weak" faith.

25. Such thinking would reinforce the direction that Sarah Rivett wishes to pursue in *The Science of the Soul*. Unfortunately, Rivett does not discuss the positions of preachers like Hooker and John Davenport, who were skeptical of basing decisions about church membership on a prospective member's ability to "relate" private experience.

26. SEC 593–94; PP 162, 376–93.

Almost from its first appearance, detractors criticized the practical syllogism for bringing works righteousness in by the back door, tempting believers to take comfort from their own accomplishments rather than from their reliance on God's gracious activity.[27] Describing Luther's perspective, John Dillenberger writes that "the temptation of the believer is to look at the works which he does in faith and suddenly to reinstitute works and merit as a new form of slavery in the very citadel of the freedom of the gospel." During a person's private meditation, "the very looking at one's works spoils them. Genuine works point to God, not to self."[28]

But Hooker knew all too well that conscientious self-examination would uncover more shortcomings than achievements. Rather than bolstering confidence that a hearer enjoyed God's favor, in fact, introspection could expose the continuing power of sin.

> Here is the cause why many a Christian finding himselfe weake, and his corruptions strong, is much daunted, because hee lookes onely to himselfe; and when any temptation stirres and his lusts move, presently hee begins to quarrel with his owne heart, and saith, Never any man had such a heart as I have; by which meanes he is more troubled than before, and pores only upon his sins, whereas hee should goe to Christ for grace.[29]

One could not build assurance upon the frail and imperfect achievements that honest introspection would discover. In all too many instances, selfishness, pride, greed, or lust were more powerful than desire to obey the Rule. The road to faith led not through achievement but through helplessness and failure, daily recognition that without God's constant assistance, Christians lacked the ability to follow his commandments. "Sinne in our soules is too hard and strong for the power that is in our selves, but it is not too hard for the grace that is in Christ; hee is the fountaine of holinesse, and if we looke to our selves wee goe to a wrong place." Spiritual auditing guaranteed that a saint would feel unworthy of God's blessing, unsuccessful in fully meeting the standards that God set for his elect. "Even hee that hath the strongest measure of grace" would have to acknowledge his continuing corruption, would

---

27. Ozment would appear to be among those detractors; see *Age of Reform*, 379.

28. "Introduction," in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Doubleday, 1959), xxix.

29. SPos 29–30.

be "bound … to the uttermost of his power to see and examine the sinfull carriages of his soule." If the signs of God's favor were this ambiguous, how could even the most conscientious member of a godly community not have wondered whether she had not deceived herself about God's love toward her?[30]

Hooker was certainly prepared to respond to the perennial concern of weak believers, "whether we have any truth of grace?" with advice to "judge of it by the works."[31] But more often than not, the "works" were recognitions of the persistent presence of sin. "Art thou able to tame those jarring affections, and to stifle them? Art thou able, when they would transport thee, to allay them, and bring thy soule to a calme frame?" Regardless of the continuing power of her sinful desires, was the person "such as have Christ Jesus framed in you"? Did the person have the Augustinian "habituall disposition of the heart for well-doing," "a frame put into the will, that sets it on, and carries it to God"? Consistent with his maxim that God judged human behavior *potius affectu, quàm effectu*, Perkins, too, had urged people to ground the practical syllogism not on the evidence of their behavior but on the underlying direction of their hearts;

> If therefore a man haue his heart continually affected with that which is truly good, either more or lesse; it is a certen token that his wicked nature is changed, and he regenerate: but contrariwise if his heart be always set on the pleasure of sinne, and the things of this world, he may justly suspect himselfe that he is not regenerated.[32]

Whenever someone focused too much on "corruptions and distempers," Hooker repeated his characteristic refrain: a hearer must forget her own short-comings and train her thoughts on the theological certainty of God's promise of salvation recorded in the Bible. "The promise only must doe it, therefore looke you to that … goe thou to the promise."[33] "When thy cursed corruptions come, and would rule thee," said Hooker, "if then thou art content to bee ruled by a Christ, and to live, and converse as he did, this is an undoubted argument, that thou chuseth Christ aright."[34]

---

30. SEx 182.

31. PP 345; SEC 633.

32. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:272.

33. SEC 87–88, 633, 634.

34. SPos 30; PP 165; SEx 161; CTCL 276; PP 63; SEC 429. Thomas Shepard's diary provides a fascinating example of the paradox of continuing brokenness leading to comfort. See *God's*

Hooker warned his hearers never to forget the paradox of faith: because faith required abandoning any confidence in one's own abilities, a sense of frustration and brokenness could be better evidence of God's favor than a sense that one's behavior was pleasing to God. "Deadnesse, wearinesse, untowardnesse, inability, is many times accompanied with most humility, with most brokennesse, with most basenesse, with most going out of himselfe unto Christ, and with most sincerity in approving the heart unto Christ." The contrition and humiliation that led to and accompanied faith would not be pleasant, enjoyable, and fulfilling. Rather than expect constant "sense and feeling … of God's favour towards us," hearers needed to remind themselves that submitting one's neck to the yoke required self-abasement and emptying of all pride.[35] Brokenness, not ecstatic experience, was the best sign of God's presence.

In an important article, Michael Winship argued that William Perkins sent out a "mixed message" about assurance. Where earlier Reformed thinkers had described the witness of the Spirit as an experience of divine comfort and consolation, Perkins understood that witness differently. A weak believer was aware primarily of her own sinfulness and a "feare of the majesty of God." "By emphasizing the frailty and unreliability of any one sign" of assurance, argues Winship, Perkins offered hope to those whose evidence seemed indeed frail. But that very emphasis—that no single sign or experience could be conclusive—made assurance "a quest … rather than a reasonable destination." Winship terms that quest "a ghastly *memento mori aeternis* that accompanied the godly on their entire earthly pilgrimage." Only if one could sustain the deliberate effort of will required to subordinate one's own interests to God's rule throughout a lifetime, only if, in Perkins's words, one could "persevere in these things to the last gasp of life," could assurance be final. "Assurance was obtained," concludes Winship, "by nurturing precious and often feeble embers of hope through a lifetime of attendance on the ordinances of the church and the counsel of godly ministers."[36]

Plot: The Paradoxes of Puritan Piety, ed. Michael McGiffert (n. p.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972). It is all too easy to overlook, I think, the extent to which the experiences of failure and discouragement that Shepard records might actually have provided him with the very signs of God's favor which he was seeking. Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama*, makes a similar point; see, in particular, 160, where he concludes that godly people had "to lose themselves in despair to rehabilitate and find fresh and prodigal identities."

35. PP 348, 345.

36. Winship, "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospelers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s," *Church History* 70 (2001): 462–81. Like Winship, Leif Dixon asserts that Calvin's "predestinarian theory" implied "that the elect should be turbo-charged and superconfident" and sees Perkins as

Winship has put his finger on the tradition in which Hooker stood. Hooker could simply not understand why assurance needed to rest on a firmer foundation than God's biblical promise to contrite and humble sinners. As Cotton Mather reported, "it became his manner at his Lying down for Sleep, in the Evening, to Single out some certain *Promise* of God, which he would Repeat, and Ponder, and Keep his Heart close unto it, until he found that satisfaction of Soul wherewith he could say, *I will Lay me down in Peace, and Sleep; for thou, O Lord, makest me Dwell in Assurance.*" Hooker could perceive the Spirit speaking through the promise and was content. When approached by hearers anxiously seeking evidence of their own salvation, he could only insist that they follow his example. In Mather's words, "he would afterwards Counsel others to take the same Course; telling them, *That the Promise was the Boat, which was to carry a Perishing Sinner over unto the Lord Jesus Christ.*"[37]

Not only did Perkins and Hooker warn godly hearers to expect a healthy portion of doubt with their faith, they also found ways to provoke that very doubt. One of Perkins's most disturbing treatises contains a section explaining how people commonly deceived themselves about their faith: "How farre a man may goe in the profession of the gospel, and yet be a wicked man and a reprobate."[38] Hooker called such self-deceivers "hypocrites," and he filled his sermons with disparaging references to them. There seemed no end to their variety: "lazy" hypocrites, "vaine-glorious" hypocrites, "whining" hypocrites, "wrangling" hypocrites, "presumptuous" hypocrites, "fawning" hypocrites, "indulgent" hypocrites," "subtle" or "discrete" hypocrites, "close-hearted" hypocrites, and in Connecticut "treacherous," "complaining," and "discouraged" hypocrites.[39] All had in common the misguided belief that they enjoyed God's

---

falling away from that standard, "Calvinist Theology and Pastoral Reality in the Reign of King James I: The Perspective of Thomas Wilson," *The Seventeenth Century* 23 (2008): 173–97, at 185. I follow Richard Muller in seeing Perkins (and Theodore Beza) as building upon Calvin rather than undermining his positions, see "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy." In my judgment, Perkins and his followers raised the bar for "full assurance" far more significantly than they lowered it for "weak faith." And one should also keep in mind Patrick Collinson's useful caveat: "did the godly do as they were told?" "The Politics of Religion and the Religion of Politics in Elizabethan England," *Historical Research* 82: 215 (2009): 74–92, at 90.

37. *Piscator* 6 {*Magnalia* 1:334}.

38. *A Treatise Tending unto a Declaration, Whether a Man Be in the Estate of Damnation, or in the Estate of Grace* in *Works*, 1:356–62.

39. SEC 161–72; SImp 236–39, cf. SEC 280; SEC 279, SImp 227–31; SEC 280–82, SImp 219–20; SImp 231–236, cf. SEC 280; SImp 218–19; FLGT 234–47; SG, 130–31, 133; FC 213, SDD 183; AR 10:419–22, 698, 425–26, 427.

favor. The ones who continued to ignore Hooker's warning would eventually suffer the torments of hell.

Along with most of his godly contemporaries, Hooker also believed that the devil interfered with human quests for assurance. One of Satan's favorite tactics was to encourage meditators to obsess on their corruptions. "The devill keeps us in our sinnes by poring continually upon our sinnes, when we thinke to have our hearts carried against our corruptions, we are more intangled in our corruptions, by dwelling continually upon them." He warned an anxious hearer that he "should not sticke too long, and looke too much, and dwell unwarrantably and continually upon the sight and consideration of his owne sinnes, upon his weaknesses and distempers, so farre as to be skared, and altogether discouraged from comming to, and depending upon the riches of Gods free grace."[40]

Since Satan would have no reason to reinforce the doubts of the ungodly, anxiety over one's election could actually provide evidence that one was elect. "Sathan doth not oppugne that faith that is of his owne, or the fleshes hatching," explained Hooker. True faith "wrestleth with doubting; is assaulted with feare within, and terrours without." Satan was "continually laying siege" to the heart of a believer, "casting into the soule many fiery darts of distrust and atheisme." Paradoxically, "a faith thus assaulted, thus annoyed, may gather assurance by these conflicts it hath with the devill, that it is from the spirit of God, not from any divellish or naturall suggestion."

Nor was Satan the only supernatural being working to create doubt. As Hooker had himself discovered while at Cambridge (and as Luther had at Wittenberg), the terrible Augustinian God could "play games" with believers and withhold assurance to keep them humble. Like a strict parent, God could cast "a frowning countenance." Even when God "mindes him most good," explained Hooker, he allowed a Christian to "believe hee will doe little for him," in order to "keepe him in a childe-like obedience." God could also withhold assurance as a punishment, could "punish our by-past negligence and carelesse respect of his mercy to us, in not giving us a just understanding of the welfare of our estates."[41]

One had to meditate on one's behavior, then, but in so doing one had to recognize that, short of heaven, that behavior would remain deeply flawed. Honest meditation could easily lead to a self-doubt that threatened to become

---

40. SEC 552.

41. CTCL 210.

despair. As that occurred, one had to turn to Christ and rely entirely on his grace

> if it be so that God wil make a man meditate of his sinnes, and that the heart of a sinner is fully resolved to muse, and ponder, and consider of his corruptions; If he will pore upon his sinnes, then he shall see nothing else but sinne: and thus the Devill hath hindred many a poore soule from comming unto Christ, and from receiving comfort of him, he shall now be always poring upon his corruptions, and therefore here lies the skill of a Christian, not to neglect meditation, and therefore here is the stint of meditation of our sinnes, you shall thus discover it: So farre see thy sinnes, so farre be affected with them, so farre hold thy minde to them, that they may make thee see an absolute necessity of a Christ, and that these sinnes may drive thee to the Lord Jesus Christ for succour.[42]

Hooker expected that the line between faith and doubt would often be faint. Even the strongest believer would find herself having to fight back—to will back—fears that she might have deceived herself about God's favor. But despite his caveats, he did believe there were "markes whereby this saving faith is discerned from the mocke-faith that is in the world?" One could distinguish "the voyce of Gods spirit witnessing to us, and with us touching the pardon of sinne, from satanicall delusions, or naturall presumptions." First of all, one could recall how faith arose. Had God first "framed" a hearer's heart, "prepared" it through contrition and humiliation provoked by a sense of God's wrath? Then it was likely to be genuine. So Hooker expected that those agonizing over the sincerity of their faith would "carefully consider the order how it is descended into our hearts." The faith that arose "from a secure, untroubled, quiet spirit, that hath continually cryed peace, peace" would prove fleeting; "we may at no hand dare to relie upon it." Authentic faith arose only through a program of abasement, fear, and longing for grace: "after the sight of sinne, humiliation for the same, hungring and thirsting after mercy." Unless the believer had first passed through the "boisterous storme" of exposure to God's wrath, her faith was likely to be wishful thinking. "Before the Lord would seale to the man that hath faith the assurance of the pardon of his sinnes," Hooker said in another lecture, "he will make him humble, and cry, and sorrow for them."[43]

---

42. SP 115.

43. SImp 234.

Second, did it inspire daily repentance? The same Holy Spirit who provoked an initial weak faith would ever be encouraging a hearer to strengthen it. Those who were, in Michael Winship's words, "nurturing precious and often feeble embers of hope through a lifetime of attendance on the ordinances of the church and the counsel of godly ministers" could take comfort from that very process.

Assurance could never degenerate into complacency because, in the depths of their souls, extreme Augustinians knew that God's promises were conditional. "There is no Promise in the Scripture," said Hooker, "but either it doth express or imply a Condition."[44] Only if they were truly contrite and humble, truly faithful, truly elected before the foundation of the world, could hearers conclude that the promise was meant for them. If their faith were to fail, their contrition prove temporary, their selfishness finally overcome their effort to suppress it, they would fear that they had deceived themselves and remained liable to the terrible punishment of an angry God. Neither Perkins nor Hooker had a definitive antidote to their fears. Only on her deathbed, after a lifetime of spiritual struggle, could a Christian certainly enjoy God's favor.[45]

From his personal and pastoral experience, Hooker had concluded early on that it was folly for a new believer to expect to feel an overwhelming outpouring of grace. So it was dishonest for a preacher to pretend that she would. The Spirit worked secretly, beneath a believer's consciousness. But its presence could be detected, because a believer would find herself able to will and to do things that she had previously not wanted, and not been able, to do. In practice, the words of the Apostle Paul (Phil. 2:12b–13) needed to be rearranged. It was because "God worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" that Hooker was able to exhort godly people to "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." When all was said and done, the clearest sign of the Spirit's work, after the "framing" and "preparation" from which authentic faith would arise, was a pattern of brokenness and self-abasement. Hooker's God was not a deity who dealt in ecstatic experiences, in a creature's rapturous feelings of oneness with her creator. The Christian life was one of self-denial.

---

44. AR 1:43.

45. In a particularly perceptive article, T. D. Bozeman demonstrated how "antinominanism" in early seventeenth-century England offered a way out from such a life-long, tedious search for assurance. See "The Glory of the 'Third Time': John Eaton as Contra-Puritan." Eighteenth-century evangelicals followed the antinomians, rather than godly preachers like Perkins and Hooker, in offering what the godly preachers derided as a "shortcut" to heaven. Michael Watts, *The Dissenters*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 1:427–28.

If faith were genuine, it would stir a believer to use every means to sustain and increase it. Faith had arisen by exposure to preaching; it would be nourished by continued exposure to sermons and to the Lord's Supper. In Hooker's words, "True faith wrought by the finger of the spirit" not only first "comes into the heart" but also subsequently "receives strength and growth by the conscionable use of the ministry of the Word, and Sacraments." If a believer were not driven to nourish her faith by regular exposure to the Church's means of grace, her "faith" was almost certainly hypocritical.[46]

But Hooker condemned Prayer Book Protestantism. It was a terrible error to imagine that God would be satisfied with simple church attendance. His preaching made clear that "injoyment of the meanes"—conscientious attendance on the liturgy and sermons of the Church of England—was necessary but far from sufficient. "Men think it enough to be good Churchmen, to have and injoy the helpes God vouchsafeth and bestoweth upon his people, to be often hearers of the Word read and preached; . . . though in the mean time they remain as blind and ignorant, and as carnall as ever."[47] Christians seriously concerned about their salvation would need to go beyond church attendance and turn to meditation and self-examination. "Let every one ask this great question," urged Hooker, "How may I know when the Spirit is in me?" "Lay hold upon the promise," he advised; meditate on the meaning of God's promise of salvation. The promises were "full of sweetnesse," but to draw out that sweetness a hearer had to ponder them seriously and "over and over againe." "You must chew them, breake them, and bestow thy heart on them. . . . And that is done by meditating on them." As "an Alchimist that distils oyle, doth draw out the spirit of metals . . . by distillation," so Hooker urged his hearers to think seriously about the gospel promises and "distill them by meditation."[48] Eager to know whether they could personally lay any claim to the promises, they would then take pains to "addresse themselves to an exact and diligent enquiry, how the case is with them." "Use often to examine, and try, and search thy heart, and all thy actions," Hooker advised his hearers. Conscientious meditation would take account not just of daily behavior but also of life-long "progresse in the course of godlinesse."[49]

---

46. Hooker elaborates the "markes" of faith succinctly in CTCL 250–55, from which the quotations in the previous paragraphs are taken.

47. SDD 212.

48. SEC 68–69.

49. CTCL 281; PP 389–90.

On one occasion Hooker gave an extended response to a hearer who yearned for the Holy Spirit to give him concrete assurance that he was one of God's chosen. "I would have the Lord say to my Soule," the hearer pleaded, "bee of good comfort, I am thy Salvation." Hooker explained that God was prepared to offer that comfort; the hearer needed only to understand "how it must bee done, and how God shall speake it." "Know this," he continued, "what the Word saith, the Spirit saith." "The Word saith *Every one that is weary shall be refreshed*; Hast not thou beene weary and has not thou seene sin worse then hell it selfe?" As the minister preached the Word, the Spirit would drive its meaning home to the anxious hearer, who would be "refreshed" by what he heard. As Hooker said in one of his Hartford lectures, only heretics like the members of the Family of Love believed that God would communicate with his human creatures apart from the Bible. The idea of "some special Word appointed, appropriated to me alone, and … spoken to none but me" was "a Familistical Dream," one which imagined a "Revelation without the Word."[50]

But this particular hearer was not satisfied. Hooker had told him that the Spirit would speak through the promises in the Bible; he yearned for more direct assurance that he was saved. "I cannot finde this assurance, and this witnesse of Gods Spirit," he would say in reply. "I cannot see it, and I cannot beleeve it." In other words, continued Hooker, "he leaves the judgement of the Word and Spirit, and cleaves to the judgement of his finding, and feeling: and thus he judgeth Gods favour in regard of his own imaginations, and not according to the witnesse of the Word and the Spirit."[51]

Hooker knew that some dissatisfied hearers were being tempted by another way of gaining assurance, "erroneous Opinions which go under pretence of Free Grace."[52] People who advanced such opinions, whom he thought of as "familists," would "hearken out where any be in perplexity of spirit." It was just about the time Hooker and his company left for Hartford that Anne Hutchinson and her followers had begun accusing most of the Massachusetts Bay ministers of preaching a covenant of works. Even after her excommunication by the Boston Church in early 1638 and subsequent exile, he feared the influence of her ideas. Although John Cotton, teacher of Boston's First Church,

---

50. AR 1:44. Given that this sermon was preached in early June 1638, Hooker was almost surely referring to Anne Hutchinson and her followers in Massachusetts Bay. But he had preached against "Eatonists and Familists" in Chelmsford, SEC 63, 65.

51. SH 176–77.

52. Michael Winship discusses the persistence of "familist" views after the departure of Anne Hutchinson and her sympathizers, even in Connecticut. *Making Heretics,* 224.

seemed to have abandoned some of his more extreme positions, Cotton continued to disagree with Hooker's rejection of any testimony of the Holy Spirit apart from the words of Scripture. Thomas Shepard, Hooker's son-in-law and confidante, wrote in the margins of his autobiography that "Mr Cotton repents not, but is hid only."[53] These "false teachers" would "make a trade to wind into mens affections" by offering them a tempting "shorter cut to heaven": an immediate revelation or voice of the Spirit guaranteeing their election. "The Revelation comes and sayes, *Thou art a Son of God, thy sins are pardoned.*" Once a hearer received such a revelation, they taught, she could rely on it "though your Faith and Grace be nought." To Hooker, this was a dangerous delusion. Unless the Spirit spoke by "soaking in" the words of Scripture, the "revelation" was a device of the devil and the false teachers were his unwitting "Factors."[54]

Looking behind Hooker's rhetoric, one can surmise that would-be believers were often disappointed with his method for reaching assurance of their salvation. Once they realized that they would get no divine communication apart from passages of Scripture, no special access to the book of life in which their names might or might not have been written, they naturally wondered if there might be some other way to know whether they were among God's chosen. Hooker, mindful of his own experience of divine rejection and his subsequent decision to trust entirely to God's promise, insisted that there was not. A twenty-first-century reader might be forgiven for concluding that Hooker forced people to stand before a perpetually unsatisfied God who appeared to accept them but never completely released them from anxiety about his favor. Because they could never be absolutely certain of his forgiveness, they could never give up trying to please him.

In Hooker's mind, as one gained the frame of heart that carried the will to God in obedience to the Rule as found in the Bible, as one heard the promises of Scripture and accepted them in faith, one gained the assurance God intended and no more. "As the Carpenter laying his Rule often to his work, makes it the more even and straight, so comparing thy selfe with the *Word*, and framing thy whole conversation to that rule, will make thy heart, though as false and slippery as *Gehazi*, to become faithfull and honest unto thee."[55]

The eminent colonial historian Edmund Morgan liked to speak of the "weaned affections" of the New England puritans. Obedience to the rule

---

53. AR 10:581–82 (preached late summer 1640), Shepard, *God's Plot*, 74 (dated Anno 1639), Winship, *Making Heretics*, 217–20, 237–38, *et passim*.

54. AR 1:39; UP 42: "they have invented a shorter cut to heaven, they have invented a new way, a backe doore to heaven." AR 10:580.

55. PHH 14–15.

required that a saint should love spouse, or children, or profession with only that degree of love that was proportionate to the ultimate importance of its object.[56] Augustine had famously distinguished between those things that humans were created to "enjoy" and those they were meant to "use" and then to put aside in their quest for ultimate enjoyment.[57] In the Garden of Eden, Adam had known that only God deserved ultimate love; even the most treasured created things would eventually be left behind. Hooker concurred. "When a man . . . lets loose his affections on shoppe, or children, or the like, oh what an hard matter is it to say, No more of that! But *Adams* affections were so ordered, that if reason should say, Love that now, and then leave it; hee would love it now, and leave it then."[58]

After reading some of the surviving diaries kept by godly people, one is tempted to concur with Winship's judgment that the quest for assurance led to a life of inner anxiety, a "ghastly *memento mori aeternis.*" But writers of diaries, no less than preachers of sermons, rarely bothered to remind prospective readers of the social context in which they wrote. With few exceptions, people sought assurance not as solitary individuals but as members of a godly company.

Those among Hooker's Chelmsford hearers who associated with godly people and followed a regimen of godly practices knew that they were living as God's elect people were intended to live. They would be all too aware of the way their behavior set them apart from their worldly neighbors. Anyone who found the will to pray regularly—in private, in her family, and in the periodic days of humiliation—to keep a godly Sabbath, to pay careful attention to sermons so as to be able to "repeat" them in holy conference, and to keep a good conscience by measuring her behavior against the Rule in meditation, would have strong reasons to assume that her ability to live a countercultural lifestyle could only be maintained with the assistance that God had reserved to his elect. Only the assistance of grace could sustain the daily effort of will needed

---

56. E.g., *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, Rev. ed. (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966), 47–51. Stone wrote that "wee should cleave to wife, children, etc: but in measure, but our cleaving to God must be beyound measure." WB 405.

57. *Illæ quibus fruendum est nos beatos faciunt. Istis quibus utendum est tendentes ad beatitudinem adjuvamur et quasi adminiculamur, ut ad illas quæ nos beatos faciunt, pervenire, atque his inhærere possimus. De Doctrina Christiana*, I.3, *P.L.* 34:20, English translation *Teaching Christianity*, trans. Edmund Hill, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, I/11 (Hyde Park: New City Press, 1996), 107.

58. PP 161.

to suppress her own selfish desires and to live in a manner so different from that of her worldly neighbors. "The power to subdue inward lusts, secret corruptions, base thoughts that rise in the minde," preached Hooker, "is not to be found in the most."[59] Her will to exert that power, day in and day out, would reassure her that she deserved to be numbered among the saints. Reprobates could never exert the will to lead a "nice," "exact," "precise" style of life by association with a godly community. "*Such as thy will is, such is thy condition*," said Hooker, "look what thou wouldest be, that thou art in truth, and in the account of the Almighty."[60]

But like other associations of the godly throughout England, Chelmsford's godly community had no formal standing. It could discipline the wayward, but its criteria for inclusion were informal at best. Might it be possible to institutionalize the gathering of saints, to create a public, universally recognized society of those who daily chose to submit themselves to God's Rule? Might membership in such a society provide still greater assurance that one enjoyed God's favor?

"Mr. Hooker's company" formed just such a society when they arrived in Newtown, and along with Mrs. Hooker and the majority of its members, the society moved to Hartford in 1636. Now organized as the Hartford Church, those members of Chelmsford's godly community who had made the Atlantic crossing could set formal standards for participation.[61] Any Hartford citizen seeking assurance of her salvation could take comfort from her church membership, her right to be associated with the godly now formally vetted by appropriate godly authority.

Hartford theology bolstered the connection between assurance and church membership. Teacher Samuel Stone explained that the actual "subject" of the Holy Spirit's application of Christ's redemption—the *subjectum applicationis* as Samuel Willard noted in the margin of his copy of the *Whole Body*—was not individual Christians but the Church. It was true that God the Father had "from Eternity" given the Son the name of every elect person, "the selected company of men [and women and children] who belong to the Redemption." But Stone contended that these elect souls were "commonly, and for the most part members of the Visible Church," the company he and Hooker served.

---

59. FC 36.

60. AR 7:332.

61. The prior existence of a Newtown church must be inferred from its ability to "call" Hooker and Stone as Pastor and Teacher upon their arrival. It is likely that not every member of the Hartford Church in its early years came from Chelmsford, but Winthrop's use of the term "Mr. Hooker's company" suggests that most did.

"Those that are Church members admitted according to the Rule, and walking in Visible holiness, are redeemed Visibly, or in the Judgment of Charity, they are Visibly acquired and purchased by the blood of Christ, and the peculiar possession of the Son of God."[62]

In other words, most of the Hartford elect would sooner or later be members of the Hartford Church. The church could err in its judgment, but Stone also presumed that it would be conscientious in admitting new members "according to the Rule," so that most of those in the visible church would be those God had predestined to salvation. Church membership was not a guarantee that one was elect, but anyone seeking assurance was far better in than out.

The church at Hartford celebrated the Lord's Supper on the afternoon of the Sabbath, following the morning sermon.[63] Both Hooker and Stone took it for granted that one of the outcomes of that ritual, which in Hartford was restricted to full Church members, was to bolster assurance of salvation.[64] Although it was once common for historians to distinguish "Anglicans" from "Puritans" by arguing that the latter emphasized preaching at the expense of the sacraments, more recent research has recognized that both preaching and the Lord's Supper—baptism being administered only once—were indispensable parts of the godly life.[65] When Hooker spoke of the gradual strengthening of faith from "weak faith" to "full assurance," he described how faith received "strength and growth by the conscionable use of the ministry of the Word, and

---

62. WB 237–38. The *Catechism* Stone used in Hartford states that "the Application of Redemption . . . is extended to the Church or Seed of Christ," 8.

63. Firmin, *Sober Reply*, 27.

64. Perkins, for example, imagined a godly worshipper saying "Surely I haue very great comfort by the Sacrament of the Lords Supper," *A Treatise Tending unto a declaration, Works*, 1:390. "The ministers giuing of the bread and wine to them that truly repent," he said in another place, "is as much as Christ should say, Beleeue thou, and life eternall belongs to thee." *A Godly and Learned Exposition... upon the First Three Chapters of the Revelation, Works*, 3:222. Such thinking was basic to Protestants; Luther had insisted that "to receive this sacrament in bread and wine, then, is nothing else than to receive a sure sign of this fellowship and incorporation with Christ and all saints" (*eyn gewiß zeychen empfahen dißer gemeynschafft und eyn leybung mit Christo und allen heiligen. . .*) *Eyn Sermon von dem Hochwirdigen Sacrament des Heyligen Waren Leychnams Christi, W.A.* 2:743, English translation *The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ, and the Brotherhoods*, trans. E. Theodore Bachman, *Luther's Works*, 35:51.

65. According to Arnold Hunt, "The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England," 57, pastors across the Protestant spectrum taught that "the value of the sacraments lay in their use as means to confirm and strengthen the assurance of one's salvation." But see the critique of Hunt's article by Peter Lake in *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 68–69.

Sacraments."[66] Christ's presence in the elements of bread and wine, while not corporeal as Roman Catholics would have insisted, was nonetheless palpable. Asking, "how is pardon and power conveighed unto mee by the Sacrament?" he explained that all depended upon "a right discerning of the body and bloud of Christ." When he could "see beyond the outward elements," he continued, he would be able to "see the spirit of Christ undoubtedly communicating the spirituall good, as I see the outward elements communicating the temporall good." To the one partaking of the sacrament, "the Spirit of the Lord doth as undoubtedly give Christ and his merits, the fruit and benefit of them in the forgivenesse of sin, and strength against corruption, as drynesse goes with the bread, and moisture with the wine." In words that can only have brought comfort to those gathered around the Lord's Table, Hooker insisted that "all that the sinner can desire, as, the pardon of what is amisse in him, power for the subduing of all corruptions for him, and the quickning of his heart to the well-leasing of God, are all conveighed and communicated to the soule by the Sacrament, and to bee received therein."[67]

If one as stingy with comfort as Thomas Hooker could speak so confidently of the assurance brought by participation in the Lord's Supper, what assurance might Samuel Stone have offered to those gathered around the table? Stone's treatment is extraordinary. By dealing with assurance under the heading of "Glorification" in the first major section on "Faith," the *Whole Body* raised it from the tedious quotidian struggle described by Hooker to a foretaste of the joy that awaited the saints in heaven. Stone returned to assurance in his second major section on "Obedience." There he again found a way to elevate assurance to the climax of his entire doctrine of divinity. It was precisely because they made participants "more certain" of their ultimate salvation, he explained, that "the Doctrine of the sacraments, is to be handled in the last place of Divinity."[68] God was well aware that his saints often faltered, because their trust in him had originated and was sustained by their knowledge of their own inadequacies. So God had designed the sacraments to reassure. As the faithful celebrated the sacrament, explained Stone, "notwithstanding all our failings, God gives us strong assurance, that he will be ours in all his Excellencies … and continue in covenant with us."[69]

---

66. CTCL 253.

67. PP 373–76; for an argument that Church membership in general and the Lord's Supper in particular functioned to strengthen assurance, see Baird Tipson, "Invisible Saints: The 'Judgment of Charity' in the Early New England Churches," *Church History* 34 (1975): 460–71.

68. The margin reads *h: certiores salutis.*

69. WB 531, 505.

Sacraments assured because they confirmed the covenant of grace. It was conventional among the godly to understand Baptism and the Lord's Supper as a "sealing" of the covenant that God had made with those he had elected, and Stone developed his position from that understanding.[70] Like Hooker, Stone saw God's covenant not as a contract but as a promise. God elected certain people in Christ and, once the Holy Spirit had brought them to faith, promised to confer benefits upon them.[71] The covenant of grace was "a confederation between the first being, and a select company out of the world." Like Hooker, Stone made very little use of covenant language in describing the process by which men and women came to believe. Covenant language was for assurance.

In the sacraments, "the Lord will have the covenant renewed and confirmed." Church members "celebrate that confederation, and make it appear famous and glorious by their assembling." Sacraments were "visible declarations" of the "mutual affection" between God and his people. "We should be exceeding carefull," urged Stone, "to improve these, prize and love them as speciall friends; take and draw the strength and sweet out of both [Baptism and the Lord's Supper], to seale and strengthen our new birth, and Assurance of Eternal life."[72]

Baptism was the sacrament of initiation (*sacramentum initiationis*), the Lord's Supper the sacrament of education (*educationis sacramentum*). While continuing the language of sealing—the Supper was "the seale of our continuance in covenant with God"—Stone also incorporated another metaphor: because the Supper offered "spirituall food," it fostered "growing up in Christ." "The inward man *feeds* upon Christ by faith, and *is nourished* to the encrease of assurance of Eternall life."[73] The reception (*receptio*), the eating and drinking (*edens et bibens*) of the bread and wine signified the "taking Christ by the hand of faith," the same faith that was "our consent to the Everlasting covenant of grace." In almost the final words of the *Whole Body*, Stone explained how a communicant's understanding would "be more assured" of her interest in Christ and how her will could "more confidently conclude, that he will be to thee according to his

---

70. See the authoritative monograph by Brooks Holifield, *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570–1720* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); unfortunately, Holifield did not have access to Stone's *Whole Body*; CGO 15.

71. WB 526. Stone made it plain that one could make no claim on God through the covenant, because "God undertakes to enable us to perform the covenant."

72. WB 524, 525,

73. WB 539; emphasis added.

Engagement."[74] Christians could certainly take comfort from their efforts to follow the Rule and their awareness that they placed trust in Christ rather than in those efforts. But it was regular participation in the Lord's Supper that most deeply grounded their assurance of salvation. "Notwithstanding the weakness of their faith and grace," those who received the bread and wine would know that "God witnesseth to their sences his Inviolable love, and their salvation in Christ." "They are assured by these signs," he continued, "that they shall never want, so long as Christ has any thing."[75]

Stone knew that not all participants were rightfully there. Extreme Augustinians could never ignore the ultimate importance of the decree of election, which made even God's most lavish offers of grace contingent upon the faith that in turn depended upon one's election before the beginning of the world. It was only to "worthy receivers," warned Stone, that "God binds himself sure and fast."

But once having gotten that caveat out of the way, Stone held little back. Participants could expect a "compleat and absolute" testimony of God's saving love and mercy. God's promise in the Supper was "a surer and deeper Testimony than in his writing" (i.e., the Scriptures). In Hartford the celebration of the Supper always included the preaching of the word, but participants in the Supper encountered "the word cloathed with the sacrament," something "greater and more efficacious" than the preached word alone. Compared to a sermon, the Supper "testifyeth more fully, and hereby we are more engaged to the Lord."[76] The water of Baptism and the bread and wine of the Supper "put a man in surer possession of Christ, than if he were present on Earth."

If participation in the Lord's Supper could convey such a benefit, how did one gain the right to partake? How did Hooker and Stone decide who should be admitted and who screened out? The next chapter will address these questions.

---

74. WB 540.

75. WB 531; cf. 524.

76. WB 529, 530.

12

Identifying the Saints

We must not iudge of a man by an action or two, but by the tenour of his life. Such as the course of a mans life is, such is the man: though he, through the corruption of his nature faile in this or that particular action, yet doth it not preiudice his estate before God, so be it he renew his repentance for his seuerall slippes and falles, not lying in any sinne; and withall from yere to yere walke unblameable before God & men.[1]

ONCE IN HARTFORD, Hooker and Stone took the opportunity to scrub the Gospel clean from what they saw as a millennium's worth of distorting human tradition. Nothing prevented them from imagining and putting in place a church order that reflected their particular version of Christianity. Central to this effort was the question, who belonged in the church and who did not? If extreme Augustinian theology accurately captured New Testament practice, how could church membership requirements be conceived so as to be faithful to that theology?

Hooker and Stone did not start with a blank slate. Both with John Forbes at Delft (a situation about which we unfortunately know too little) and at Chelmsford (about which we know a great deal), Hooker had had extensive experience setting boundaries to godly communities. Many of the Hartford colonists had come from Chelmsford, and they brought their experience in "Mr. Hooker's company" with them to Connecticut.

Most of the Massachusetts Bay churches decided early to restrict church membership by requiring each prospective member to give a "relation" of her experience of grace, a declaration before the entire church "of God's manner

---

1. William Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:286.

of working upon [her] soul."[2] British critics found the requirement of a relation a striking and unwelcome innovation, and the Massachusetts clergy were forced to rise and defend it.[3] Although his role has been contested, the Boston minister John Cotton is generally assumed to have initiated the innovation.[4]

Thomas Hooker joined his colleagues in defending the "New England Way," but he disagreed with their requirements for church membership. (Some contemporaries even concluded that this disagreement was among the reasons for his emigration to Connecticut.) In Hartford, his church pointedly chose not to require a relation. Samuel Stone wrote a brief discourse against the practice, though this circulated only in manuscript.[5] The reader is now in a position to understand what was at stake in this decision and how Hartford's requirements faithfully reflected what Hooker and Stone thought about conversion.

Augustine, too, had faced the challenge of reconciling theology and practice. His conception of the "church," the body of Christ on earth, had held two purposes in tension. Many—but not all—church members were thought to be predestined to spend eternity in heaven. By providing sermons and administering sacraments, the church offered these elect Christians a foretaste of the fellowship they would eventually enjoy in the world to come. Through these "means," grace was dispensed to those God had chosen. God used the institutional church, in other words, to convert and sustain his elect.

---

2. A Platform of Church Discipline … Agreed Upon by the Elders … in the Synod of Cambridge, ch. 12, in *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, ed. Williston Walker (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1960), 223. Francis J. Bremer has recently argued that this requirement was far less widespread, even in Massachusetts, than has usually been assumed. See "Not Quite So Visible Saints: Reexamining Conversion Narratives in Early New England," forthcoming. *New England Quarterly*, December 2014.

3. The classic account of these developments remains Edmund Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea* (New York: New York University Press, 1963). A corrective was offered by Raymond Stearns and David Browner, "New England Church 'Relations' and Continuity in Early Congregational History," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 75 (1965): 13–45, which was in turn critiqued in Tipson, "Invisible Saints." Helpful comments were then made by Patricia Caldwell in *The Puritan Conversion Narrative: The Beginnings of American Expression* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), subsequently critiqued in Tipson, "Elusiveness of 'Puritanism'," 251–54. See now Bremer, "Re-Examining."

4. Both Morgan, *Visible Saints*, 93–105, and David D. Hall, *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 96–97, emphasize Cotton's role. Michael Ditmore demurs; he finds Thomas Shepherd a "much more likely candidate for originator of the church relation requirement than Cotton." "Preparation and Confession: Reconsidering Edmund S. Morgan's *Visible Saints*," *New England Quarterly* 67 (1994): 298–319, at 317.

5. See Stone's Discourse.

But it would never have occurred to Augustine to confine the mission of the institutional church exclusively to the elect. As Bishop of Hippo Regius, Augustine recognized that the reach of his church included many who had not yet been brought to faith and still more who would never believe. Although he knew that some of his hearers were not destined to be among God's chosen, he believed that all of them needed to be subject to the church's ministry. His rationale was simple and could be expressed with generosity: neither he nor any other human being had been given the ability to discern which individuals God had chosen for salvation and which he had passed over. "Charity" demanded that all be treated as if they might be predestined to salvation. "Not knowing who belongs to the number of the predestinated, and who does not belong, we ought to be so affected by the affection of charity that we wish all saved."[6] Because only God could know which individuals he had chosen, it was the church's responsibility to make every effort to bring all the not-yet-saved to repentance.

Such apparent generosity had a harsher side. Augustine had notoriously justified the use of force to compel the schismatic Donatists to come under his authority, so he had no hesitation in endowing the church with responsibility to exercise moral control over anyone within its boundaries, particularly those who flouted its teachings.[7] Any person was potentially among the elect. Any person, even the most unlikely, might be moved to faith by the proper teaching. So Augustine insisted that the sinners among his flock be subject to "discipline" (*disciplina*) or "reproof" (*correptio*), what Peter Brown calls "a positive process of corrective treatment."[8] The church would always exercise such discipline with the best of intentions (*medicinaliter*), for the purposes of healing those who were spiritually sick. But Augustine left no doubt that those being disciplined would perceive their correction as "severe."[9]

---

6. *sic affici debemus charitatis affectu, ut omnes velimus salvos fieri, De correptione et gratia* xv.46, *P.L.* 44:944, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians,* 4:490.

7. See especially *Sermo* CXII.8, *P.L.* 38:647, *Sermons,* trans. Edmund Hill, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century,* III/4 (Brooklyn, NY: New City Press, 1992), 152, on Jesus's words in the parable of the invitation to the great dinner, Luke 14:23, "Go out into the roads and lanes and compel people to come in [*compelle intrare*], that my house might be filled," and Peter Brown, "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion," in *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 260–78; also Brown, *Augustine of Hippo,* 233–43. In their own minds, of course, those he called "Donatists" were actually the true Catholic Church.

8. Brown, "Attitude to Coercion," 274–75; *Augustine of Hippo,* 236.

9. *omnibus, ne pereant, … adhibenda est à nobis medicinaliter severa correptio, De correptione et gratia* xvi.49, *P.L.* 44:946, *Rebuke and Grace, Answer to the Pelagians,* 4:142.

In the Augustinian model, the institutional church was a comprehensive body. It included within itself not only a certain number of the self-consciously faithful but also many others. Some of these (former Donatists, for example) had been forced to join, but all were subject to the church's discipline. So the "true" Christians who had already been brought to faith were invariably mixed with unbelievers. Some of those had yet to accept the full responsibility of church membership; others would never believe. Augustine treated the church, in the words of Peter Brown, "as essentially a community made up of two layers … a large, even a predominant, element of seemingly intractable human material, surrounding a core of "true" members.[10]

The process by which "true" members were admitted to Augustine's church at Hippo Regius reflected this understanding of the church. Not that he had designed that process; he inherited it and had experienced it himself during his childhood at Thagaste. The population of Hippo Regius included many non-Christians: so-called "pagans" as well as Jews. Non-Christians were welcome to attend services of Christian preaching, and in the spirit of enquiry some apparently did so. Alongside these stood two other groups: "true" church members and "catechumens" who were in the process of being prepared for the baptism that would initiate them into membership. Infant baptism in late fourth- and early fifth-century North Africa was uncommon; only children in danger of dying would ordinarily be brought to the sacrament. Augustine had once been such a child; during an illness his mother had considered an emergency baptism. But he recovered, and she deferred.[11]

After declaring his intent to a priest, an enquirer entered the catechumenate (Gk. *katechesis* = instruction) through a solemn ceremony that included the priest's delivering a catechetical lecture and performing four separate rituals over each individual inquirer: making the sign of the cross, laying on hands, exorcising (by "breathing out" the evil spirits which were thought to reside within the enquirer), and celebrating "the sacrament of the salt" (whose nature remains unclear). From then on, the catechumen was expected to instruct him- or herself by attending sermons. One could remain in the catechumenate for years, and many would, sometimes postponing baptism until their deathbed.

Once having undergone the solemn rite of baptism, a church member who fell into serious sin risked excommunication and social ostracism. For

---

10. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 223

11. This brief account of the initiation process in Augustine's Church is drawn from F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1961), ch. 12 "Becoming a Christian"; for Monica's decision, *Confessiones* I.xi.17–18, *P.L.* 32:668–69, *Confessions*, 50–52.

that reason, nominal Christians would take the step to full membership only after considerable deliberation and resolution. After catechumens had made the choice to proceed, usually just before the Lenten season, they took on the status of *competentes* ("those seeking together"). Baptism was ordinarily administered just once a year as part of the evening vigil before Easter Sunday. During the seven weeks of Lent, the *competentes* prepared for that awesome sacrament. They fasted, underwent further instruction, were again exorcised of Satan and all his servants, and by a procedure called *scrutinium* were questioned—"in the night" on several occasions before the entire congregation—about their conduct and their resolve to undergo baptism. They were taught the creed and the Lord's Prayer (sacred texts kept from them as catechumens) and required to memorize them and keep them in their hearts. Finally they gained access to the sacrament of baptism, were received into full membership, and were welcomed at the Eucharistic meal. It was the church's practice to dismiss catechumens and non-Christians at the conclusion of the sermon; only the baptized saints (as Christians were called in Augustine's day) would remain for the mystery of the Eucharist.[12]

To summarize: Augustine's congregation was not one undifferentiated body. There were several degrees of affiliation: those "enquiring" or merely curious, those active or inactive in preparing for baptism, and those fully initiated in the church's mysteries. Could she have been a fly on the wall as enquirers underwent the rituals admitting them to the catechumenate, an observer would have watched the church passing judgment on prospective members' knowledge of the Christian faith, critiquing their everyday behavior, and weighing the degree of their commitment to undertake the responsibilities of full church membership.

During the eleven and a half centuries between Augustine's lifetime and that of William Perkins, the Constantinian settlement took full hold on Western Europe. For all practical purposes, church membership became automatic. The inhabitants of Perkins's Cambridge were each assigned to a particular parish and (except in unusual circumstances) taken to be baptized as infants in their parish church. They were expected to attend its services, be catechized by its minister (often in the small room above the north entrance), commune at least once a year, and pay a tithe of their income to support its activities.

---

12. A number of the sermons that Augustine preached *in traditione symboli*, to "hand along" the Creed, have survived; see *Sermones CCXII–CCXV* and *Sermo CCXVI Ad competentes, P.L.* 38:1058–84, *Sermons*, trans. Edmund Hill, O/ P., *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, III/6 (New Rochelle: New City Press, 1993), 136–76. *Sermo CCXVI* refers to exorcism and the *scrutinium*.

While an unknown number of unreconstructed Catholics might secretly or openly resist the church's teaching, and while a few clandestine members of the Family of Love might interpret the preacher's teaching in unorthodox ways, no large group of pagans remained beyond its influence, and no class of "catechumens" moved painstakingly toward baptism.[13] Just as it had been before the Reformation of King Henry VIII, the late sixteenth-century Church of England was theoretically comprehensive: every English man and woman was assumed to belong. Perkins and similar thinkers therefore faced the challenge of accommodating extreme Augustinianism to a church-model very different from Augustine's.

Like Augustine, Perkins had no illusions about the spiritual state of those in his congregation. He found the same large element of "seemingly intractable human material" in the Church of England that Augustine had found in the diocese of Hippo Regius.[14] But while the rigorous process of initiation in Augustine's Hippo kept most of this element away from the Church's mysteries, the Church of England admitted all and sundry. Forced to defend this situation, Perkins fell back on the distinction between the secret "will of God's pleasure" (*voluntas beneplaciti*) and the portion of God's will that God had chosen to reveal to human beings (*voluntas signi*). God's ministers based their preaching on the *voluntas signi*; their charge was to proclaim God's promises to every man, woman, and child. But only a fraction of those who heard the ministers' preaching were actual or potential saints, and God alone knew who belonged to that fraction. Because God had chosen them through his *voluntas beneplaciti*, he knew by a "judgment of secret and infallible certainty" (*iudicium occultæ & infallibilis certitudinis*), completely hidden from human beings, who among the members of the Church of England would actually be saved. But the Church of England itself, forced to rely on God's *voluntas signi*, would use an entirely different standard. Its yardstick would be "the charitable judgment of Christians" (*iudicium charitatis Christianorum*).[15]

---

13. On the clandestine presence of Familists, see Christopher Marsh "The Gravestone of Thomas Lawrence Revisited (or the Family of Love and the Local Community in Balsham, 1560–1630)," in *The World of Rural Dissenters, 1520–1725*, ed. Margaret Spufford (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 208–34; and "Piety and Persuasion in Elizabethan England: The Church of England Meets the Family of Love," in *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (London: UCL Press, 1997), 141–65.

14. In his *Godly and Learned Exposition or Commentarie vpon the three first Chapters of the Revelation*, Perkins claimed that "the greatest part" of the members of particular churches served God only in appearance. *Works*, 3:*316, see also 278, 280.

15. Perkins, *De Prædestinatione*, 82–83, *Treatise of Predestination, Works*, 1:624, commenting on the chapters of *De correptione et gratia* cited above. For another explanation of God's

With respect to Church membership, then, only God with his judgment of certainty would know which members of the congregation were members in his own reckoning (*membra coram Deo*), "true" church members (*membra vera*). The Church of England, using the judgment of charity, could only pass judgment on whether someone was an "apparent" member (*membrum apparens*), a "member before other people" (*membrum coram hominibus*). The members before other people would inevitably include many who were reprobate; in God's eyes they were no more a part of the true church than a wooden leg was a true part of a human body.[16] But the church, leaving secret judgments to God, was permitted "charitably to thinke, that al those, that liue in the Church of God, professing themselves to be members of Christ, are indeede elect to saluation." "Concerning the persons of those that be of the Church," continued Perkins, "wee must put in practice the iudgement of charitie, & that is to esteeme of them as of the elect of God till God make manifest otherwise."[17] No human being had a right, he argued, to pass judgment that another was a reprobate. Christians were to follow "the rule of love which is to thinke and wish the best of others." "Not knowing his secret counsell," God's ministers ought "in charitie [to] thinke all to be elect."[18]

Perkins explained that the Church of England was by necessity a "mixt and compounded companie of men: not of one sort, but true beleeuers and hypocrites mingled together." He could compare that Church to "a barne store, where is both wheate and chaffe," "a corne field where there is both tares & good corne," "a draw net, wherein is both good fish and bad," "a stocke of sheep mingled with goats."[19] But unlike Augustine, Perkins had to defend a system where no serious effort was made to exclude large groups of men and

---

absolute and revealed wills, see Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:131. On the judgment of charity, see Tipson, "Invisible Saints."

16. *non magis sunt membra Christi quam … lignea tibia corpori artificiosé affixa*, Perkins, *Armilla Aurea*, 234–35, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:78; see also *Armilla Aurea*, 345, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:109; *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:304; *Commentary on Galatians, Works*, 2:311; *De Prædestinatione*, 138, *Treatise of Predestination, Works*, 2:636.

17. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:282, 290, see also 190; and *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:105.

18. *Iudicium de cuiusquam reprobatione nullum faciendum est, Armilla Aurea*, 357, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:113; *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:190, 290, 297. See also *Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:105 and 195; and *Commentary on the First Three Chapters of the Revelation, Works*, 3:*336 and 308 for further discussion of the judgment of charity. Luther had made a similar distinction between the *canon charitatis* and the *canon fidei* in *De Servo Arbitrio, W.A.* 18:651–52, *Bondage of the Will*, 122–23.

19. *Cloud of Faithful Witnesses, Works*, 3:*16; *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:263.

women from church membership. Everyone who lived within the defined boundaries of a parish was presumed to be a member of that parish church. Although Archbishop Thomas Cranmer was himself largely sympathetic to the Augustinian program, he and the other authors of the *Book of Homilies* had decided at the outset that the ministers of the Church of England would construct their sermons on the assumption that every Church member had been predestined to salvation.[20]

Since parishioners overwhelmingly entered the Church of England through baptism as infants, nothing in the parishes of Perkins's Cambridge corresponded to the rigorous stages of initiation which Augustine took for granted. The occasional foreign visitor might attend as an enquirer; older boys and girls, at least in theory, would attend catechetical instruction; but the visible divisions in an English parish were based on social class rather than fervency of belief. Families jealously guarded prominent pews. When churchwardens faced the task of assigning pews in a newly constructed or reconstructed sanctuary, everyone took for granted that the most prestigious pews would be assigned to the most important families.[21] There was no visible differentiation of church members based on their likelihood of being saved.

Godly church members chafed under the parish structure. They made strenuous efforts to identify those most and least likely to be part of the elect remnant. Perkins conceded that individual parishioners' obstinate refusal to hear and obey the Word of God was "a feareful signe that God will at length destroy them." He allowed that painful preaching might act as a threshing "fanne" which could begin to separate the "wheate" from the "chaffe."[22] But because he did not challenge the parish structure, he had to admit that any such separation could not be complete before the last judgment. An observer would find nothing in the initiation of new members or in the organization of the parish that might begin to identify those who were members of the "true" church. God's chosen were simply absorbed in the "apparent" church that included all and sundry.

How did an extreme Augustinian such as Perkins preach in such a church? How did he, a godly preacher faced with "mixt" hearers, bring the reality home

---

20. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 375. Luther took a similar view.

21. See, for example, Christopher Marsh, "Order and Place in England, 1580–1640: The View from the Pew," *Journal of British Studies 44* (2005): 3–26.

22. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:274, 263.

that many of them were basing their hopes for salvation on a false foundation? How did he propose to bring mere conformists to submit to the exacting demands of the godly gospel?

Perkins began with a simple assumption. Accepting the premise that he was obliged to preach as if every one of his parishioners had been elected, he confronted those parishioners with a reciprocal obligation. With church membership and presumed election, he insisted, came the requirement that members of his congregation convince themselves that they were personally predestined to salvation. "Euerie member of the Church is bound to beleeue his owne election." "No man can belieue himselfe to be a member of the Church, unlesse withal hee beleeue that he is predestinate to life euerlasting."[23] The Church of England cast a wide net, drawing in bad fish and good. Perkins commanded every one of those fish, every churchgoing inhabitant of every parish, not only to believe in Christ but also to believe that he or she personally had been chosen for salvation before the creation of the world. By this standard, little wonder that Perkins's experience taught him that only a minority of the apparent members of the Church of England would prove to be members *coram Deo*.

To those wresting with the "greatest" question any human being could face: "how a man may know whether he be the childe of God, or no," Perkins explained that membership in the Church of England could by itself give little comfort.[24] *Coram hominibus*, virtually everyone was included in the visible church. It was only what each member knew of her own heart that could give meaningful evidence about her status *coram Deo*.

Perkins did not defend an absolutely inclusive church; he was not prepared to invite every last Englishman to its most sacred rites. "Notorious offenders," he wrote, those who were "morally and spiritually vncleane," had to be "put back" from the Lord's Table.[25] But absent such negative evidence—evidence of obvious unworthiness—everyone should be invited to the sacraments. Children of believers (and all church members were obligated and assumed to believe) were "born holy and Christian" and thus to be baptized. Even the children of "wicked Christians," including children

---

23. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:290, 298, see also 282–83, *Armilla Aurea*, 327, *Golden Chaine, Works*, 1:104.

24. *A Case of Conscience, the GREATEST that ever was: how a man may know whether he be the childe of God, or no, Works*, 1:421.

25. *Clowd of Faithful Witnesses, Works*, 3:*154, *Commentary on Revelation, Works*, 3:*264, 296. Writing in the mid-seventeenth century, Giles Firmin recalled "old Divines" who would "keepe back, it may be halfe their Parish from the Lords Supper." *A Sober Reply to*

"borne in fornication," were to be baptized, for the church was bound to "not onely regard the next parents, but also the ancestours," who had presumably been better Christians.[26] He was similarly inclusive about admission to the Lord's Supper. A hearer who doubted the authenticity of his faith, who lacked "both the testimonie of Gods spirit, and his owne spirit," was nonetheless encouraged to participate in the Lord's Supper. Both he and the church would hope that God could choose to use the Supper as an occasion for the Spirit to convey grace and assurance, making it what New Englanders would later term a "converting ordinance."[27]

Perkins hoped and expected that hearers who took the minister's words to heart would soon recognize the precariousness of basing their claim to salvation on their simple membership in the Church of England. Serious hearers would respond to the minister's exhortations, examine their consciences, and seek expert advice from the minister or another visibly godly parishioner. If exposure to Perkins's extreme Augustinianism was more than casual, it would quickly lead a receptive parishioner to conclude that participation in "ceremonies"—the official worship of the Book of Common Prayer—was scant evidence of "true" membership in the invisible church of God's elect.

As previous chapters have explained, those convinced of their election would inevitably come to form a "church within a church," and much of the history of English Puritanism in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries would center on the tactics through which a godly group created a separate identity within the larger parish structure.

Despite his respect for Perkins's teaching, Hooker—along with other idealistic young ministers of his generation—judged that Perkins had made unacceptable compromises with the parish structure of the Church of England. From the outset of his public ministry, Hooker parted with Perkins at two critical points. First, he was unwilling to base his preaching on the assumption

---

the Sober Answer of REVEREND Mr. CAWDREY (London, 1653), *Wing* F966, 2. During an outbreak of the plague in 1596–97, the godly minister Richard Leake attributed the pestilence to God's anger at the practice of administering the sacrament to everyone without separating the ungodly from the godly, "the profane from the sound professor, the dogs and swine from the sincere and sanctified people of the Lord." *Foure sermons preached … within the baronrie of Kendall, and countie of Westmorland: immediately after the great visitation of the pestilence in the fore-sayd countie* (London, 1599), *NSTC* 15342, 42–48, cited in Mears, "Public Worship," 12. Members of the English Church at Amsterdam expected one of the pastors to visit them individually before they partook of the Lord's Supper, presumably to judge their worthiness, and this practice may have been widespread among the godly. Paget, *Answer to William Best*, 96.

26. *Commentary on Galatians, Works*, 2:204, 263–64.

27. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works*, 1:287.

that all of his Chelmsford parishioners were elect. Second, he began to imagine how he could insist on positive evidence of authentic faith and obedience before admitting people to the sacraments. At both these points he was seeking to find a practice that was more consistent with the extreme Augustinianism he had learned at Cambridge than was the practice of Perkins, his great Augustinian predecessor.

At Chelmsford, as a Lecturer, Hooker was relieved of the necessity of administering either sacrament; so far as we know, he made no unusual efforts there to restrict access either to baptism or to the Eucharist. But no one can read the texts of his Chelmsford sermons without recognizing his primary purpose: challenging his hearers to recognize the state of their hearts and to identify themselves either as true or only apparent members of Christ. Did they serve Christ, or were they servants of sin and Satan? His sermons were designed to convince anyone who refused to take up the challenge of exact submission to his gospel that they belonged in the "carnal," "worldly," self-deceived group of parishioners whose behavior was hateful to God.

When Hooker thought of "the church," he was not inclined to include those parishioners; he defined the church as "the company of the faithfull which serve God in uprightnesse of heart." Baptism brought virtually all English children into the institutional church, what he called "the politick body of Christ," but Hooker's ideal of the church would be Christ's "mysticall body," which required repentance and faith from its participants.[28]

Everywhere they looked, godly people found evidence that many fellow parishioners had no business imagining that they were headed for heaven. With respect to behavior that could be observed, godly doctrine followed common sense: people were considered "good" or "bad" because they behaved well or badly before others. Like every Protestant minister, Hooker never tired of insisting that good faith inevitably produced a good life: "if you had a good heart, you would have a good life, and a good tongue. ... There must be an expression of inward goodness of the heart, by the outward conversation."[29] Drunkards, adulterers, and cheating merchants revealed the state of their hearts by their sinful behavior. Those who prayed in their families, observed fasts, meditated daily, and attended conferences belonged, or aspired to belong, to the godly group. Observable evidence would rarely be lacking that someone had made the transition from worldly to godly.

---

28. SIng 5; CTCL 294–95.

29. FC 200–201.

But Hooker went further. His English sermons demonstrate that he and his company had taken positive steps to institutionalize this transition. They had found practical ways to mark a hearer's entrance into the godly "church with the [parish] church." Responding to the question how a parishioner who doubted his worthiness to receive the Lord's Supper—the very issue on which New England church membership would turn—should proceed, Hooker explained that he should make a "relation" of his spiritual estate to a godly minister:

> He must openly, nakedly, plainly, and to the full lay open his estate unto some faithfull, judicious, and holy-hearted Minister; and *if upon sincere relation of his estate*, the Minister, out of the Word, shall answer all the objections that he can make against himselfe, and is able to give, out of his owne relation, arguments to convince him, then is hee bound to submit unto the Word, and to addresse himselfe unto the partaking of the Sacrament.[30]

At the invitation of Francis Drake, Hooker had come to Esher with a "new answering method" which he used on Joanna Drake in an attempt to lift her out of her spiritual doldrums.[31] The minister would encourage a doubting Christian to describe as fully and frankly as possible the state of her soul, and he would listen carefully. As a member of the Church of England, the doubting Christian would not only be eligible to receive the sacrament but would also be expected to do so at least annually. But Hooker was using a higher standard. Did she believe, and had she repented of past sins? Her faith might be weak and the power of remaining corruption strong, but if a minister could answer all her objections and give "out of [her] own relation" convincing arguments that she had met the standards, she was "bound" to commune.

Hooker put his method to use on many other occasions. Cotton Mather writes that he gained a reputation with "the Godly Ministers round about the Countrey" as someone who could resolve "*Difficult Cases,*" and Perkins had already defined anxiety over salvation as the greatest case of conscience "that ever was."[32] His hearers, lay and clerical, apparently took for granted that there would be situations where someone in doubt of her election would "relate" her "estate," would describe her inner life, to a minister. As an anxious parishioner

---

30. PP 370–71; emphasis added.

31. *Trodden Down Strength*, 120.

32. *Piscator* 11 {*Magnalia* 1:336}.

described what she hoped were experiences of grace, Hooker expected a minister to look for the evidence of the contrition and humiliation that would suggest a will desperate for Christ's help, a heart "framed" toward God.

There is no evidence that ministers required such relations for membership in their holy conferences, nor any suggestion that relations were given in public. Godly ministers were prepared to exclude notorious evildoers from the Supper, but it is highly unlikely that they attempted a standard such as this.[33] What can be said is that Hooker had a mechanism in place, a mechanism he did not hesitate to use, to establish someone's godly credentials, to make a determination that her faith was either authentic or hypocritical.

This mechanism did not originate with Hooker. In the *Prophetica*, William Perkins had described what he called an *exploratio status*, a procedure whereby those who had fallen—into sin, into doctrinal error, or simply into doubt of their salvation—could have their estate privately vetted by a minister. During the *exploratio status* the minister, through judicious questions, was instructed to draw out from such anxious parishioners "whether they have a hatred of sin as it is sin, which is the foundation of repentance," and "whether they have or feel in their heart a desire to be reconciled with God, which is the ground of a lively faith."[34] The minister could then pass judgment on their spiritual estate.

Hooker had similar expectations for this private conference. The uncertain hearer would be directed to make "a sincere relation of his estate," exposing the deepest secrets of his heart. "Openly, nakedly, plainly, and to the full," the hearer would "lay open his estate unto some faithfull, judicious, and holy-hearted Minister." The hearer would be encouraged to overcome his natural reticence, reveal the depths of his prior sinfulness, describe what he hoped were signs of nascent grace, and wait anxiously for the minister's judgment of his status before God. Assuming that the minister was touched by the hearer's sincerity and his willingness to "take shame" in the minister's eyes,

---

33. Christopher Haigh, "Communion and Community: Exclusion from Communion in Post-Reformation England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History 51* (2000): 721–40, esp. pp. 728–29. Before leaving for New England, John Wilson challenged a would-be communicant in Sudbury "who had been absent, for some while among the Papists": "If you have Defiled your self with their worship and Way, and not Repented of it, by offering to partake, at this Time, in the Holy Supper with us, you will Eat, and Drink your own Damnation." Only if the man were clear in his own mind that he had not so "defiled" himself would Wilson allow him to receive the bread and wine. *Memoria Wilsonia* 32 {*Magnalia* 1:316}.

34. *an habeant vel sentient in corde desiderium reconciliatonis cum Deo, quod viuæ fidei principium est*, *Prophetica*, 100, *Arte of Prophesying*, *Works*, 2:667. In his *Commentary on Revelation*, Perkins spoke of "regenerate" Christians "who haue giuen good testimonies of their vocation." *Works*, 3:*308.

the minister would make every effort to uncover hopeful signs of God's favor. Once the minister had heard the relation, in fact, it would be his primary task to "answer all the objections that [the hearer] can make against himselfe" and then "to give, out of his [the hearer's] owne relation, arguments to convince him, then is hee bound to submit unto the Word, and to addresse himselfe unto the partaking of the Sacrament." Exact day-to-day behavior would over-rule a hearer's admission that he had not sensed God's grace: "if a man that walkes exactly before God, cannot see the power of grace, that helps him so to do; it is certain, this cannot hinder him from the right of comming to the Sacrament."[35]

In another lecture, Hooker revealed more of his pastoral approach in such examinations:

> let it be in case of Conscience a poore soule comes to anguish of spirit, the onely way to set this man on foote againe, is to answer all his objections and questions; and resolve all his doubts, and to make the way good and the case cleare. ... And in the way of examination, if a man came to examine a sinner, he takes away all his cavils, and all his carnall shifts, that he hath to hinder the word, and forces the soule to say, It is Gods word, though he will not entertaine it.[36]

While it was the minister's goal "to set this man on foote againe" and "to make the way good and the case cleare," the goal could not be achieved unless the minister first removed "all his cavils, and all his carnall shifts" to enable him to see sin with the proper eyes. Only when the man's conscience was convinced of the binding force of God's rule and of his own sinfulness in disobeying it, so that he was resolved in the future not to "flinch out from the ordinances of God," could the minister end the examination with a word of comfort.

Nor was it enough to judge a hearer's sincerity. A "terrified hypocrite" could fool himself into thinking his faith was authentic. "This poore creature may in his owne sense and feeling apprehend and thinke, that he doth renounce all sinne truly, and that he puts the highest esteeme and greatest account upon the Lord Jesus Christ above all things in the world." Unless the minister were "very wise in charitie," he could easily be deceived as well.[37]

---

35. PP 370–71, 346.

36. SP 62–63.

37. SEC 180.

It would be surprising if such private conferences were not occurring regularly in Hooker's Chelmsford. To be touched by Hooker's preaching was to begin to take stock of one's previous life. Hooker's lectures were filled with instructions for self-examination, designed to prepare his hearers for a godly life through contrition and humiliation for their sinfulness. But despite the best of instructions, not every hearer would proceed exactly as Hooker might have wished. He plainly found some of his hearers letting themselves off too leniently. Others, overcome with despair at their newly examined wickedness, were judging themselves too harshly. It would be unusual if he had not urged those in doubt about their estate to confide personally in him. Hooker's own description put it best:

> A searching and *examining Heart*, that takes much paines with himselfe, trying his estate at Gods touchstone, desiring rather to bee deceived in any thing, than in the matter of his salvation; and because he knows other mens eyes may see more than his owne, hee desires that others that have more skill than himselfe, should judge of his estate, and therefore as the poore Countreyman carries his evidence to the Lawyer, to see if his title bee good or no; so hee doth earnestly desire that the Word may ransacke him to the bottome, and love such Preachers as dive and search most narrowly; he knowes what a waighty matter salvation is, and how easily hee may bee cozened by the Devill and his owne deceitfull heart, and how many thousands have miscarried therein; therefore he cares not what paines hee spend that way, that hee may be sure to bee right, *Lam.* 3.48.[38]

Did these relations always remain private? One might assume that they did, but an intriguing passage in one of Hooker's Chelmsford lectures suggests that he sometimes encouraged hearers to share their spiritual condition with the rest of the congregation. As he came to the conclusion of one of the sermons preserved in print as *The Unbeleevers Preparing for Salvation*, the temperature of Hooker's rhetoric rose, and he urged his hearers to testify to their faith before the entire congregation:

> let every soule resolve that hath heard mee this day, that they will have Christ, and let them take heede that they never start backe from him, and *say to your soules before so many witnesses in the Congregation, the*

---

38. PHH 48–49.

Lord called and asked whither I would have him? and I answered, I was willing.[39]

What might it have meant for Hooker's hearers to say to their souls before so many witnesses in the Congregation that Jesus had "called" them? One cannot be entirely sure, but it certainly appears that Hooker and his Chelmsford congregation had devised something similar to an "altar call." Hearers who believed that they could sense God working within their hearts were identifying themselves as he spoke, identifying themselves in a manner that the rest of the congregation could observe, could "witness." The "precise" ones among his hearers would presumably have been on the lookout for such behavior, and as the sermon reached its climax, have recognized those touched by the preacher's words as potential converts to their "exact" discipline.

Should we think of this as a sort of "proto-relation," practiced while Hooker's company was still in old England? This elusive remark, for which no parallel exists in Hooker's other published sermons, will not allow us to go so far. It suggests only that the godly element within his congregation was making an assumption. Godly laypeople were assuming that they could recognize other hearers who were in the throes of deciding whether to answer Christ's call, and assuming that they could pass at least superficial judgment upon the experiences of those who shared them so publicly. Some would-be converts were not only describing their experiences in detail to the minister in private but also at least briefly to the congregation in public.

We can conclude with a good deal more certainty, on the other hand, that Hooker was in the habit of conducting private counseling sessions with anxious hearers to pass judgment on their spiritual estate. During such sessions, the hearers were giving a description of their struggles to believe and their efforts to avoid sin and were providing other relevant evidence of the work of grace within them. Both Hooker and his great theological mentor used the verb "relate" to describe what the anxious hearers were doing, so it is not stretching matters to classify them as "relations." But unlike the later practice in the Bay Colony, these were to a minister, not to the entire body of the godly.

One can easily overemphasize the importance of these private English relations and overlook the importance of their context. The anxious hearers were men and women who were making countless everyday choices, choices visible to the entire community, that identified them as godly or worldly. Among the

---

39. UP 80; emphasis added.

mass of ordinary believers, the godly already stood out. Hooker's preaching was designed to sharpen already visible distinctions.

Without question, Hooker and his hearers had recognized the basic assumption of the Augustinian model: some way must be found to begin to differentiate the "core of 'true' members" from the "element of seemingly intractable human material." They took for granted the existence of a distinctive group of saints within the "mixt" inclusive parish—the evidence was all around them—and were groping for a way to bring the distinction into the church building. Church law forbad them from doing what Augustine had done—actually restricting the most sacred rites to those whose faith and practice demonstrated that their church membership was more than "apparent"—but the logic of his model was driving them to develop mechanisms that more clearly separated sheep from goats. The private relation to the minister might reassure anxious saints and undermine false confidence; some sort of public testimony would allow the godly not only to identify one another but also to proclaim their faith to the entire community.

We know that Hooker presided over a community within a community in the area around Chelmsford. John Eliot's recollections of "a communion of Christians who held frequent communion together, used the censure of admonition, yea and of excommunication" could hardly be more explicit. The fragmentary nature of the surviving evidence will probably prevent us from ever knowing exactly what took place in Chelmsford, but it seems plain that the essential pieces were in place for what would become the practice of the Hartford Church. Once settled along the Connecticut River, Hooker and those members of his company who had joined him would be presented with the opportunity to tune the Augustinian model more precisely. At least in their own minds, they would remain attached to the institutional structure of the Church of England, but they were determined to rid that structure of impurities and to come as near as was possible in the wilderness to the church order of the New Testament.[40]

Like most of his colleagues in the Bay Colony, Hooker took for granted that there could be only one true church. All colonists, godly and worldly, would attend its services, voluntarily or by coercion. He agreed with the arguments

---

40. For the desire of godly ministers to return to the practices of the New Testament, see Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988). David Hall's authoritative *A Reforming People*, 115, grants that "exiles in the Netherlands" (such as Hooker and Hugh Peter) had attempted to put in practice a system of church government similar to what arose in New England, but he gives too little credit, it seems to me, to the influence of these earlier experiments.

of Augustine and Perkins that if the ungodly were forced to hear the word preached, God might use the occasion to change their hearts.

But he was also determined to undo for good the sort of compromises that Perkins had made in adapting his theology to the parish structure of the Church of England. Far too many English worshippers were granted the status of "apparent" members, members who might presume, and be presumed by the church, to be on the road to salvation. In Augustine's church, enquirers could only attain the status of *membra coram hominibus* after a prolonged period as catechumens. Before their Easter baptism, they would endure intense scrutiny from the congregation. Even then their final fate was far from guaranteed; at the last judgment, a full church member might still prove to be *membrum apparens* rather than *verum*.

But a large proportion of the citizens of Hippo Regius would not attain even that status; they had never survived the church's *scrutinium* and would not be considered even apparent members. Membership in the Church of England was far too easy, a birthright enjoyed by every citizen (recusant Catholics and the excommunicated excepted). Not only did this render the church intolerably impure, it also gave false security to the baptized but unconverted. More than many of his English colleagues, Hooker felt a pressing duty to the ungodly, a duty to make them aware in every possible way that they were not bound for salvation in their present state.[41] In England he could make this a central theme of his preaching; in Hartford he could bar the ungodly from full participation in the church's ordinances. Just as Augustine's church had reserved the sacraments to those who had demonstrated their worthiness through a rigorous process of initiation, so would the church at Hartford.

Just as in old England, the church's judgment of charity would govern the worthiness of any candidate for full church membership. No more than in Augustine's Hippo Regius or Perkins's Cambridge would the godly in Hartford imagine they could judge prospective members by the *iudicium occultæ et infallibilis charitatis*, and so they could never presume to know whether anyone who passed their scrutiny was a *membrum verum* or merely a *membrum apparens*.[42] But Hooker and his company completely redefined the function of the *iudicium charitatis*, which for Perkins had justified including every English man and women into the visible church. The *iudicium charitatis* would now stand as a gate which the church would open only to those who met its standards. In

---

41. Edmund Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, 175, op cit.

42. CTCL 229: "of another mans estate before God, no man can judge with a judgement of certainty."

England those who identified themselves as godly had functioned informally as an "invisible" church within a more comprehensive "visible" church; in New England the distinction would be formal. Only the visibly godly would be allowed the status of *membrum apparens*. As in Augustine's Hippo, others would be exposed to its preaching but barred from its sacraments.

Augustine had not had to develop his own standards for church membership. Although he probably made minor modifications, he adopted the system in which he had grown up. Given the chance to develop standards from scratch, Perkins might well have constructed a system closer to the Augustinian model than the one in which he grew up. Hooker and his colleagues along the Connecticut River were given that chance. Without external constraints, how might a group of godly Christians, who had constituted themselves as a church, decide who was worthy to join them? What standards ought they to use? By what process should the church apply those standards? In particular, should the ministers play the primary role in assessing the worthiness of candidates, or should that responsibility be shared with lay members? On Hooker's answers to these questions we can speak with some confidence, for the surviving evidence is abundant.

To take the last question first, Hooker and his company were confident that experienced saints could "tel how to judg." The process of passing judgment on the presence or absence of grace in prospective candidates could involve laypeople. Just as a self-appointed group of godly parishioners in Chelmsford had helped determine who belonged among their number, the godly in New England were competent to exercise the judgment of charity. While not every saint would know the exact moment of his regeneration, he could always "give such proper and special evidence, such never failing and infallible fruits of this work, that they may undoubtedly discover to others, and ascertain to his own soul, that the stroke is struck indeed." "Carnal men," on the other hand, could "have no discerning, or right Judgment of a Spiritual Condition, either their own, or others."[43]

More complicated were the standards. To repeat once more, the Hartford church never claimed to duplicate God's standards, to judge by the *iudicium occultæ et infallibilis certitudinis*. "It is impossible," stressed Hooker, "for the eye of man to search into heart secrets, and inward sincerity." The church would

---

43. CCLP 80; AR 10: 376; CCLP 409. Perkins had been more cautious about laypeople's ability to judge: "other Christians being priuate men, though they be sanctified, & haue a good measure of knowledge, yet haue they not the same *spirit of discerning*, that godly Ministers haue." *Of the Calling of the Ministerie, Two Treatises, Works*, 3:*437. For an extended discussion of lay involvement in the churches of England and New England, see Francis Bremer,

proceed "according to the lawes and limits of rationall charity." In evaluating the validity of a candidate's profession of faith, members of the church were free to make a judgment on the sincerity as well as the orthodoxy of that profession, but only on "*sincerity*, so far as the judgement of *rationall charity* shall require."[44]

At Hartford, the critical standards were visible repentance, profession of faith, and willingness to submit to God's rule. Candidates ought to be admitted, wrote Hooker, "who expressing their repentance, with their profession of the truth, ingage themselves to walk in the waies of God, and in the truth of his worship."[45] What precisely did these terms mean?

Hooker defined the word "profession" broadly enough to include all three standards:

1. *PROFESSION* in the most frequent and familiar apprehension, signifies *the publike manifestation of our assent to the doctrine of Faith, as in the word delivered and received by us, and our resolution to persist in the maintainance of the same.* And then it is commonly used in a way of distinction from *PRACTICE.*
2. *Profession is yet larger*, and includes also a *sutable carriage in the life,* so far as the profession which is made, is *void of scandalous courses.*
3. As *Profession* must not be too narrow, so we must be carefull not to make it too broad, as to exact more then is competible [*sic*] in truth unto it. Namely *Such a profession of the faith and assent to the doctrine of truth, is not here exacted, as that a person should not be counted to hold forth a profession of the faith that* (happily through ignorance and mistake) *shall hold something differing from the truth, and from the apprehensions of many other both persons or Churches which professe the same.*[46]

By this definition, profession included three elements: a declaration of the doctrine to which one "assented," a resolution to continue in that assent, and visible behavior compatible with that resolution and "void of scandalous courses."[47] Hooker explicitly expected the church to pass judgment on the

---

"To Taste the Preciousness of Each Other's Experiences": Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism (Manchester, England: University of Manchester Press, 2015).

44. SSCD 2:18, 3:22.

45. SSCD 1:36–37.

46. SSCD 1:60–61.

47. Sargent Bush understands Hooker's catechism, *An Exposition of the Principles of Religion*, as having been written at Hartford in an effort to influence the Westminster Assembly,

sincerity with which a candidate's profession was presented; church members were to anticipate a "profession which intimates sincerity" even as they recognized that in judging sincerity, the church—as opposed to God—could "judge *the tree* (onely) *by the fruits.*"[48]

Further, Hooker had found that even those who did know, or believed they knew, could often find their tongues tied when speaking before the assembled congregation. He gave his most extended justification for not requiring a relation when he commented on the apostle Paul's forbidding women from speaking in church.[49] It was true that Paul had forbidden women from teaching in church, Hooker explained, but there were other occasions when it was appropriate for them to speak. Those who had been censured by the church, for example, might "give in *testimony of repentance*," because such testimony would "argue *subjection*, and so suit with their sexes."

Making a relation of one's experience of grace before the congregation was something else again. Hooker knew that many women had "the precious work of saving grace in their hearts" but still found it difficult or impossible to make a public relation. "We find it by experience," he wrote, that "the feeblenesse of some, their shamefac't modesty and melanchollick fearfulnesse is such, that they are not able to expresse themselves in the face of a Congregation." As a result, the elders were "forced to take the *expressions of such in* private, and *make report of them to the Congregation.*" The elders would present ample evidence to the assembled church members, and the women were spared the trial of a public profession.

Believing that such a procedure was "warrantable" for women, Hooker and Stone simply took the logical next step and extended it to every prospective church member, "so that the infirmities of the weakest may be releeved, and the seeming exceptions of others also may be prevented."[50]

Absence of any of these standards could trump the presence of the others. A "common and ordinary drunkard" might profess the faith, be "eager after the seals," and "most desirous of society within the Church," but her visible behavior would nonetheless disqualify her.[51]

"Thomas Hooker and the Westminster Assembly," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 29 (1972): 291–300. I prefer an English origin and a more practical purpose: to catechize prospective church members.

48. AR 10:375; SSCD 3:22.

49. 1 Cor. 14:34–35; cf. 1 Tim. 2:11–15.

50. SSCD 3:6. It is possible to read this passage as referring only to every prospective *female* church member. In view of other evidence, however, one can conclude that Hooker was referring to both men and women here.

51. SSCD 1:33.

Just as revealing is a standard the church was not to employ: "astonishing terrors … fleshy and groundless inlightenings and raptures." Candidates were not expected to relate a liminal "conversion experience" upon which confidence of election could be based. Hooker wrote famously that

> there be many truly and savingly called, who *never knew the time and manner of their conversion*, and **therefore cannot relate it unto others**, and yet express the power of grace in their lives, and consequently had it effectually wrought in their hearts, though they did not *at the first* know how the spirit breathed in their birth.[52]

Just as in Old England, membership in the godly fraction of society would be determined primarily by how one lived from day to day.

When he asked himself (in good Ramist fashion) "*What is the rule*" governing the church's decision whether to admit a candidate, he answered "if a person live *not in the commission of any known sin*, nor *in the neglect of any known duty*, and *can give a reason of his hope towards God*, this casts the cause, with judicious charity, to hope and beleeve there is something *of God and grace in the soul*, and therefore fit for Church-society."[53] Did a candidate submit, day in and day out, to the rigorous demands of the Rule? Did the church, unable to know any person's inmost motivations, find the candidate's behavior "exact," "precise"? It was impossible for an observer to determine whether any person's heart was thoroughly "framed" to submit to the Gospel, but could the church see whether she was acting the way one would act if her actions issued from a framed heart?[54]

Hooker's expectations can be further deduced from his controversy with the English Baptist John Spilsbery. As part of his argument in favor of the necessity of infant baptism, Hooker described the standards for admission to the church's two sacraments. Since access to the Supper was restricted to full church members, the requirements for admission to the Lord's Supper were in practice identical to those for church membership. But baptism, too, had its standards; "men of years" who applied to be baptized would find themselves

---

52. CCLP 81; SSCD 3:5; bold added; see also AR 10:376.

53. SSCD 3:5.

54. Preface to Fresh Suit (:) (:) 4ᵛ–A1ʳ "for the lives of men are like living books, which a wise man will serch into, & observe." SEC 463: "he that hath so much faith in his heart, must needs have a gracious and a godly life; if a man have much sap within, and no signe of it without, it is certaine it is not true faith."

faced with significant expectations. The Hartford church could reasonably require that adults asking to be baptized would

> be sensible of their sin and misery that attend upon them, and be will-ing and ready to bewaile their sin, and must be freely willing to know them, and know the manner of the committing of them, and confesse them after that manner, that the intelligent hearer, that is judiciously charitable, may think they have true repentance, that he may have good hope his heart is in such a frame of sorrow, as all may passe sentence upon reasonable charity; and then we may practice according to a rule, and not be misled; .... Secondly, They must not onely be sensible of their sin, but they must be sensible of their insufficiency to help them-selves, and be willing to yeeld to Christ to help them.[55]

If the church wished to "practice according to a rule," in other words, it would look for evidence of contrition and humiliation. Was a candidate's heart rightly prepared; did it have a "frame of sorrow"? Was that sorrow accompanied by a recognition of his own incapacity and a willingness to rely entirely on God's grace? Only then could he be baptized.

But baptism was only "the entrance into [Christ's] family." There was "much more to be looked at, to make a person capable of the supper of the Lord" and of full church membership. Specifically, "a man must be able to examine himself, he must not onely have grace, but growth of grace: he must have so much perfection in grace, as to search his own heart, and he must be able to *discern the Lords body*, or else, *he is guilty of the body and blood of Christ:* so as there is more required in this, for there must be a growth." Later in the same treatise Hooker referred once more to the Lord's Supper as "a sacrament of growth."[56]

The separate Hartford standards for admission to adult baptism and to the Lord's Supper help us to understand what it took to become a full church member. Hooker's standards for adult baptism required evidence of "contri-tion" and "humiliation." Assuming with the judgment of charity that the can-didate's "frame of sorrow" was genuine and not hypocritical, Hooker would presumably then have concluded that the Spirit was already working within the candidate's heart to reorient it toward submission to the rule. In other words, though her faith may have been "weak," and though she herself might

---

55. CGO 21–22.

56. CGO 21, 79.

not yet have perceived any belief, the candidate, to the judgment of charity, would be regenerate.

Why then not admit her immediately to the Lord's Supper? What further evidence was required? In Hooker's words, what was needed was "growth in grace," "perfection in grace." Newly baptized applicants for full membership would have to be observed over time. Did they persist in submitting to the rule? Were they constant in behaving like someone whose heart was framed? Did they, so far as their neighbors could tell, progress from a "weak" toward a "strong" faith?

Embedded in these standards was a realistic recognition that initial impressions, no matter how conscientiously gained, might be mistaken. Too much was at stake, both for the church and for the applicant, to base a final decision on less than prolonged observation of a candidate's mode of life.[57]

All this was consistent with the Augustinian assumption that divine activity within the human soul would almost always be mysterious and beneath perception. "So marvelous, secret, and unsearchable are the Dispensations of the Spirit unto the Soul," explained Hooker, "the hidden Mysteriousness of the manner of the Spirits work in the truth of it … so hard to discern, that to make any approach so as to discover the way of God … is more than ordinarily difficult."[58] With so much at stake, it was far better for the church to base its judgment on what members could search: visible behavior over a good period of time. "Let men be Probationers in our apprehensions," he concluded, "let them proceed in a fearful and painful way to make proof of the inward disposition of their hearts, by their outward practices in a constancy of an holy conversation."[59]

What was the process by which candidates applied for and gained admission? "The person that desires to joyn himself Member with the Church," explained Hooker, would begin by making his desire known to a layman: the

---

57. Giles Firmin recounts an occasion where he heard Hooker tell a group of ministers to distrust the kind of histrionics that might accompany a relation and to look instead for the person "who tells you plainly what God hath done, but he cannot shed tears as the other, but yet proves the better Christian." *Real Christian*, 86.

58. AR 1:34. Contrast this with John Wesley's conviction a century later that "by 'the testimony of the Spirit' I mean an inward impression on the soul, where by the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God." *John Wesley*, ed. Albert Outler, 211. By "immediately" Wesley asserts that the Spirit communicates without any "means," such as a person's hearing a promise of Scripture and believing herself to be included in it.

59. AR 10:356; see also SSCD 1:28.

Ruling Elder or Elders.[60] On this person or persons would fall the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's fitness. "It's peculiar to his Office to lead the action of Admission." The Ruling Elder's (for the purposes of discussion assuming only one) task was to gather evidence. He would investigate "the *uprightnesse of the persons carriage* and conversation" by gathering testimony from friends and acquaintances, and by conferring with the candidate to discern "his knowledge and acquaintance ... with the things of Christ and his Kingdom." Through this process the Ruling Elder was to "discern, *whether he be a visible Saint to the judgment of reasonable charity*."

Only when this layperson had made a positive judgment would he propound the candidate's desire for membership to the full Church, "that *they* also may *use their best information* by their own experience, and take in the consideration of others, to be fully informed and satisfied, touching the unblameableness of [the candidate's] conversation." In other words, full Church members would have an opportunity to bring their knowledge of the candidate's behavior to bear on their judgment of a candidate's worthiness, but only after the Ruling Elder had reached a preliminary decision. What Hooker explicitly forbade them to do was conduct a separate investigation of a candidate's experience of conversion. "That the Members should at severall times, by several companies, repair in *private* to them, to examine the *work & manner of their conversion*, I am afraid it is a *presumed kinde of liberty*, which wants precept and example, for any thing that ever appeared to me in the Scripture."[61] It was the Ruling Elder's prerogative—not the congregation's—to confer with the candidate and to discern "*whether he be a visible Saint.*"

Most importantly, Hooker stated plainly that "the stresse of the tryall," "the last resolution of judicious and reasonable charity ... whether a person be a

---

60. The following discussion of admissions procedures draws largely on SSCD 3:4–7.

61. Laypeople at some of the churches in the Bay must have been doing precisely this, which might help explain the reports reaching England that Hooker preached against strict admissions practices in the Bay. "Letter from Robert Stansby to John Winthrop, April 17, 1637," in *Winthrop Papers*, 3:390. Cotton Mather noted that Hooker "kept the *Examination* of them [candidates] unto the *Elders* of the church, as properly belonging unto their *Work* and Charge" and that "he would have nothing publickly propounded unto the *Brethren* of the church, but what had been first privately prepared by the *Elders*"; implying that the Pastor, Teacher, and Ruling Elders kept ordinary church members at arm's length. *Piscator* 39, 38 {*Magnalia*, 349}. Hooker's contemporary Thomas Lechford gave a thorough account of church admission practices in Massachusetts Bay in *Plain Dealing, or News from New England*, ed. J. Hammond Trumbull (Boston: J. K. Wiggin and Wm. Parsons Lunt, 1867), 18–29. Ralph F. Young's helpful account of the influence of New England church admission practices on English Congregationalism, "Breathing the 'Free Aire of the New World,'" does not discuss the differences between Hartford and Massachusetts Bay.

visible Saint or no," did not rest on "the work and manner of their conversion." "All such pains misseth the end and fruit of it," he continued, because the judgment of charity would be made on a different basis altogether: whether candidates could "expresse the power of grace in their lives, and consequently had it effectually wrought in their hearts." The "stresse of the tryall" would be on the candidate's visible behavior, observed over a considerable period of time. Was it the kind of behavior that arose from a framed heart? From that behavior—"consequently"—the church would pass judgment on the likelihood that grace was present in the candidate's heart.[62]

If one of the full Members discovered some "scandal in [the candidate's] carriage" that the Ruling Elder had overlooked, she or he might confront the candidate, and if "no reality of satisfaction" was achieved, make a complaint to the Elder. This would "stay" the process. If after sufficient time "nothing scandalous" appeared, the candidate took the final step. "The person doth shortly *give some reason of his hope* in the face of the Congregation, & is admitted." From Hooker's description, it is difficult not to assume that once a candidate had reached this stage, giving a "reason of hope" was largely a formality, for he makes no mention of any further examination between this public performance and admission itself.

What did "giving a reason of hope" involve? Hooker's description in the *Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline* is vague, and nowhere did he describe the candidate's time before the full congregation in more detail. Fortunately, an account from Increase Mather informs us that it was the practice of the Hartford church to pose questions to the candidates before the full congregation, allowing all assembled to be edified by the candidate's answers. Mather, who was defending the practice of requiring relations of conversion for admission, tacitly admitted that "the Church at *Hartford* in Mr. *Hooker's* Time" did not require a relation. His son Cotton, another proponent of required relations, in speaking about candidates for membership at Hooker's Hartford, also admitted that "usually they only answered unto certain probatory *Questions*, which were tendered them."[63] It is not unreasonable to surmise that Hooker chose not to elaborate on what "giving some reason of hope" actually involved because he did not wish to expose differences between Connecticut and the Massachusetts Bay Colony to an English audience.

62. See AR 5:272: "Thus far indeed we may go without any breach of Charity, and the Word will give us sufficient warrant, to wit, Observing the lives of men."

63. Increase Mather, in Cotton Mather, *Magnalia* 4:159; see also 4:179, 3:66–67; *Piscator* 39 {*Magnalia* 1:349}.

Samuel Stone was even more outspoken in his opposition to requiring relations. In a manuscript "discourse against the binding Persons to make a Relation of the time & manner of there Conversion in order to there Admission into the Church," he insisted that the church was within its rights to require "Knowledge," manifested by "a Profession of the Principall Articles of the Creed."[64] The church could expect candidates to "profess thatt they look towards Christ alone for righteousness and life." If a candidate wished and the church consented, he might "relate … the great things that God hath don for him," but it was simply not within the church's right to require that relation. What the church was bound to require, in addition to "Knowledge," was "blamlesse life and conversation."

Stone admitted that visible behavior could be deceptive. Unworthy candidates would slip through. Using the example of Judas Iscariot, Stone argued that if Judas had applied for admission to a church, even though Christ would have known the deceitfulness of Judas's heart, the Rule would have bound Christ "to vote for his admission." Judas's knowledge and visible behavior would have satisfied the church's test. "Secret Wickedness" would disqualify a candidate only if the candidate decided on his own not to present himself for admission. If he chose to do so, the church was bound to judge on what it could observe, because "the Church Judgest not of secrets."

Stone's "Discourse" also reveals his discontent with what he had seen of relations in the Bay. He was troubled by two "abuses" in particular. Some relators might say too little, because even the truly godly might still have difficulty articulating their experience. Such people made "such poore relations that the hearts of understanding men are unsattsified & troubled." This would be especially true of those who were "converted by there parents in private instructions." Echoing Hooker, Stone argued that because their conversion had been "gradual," "they may say they are converted but the instant of their conversion they cannot declare."

Others would say too much, "will adventure on some things that are very unsafe, inconvenient and absurd." There was no knowing what an earnest layperson, untrained in formal theology, might say before the congregation. Better to entrust the process to the ruling elders and the professional clergy.[65]

---

64. The following discussion is based on Stone's Discourse.

65. Frank Shuffleton's judgment on why Hooker distrusted John Cotton's and the Boston Church's requirement of a relation is instructive: "Cotton's emphasis upon direct knowledge of Christ might lead to all sorts of direct revelations, inner voices, etc.—and did so lead Anne Hutchinson. It would also restrict participation in the church … to the most imaginative, hypersensitive, and introverted members of the community." *Thomas Hooker*, 249.

Inability to give a relation would clearly not disqualify a candidate from membership in the Hartford Church, because none was required. What would disqualify? Ungodly behavior: living "in known omissions of duty, or commission of sin," not being "willing to submit to the rules of Christ."

By restricting the investigation of a candidate's "knowledge and acquaintance … with the things of Christ and his Kingdom" to the Ruling Elder, a duty which in Hooker's judgment the Elder's office "bindes him unto," the Hartford admissions process forestalled the "curious inquisition and niceties" which unauthorized Church members might use in conducting their own separate investigations. By concentrating on visible sanctity that persisted over time, it minimized the danger that personal antagonisms—"those sottish pangs … when persons complain they *cannot joyn with such and such,* and yet cannot shew a just exception"—would compromise charitable judgment.

How did Hartford's membership standards then compare to those of Augustine's Hippo Regius and Perkins's Cambridge? In Hippo Regius, standards for reception of adult baptism were practically identical to standards for admission to the Supper. The *competentes,* once baptized, immediately participated in the Eucharist. Hooker and Stone, on the other hand, expected the church to observe the behavior of a baptized adult for a considerable period of time before she was ready for full church membership and participation in the Lord's Supper.

But given this difference, one cannot help but be struck by how Hartford's admission standards have abandoned Perkins's and moved close to those of Augustine. While obviously different in detail from the Lenten preparation of the *competentes,* the standards of the Hartford church were certainly intended to serve the same function as that preparation, especially the *scrutinium.* Only those could be admitted to the Lord's Supper who had demonstrated knowledge of doctrine, had made an appropriate profession of faith, had convinced an "intelligent hearer, that is judiciously charitable" that their repentance of sin was genuine, and whose visible behavior had been deemed acceptable to church members over a period of time. In Perkins's Cambridge, baptism was a birthright; the only *scrutinium,* and that largely ritualistic, was of the godparents of the infant being baptized.

Admittedly, most members of Hooker's church would have been baptized as infants in old England, and he insisted on baptizing the children of church members as infants as well. Serious judgment of such persons' qualifications occurred only before their admission to full church membership and the Lord's Supper. But one cannot fail to see a similar dynamic at work in Hippo and at Hartford.

One is equally struck by the degree to which Hartford practice existed in embryonic form in Hooker's Chelmsford. The "communion of Christians"

described by John Eliot had lacked only officers and sacraments; Hooker and Stone added them in. Once freed from episcopal oversight, Hooker's English "church within a church," defined by a well-established repertoire of godly practices, became "the church" at Hartford. Hooker's exile in Holland had given him a chance to work out the logical implications of what he had been doing in England, and he and Stone were merely waiting for the opportunity to put already formed ideas into practice.[66]

It is worth recalling that in the proper circumstances, Hooker held relations of a person's spiritual estate in high regard.[67] Not only did he encourage relations in appropriate situations both in his preaching and his practice, but he also had confidence that godly laypeople as well as clergy were capable of judging their validity. But unlike their counterparts in the Bay, Hooker and Stone made a conscious decision that it was not appropriate to require relations for church membership.

Conscientious application of what Hooker and Stone believed to be the appropriate "rule" for admitting church members allowed those members to build assurance on their participation in the sacraments. Only God's eternal election could finally distinguish the *membra vera* from the *membra apparens*, but by following what they believed to be his instructions, they had come as close as humans were permitted to the mind of God.

---

66. *Pace* Susan Hardman Moore, "Popery, Purity and Providence: Deciphering the New England Experiment," in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, ed. Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 257–89, at 281; and "New England's Reformation: 'Wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill, the Eies of all People are upon Us,' " in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 143–58, at 149, I see no need to argue that the colonists' "view of popery defined the kind of purity they looked for."

67. Giles Firmin's account of Hooker's remarks at a meeting of ministers, referenced in n. 56 above, seems to be describing a meeting at which Hooker took the validity of relations for granted. *Real Christian*, 86.

13

Concluding Reflections

IF THIS BOOK has achieved its purpose, the reader has come away with a deeper understanding of the place of Hooker and Stone both in early seventeenth-century England and New England and in the overall development of Protestant Christianity. Despite his notable idiosyncracies, Thomas Hooker emerges as firmly rooted in the godly culture of early Stuart England.[1] As a coda, I would like to comment briefly on some important issues that the previous chapters have tended to push aside.

In the first place, if English puritans like Perkins and Hooker were comfortable with the idea of someone's giving a "relation" of her experience, and if important churches such as those in Hartford and New Haven nonetheless did not require them for full membership, it may be time to take another look at the assumption that it was the requirement of a relation that best distinguished the "New England Way" from its English (and Anglo-Dutch) counterparts.[2] More broadly, one might ask whether the migration to New England had as great an effect on English Puritan theology and practice as is often assumed. Hooker's preaching before and after the migration provides important evidence to resolve the question whether the "free aire" of Connecticut (as imagined in Frederic Church's *Hooker and Company*) significantly changed the nature of his preaching, and it seems plain that it did not.[3] Apart from some toning down of his "popular" rhetoric, a comparison of his Chelmsford lectures to the "re-preached" versions of those same lectures given at Hartford

---

1. Insightfully described in Webster, *Godly Clergy*.

2. As Francis Bremer does in "Not Quite So Visible Saints: Reexamining Conversion Narratives in Early New England."

3. I cannot resist citing Peter Brown on the influence of the desert on St. Anthony's development of monasticism. Brown writes, "The deep desert, the *Panerémos*, to which [Anthony]

finds almost no significant difference. Hooker did expand on some topics, and he made criticisms explicit that had previously been implicit (notably his critique of Jesuit/Arminian positions). The fundamental principles of his theology, however, remained consistent. This consistency will be less surprising when one remembers that he spent most of his professional life in England and was nearly 50—an old man by contemporary standards—when he first arrived in Hartford.

Even Hartford's ecclesiology appears to reflect the positions Hooker had worked out with Hugh Peter and William Ames in the Netherlands, for it was just at the time Hooker was leaving for the New World that Peter implemented virtually the same church order in his Rotterdam congregation that Hooker and Stone would later impose on Hartford's. If one remembers that the New England sermons were published without episcopal censorship and that the English sermons were published from hearers' shorthand notes, the slight theological shift that some scholars have observed from old to New England largely disappears.[4]

Not that a decade's further experience and his responsibilities in a new "plantation" had no effect at all on the content of Hooker's preaching. Most notably (as elaborated in chapter 10), the Hartford sermons explicitly allow the possibility of a person's coming to saving faith without experiencing God's terror:

> *Somtimes God keeps his by the strokes of his common Graces, restraining from scandalous evils, and constraining by means appointed and blessed to that end, the holy endeavors, the counsels and examples of Godly Parents, the society of such who are holy, the power of the Ordinances* under which they are bred and brought up, toling and tilling of their hearts and affections by many moral perswasions, to the love and liking of the excellency of a holy course, which he knows how to present, and by which to draw out the exercise of all those moral abilities they are endued withal, and at the last insensibly, and yet truly plucks them off from the root of old *Adam*, and implants into the true Vine Christ Jesus.[5]

---

retired later in his life created the asceticism of the fourth-century monks *as little as the inhospitable woods of the New World created the Puritanism of the Pilgrim Fathers. It only gave ascetics a new freedom with which to follow ideals and practices that they had taken with them into the desert from the churches of their villages." *The Body and Society*, 204–5; emphasis added.

4. E.g., Shuffleton, *Thomas Hooker*, 264, 254.

5. AR 10:375.

The comparable lectures (later published as *The Soules Preparation*), preached in England ten years earlier, did not explore the possibility of an insensible conversion.[6] The practical experience of presiding over Hartford's church membership procedures may well have led Hooker to recognize the limitations of the homiletics of fear.

A noticeable change of emphasis did occur during Hooker's final Hartford years. From about the middle of February 1638/9, Hooker seemed to become obsessed with disorder among the young. "Disobedient," "rebellious," "stubborn" children needed the restraint of their parents; "crooked," "careless," "stubborn," "rebellious," "self-willy" servants (often just a little older than the children) needed "ordering" and "subjection." Even "wives" had become "sharp," "perverse," and "froward." In every case, the remedy was submission and obedience to the appropriate authority, generally an adult male.

Was this the conventional reaction of an elderly preacher to youthful exuberance, or had Connecticut's adolescents suddenly become unusually restive? Whatever the provocation, Hooker's disapproval thundered from the pulpit: "[D]o not our plantations groan under such sons of Belial? Such senceless stocks do they not swarm in our streets? Are not our families pestered with such?" Unruly servants were the archetypical proud hearts who refused to be ashamed of their misdeeds, even quoting Scripture in their defense:

> so tel the rebellious servant of his or her rugged carriage, unruly language, that they have *tongues set on fire of hel*, unweariable in wording of it, slighting and gainsaying, *Titus.* 2.9. *Exhort servants to be obedient to their own masters to please them wel in al things, not answering again*; because they are stopped from answering frampfully, therefore they wil not modestly and in meekness of wisdom ask counsel and direction from a Governor … they flout the truth and cast it away in a scorn, as though they should say, you may see what sweet rules the scripture gives for the Government of servants.[7]

Whatever provoked these outbursts may also have caused Hooker to lump women with children and madmen as people unable to exercise power in the church. "Women, because of their sexe, and Children because of their weakness, and mad Men, because of their distempers, are disinabled, and so

---

6. SP 136–65.

7. AR 10:59, 104, 252–53, 321, 357, 371, 429, 594, 623, 653, 658–59, 683, 689–90, 694–95.

excluded this priviledge."[8] Hooker may well have become crankier with age, but such preaching plainly reflects the behavior of the patriarchal God he imagined, a strict parent who would withhold a sense of his favor from his child so as to "keepe him in a childe-like obedience."[9]

More unexpected to those fond of imagining the New England colonies as holy commonwealths must be Hooker's decision to use the same polarizing tactics in Connecticut that had characterized his preaching in England.[10] Someone making a tour of New England congregations, he thought, would need to conclude that God was "taking the Charter of the Gospel from the present Generation … and removing the Markes, there is no stirring, Trade [in the Gospel] is dead, men come dead [to worship], and sit so, and return so unto their Habitations." Even in supposedly Puritan Connecticut, preaching continued to divide communities; to set colonists "in greatest opposition, and crossness one to another."[11]

If Hooker's Connecticut religion was no more liberal than it had been in England, was he equally traditional in his politics? The opening chapter described how Perry Miller burst the bubble of those who praised Hooker as the father of American democratic institutions. Miller was plainly irked that historians might find early seventeenth-century Connecticut more "democratic," than Massachusetts Bay, and his trenchant analysis provided a needed corrective. In the final analysis, though, I believe Miller gave Hooker too little credit.

Steven Ozment reminds us that early modern Europeans imagined democracy as the kind of utopianism associated with communal theocratic movements like that of Thomas Müntzer. Miller argued that what earlier historians had called Hooker's "irrepressibly democratic dynamic" was in fact common to all Protestant theology, but he added that "all good Protestants strove to

---

8. SSCD 186, see also 204. It appears, AR 10:653, that servants were even quoting Scripture against their masters. While it is hard to argue with Amanda Porterfield, *Female Piety in Puritan New England*, when she suggests that the standards Hooker set for husbands' behavior toward their wives may have worked to women's benefit, one might question whether she gives sufficient weight to such misogynistic passages as these.

9. CTCL 210.

10. New England propaganda certainly tried to leave this impression on contemporary readers. Hugh Peter, for example, wrote of his experience in New England that "in seven years among thousands there dwelling, I never saw any drunk, nor heard an Oath, nor any begging, nor Sabbath broken." *The Case of Mr. Hugh Peters, Impartially Communicated to the Vievv and Censure of the Whole World: Written by his own hand* (London: Samuel Speed, 1660), 3.

11. AR 10:565; CCLP 123, op cit.; and chapter 10 above. Those who put much stock in later "Jeremiads" have tended not to notice comments such as these in the first-generation Hooker.

stifle it." He underestimated the extent of that stifling. The Danish Lutheran Niels Hemmingsen, to take a typical example, more "liberal" than Hooker in his understanding of predestination, had only scorn for democratic ideals.[12] David Hall was much closer to the truth when he wrote that if first-generation New Englanders were not "republicans *à la lettre* … something of the republican spirit was at work among them." And when John Winthrop spoke from the Bay in favor of restricting important matters of government to an élite group, it was Connecticut's Hooker who admonished him that his stance was "a way which leads directly to tyranny." Acknowledging that the people "should referr matter of counsell to their counsellours," Hooker insisted that "in matter of greater consequence" not the "few" but the "multitude" should decide.[13] I am among those who believe that it is altogether fitting and proper for a Hooker statue to stand before the Connecticut State House, and Hall's recent *A Reforming People* only reinforces my conviction.

Placing Hooker and Stone in the context of an English "long Reformation" begs a different kind of question: how to describe the relationship of their preaching to that of the Protestants of the early and mid-sixteenth century. Patrick Collinson, whose writings on English Puritanism have reshaped the field over the past quarter-century, liked to describe godly preachers like Hooker and Stone as "perfect Protestants." They would presumably represent the cutting edge of the larger effort to purge the Church of England of its remaining "Catholic" elements and to recast its doctrine along strict Protestant principles.

But how ought a term like "Protestant" be defined? If one approaches nearer to perfection the more one "purifies" the Church of England, Hooker was undoubtedly more "Protestant" than Lancelot Andrewes or William Laud. But what if one takes as one's standard the article on which Luther insisted the church stands or falls: justification by faith alone? In that event, Hooker's

---

12. In a commentary on the fifth chapter of Paul's letter to the Ephesians, Hemmingsen writes that *δημοκρατίαν quodammodo contra naturam esse. … Fieri enim non potest, ut pax sit & Concordia diuurna, ubicunque, est ισοτιμία, quæ facit, ut nemo alteri cedere velit, Commentarius in epistola Pavli ad Ephesios* (London, 1576), 137, trans. Abraham Fleming, "Democracie, that is, the regiment of the people, when all rule lieth in their hands, not allowing anie governour, but themselves, is in a manner against nature. … For, it cannot be, that there should be continuance of peace, and maintenance of concord, wheresoever this *ισοτιμία*, that is to saie, equall swaie, and rule all alike is receiued, which bringeth to passe, that euerie man is for himselfe, all to commaund, and none to obeie." *The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule … to the EPHESIANS* (London, 1580), 197–98.

13. *Winthrop Papers* 4:81–82, cited in Hall, *Ways of Writing*, 158. Hall's *A Reforming People* makes a convincing case for Hooker's willingness to rely on the judgment of a broad segment of the population.

insistence that God could not "justify" a sinner without first changing her nature by cutting her off from her sin can only appear as less "perfect." When Hooker said, "it is impossible for the Word of God, that is pure in it selfe, to find any place in an impure heart," when he insisted that "the cursed union betwixt sin and the soul comes to be loosened" before God would infuse faith, had he inadvertently compromised a basic Protestant truth?[14] And were worldly detractors mistaken when they found the godly in Chelmsford and Hartford taking pride in their lack of pride, so that in practice they turned contrition and humiliation into "works" that perversely undercut justification by faith alone? Might the more "perfect" Hooker and Stone have failed to grasp a fundamental Reformation insight in its fullness?

Another historiographical truism argues that an initial heart-felt piety had declined by the third or fourth New England generation to a dreary moralism. First explored by Joseph Hartounian and subsequently discussed at great length as reality and perception by Perry Miller, it hypothesizes a dichotomy between vibrant conversionist preaching ("piety") and a shallow legalism ("morality").[15]

Samuel Stone's *Whole Body* certainly recognized the limitations of law without gospel. In discussing the Ten Commandments, Stone observed that "all duties of the second table which men perform without subordination to the first, are but morality. There is a form and carcass of religion remaining, but the life is gone."[16] But this study has found no conflict between "moralism" and enthusiastic, revivalistic preaching. We find Hooker, generally assumed to be the most theatrical and "conversionist" of the first-generation preachers, constantly urging submission to the Rule, and Stone's discussion of "obedience" occupies the entire second part of the *Whole Body*. Their piety intensifies

---

14. SDD 236; AR 10:324; see also SDD 54: "The main end of Christ is the redemption of a people from all iniquitie; which implieth not onely the removal of the guilt of sin, but the destroying of the bodie of sin" and SDD 5: "the heart that hath faith in it, eyeth the soul, and as is discovereth any impuritie, though it be never so secret, or never so small … it scummeth it off, and it is his continuall work and desire to make riddance of any corruption which doth appear." T. D. Bozeman, *The Precisionist Strain*, chapter 4, perceptively recognizes many elements of Roman Catholic piety, in contradistinction with Luther, in godly practice.

15. Joseph Haroutunian, *Piety versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology* (New York: Henry Holt, 1932); Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961). Harry Stout accepts the dichotomy even as he finds no shift from piety to moralism in second-generation preaching. *The New England Soul: Preaching and Religious Culture in Colonial New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 94.

16. WB 393.

rather than challenges their moralism, which is at the heart of their message from the outset. Their breathtaking Ramist confidence in their ability to know what God wants always threatens to reduce Christianity to the heroic exertion of will-power in following the Rule. Despite one's best efforts, the will falls short, and in one's failure one turns to Jesus to satisfy God's demands on one's behalf. But the next day one is at it again, relentlessly willing oneself to submit to the Rule.[17]

As godly hearers encountered ever higher standards for "true contrition," they were asked to cultivate a scrupulosity, an obsessive focusing on fulfilling every jot and tittle of the law, that made them the laughingstock of their neighbors. The search for certainly of one's salvation through what Hooker called "spiritual auditing," the painstaking examination of one's innermost thoughts, led paradoxically to more awareness of one's shortcomings and even to the fragility of one's faith. The perpetual struggle between "spirit and flesh," meant to be the process by which one achieved mature faith, risked being the product. Christianity was in danger of becoming a set of individual interior dispositions which led one to submit to rules, and its normative experience one of being humiliated and broken down.

With Luther, Hooker argued that sinners had to be broken down before they could be edified, but the reader of Hooker's sermons cannot help but ask whether the breaking down did not overwhelm the building up. In a sixteenth-century context, was Hooker stuck in the monastery where Luther had been before his *Turmerlebnis*, desperate to be contrite enough to satisfy an angry God? In twenty-first-century language, was this theology not keeping Hooker's company in perpetual dependence, in a kind of spiritual adolescence? It is one thing to assert that the nature of faith is to go out of self to another; it is something else to question every motive and to destroy every trace of self-confidence in one's hearers. And, as was one outcome of Augustine's

---

17. Depending upon a hearer's temperament, the Perkinsian emphasis on the quality of one's willing (*quàm affectu potius effectu*) could lead either to a sense of "holier-than-thou" (if one compared one's willing to the way one imagined the ungodly willed) or to a constant sense of falling short (if one compared oneself to what one imagined to be God's expectations). Sydney Ahlstrom recognized how the Law could overshadow the Gospel: "The auditor or reader who did not share Hooker's orthodox allegiance to the Synod of Dort or the inattentive listener who ignored Hooker's occasional warnings could, therefore, come to see the essence of Christianity as a code of laws or a set of principles rather than a Gospel. The 'good news' was veiled, hid by the Law. The Christian way of life was open, in other words, to thorough-going moralization." "Thomas Hooker, Puritanism, and Democratic Citizenship," 20.

critique of Pelagius, did Hooker's theology not serve to force "dependent" lay-people into lifelong reliance on God's spokesmen, the clergy?[18] It was from this sort of religiosity that Wesley, Whitefield, and their colleagues felt compelled to break.

One might also ask whether the intensity of their spiritual auditing caused Hooker's hearers to focus on the state of their own souls at the expense of responsibility to fellow human beings. In an influential article on Old Testament laments, Claus Westermann decries the "individualism" of Reformation theology from Luther on down. "We can no longer overlook the fact," Westermann concludes, "that the theology of the Reformation was one-sidedly individualistic. The justification of the sinner has to do with the individual, and the church consists of justified individuals. The 'salvation of souls' is quite simply the salvation of the individual."[19] To complement this individualism, the Reformers—not least Calvin and his followers—emphasized the Christian's obligation to meet the needs of her neighbor, in particular, her neighbor who was poor. In a trenchant essay, Marilynne Robinson celebrates this strain in Reformed theology.[20] Were she to look closely at the writings of William Perkins, she would be pleased to find the strain persisting. The very "liberalism" she celebrates shines out in Perkins's preaching. "Prouiding of maintenance for the poore," he writes,

> is not a worke of freedome or libertie, left to mens choise, whether they will doe it or no, but a matter of iustice, and the not doing of it is iniustice, against the law of God and of nature, which require that the poore should be maintained at home without begging abroad. Secondly, this should mooue vs, to set aside some portion of our goods to giue vnto the poore, for the poore haue interest vnto them: and for this cause we ought to cut off our superfluities in feasting, in attire, in sports and pleasures, that so we may be better inabled to doe iustice in giuing vnto the poore, for hereby commonly men are disabled to doe this part of iustice. Thirdly, this should teach vs according to our places,

---

18. In his studies of Christianity in late antiquity, Peter Brown constantly reminds his readers that one must never assume that laypeople behaved preciously as their preachers insisted that they should. Francis J. Bremer's *"To Taste the Preciousness of Each Other's Experiences"* will provide ample evidence that godly laypeople had hearts of their own.

19. Westermann, "The Role of Lament in the Theology of the Old Testament," *Interpretation* 28 (1974): 20–38, at 29.

20. Robinson, "Open Thy Hand Wide: Moses and the Origins of American Liberalism," in *When I Was a Child I Read Books* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2012), 59–83. Robinson is best known for her Pulitzer Prize winning novel, *Gilead.*

to see those good orders well maintained and set forward, which bee
prouided for the conuenient releefe and maintenance of the poore; for
neglecting of them is iniustice, and a kind of theft against the poore.[21]

But Hooker's preaching seems to lack this complementary side. Despite his
demonstrated interest in the spiritual health of the poor and his persistent
condemnation of usurers who took advantage of poor lenders, Hooker's lec-
tures pay painfully little attention to the godly community's responsibility for
the physical health of its poorer members. Had that community's experience
as a group apart made it difficult for the saints to extend concern to their
disadvantaged neighbors?

A final question of particular interest for historians of American
Christianity: did the godly preaching of ministers like Hooker and Stone pave
the way for "evangelicalism" in both the United States and Great Britain?
Ought they to be imagined as "evangelicals" before their time? One conven-
tional definition of "evangelical," proposed by David Bebbington and adopted
by Mark Noll, relies on four criteria: a focus on conversion, grounding all
authority on the bible, "activism," and "crucicentrism" (i.e., insisting that sal-
vation through Christ's sacrificial death is the heart of Christianity).[22] Hooker
and Stone certainly meet those criteria. Their decision to immigrate to New
England—in their minds undertaken for the gospel's sake—cannot help but
meet the criterion of "activism," and no reasonable interpreter will question
their commitment to the Bible, conversion, and the centrality of the atone-
ment. If we further accept Michael Crawford's argument that "preaching
of terror" and "adoption of charismatic style" also belong high on the list of
evangelical characteristics, Hooker in particular gains additional credentials.[23]
Assuming that Protestantism had a certain distance to cover in order to travel
from the Reformation of the sixteenth century to the Evangelical Revival of

---

21. *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works*, 3:104. The godly in
Dorchester did their best to put these words into practice; see David Underdown, *Fire from
Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press,
1992). For a different take on Perkins, see Christopher Hill, "William Perkins and the Poor,"
in *Puritanism and Revolution: The English Revolution of the 17th Century* (New York: Schocken
Books, 1964), 215–28; and "The Poor and the Parish," in *Society and Puritanism in
Pre-Revolutionary England*, 2nd ed. (New York: Schocken Books, 1967), 259–97, esp. 283.

22. Mark A. Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys*
(Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 19; following David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism
in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Routledge, 1989), 1–17.

23. Crawford, "Origins of the Eighteenth-Century Evangelical Revival: England and New
England Compared," *Journal of British Studies* 26 (1987): 361–97 at 365, 376.

the eighteenth, one might be tempted to argue that most of that distance had already been covered in the writing and preaching of Hooker and Stone.

Why then can we not accept them as full-fledged "evangelicals"? Hooker's zeal for conversion preaching certainly rivaled that of any later revivalist, and his pulpit antics anticipated those of a George Whitefield (whom his biographer calls "the Divine Dramatist").[24] But they differed on a fundamental point: Whitefield and his eighteenth-century colleagues would not have been happy with Hooker's understanding of conversion, nor he with theirs. Hooker's God reached hearts through, and only through, the written and spoken words of the Bible. He was deeply suspicious of the direct, extra-biblical divine communication dear to Quakers and antinomians in his day and to evangelicals a century later. As we saw in their ordering of the Hartford Church, he and Stone recognized that "relations" of personal conversion had their place, but they paled in significance when compared to the day-to-day evidence of "Christian conversation." They were not to be required for membership in the Church.

In an influential essay on the origins of the evangelical revival, John Walsh argues that evangelicals like John Wesley rebelled against the "stern, objective, moralistic piety" of William Law's influential *Serious Call to a Devout and Godly Life*. Wesley could find in Law's *Serious Call* only "a grim, incessant battle against self, which promised to continue to life's very end."[25] Michael Watts, an influential historian of English Dissenters, takes a similar position; he believes that evangelical preaching "brought relief and joy to men and women whose consciences were tormented by the memory of unforgiven sins and whose lives were burdened by the over-scrupulous performance of religious duties." We must, I think, understand Hooker and Stone as the very sort of preachers whose angry God had created those intolerable torments and burdens.[26] So there is indeed a gap between them and their eighteenth-century successors.

Nevertheless, I have suggested that Hooker and Stone stand squarely on a trajectory that leads from the Protestant Reformation to the Evangelical

---

24. Harry Stout, *The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991).

25. John Walsh, "Origins of the Evangelical Revival," in G. V. Bennett and J. D. Walsh, eds., *Essays in Modern English Church History in Memory of Norman Sykes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 132–62.

26. Watts, *The Dissenters* (Oxford, 1978), 1:427–28, where he also stresses the continuities between Quakers, Antinomians, and the Evangelical Revival; cf. Tipson, "How Can the Religious Experience of the Part Be Recovered? The Examples of Puritanism and Pietism."

Revivals of the eighteenth century. One can debate the extent to which they fit within a generally accepted definition of "evangelical."[27] But more is at stake here than assigning a label. It should be evident that a prototype of the religiosity we have come to think of as "evangelical" was present from the first settlement of the American colonies. Even what we describe as an "altar call" was an ordinary part of Hooker's repertoire. Preaching in Hartford near the end of his life on John 17:20–26, his voice would have risen as he reached his "Use of Exhortation":

> Why stand we gazing one upon another? go we to Heaven. When our Savior saies, *I will, they be with me*, Answer, *and I wil be with thee, Lord.* Say so ye Father and Mothers in *Israel*, ye are almost within sight of shore: there is one step to Death, that is the Wagon, and then to Christ. Say so ye Yong men and Maidens, though ye may live long, ye cannot better, this is the marriage I wil go also, I wil be with Christ also, who hath loved me, died for me, and redeemed me. And if any be yet in a demur, let me ask them, as *Laban* asked *Rebecca. Gen.* 24.57, 58. When *Eleazar, Abrahams* servant came to fetch her, *Wilt thou go? and she said, I wil go.* So let me propound the wil of Christ. He hath chosen it, desires it, prayes for it, **what say ye? wil ye go to Jesus? I wil go. Truly, let us go.**[28]

I have tried to show how Hooker's preaching was shaped by an extreme Augustinian theology derived from William Perkins, a Ramist hermeneutic gained from Alexander Richardson, and a theatrical style learned at the feet of John Rogers of Dedham. These influences produced a blend unique to him, but at the heart of that blend was a goal that later evangelicals would almost surely have been proud to own. As William Perkins said to those in his Cambridge audience who asked "how may wee be founde worthy to stande before Christ at that day?" *Answere.*

> Doe but this one thing: for your liues past be humbled before God, and come unto him by true, hearty, and unfained repentance, be changed and become newe creatures: pray unto him earnestly for the pardon

---

27. I had originally intended to offer more extended arguments for and against their being so included, but space limitations forbid further discussion here. I hope to present my arguments in a future article.

28. CCLP 363. One hears here the voice of "roaring Rogers."

of your sinnes in Christ, and pray continually that God will turne your heartes from your olde sinnes euerie day more and more: and then come the last iudgement when it will, ye shall be founde worthy to stand before Christ at his comming.[29]

Central to the preaching of godly ministers like Perkins and Hooker, in other words, was the need to go beyond outward participation in the liturgies of the church—the chief element in what they called "means"—to some kind of inner relationship with Christ. That relationship was the "end" toward which any "means" had always to be directed, and that relationship remains the heart of evangelicalism today.

---

29. *Exposition of the Symbole, Works,* 1:262.

Hooker's Metaphors of Conversion

In his discussions of conversion, Hooker's most commonly used metaphors fall into two categories. Most often, Hooker would compare an unconverted person to an object possessed with its own destructive momentum, momentum which carried the person "naturally" toward her own prideful goals and away from God's Rule. In one notable example, he depicted the soul as a malfunctioning clock which needed repair. The will and the affections were "the wheeles of this great and curious clocke," and they moved the clock "freely." But because the will and affections had a distinct "disposition," "the frame of the soule" in Hooker's language, the clock's "wheeles" (and so the person) inevitably moved "hel-ward and sin-ward." To repair such a clock, a workman had to perform two distinct actions: first, "stoppe it that it runne no longer wrong," and then "turne it and set the wheeles right."

Just so, in Hooker's mind, conversion required a twofold divine act: first "the Lord must stoppe the soule, and that is done by the discovery of sinne, and by this humiliation of heart." Then, in a separate, subsequent act, "the Lord gives him of his Spirit," a gift which set the clock's gears and weights (which Hooker compared to "the weight of the soule"), moving properly. From then on, "by the power of that spirit" the soul was able to "runne right."[1] During the first, preparatory act, the will was passive, acted upon. Once God had rearranged the will and the affections—in theological terms, "regenerated the soul"—they could work alongside the influence of the Spirit in the "second act."

Similarly, the rebellious will could be compared to a bowling ball already hurled and headed toward a mark. "It runneth, because it is a round thing, but that it

---

1. SP, 168–69; see also UP 30, *25–26; SEC 348; CGO 31.

runneth at such and such a marke, is because it has a Bias upon it whereby it is swayed and carried to that marke." "So it is with the heart of a man," continued Hooker, "there is a frame and a disposition in the Will, either to good or evill, either to grace or sinne; and as the will of a man is biassed and swayed, so a man is said to will good or evill, not in regard of the naturall faculty of the Will, but in regard of the disposition of that facultie which doth carrie the faculty to the performance of any worke."[2]

The clock-wheel's running wrong and the bowling ball's bias toward sin stood for the rebellious disposition of the will. In conversion, God through the minister intervened to stop the wheels, to bring the bowl to a halt. This was the "legal" or "preparatory" phase. God could then redirect the bowl or fit the clock with different weights and rewind it. God took control from the prideful, willful self and shaped a disciplined, law-abiding self which could, with God's continued help, submit to the Rule.

A second set of metaphors pictured the unruly will as so badly damaged that only a total overhaul could repair it. One would not pour pure water into a vessel that is full of "pudly and filthy water," argued Hooker; only when it was "emptied of that filthy water" would it be "capable to receive pure water." Because the soul was "brimme full. … of abominations, full of covetousnesse, full of malice, full of pride, ful of love of ourselves, full of hypocrisie, full of carelessenesse, loosenesse, and profanenesse, full of all manner of lusts, and corruptions, and concupiscence of the flesh," it was unprepared to take any initiative toward God. Because it was "impossible that grace and corruption should lodge in the same bosome," God would first have "to empty the soule of these lusts, and abominations, and prepare him for grace, before grace can be put into him." Similarly, the will was "fallow ground that hath a great many thistles, and is full of weedes, and nettles, and grasse … it must first be plowed, for all the while this trash is in it, it is not fit for seed, though it may be made fit by tilling of it." "So the soule of a sinner is arable, God can fit it, and prepare it to receive grace and eternall life, but he must be first plowed and made fit, he is overrunne with all corruptions, and therefore of himselfe, for a while before the Lord humble him and fit him, and prepare him to entertaine Christ, and receive grace, he cannot receive it."[3]

In all four of these metaphors, God through the agency of preaching had to "fit," "frame," "prepare," "dispose" the will before it would be capable of any good motion of its own. During the time it was being prepared, explained Hooker, the will was completely passive. It "doth nothing" and was "only a sufferer."[4]

---

2. UP, 127–28; see also AR 8:400–401.

3. UP 95–96.

4. UP *23–26. Note the similarity of these verbs to those of Augustine described in chapter 4.

Focusing on metaphors like these respects the "life-setting" in which Hooker's lectures were heard. They were not constructed as literary texts that could be "read" and painstakingly analyzed. The printed versions to which scholars have access today (with the notable exceptions of the Hartford collections, *The Application of Redemption* and *A Comment on Christ's Last Prayer*) were neither intended nor authorized. Hooker's Chelmsford hearers experienced Hooker one sermon at a time, and Hooker knew that many of them, visiting Chelmsford for the market, would only be present for one or two parts of a sermon series that might extend over many weeks. He had to construct his lectures so that the gist of his message could be available on virtually every lecture day, available so that it could lodge memorably even in an occasional hearer's brain. While he was certainly skeptical of any conversion that did not include a healthy dose of self-denial and sorrow for sin, it is highly unlikely that he expected people to be experiencing only the precise component of conversion (e.g., sorrow but no shame) that he happened to be preaching about at a given moment.

Given the unmistakable import of all these metaphors, one should not be surprised that Hooker had only contempt for anyone who refused to attend the sermons through which God would make his benefits available. Just as the Jesuit Molina had called a farmer "mad" who refused to sow crops and then blamed God when he had nothing to harvest, the Protestant Hooker insisted that "if a man should reason thus: I can do nothing for my self, therefore I wil take a course that no man shall do any thing for me; it were not a weakness, but a kind of madness." Three decades earlier, Perkins had allowed a similar role for human initiative:

> we must consider that God giues grace indeede, yet not miraculously in Ale-houses and Tauernes, but then when men vse the meanes to come by grace, and do that which by nature, they are able; that is, come and heare the word attentiuely, endeauouring to beleeue and to obey the same: for though the good vse of the gifts of nature cannot merit any grace, yet ordinarily we may obserue, that in the vse of meanes is grace receiued.

So common sense dictated a different course of action: "I can do nothing of my self, therefore I must attend upon God in those means which he useth to do for all those he useth to do good unto."[5] The Jesuits might have been forgiven for detecting a whiff of the *occasio sine qua non* that Protestant theology had supposedly rejected.

Through these metaphors (and throughout his preaching), Hooker was making two critical points. First, in good Augustinian fashion, he was explaining that

---

5. Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works,* 1:64; AR 10:320. See also TGS 28.

a hearer did not prepare herself. She was prepared by an external force. Second, in good Protestant fashion, he was insisting that that external force was his own preaching, the only medium through which God would ordinarily effect a conversion. To be prepared, a person had to hear sermons. As the preacher laid out and applied God's written words from the Bible, God would work through the preacher's spoken words, "soaking them in" to the hearer's heart.

So while a convert was theologically "passive" until the moment of her regeneration, acted on by the Holy Spirit but not contributing to the Spirit's work, "passive" did not mean comatose. Conversion was never a "holy rape."[6] A worldly person could put herself—or be put by government edict—in a position to hear sermons. Although she might resist what the Spirit—through the medium of the preacher's words—was trying to tell her, she would be fully conscious of the message and the way it challenged her self-esteem. As in the case of William James's "divided self," she would recognize, even as she resisted it, how the Spirit was holding forth a promise "in, with, and under" the minister's words. The merest inclination to imagine that that promise might be meant for her, the first hint of "activity," would mark the presence of faith.

It seemed preposterous to Hooker that faith would arise without warning in an unsuspecting hearer. If faith required a "going-out of self" to depend entirely on the promises of God made through preaching, then some degree of self-denial and sorrow for sin would need to be present for faith to come into being. At least in Hooker's own mind, urging people to put themselves in a position to hear God's promises did not constitute closet Arminianism.

Hooker's metaphors convey this message plainly. But what about the statements throughout his sermons that Gospel promises came with conditions, conditions which seemed to presume an element of human initiative?[7] Gospel promises were not for everyone. Even the most expansive Gospel promise could never be absolute, for the preacher could not presume to know whether God might have predestinated some of his hearers to eternal damnation. But more than many of his colleagues, Hooker tended to present Gospel promises to his hearers in the form of an "if … then." "The soule must reason thus, *If* I receive Christ as Lord and King, as a Prophet, and as a Priest; *if* I receive Christ, and yeeld my self to him, and take Christ upon his owne termes, and accept him upon his own conditions, I shal be saved, and have life, and peace, and comfort, and joy in the holy Ghost."[8] If a casual

---

6. Miller, "Preparation for Salvation," 261, discussed in chapter 1.

7. Another theological area in which he took issue with "Eatonists and familists." See Parnham, "Redeeming Free Grace," esp. 928–30. Holifield, *Theology in America*, 40–41, offers a brief and insightful description of covenant conditions in early New England.

8. SS 25–26; emphasis added; see also AR 1:34: "The Spirit of God never gives in immediate Evidence of any right we have to, or that we are made partakers of any benefit from Christ without respect to some Qualification, gracious Disposition, or Condition in the Soul."

hearer took this to mean merely that one could not be saved without faith in Christ, Hooker corrected her. While it was true that "the Lord Jesus came to seek and save that which is lost," in reality Jesus would save only a hearer who was "truely lost," and a "truely lost" hearer was one who met a condition. He "seeth the evill of sinne, and the punishment that comes thereby, & comes to be lost in his owne apprehension, in regard of his owne estate." Lest anyone miss the point, Hooker spelled Christ's terms out clearly: "the qualification of that party whom Christ will *seeke* and *save*, he must be a *lost* man in his owne apprehension." "Our eternall life dependeth upon the promise of God, and therefore it is sure, because God cannot faile, cannot change, his promise cannot be altred: *if we observe the conditions*, eternall life is sure unto a broken hearted sinner."[9]

Imagine listening to Hooker as he spelled out the promise to his Chelmsford hearers, using as his text Isaiah 66.11: *They shall sucke and be satisfied with the brests of the consolation, that they may milke out, and be delighted with the abundance of her glorie*. The congregation would learn that "the brests of the consolation" were "the promises of the Gospell," and those who could "suck out and be satisfied" with them were "the elect." Moving to Isaiah 55:1, *Come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price*, Hooker explained that "to come, is to repaire to the promise; and to buy, is nothing else, but to embrace it for our good and comfort."

But there was always a condition: "The Lord sets open the shop of grace and salvation every day where the Gospell is preached," but a hearer had to "come to the agreement and buy," had to say, "I will lay downe all my lusts, and part with all for Christ." Only when hearers had met this condition could they "take mercy and comfort," for they had "bought it." Hooker even imagined God's offer of salvation as a transaction which included "articles of agreement": "the Articles of agreement, whereby God passeth over his promise to a poore sinner, are these: *If wee will part from our selves and our sinnes, the Lord Jesus saith all this grace and mercy is yours.*" "The promise is all sufficient … it is certaine the Lord intends it for thee, *if thou beest humbled*."[10] God set conditions to his promise.

Imagine hearers on another occasion, listening to another lecture on the same text from Isaiah: "*Esay* 55.1, 2. *Buy without money*, this is the condition, that God offers mercy upon; *Buy wine and milke*, that is, grace and salvation, without money, that is, without sufficiencie of your owne." Then Hooker explained what the condition was: "This is all the Lord requires of thee, to see thy sinnes; and be weary of them, and be content that the Lord Jesus shall reveale what is amisse, and take it away, and that the Lord should give thee grace."[11]

---

9. SP 166; SEC 84; emphasis added.

10. SEC 306–309, 329; emphasis added.

11. SEC 609.

In short, the promise included a requirement: the recognition of one's need and the willingness to accept God's help. The hearer had to recognize her sinfulness, be weary of sinning, and be willing for Christ not only to forgive past sins but also to take away the will to sin in the future. In short, she had to be "contrite" and "humble."

Only a superficial hearing of such language could imagine that by speaking of contrition and humiliation as conditions, Hooker was using "preparation" as a *facienti quod est in se*, a device to undermine predestination and to persuade his hearers that they had the ability to influence God to convert them.[12] His descriptions of "preparation" were intended to induce a sense of despair, not encouragement to think that one could affect God's decision. God through the preacher was breaking a hearer's self-confidence. In spite of herself, she was coming to the recognition that she had no ability whatsoever to influence God's choice. Only then would she cast her entire confidence on God's promise.

Just as had Augustine, Hooker constantly returned to the metaphor of God's "framing" or "preparing" the reluctant will. Commenting on Ephesians 3:17, "Hereby Christ dwells in our hearts," Hooker explained that "where he dwelleth there he moulds fashions, frames, and renues the heart." "There shall bee no work of the hand, no walk of the foot, but grace will frame it." "It is not the very nature of the faculty of the will, but a frame put into the will, that sets it on, and carries it out to God."[13] When a reader finds Hooker speaking of "preparation," she needs to keep this Augustinian definition in mind.

---

12. Alister McGrath appears to making such an assumption in his discussion of Hooker, *Iustitia Dei*, 2:117–18.

13. CTCL 290; PP 189, 63.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

I. ABBREVIATIONS OF HOOKER AND STONE TEXTS

Thomas Hooker

Printed versions of Hooker's works fall into two broad categories: those he prepared for publication and those published without his direct involvement. His undisputed New England writings, *The Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline*, *The Covenant of Grace Opened*, *A Comment on Christ's Last Prayer*, and *The Application of Redemption* (published in two separate volumes) all fall into the former category. Sargent Bush, Jr., argues that *A briefe Exposition of the Lords Prayer* and *An Exposition of the Principles of Religion* were also written in New England and prepared for publication by Hooker in an attempt to influence the Westminster Assembly. But even if the latter two in fact stem from years in England (as I think is more likely), it remains the case that only a small fraction of the material that appeared in print from his years in England and Holland—namely those two treatises in question, Hooker's answers to Paget's queries, and the introductory material to the books by Ames and Rogers—would have gone straight from his pen to the printer.[1] The majority of his published English writing and essentially all of his English preaching was brought into print by others. Cotton Mather, probably relying on testimony from John Eliot, explained that "many wrote after him in *Short-Hand*; and some were so bold, as to Publish many of them, without his Consent or Knowledg."[2] In other words, the texts of the unauthorized publications were derived from notes taken while Hooker was preaching.

---

1. Bush, "Establishing the Hooker Canon" and "A Bibliography of the Published Writings of Thomas Hooker," in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626-1633*. Harvard Theological Studies 28, ed. George H. Williams, Norman Pettit, Winifred Herget, and Sargent Bush, Jr. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 378-425. Although I believe it is safer to assign an English provenance to these writings, the issue here concerns Hooker's published English *sermons*, not treatises intended for publication.

2. *Piscator Evangelicus*, 34 {*Magnalia* I:347}.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that in a number of cases, carefully described by Sargent Bush in his Bibliography of Hooker's works and by Winfried Herget in "The Transcription and Transmission of the Hooker Corpus," we have more than one printed version of what appears to be the same lecture, and the versions do not always agree.[3] Can we be confident, then, that we are reading Hooker's own words when we read the published versions of his lectures?

The preface to the first printed collection of Hooker's Chelmsford lectures, *The Soules Preparation*, suggests that the relationship between spoken word and printed text was likely to be complex. It was 1632, and Hooker was in Holland, unavailable to provide a written text or to correct copy. So the collection's "editor" explained to the "Christian Reader" that "thou hast here some sermons brought to light, which by reason of the Authors absence, are presented to thy view, both with some lesser escapes, and in more homely terms, then his judicious eye would have suffered."[4] Had Hooker been available, the editor implies, the printed text would have been different. But different did not necessarily mean closer to what Hooker had actually said. In his "Epistle" to the *Doctrine of Faith* (to which Hooker also wrote an Epistle "To the Reader"), Hooker's mentor John Rogers commented on the relationship between a text based on hearers' notes and one prepared by the preacher after the fact. Rogers conceded that if he had prepared his sermons for publication "in cold blood" and "long after" he had preached them, he would not have been able to "call to minde or write those stirring passages that God brings to hand in the heate of preaching."[5] In other words, Rogers (and Hooker) often interjected extemporaneous passages into their own prepared notes, so that an auditor with good shorthand skills would almost certainly have produced a more "accurate" version of what was preached than the preacher himself, working from memory and his notes after some

---

3. *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626-1633*, 253-270. David Hall and Alexandra Walsham assert that editors took considerable liberties with Hooker's texts: "Detailed examination of the printed sermons series of Thomas Hooker reveals how extensively his London bookseller-publishers revised their copies, some of which were products of the art of "brachigraphy,". . .." 'Justification by Print Alone?': Protestantism, Literacy, and Communications in the Anglo-American World of John Winthrop," in *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England 1588-1649,* ed. Francis J. Bremer and Lynn Botelho (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005): 334-85 at 357-58.

4. SP Errata page opposite page 1.

5. DF sig. A5. Arnold Hunt argues convincingly that "the unauthorized shorthand editions so often condemned by preachers as inaccurate and untrustworthy may, in some cases [such as Hooker's English sermons] provide a relatively accurate account of the sermon as originally delivered." Better than editions prepared by the author, they often "preserve elements of oral preaching in a raw, unaltered, state." *The Art of Hearing*, 146, 12. Since grammar school pupils were systematically trained in to take shorthand notes during sermons, they often became remarkably sophisticated at capturing the preacher's exact words. *Ibid.* 97-99.

time had passed.[6]How close could an auditor with a good command of contemporary shorthand ("brachygraphy") come to a verbatim text? Comparing the entries in Henry Wolcott's shorthand notebook (where he recorded lectures by Hooker and his colleagues along the Connecticut River) to the printed sermons in *The Application of Redemption* would lead one to the conclusion that Wolcott took down the main points but little of the supporting material. His shorthand notes are anything but a verbatim transcript. Many auditors were much more skillful, however.[7] Furthermore, notetakers were not forced to rely entirely on what they could record while the minister spoke. At "conferences" after the lecture, sermons would be discussed and the main points repeated; notetakers would have ample opportunity to compare their versions to those of others, to add material they had missed on first hearing and to correct errors.[8] As Harold Love has shown in *The Culture and Commerce of Texts*, many ministers actually preferred "scribal publication" to print, and the handwritten copies that circulated among a preacher's colleagues and followers often enjoyed his blessing. Everyone involved had an interest in preserving the best possible text.[9]Finally, the printer almost always made some effort to engage expert help in preparing the text for the press, as we learn from the Dedicatory Epistle to *The Christians Two Chief Lessons*:

> The Printer, tendering the Authours reputation, and the Readers benefit, hath beene at some cost to have it reviewed, and corrected; and one that was inwardly acquainted with the Authour hath lathered with me in this taske; yet we durst not make so bold, as to alter his phrase, or adde any thing of our owne, onely we amended such errours as would have beene imputed to the Authour through the oversight of the Scribe.

---

6. One is reminded of the circumstances of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech, whose most famous passages occurred when King departed extemporaneously from his printed text.

7. As Peter Brown writes of Augustine's sermons: "In reading sermons of Augustine, we can usually be certain that we are not reading carefully reedited texts (as was the case with Ambrose). *We are reading his own words as they were first heard.* This is because rich members of the congregation would pay skilled experts in shorthand to take down every word as it came from his lips." *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 339, emphasis added.

8. The editor of William Perkins's lectures on the Sermon on the Mount described how he produced a text "out of mine owne and others notes." Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount, Works* 3:sig. A4ᵛ.

9. *The Culture and Commerce of Texts Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (1993; reprinted Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998).David D. Hall, *Ways of Writing: The Practice and Politics of Text-Making in Seventeenth Century Massachusetts* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008) is more skeptical of printers' interest in presenting the best possible text. See especially "Not in Print yet Published: The Practice of Scribal Publication," 29-80. More than a century after Hooker's death, evangelicals like John Newton relied on scribal publication for the dissemination of letters and hymns, see

The author of that Epistle conceded that "If the Copie had beene sent to the Presse immediately from the Author, it would have come forth more exact and perfect," but he boasted that if he "had not taken some paines in the perusal and transcribing thereof, after it came into the Printers hands, it would have paßed the Preße more imperfectly then now it doth."[10]

To summarize, it is unlikely that the versions of Hooker's English lectures preserved in print represent exactly what Hooker said or what he would himself have prepared for the press. Close literary analysis of the printed texts should be attempted with some caution.[11] But the sophisticated use of shorthand, the practice of attending "conferences" where sermons would be reviewed after they were preached, and the tradition of scribal publication combined to produce a text that was probably remarkably faithful to the original lecture. The more one reads Hooker's English lectures, the more one detects the same themes, the same metaphors, the same colloquialisms from collection to collection, the more confidence one gains that the printed texts offer a reliable window into Hooker's thinking and preaching. One begins to sense the cadences and to imagine the rising and falling of the preacher's voice. Peter Lake has proposed that "in the cadences and catches, the rhythms and repetitions" of Ben Johnson's caricature of a Puritan, Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, "we approach as closely as we are ever likely to get to what certain forms of puritan pseudo-extempore preaching actually sounded like."[12] One has a similar sense in reading the printed sermons of an actual Puritan, Thomas Hooker. With these considerations in mind, and drawing heavily on Sargeant Bush's Hooker bibliography, I have used the following abbreviations for Hooker's writings.[13] Short Title Catalogue (*NSTC*) and Wing (*Wing*) references are to the second editions of those reference works. Unless otherwise indicated, a citation in the footnotes is to the original edition.

English Writings

Answers = "Mr Paget's 20 Propositions to Mr Hooker with his Answere thereto," in
  Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633. Harvard Theological

---

Bruce Hindmarsh, *John Newton and the English Evangelical Tradition between the Conversions of Wesley and Wilberforce*, e. g 262.

10. CTCL sigs. A2v-A3.

11. To take one example, in the 1637 version of "Spiritual Love and Joy," Hooker speaks of how hypocrites "break the necke of the truth, and breake their owne neckes into hell" by resisting the meaning of scriptural passages, In the 1640 version, "into hell" becomes "in hell, too," decisively changing the meaning. SImp 225, cf. SImp Olive 253.

12. Lake with Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, 602.

13. Sargent Bush, Jr., "A Bibiolography of the Published Writings of Thomas Hooker," in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626-1633,* 390–425.

Studies 28, 277–91. Edited by George H. Williams, Norman Pettit, Winifred Herget, and Sargent Bush, Jr. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

CTCL = *The Christians Two Chiefe Lessons, viz. Selfe-Deniall And Selfe-Tryall. As also The Priviledge of Adoption and Triall Thereof in three Treatises on the Texts following: viz. Matt. 16.24 2 Cor. 13.5. Iohn 1.12, 13.* London, 1640. *NSTC* 13724.

DD = *The Danger of Desertion: Or A Farvvell Sermon of Mr Thomas Hooker, Sometimes Minister of Gods Word at Chainsford in Essex; but now of New England. Preached immediately before his departure out of old England.* London, 1641. *Wing* H2646, reprinted in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, 228–52.

DF = John Rogers, *The doctrine of faith vvherein are practically handled twelve principall points, which explaine the nature and vse of it. By Iohn Rogers, preacher of Gods Word at Dedham in Essex.* London, 1627. *NSTC* 21187.5; Hooker's "To the Reader" is reprinted in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, 143–46.

EP = *An Exposition of the Principles of Religion.* London, 1645. *Wing* H2647. Sargent Bush, Jr., suggests this was written in New England, but his evidence is circumstantial.[14] Given that it was bound with *A briefe Exposition of the Lords Prayer*, most likely written in England, the fact that his son submitted *An Exposition of the Principles* for publication while in England does not in my judgment argue for a New England origin, especially since Hooker is not identified as being from New England.

FC = *The Faithful Covenanter. A Sermon Preached at the lectvre in Dedham in Essex by that excellent servant of Iesus Christ, in the work of the Gospel, M^r. Tho. Hooker, late of Chelmsford; now in New England.* London, 1644. *Wing* H2648.

FLGT = *Fovre Learned and Godly Treatises; viz. The Carnall Hypocrite. The Churches Deliverances. The Deceitfulnesse of Sinne. The Benefit of Afflictions.* London, 1638. *NSTC* 13725, "The Churches Deliverance" and "The Carnal Hypocrite" are reprinted in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, 60–88, 91–123.

FS = "An Advertisement to the Reader" and "The Preface" in Williams Ames, *A Fresh Svit Against Human Ceremonies in God's VVorship. Or A Triplication unto. D. Bvrgesse His Rejoinder for D. Morton.* n. p., 1633. *NSTC* 555, reprinted in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, 320–77.

LP = *A briefe Exposition of the Lords Prayer: Wherein the meaning of the words is laid open to the understanding of weake Christians, and what the carriage of their hearts ought to be in preferring each petition.* London, 1645. *Wing* H2642. Bush admits that this was extant in England in 1637 but suggests that Hooker may have revised it in New England.[15]

---

14. Bush, "Thomas Hooker and the Westminster Assembly," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 29 (1972): 291–300.

15. Ibid., 296,

PDC = *The poore doubting christian drawne to Christ Wherein the maine letts and hindrances which keepe men from comming to Christ are discovered.* London, 1635. *NSTC* 13726.2, reprinted in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, 152–86.

PHH = *The Properties of an honest Heart: Laid out in a Sermon upon Psalme 51.16.* [actually 51:6] *Behold, thou lovest truth in the inward parts.* London, 1638, bound with *The stay of the faithfull: NSTC* 23240.

PP = *The Paterne of Perfection: Exhibited in Gods Image on Adam: And Gods Covenant made with him. Whereunto is added an Exhortation, to redeem the time for recovering our losses in the premisses. And also some Miscellanies, viz. I. The Prayer of Faith II. A Preparative to the Lords Supper III. The Character of a sound Christian, in 17. markes.* London, 1640. *NSTC* 13726. Shuffleton assumes this is a collection of New England sermons; I seen no evidence for this.[16]

SDD = *The Saints Dignitie, and Dutie, together with The Danger of Ignorance and Hardnesse.* London, 1651. *Wing* H2654. Sargent Bush argues that Hooker preached these sermons in New England.[17] I concur with Michael Winship's argument that they are English.[18]

SEC = *The Sovles Vocation or Effectval Calling to Christ.* London, 1638. *NSTC* 13739.

SEx = *The Soules Exaltation A treatise containing the soules union with Christ, on I Cor. 6. 17. The soules benefit from vnion with Christ, on I Cor. 1. 30. The soules justification, on 2 Cor. 5. 21.* London, 1638. *NSTC* 13727.

SF = *The Stay of the Faithfull: Together with the Properties of an honest Heart. In two Sermons.* London, 1638. *NSTC* 23240.

SG = *The Saints Guide, in Three Treatises; I. The Mirror of Mercie, on Gen. 6.13. II. The Carnall Mans Condition, on Rom. 1.18. III. The Plantation of the Righteous, on Psa. 1.3.* London, 1645. *Wing* H2655.

SH = *The Sovles Humiliation.* London, 1637. *NSTC* 13729.

SImp = *The Soules Implantation. A Treatise Containing, The broken Heart, on Esay 57.15. The Preparation of the Heart, on Luke. 1.17. The Soules Ingraffing into Christ, on Mal. 3.1. Spirituall Love and Joy, on Gal. 5.22.* London, 1637. *NSTC* 13731.

SImp Olive = *The Soules Implantation into the Naturall Olive.* London, 1640. *NSTC* 13732.

SI = *The Sovles Ingrafting into Christ.* London, 1637. *NSTC* 13733.

SM = *Spirituall Munition: A Funeral Sermon. (London, 1638) Bound with The Sovles Possession of Christ: Shewing how a Christian should put on Christ, and bee able to doe all things through his strength. Whereunto is annexed a Sermon Preached at the Funerall of that worthy Divine M*ʳ*. Wilmott, late Minister of Clare, in Suffolke.* London,

---

16. *Thomas Hooker,* 262f.

17. Bush, *Writings of Thomas Hooker,* 74–95,
18. Winship, *Making Heretics,* 290–91.

1638. *NSTC* 13734, reprinted in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, 41–52.

SP = *The Sovles Preparation for Christ, or, A Treatise of Contrition. Wherein is discovered How God breaks the heart and wounds the Soule, in the conversion of a Sinner to Himselfe*. London, 1632. *NSTC* 13735.

SPos = *The Sovles Possession of Christ: Shewing how a Christian should put on Christ, and bee able to doe all things through his strength*. London, 1638. *NSTC* 13734.

SS = *The Sinners Salvation: Resolving This weighty case of Conscience; viz; What course a poore soule should take that hee may bee saved*. London, 1638. *NSTC* 22578.

ST = *Spirituall Thirst: A Sermon Preached upon Iohn 7.37*. London, 1638. *NSTC* 23953.

TGS = *Three Godly Sermons*. London, 1638. *NSTC* 12579.

UP = *The Vnbeleevers Preparing for Christ*. London, 1638. *NSTC* 13740 (* = second pagination).

New England Writings

AR = *The Application of Redemption, By the effectual Work of the word, and Spirit of Christ, for the bringing home of lost Sinners to God. The first eight Books*. London, 1656. *Wing* H2639. *The ninth and tenth books*. London, 1657. *Wing* H2640.

CCLP = *A Comment upon Christ's last Prayer In the seventeenth of John. Wherein is opened, The Union Beleevers have with God and Christ, and the glorious Priviledges thereof*. London, 1656. *Wing* H2643.

CGO = *The Covenant of Grace Opened: Wherein These Particulars are handled; viz. 1. What the Covenant of GRACE is, 2. What the Seales of the Covenant are, 3. Who are the Parties and Subjects fit to receive these Seales. From all which particulars Infants Baptism is fully proved and vindicated. Being severall Sermons preached at Hartford in New-England*. London, 1649. *Wing* H2644.

SSCD = *A Survey of the Summe of Church-Discipline. Wherein, The Way of the Churches of New-England is warranted out of the Word, and all Exceptions of weight, which are made against it, answered: Whereby also it will appear to the Judicious Reader, that something more must be said, then yet hath been, before their Principles can be shaken, or they should be unsetled in their practice*. London, 1648. *Wing* H2658.

Other Sermons, Letters, and Unpublished Writings

Sermon June 20, 1647 = Untitled sermon preached at Windsor on June 20, 1647, on Rom.1.18, transcribed from manuscript notes of Matthew Grant by J. Hammond Trumbull and printed in George Leon Walker, *History of the First Church in Hartford, 1633–1883* (Hartford: Brown & Gross,1884), 429–34.

Sermon October 4, 1638 = "A Thomas Hooker Sermon of [October 4,] 1638," ed. Everett Emerson, *Resources for American Literary Study* 2 (Spring 1972): 75–89.

Touching the Crosse = "Touchinge the Crosse in the Banner," *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings* 62 (1909): 272–80.

Letter to Cotton c. April 1633 = "Thomas Hooker to John Cotton, about April 1633," *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, ed. Sargent Bush, Jr. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 177.

Letter to Shepherd, Nov. 2, 1640 = in Lucius R. Paige, *History of Cambridge, Massachusetts 1630–1877* (Boston: H. O. Houghton & Co., 1877), 46–50.

Letter to Winthrop, c. Dec., 1638 = in *Winthrop Papers*, 5 vols. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929–1947), 4:82.

Miscellanea = Hooker's notebook *Miscellanea* transcribed by Andrew Thomas Denholm in "Thomas Hooker: Puritan Preacher, 1586–1647" (Ph.D. dissertation, Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1961), 356–409, 499–504.

Wolcott Shorthand Notebook = "The Wolcott Shorthand Notebook Transcribed" by Douglas H. Shepard (Ph.D. dissertation, Department of English, University of Iowa, 1957).

Samuel Stone

Catechism = *A Short Catechism Drawn out of the Word of God*. Boston: Samuel Green for John Wadsworth, 1684. *Evans* 378

CCCVC = *A Congregational Church Is a Catholike Visible Church, or, An Examination of M.* Hudson *his Vindication concerning the Integrality of the Catholike Visible Church Wherein also satisfaction is given to what M. Cawdrey writes touching that subject, in his Review of M. Hooker's Survey of Church Discipline.* London, 1652. *Wing* S5734.

Discourse = "Samuel Stone's 'Discourse' against Requiring Church Relations," ed. Baird Tipson, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., 46 (1989):786–99.

Letter to Shepard 1647 = Letter to Thomas Shepard, June 19, 1647," *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society,* 4th Ser., 8 (1868): 544–46.

WB = *The whole body of Divinity in a Catecheticall way handled by Mr Samuel Stone, Teacher of the Church in Hartford, 1697.* Microfilm edition. 1 reel. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society.

II. OTHER MANUSCRIPT SOURCES CITED IN THE TEXT

"A relation in wᵗ mannʳ any persons are received into yᵉ congregations of Newe England [1637]." *Public Records Office.* Colonial Office Papers. 1/9, folio 166.

Hartlib, Samuel. "Ephemerides." Transcribed in *The Hartlib Papers: A Complete Text and Image Database of the Papers of Samuel Hartlib (c. 1600–1662) Held in Sheffield University Library.* 2d ed. Sheffield: Humanities Research Online, 2002.

Keayne, Robert. "Sermon Notes June 1627 to June 1628." Transcribed by Susan M. Ortmann in "Gadding about London in Search of a Proper Sermon: How Robert Keayne's Sermon Notes from 1627–28 Inform Us about the Religious and

Political Issues Facing the London Puritan Community." M.A. thesis. Millersville University, 2004.

"3. Propositions which have divided Mr. Hooker and Mr. Cotton in New England." *Public Record Office*. Colonial Office Papers. 1/9. folio 159.

Ward, Samuel. "The Diary of Dr Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex College," Mss. in Dr. Williams Library.

III. PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Ames, William. *Medulla S. S. Theologiæ, ex Sacris literis, earumque, interpretibus, extracta, & methodicè disposita.* London, 1629. *NSTC* 556.5. English translation *The Marrow of Theology.* Translated John D. Eusden. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1968.

——. *Disputatio Theologica, de Præparatione peccatoris ad conversionem*, in *Guilielmi Amesii Opera Omnia.* 5 vols. Amsterdam, 1658–61. 5:26–34.

——. *Bellarminus Enervatus, sive Disputationes Anti-Bellarminianae ...* Londini: Apud Joannem Humperidum, 1632. *NSTC* 551.

——. *William Ames: Technometry.* Edited by Lee Gibbs. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979.

Andrewes, Lancelot. *Selected Sermons and Lectures.* Edited by Peter McCullough. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae.* English translation *Summa Theologica.* Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007.

Arminius, Jacob. *Iacobi Arminii ... Opera Theologica.* Lvgdvni Batabvorvm: Godefridvm Fasson, 1629. English translation *The Works of James Arminius.* Translated James Nichols and W. R. Bagnall. 3 volumes. Auburn and Buffalo: Derby, Miller, and Orton, 1853.

Auden, W. H. *Collected Poetry of W. H. Auden.* New York: Random House, 1945.

Augustine of Hippo. *Opera*, in J. B. Migne, ed. *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina.* Volumes 32–46. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1878–90.

——. *Answer to the Pelagians, I–IV. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century.* I/23–26. Translated Roland J. Teske, S.J. New Rochelle, NY: New City Press, 1997–99.

——. *The Confessions. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century.* I/1. Translated Maria Boulding, O.S.B. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1997.

——. *Saint Augustine: The City of God against the Pagans.* Loeb Classical Library. Translated by George McCracken, William Green, David Wiesen, Philip Levine, and Eva Matthews Sanford. 7 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957–72.

——. *Miscellany of Questions in Response to Simplician* in *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century.* 1/12. Edited by Boniface Ramsey. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2008.

Augustine of Hippo. *Sermons. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. Volumes III/1–13. Translated by. Edmund Hill, O.P. New Rochelle, NY: New City Press, 1990–97.

———. *The Enchiridion on Faith, Hope, and Love*. Translated by Bruce Harbert. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. I/8. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2005.

Barlow, William. *The Summe and Substance of the Conference … at Hampton Court* (1605), in Edward Cardwell, *A History of Conferences …* 167–212. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1849.

Baro, Peter. *Petri Baronis Stempani … in Jonam prophetam prælectiones 39*. London, 1579. *NSTC* 1492.

———. "Letter to Nicolaus Henningsen, April, 1596 (including *Summa Trium de Praedesintation sententiarum*)." In *Praestantium ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolae*, 29–32. 2d. ed. Amsterdam, 1684.

———. *A Speciall Treatise of Gods Prouidence* [by Andreas Hyperius]. . . *Heerunto is added an appendix of certaine* Sermons & Questions, (conteining sweet & comfortable doctrine*) as they were vttered and disputed ad Clerum in* Cambridge Translated I[ohn]. L[udham]. London: Iohn Wolfe, 1588?

Bayle, Pierre. "Augustin." *Dictionnaire historique et critique*. Rotterdam, 1702.

Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963. English translation *The Book of Concord*. Translated by Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.

Bellarmine, Robert. *Disputationes de controversiis Christianæ fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*. Edited by Justinus Fevre. Volume 6 of *Roberti Bellarmini Opera Omnia*. 12 vols. Paris: Ludovicum Vives, 1870–74.

The Book of Common Prayer 1559, in *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Edited by Reverend William K. Clay. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847.

Calvin, John. *Acta Synodi Tridentinæ cum Antidoto* in Volume 7 of *Corpus Reformatorum Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*. Edited Wilhelm Baum, Eduard Cunitz, and Eduard Reuss. 59 vols. Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke & Son, 1863–1900. English translation in *Calvin: Tracts and Treatises*, 3:17–188. Translated by Henry Beveridge. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1851.

———. *Institutionis Christianae Religionis 1559*, Volumes 3–5 of *Joannis Calvini Opera Selecta*. Edited by Peter Barth and William Niesel. 5 vols. Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1928–36. English translation *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated Ford Lewis Battles. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

———. *Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis* in *Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*. Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke & Son, 1892. Volume 47. English translation in *Calvin's Commentaries: The Gospel according to St. John 1–10*. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1959.

Carleton, George. *An Examination of Those Things Wherein the Author of the Late Appeal* ... London, 1626. *NSTC* 4635.

Cawdrey, Daniel. *The Inconsistencie of the Independent way, with Scripture and It Self. Manifested in a threefold Discourse, I. Vindicia Vindiciarum, with M. Cotton. II. A Review of M. Hookers Survey of Church-Discipline. The first part. III. A Diatribe with the same M. Hooker Concerning Baptism of Infants of Non-confederate parents, Cap 2. Of his third part.* London: A. Miller for Christopher Meredith, 1651. *Wing* C1629A.

Chibald, William. *A Trial of Faith: by the Touchstone of the Gospel, the Word of Faith* ... London, 1622. *NSTC* 5134.

——. *An Apology for ... A triall of Faith.* London, 1624. *NSTC* 5130.

Clarke, Samuel. "The Life and Death of Mr. Richard Blackerby, who died Anno Christi, 1648," in *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in This Later Age,* 57–66. London, 1683. *Wing* C4538.

Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church: Dedham and Bury St. Edmunds. 1582–1590. Church of England Record Society 10. Edited by Patrick Collinson, John Craig, and Brett Usher. Woodbridge: Church of England Record Society, 2003.

Corbett, Richard. *The Poems of Richard Corbett.* Edited by J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Cosin, John. *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D. Lord Bishop of Durham: Together with Other Papers Illustrative of His Life and Times.* Edited by George Ornsby. 2 vols. Durham: Andrews & Co., 1869–1872.

Cotton, John. *Of the Holiness of Church Members.* London, 1650. *Wing* C6448.

——. *The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England.* London, 1645. *Wing* C6471.

——. *John Cotton on the Churches of New England.* Edited by Larzer Ziff. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.

——. *The Correspondence of John Cotton.* Edited by Sargent Bush, Jr. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Cotton, John, Jr. "Letter to Increase Mather, 1677." *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society,* 4th Ser., 8 (1868): 240.

Culverwell, Ezekiel. *A Treatise of Faith:* ... London, 1623. *NSTC* 6115.

Davenant, John. *Determinationes Quæstionum Quarundam Theologicarum.* Cambridge, 1634. *NSTC* 6294.

——. *Animadversions.* London, 1641. *Wing* D315.

——. *Dissertatio de Morte Christi.* Cambridge, 1650. *Wing* D317. English translation *On the Death of Christ.* Translated Josiah Allport. London: Hamilton, Adams and Company, 1831.

Defoe, Daniel. *A Journal of the Plague Year.* 1722. Reprinted New York: Modern Library, 2001.

Dent, Arthur. *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven.* London, 1601. *NSTC* 6626.5.

Denzinger, Heinrich. Editor. *Enchiridion symbolorum: definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*. Freiburg: Herder & Herder, 1955.

De Vries, Peter. *Voyages from Holland to America, A.D. 1632 to 1644*. Translated by Henry C. Murphy. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1971.

Donne, John. *The Works of John Donne*. Edited by Henry Alford. 6 vols. London: John W. Parker, 1839.

Dort, Synod of. *Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium in Foederato Belgio*. Herderwiici, 1620.

——. *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618–19)*. Edited by Anthony Milson. Church of England Record Society. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005.

——. *Suffragium Collegiale Theologorum Magnæ Britanniæ de Quinque Controversis Remonstrantium Articulis, Judicio Synodico Prævium . . . .* London, 1627. *NSTC* 7068. English translation, *The Collegiat Suffrage of the Divines of Great Britaine, Concerning the Five Articles Controverted in the Low Countries*. London, 1629. *NSTC* 7070.

Eliot, John. "John Eliot to Richard Baxter, October 7, 1657." In F. J. Powicke, "Some Unpublished Correspondence of the Rev. Richard Baxter and the Rev. John Eliot, 'The Apostle to the American Indians,' 1656–1682," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 15 (1931): 138–76, 442–66.

[Emmanuel College]. *The Statutes of Sir Walter Mildmay Kt Chancellor of the Exchequer and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors, Authorised by Him for the Government of Emmanuel College Founded by Him*. Edited by Frank H. Stubbings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Erasmus of Rotterdam. *De Libero Arbitrio ΔIATPIBH, sive Collatio*. Edited by Johannes Walter. Quellenschriften zür Geschichte des Protestantismus 8. Heft. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Buchhandlung, 1910.

Fenner, Dudley. *The Arts of Logic and Rhetoric*. Middelburg, 1584. *NSTC* 10766.

——. *Sacra Theologia*. n.p., 1585. *NSTC* 10773.5.

——. *Certain Godly and Learned Treatises*. Edinburgh, 1592. *NSTC* 10769.

Feuerbach, Ludwig. *Das Wesen des Christentums*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam Jun., 1969. [First published, 1835]. English translation, *The Essence of Christianity*. Translated by George Eliot. New York: Harper & Row, 1957. [First translated 1854].

Firmin, Giles. *Separation examined: or, a treatise vvherein the grounds for separation from the ministry and churches of England are weighed, and found too light*. London, 1652. *Wing* F964.

——. *A Sober Reply to the Sober Answer of REVEREND Mr. CAWDREY*. London, 1653. *Wing* F966.

——. *The Real Christian, or a Treatise of Effectual Calling . . .* London, 1670. *Wing* F963.

——. *The Questions between the Conformist and Nonconformist*. London, 1681. *Wing* F962.

Freud, Sigmund. *Die Zukunft einer Illusion*. Leipzig: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1927. English translation *The Future of an Illusion*. Translated W. D. Robson-Scott. London: Hogarth Press, 1928.

Goodwin, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D., Sometime President of Magdalene College, Oxford*. Edited by John C. Miller. 11 vols. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1861–65.

Greenham, Richard. *"Practical Divinity": The Works and Life of Rev'd Richard Greenham*. Edited by Kenneth L. Parker and Eric J. Carlson. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

Hall, David D. Editor. *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636–1638: A Documentary History*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1968.

Harsnett, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached at S. Pauls Cross*. Printed in *Three Sermons Preached by the Reverend, and Learned Dr. Robert Stuart, … To which is ad[d]ed, a fourth Sermon, Preached by the Right Reverend Father in God, Samuel Harsnett, Lord Arch-Bishop of* Yorke. London, 1656. *Wing* S5527.

Heartwell, Jasper (?). *Trodden Down Strength by the God of Strength*. London, 1647. *Wing* H960.

Hemmingsen, Niels. *Commentarivs in Epistolam Pavli ad Ephesios*. London, 1576. *NSTC* 13057.5. English translation *The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule. … To the Ephesians … Faithfully Expounded … by Nicholas Hemming*. Translated by Abraham Fleming. London, 1581. *NSTC* 13058.

Heywood, Oliver. *A Narrative of the Holy Life, and Happy Death, of that Reverend, Faithful and Zealous Man of God, and Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Mr John Angier*. London, 1683. *Wing* H1772.

Hooker, Richard. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Edited by W. Speed Hill. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Hudson, Samuel. *The Essence and Unitie of the Church Catholike Visible, And the Prioiritie thereof in regard of Particular Churches Discussed*. London, 1645. *Wing* H3265.

———. *A Vindication of the Essence and Unity of the Church Catholike Visible*. London, 1650. *Wing* H3266.

Huit, Ephraim. *The Anatomy of Conscience. Or the Summe of Pauls Regeneracy, Wherein are handled the places of Conscience, Worship, and Scandall; with diverse Rules of Christian practise; very profitable for the weake Christian*. London, 1626. *NSTC* 13928.

Huntington, Gale. "Dragging—1934." *The Dukes County Intelligencer* 54 (2012): 7–17.

Keayne, Robert. *The Apologia of Robert Keayne* … Edited by Bernard Bailyn. Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts 42, 243–341. Boston: Published by the Society, 1964.

Keckermann, Bartholomäus. *Ouranognosia. Heauenly knowledge A manuduction to theologie*. London, 1622. *NSTC* 14896.

Leake, Richard. *Foure sermons preached … within the baronrie of Kendall, and countie of Westmorland: immediately after the great visitation of the pestilence in the fore-sayd countie*. London, 1599. *NSTC* 15342.

Lechford, Thomas. *Plain Dealing, or News from New England*. Edited by J. Hammond Trumbull. Boston: J. K. Wiggin and Wm. Parsons Lunt, 1867.

Loyola, Ignatius of. *Ejercicios Espirituales* in *Obras Completas de San Ignacio de Loyola*. Edited by Candido de Dalmases, S.J. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1963. English translation *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola. Spanish and English with a Continuous Commentary*. Edited by Joseph Rickaby, S.J. London: Burns & Oates, 1915.

Luther, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Edited by J. K. F. Knaake, G. Kawerau, et al. Weimar, 1883–.

——. *Luther's Works*. 55 vols. St. Louis and Philadelphia: Augsburg and Fortress, 1955–75.

——. *The Pagan Servitude of the Church*, in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, 249–359. Edited by John Dillenberger. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Doubleday, 1961.

——. *The Bondage of the Will*. Translated by J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston. Westwood, NJ: Fleming Revell, 1957.

——. *Luther: Lectures on Romans*. Edited and Translated by Wilhelm Pauck. The Library of Christian Classics. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

——. *Martin Luther's Spiritual Songs*. Translated by Richard Massie. London: Hatchard & Son, 1854.

——. *Sermons of Martin Luther*. Translated by John N. Lenker. 8 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. *Nicholas Machiavel's Prince*. London, 1640. *NSTC* 17168.

Mason, John. *A brief history of the Pequot War: especially of the memorable taking of their fort at Mistick in Connecticut in 1637: Written by Major John Mason*. Boston, 1736.

[Massachusetts Bay Company]. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*. Edited by Nathaniel Shurtleff. 5 vols. Boston: William White, 1853–54.

Mather, Cotton. *Piscator Evangelicus, or, The Life of Mr. Thomas Hooker*, attached to *Johannes in Eremo*. London, 1695. *Wing* M1117.

——. "Doctor Irrefragabilis: The Life of Mr. Samuel Stone," in *Magnalia Christi Americana*, 1:434–438. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

——. *Memoria* WILSONIA. The Life of Mr. John Wilson, in *Johannes in Eremo*. London, 1695. *Wing* M1117.

——. *Magnalia Christi Americana: Or, The Ecclesiastical History of New England, from Its First Planting in the Year 1620, unto the Year of our LORD, 1698*. London, 1702.

——. *Magnalia Christi Americana*. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

Mather, Increase. "To the Reader," in James Fitch, *The First Principles of the Doctrine of Christ*. Boston, 1679. *Wing* F1064.

——. *Catechismus Logicus*. Included in Rick Kennedy and Thomas Knoles, "Increase Mather's '*Catechismus Logicus*': A Translation and an Analysis of the Role of a Ramist Catechism at Harvard," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 109 (1999): 145–223.

Mather, Nathaniel. "Letter to Increase Mather, 1681." *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 4th Ser., 8 (1868): 32–33.

Mather, Richard. "A Letter of Richard Mather to a Cleric in Old England." Edited by B. Richard Burg. *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 29 (1972): 81–98.

Molina, Luis de. *Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiæ Donis, Divina Præscientia, Providentia, Prædestinatione et Reprobatione Concordia*. Edited by Johannes Rabeneck, S.J. Oña: Collegium Maximum S.J., 1953. Partial English translation in *On Divine Foreknowledge* (*Part IV of the Concordia*). Edited and Translated by Aldred J. Freddoso. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Montagu, Richard. *Appello Cæsarem. A Iust Appeale from Two Uniust Informers*. London, 1625. *NSTC* 18030.

Norton, John. *The Answer To the Whole Set of Questions of the Celebrated Mr. William Apollonius* ... Translated by Douglas Horton. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958.

——. *The Orthodox Evangelist. ...* London, 1654. *Wing* N1320.

Norwood, Richard. *The Journal of Richard Norwood Surveyor of Bermuda*. Edited by Wesley F. Craven and Walter B. Hayward. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1945.

Orr, Charles. *History of the Pequot War: The Contemporary Accounts of Mason, Underhill, Vincent, and Gardner*. Cleveland: Helman-Taylor, 1897.

Paget, John. *An Answer to the Unjust Complaints of William Best*. Amsterdam: Iohn Fredericksz Stam, 1634.

"Papers Relating to the Controversy in the Church at Hartford, 1656–59." *Connecticut Historical Society Collections* 2 (1870): 51–125.

Pelagius. *Epistula ad sacram Christi virginem Demetriadem*. In J. P. Migne, Editor. *Patrologia Latina* 30:15–45. English translation "To Demetrias" in *The Letters of Pelagius and His Followers*. Translated by B. R. Rees. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991, 29–70.

Perkins, William. *The Workes of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Vniuersitie of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins*. 3 vols. London: John Legatt, 1616–18. *NSTC* 19651.

Peter, Hugh. *A Dying Fathers Last Legacy to an Onely Child* ... London: G. Calvert and T. Brewster, 1660. *Wing* P1697.

——. *The Case of Mr. Hugh Peters, Impartially Communicated to the Vievv and Censure of the Whole World: Written by his own hand*. London: Samuel Speed, 1660. *Wing* P1695.

Prynne, William. *A Fresh Discovery of some* Prodigious New Wandring-Blasing-Stars, & Firebrands, *Stiling themselves NEW-LIGHTS* ... London: John Macock, 1645. *Wing* P3963.

——. *Canterburies Doome: or the First Part of a Compleat History of the Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of William Lavd Late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*. London: John Macock for Michael Spark, 1646. *Wing* P3917.

Richardson, Alexander. *The Logicians School-Master: or, A Comment upon Ramus Logicke*. London, 1629. *NSTC* 21012; 2d ed. London, 1657. *Wing* R1378.

Robinson, Marilynne. *Gilead*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2004.

Rogers, John. *The Doctrine of Faith* … 2d ed. London, 1629. *NSTC* 21187.

——. *A Godly & Fruitful Exposition upon All the First Epistle of Peter*. London, 1650. *Wing* R1808.

Rogers, Richard. *Seven Treatises, Containing Such Direction as Is Gathered Out of the Holie Scriptures, Leading and Guiding to True Hapines*. London, 1603. *NSTC* 21215.

Rogers, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Rogers, 1634–38*. Edited by Tom Webster and Kenneth Shipps. Church of England Record Society 11. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004.

Shepard, Thomas. *Autobiography* and *Journal* in *God's Plot: Puritan Spirituality in Thomas Shepard's Cambridge*. Edited by Michael McGiffert. Revised ed. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.

——. *Thomas Shepard's Confessions*. Edited by George Selement and Bruce C. Wooley. *Collections of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 58. Boston: Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1981.

——. "Thomas Shepard's Record of Relations of Religious Experience, 1648–1649." Edited by Mary Rhinelander McCarl. *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., 48 (1991): 432–66.

Sibbes, Richard. *The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D. D.* … Edited by Alexander Grosart. 7 vols. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1862.

Stansby, R. "To John Wilson." *Winthrop Papers*, 5:390. 5 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929–.

Strauss, David F. *Das Leben Jesu: kritisch bearbeitet*. Tübingen, 1835. English translation *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. Translated by George Eliot. Edited by Peter Hodgson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

Ussher, James [attributed]. *A Body of Divinitie, or The Summe and Substance of Christian Religion, Catechistically propounded, and explained, by way of* Question *and* Answer: *Methodically and familiarly handled*. London, 1645. *Wing* U151.

Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church. Volume 1. Edited by Kenneth Fincham. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994.

Walker, George. *A True Relation of the chiefe passages betweene Mr.* Anthony Wooten, *and Mr.* George Walker … London, 1642. *Wing* W367.

Walker, Williston. Editor. *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1960.

Ward, Samuel. *Gratia Discriminans*. London, 1627. *NSTC* 25027.

——. *Opera Nonnulla*. London, 1658. *Wing* W811.

Weld, Thomas. *A Brief Narration of the Practices of the Churches in New-England*. London, 1645. *Wing* W1263. Reprinted *The Congregational Quarterly* 17 (1875): 253–71.

Wesley, John. *John Wesley*. Edited by Albert C. Outler. Library of Protestant Thought. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Willard, Samuel. *Covenant-Keeping, the Way to Blessedness*. Boston: James Glen, 1682. *Wing* W2272.

——. *Complete Body of Divinity*. Boston: B. Green and S. Kneeland, 1726.

Williams, Roger. *The Correspondence of Roger Williams*. Edited by Glenn W. LaFantasie. 2 vols. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1988.

Winthrop, John. "Common Grievances Groaning for Reformation." *Winthrop Papers* 1:295–310. 5 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929–47.

——. "For Preventing Drunkenness." *Winthrop Papers* 1:371–74. 5 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929–47.

——. "John Winthrop's Experiencia." *Winthrop Papers* 1:161–69, 182–215, 235–38, 405, 412–13; 2:103. 5 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929–47.

——. "Upon some differences in o[u]r Churche about the waye of the Spirit of God in the worke of Justif: . . ." In Robert C. Winthrop, *Life and Letters of John Winthrop*, 2:161. 2 vols. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1895.

——. *The Journal of John Winthrop 1630–1649*. Edited by Richard S. Dunn and Laetitia Yeandle. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Winthrop, John, et al. *Winthrop Papers*. 5 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929–47.

Yates, John. *Gods Arraignement of Hypocrites: with an Inlargement concerning Gods decree in ordering sinne. As Likewise a Defence of Mr. Calvine against Belarmine; and of M. Perkins against Arminius*. Cambridge, 1615. *NSTC* 26081.

——. *A Short and Briefe Svmme of saving Knowledge; Consisting of the Creed, ten Commandements, Lords Prayer, and the Sacraments. And is made as a profitable Introduction to the larger Art of Divinitie, composed by the methodicall Tables of A. R.* London, 1621. *NSTC* 26088.

——. *A Modell of Divinitie, catechistically composed, Wherein is delivered the matter and method of religion, according to the creed, ten Commandements, Lords Prayer, and the Sacraments*. London, 1622. *NSTC* 26085.

"Yow Puritans all." In *Records of Early English Drama: Dorset*. Edited by Rosalind C. Hays and C. E. McGee, 181. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

IV. SECONDARY SOURCES CITED IN THE TEXT

Abercrombie, Nigel. *The Origins of Jansenism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Adams, John C. "Alexander Richardson's Philosophy of Art and the Sources of the Puritan Social Ethic." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50 (1989): 227–47.

Ahlstrom, Sydney. "Thomas Hooker, Puritanism, and Democratic Citizenship: A Preliminary Inquiry into Some Relationship of Religion and American Civic Responsibility." The Third Hooker Lecture. First Church of Christ, May 16 1962. Later Published in *Church History* 32 (1963): 415–31.

Allen, David Grayson. *In English Ways: The Movement of Societies and the Transferal of English Local Law and Custom to Massachusetts Bay in the Seventeenth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.

Andrews, Charles McLean. *The River Towns of Connecticut: A Study of Wethersfield, Hartford, and Windsor*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and

Political Science 7th Ser., VII–IX. Edited by Herbert B. Adams. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1889.

Andrews, Charles McLean. *The Colonial Period of American History.* 4 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934–38.

Armstrong, Karen. *A History of God.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994.

Astrain, Antonio. "Congregatio de auxiliis." *The Catholic Encyclopedia* 4: 238–39. 15 vols. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907–12.

Bancroft, George. *The History of the United States.* Revised ed. Boston: D. Appleton & Co., 1876.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics.* 4 vols. in 14. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936–77.

Beeke, Joel R. *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation.* New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

——. "The Order of the Divine Decrees at the Genevan Academy: From Bezan Supralapsarianism to Turretinian Infralapsarianism." In *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564–1864,* edited by John B. Roney and Martin I. Klauber, 57–75. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998.

Bellos, David. *Is That a Fish in Your Ear: Translation and the Meaning of Everything.* New York: Faber and Faber, 2011.

Berkouwer, G. C. *Divine Election.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1960.

Bierma, Lyle D. "Federal Theology in the Sixteenth Century: Two Traditions?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 45 (1983): 304–21.

Bizer, Ernst. *Fides ex auditu: Eine Untersuchung über die Entdeckung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes durch Martin Luther.* 3d ed. Neukirchen: Verlag des Erziehungsverein, 1966.

Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages.* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Nachfolge* (1937). In *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Werke.* Munich: Kaiser Verlag), 1989. English translation *The Cost of Discipleship,* translated by R. H. Fuller. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

Bornkamm, Heinrich. "Zur Frage der Iustitia Dei beim jungen Luther." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 52 (1961): 16–29 and 53 (1962): 1–60.

Bossy. John. "Five Centuries of Sin [review of Jean Delumeau, *Le peche et la peur*]." *Times Literary Supplement,* Feb. 24, 1984, 180.

——. *Christianity in the West 1400–1700.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Boulton, J. P. "The Limits of Formal Religion: The Administration of Holy Communion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England." *London Journal* 10 (1984): 135–54.

Bowers, Roger. "The Chapel Royal, the First Edwardian Prayer Book, and Elizabeth's Settlement of Religion, 1559." *Historical Journal* 43 (2000): 317–44.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. "The Glory of the 'Third Time': John Eaton as Contra-Puritan." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996): 638–54.

——. *The Precisionist Strain: Disciplinary Religion & Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Bremer, Francis J. "The Heritage of John Winthrop: Religion along the Stour Valley, 1548–1630." *New England Quarterly* 70 (1997): 515–47.

——. *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

——. *Building a New Jerusalem: John Davenport, a Puritan in Three Worlds*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

——. "Not Quite So Visible Saints: Reexamining Conversion Narratives in Early New England." *New England Quarterly* (December, 2015).

——. *"To Taste the Preciousness of Each Other's Experiences": Lay Empowerment and the Development of Puritanism*. Manchester, England: University of Manchester Press, 2015.

Bremer, Francis J., and Ellen Rydell. "Performance Art? Puritans in the Pulpit." *History Today* 45 (Sept. 1995): 50–54.

Bremer, Francis J., and Tom Webster. *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO, 2006.

Brigden, Susan. "Youth and the English Reformation." *Past and Present* 95 (1982): 37–67.

Brodrick, James S.J. *The Life and Work of Blessed Robert Francis Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J. 1542–1621*. 2 vols. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1928.

Brooks, Christopher. "Apprenticeship, Social Mobility and the Middling Sort, 1550–1800." In *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society and Politics in England, 1550–1800*, edited by Jonathan Barry and Christopher Brooks, 52–83, 233–42. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo*. New edition with epilogue. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

——. "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion." In Peter Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, 260–78. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

——. *The Making of Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

——. "Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century A.D.: Augustine and Julian of Eclanum." In *Tria corda: scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, edited by E. Gabba, 49–70. Biblioteca di Athenaeum 1. Como: New Press, 1983.

——. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

——. *A Life of Learning*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2003.

——. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 A.D.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Brownlow, Frank W. *Shakespeare, Harsnett, and the Devils of Denham*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993.

Brueggemann, Walter. "Imagination as a Mode of Fidelity." In *Understanding the Word: Essays in Honor of Bernhard J. Anderson*, edited by James T. Butler, Edgar W. Conrad, and Ben C. Ollenburger, 13–36. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 37. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

——. *Interpretation and Obedience: From Faithful Reading to Faithful Living*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

——. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.

Bruhn, Karen. "'Sinne Unfoulded': Time, Election, and Disbelief among the Godly in Late Sixteenth- and Early Seventeenth-England." *Church History* 77 (2008): 574–95.

Brumm, Ursala. "The Art of Puritan Meditation in New England." In *Studies in New England Puritanism*, edited by Winfried Herget, 139–67. Studien und Texte zur Amerikanistik vol. 9. Bern: Peter Lang, 1983.

Bush, Sargent, Jr. "Thomas Hooker and the Westminster Assembly." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 29 (1972): 291–300.

——. "Establishing the Hooker Canon" and "A Bibliography of the Published Writings of Thomas Hooker," in *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, edited by George H. Williams, Norman Pettit, Winfried Herget, and Sargent Bush, Jr., 378–425. Harvard Theological Studies 28. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

—— *The Writings of Thomas Hooker: Spiritual Adventure in Two Worlds*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.

——. "Thomas Hooker." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* 27:978–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Calamy, Edmund. *An Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of His Life and Times*. London, 1702.

Caldwell, Patricia. *The Puritan Conversion Narrative: The Beginnings of American Expression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Calhoun, Robert Lowry. *Scripture, Creed, Theology: Lectures on the History of Christian Doctrine in the First Centuries*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011.

Cambers, Andrew. "Pastoral Laudianism? Religious Politics in the 1630s: A Leicestershire Rector's Annotations." *Midland History* 27 (2002): 38–51.

——. "Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, circa 1580–1720." *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007): 796–826.

Carlson, Eric Josef. "'Practical Divinity': Richard Greenham's Ministry in Elizabethan England." In *Religion and the English People 1500–1640. New Voices, New Perspectives*, edited by Eric Josef Carlson, 147–98. Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 45. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1998.

Carrive, Lucien. "L'Assurance du salut, doctrine de la Réforme en Angleterre." *Études anglaises* 31 (1978): 259–72.

Chadwick, Henry. *Augustine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Châtellier, Louis. *The Religion of the Poor: Rural Missions in Europe and the Formation of Modern Catholicism, c. 1500—c. 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Clark, Peter. "The Alehouse and the Alternative Society." In *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*, edited by Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas, 47–72. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

——. *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200–1830*. London: Longman, 1983.

Clarke, Samuel. *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in This Later Age*. London, 1683. Wing C4538.

Cliffe, J. T. *The Puritan Gentry: The Great Puritan Families of Early Stuart England*. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1984.

Cogswell, Thomas. "England and the Spanish Match." In *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–1642*, edited by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, 107–33, 256. London: Longman, 1989.

——. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Cohen, Charles L. *God's Caress: The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

—— "Two Biblical Models of Conversion: An Example of Puritan Hermeneutics." *Church History* 58 (1989): 182–96.

Collingwood, Deryck. *Thomas Hooker, 1586–1647, Father of American Democracy. A Pilgrim's Guide to the England He Knew* ... Interlaken, NY: Heart of the Lakes Publishing, 1995.

Collinson, Patrick. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1967.

——. "Lectures by Combination: Structures and Characteristics of Church Life in 17th-Century England." *Bulletin of the Institute for Historical Research* 48 (1975): 182–213.

——. *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559–1625*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

——. "The Godly: Aspects of Popular Protestantism." In Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, 1–18. London: Hambledon Press, 1983.

——. "England and International Calvinism, 1558–1640." In *International Calvinism, 1541–1715*, edited by Menna Prestwick, 197–223. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

——. "The English Conventicle." In *Voluntary Religion*, edited by W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood, 223–59. Studies in Church History 23. London: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

——. *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religion and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988.

Collinson, Patrick. "The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful." In *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, edited by Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, 51–76. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

——. " 'Not Sexual in the Ordinary Sense': Women, Men and Religious Transactions." In Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays*, 119–50. London: Hambledon Press, 1994.

——. "Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture." In *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, edited by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, 32–57, 267–68, 280–88. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

——. "Comment on Eamon Duffy's Neale Lecture and the Colloquium." In *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, edited by Nicholas Tyacke, 71–86. London: UCL Press, 1997.

——. "The Foundation and Beginnings." "Emmanuel and Cambridge: The Early Seventeenth-Century Heyday." "Puritan Emmanuel." "Emmanuel, New England and Harvard." "The English Revolution and the Strange Death of the Old College." "Restoration and Transmogrification." In *A History of Emmanuel College*, edited by Sarah Bendall, Christopher Brooke, and Patrick Collinson, 13–55, 56–90, 177–226, 227–39, 240–92. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999.

——. "Night Schools, Conventicles and Churches: Continuities and Discontinuities in Early Protestant Ecclesiology." In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, 209–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

——. *The Reformation: A History.* New York: Modern Library, 2004.

——. "The Fog in the Channel Clears: The Rediscovery of the Continental Dimension to the British Reformation." In *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, edited by Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, xvii–xxxvii. Proceedings of the British Academy 164. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

——. *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism.* Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Como, David R. "The Kingdom of Christ, the Kingdom of England, and the Kingdom of Traske: John Traske and the Persistence of Radical Puritanism in Early Stuart England." In *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England*, edited by Muriel C. McClendon, Joseph P. Ward, and Michael MacDonald, 63–82, 303–309. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

——. "Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 64–87. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.

——. "Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London." *Historical Journal* 46 (2003): 263–94.

——. *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil War England.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Como, David R. "Radical Puritanism, c. 1558–1660." In *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, 241–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Coolidge, John S. *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Craig, John S. *Reformation, Politics and Polemics: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns, 1510–1600*. Albershot: Ashgate, 2001.

——. "Sermon Reception." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, 178–97. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

——. "Bodies at Prayer in Early Modern England." In *Worship and the Parish Church in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Natalie Mears and Alec Ryrie, 173–96. Saint Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2013.

Cranfield, Nicholas W. S. "Moral Tales at the Hearth: Jephthah's Daughter in the Seventeenth Century." In *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, edited by Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene, 58–73. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

——"Corbett, Richard (1582–1635)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept. 2012. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6292.

Crawford, Michael. "Origins of the Eighteenth-Century Evangelical Revival: England and New England Compared." *Journal of British Studies* 26 (1987): 361–97.

Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Croft, Pauline. "The Religion of Robert Cecil." *Historical Journal* 34 (1991): 773–96.

——. "The New English Church in One Family: William, Mildred and Robert Cecil." In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten, 65–89, 225–29. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.

Cunnington, Phillis, and Catherine Lucas. *Occupational Costume in England from the Eleventh Century to 1914*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1967.

Curtis, Mark H. *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558–1642: An Essay on Changing Relations between the English Universities and English Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Davids, T. W. *Annals of Evangelical Nonconformity in the County of Essex*. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder, 1863.

Davies, Julian. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1625–1641*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Delbanco, Andrew. *The Puritan Ordeal*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Delumeau, Jean. *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire*. Paris: Presses universitaire de France, 1971. English translation *Catholicism between Luther and Voltaire*. Translated by Jeremy Moiser. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.

Delumeau, Jean. *La Peur en Occident (XIVe–XVIIIe sicles): Une cité assiégée*. Paris: Librairie Artheme Fayard, 1978.

——. *Le Péché et la peur: La Culpabilisation en Occident, XIIIe–XVIIIe siècles*. Paris: Librarie Artheme Fayard, 1983. English translation *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture 13th–18th Centuries*. Translated by Eric Nicholson. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Dent, Christopher M. *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Dillenberger, John. "Introduction." In *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, edited by John Dillenberger, xiv–xxxiii. New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Ditmore, Michael G. "Preparation and Confession: Reconsidering Edmund S. Morgan's *Visible Saints*." *New England Quarterly* 67 (1994): 298–318.

Dixon, Leif. "Calvinist Theology and Pastoral Reality in the Reign of King James I: The Perspective of Thomas Wilson." *The Seventeenth Century* 23 (2008): 173–97.

——. "Richard Greenham and the Calvinist Construction of God." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 61 (2010): 729–45.

——. "William Perkins, 'Atheisme,' and the Crises of England's Long Reformation." *Journal of British Studies* 50 (2011): 790–812.

Donagan, Barbara. "The Clerical Patronage of Robert Rich, Second Earl of Warwick, 1619–1642." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 120 (1976): 388–419.

——. "The York House Conference Revisited: Laymen, Calvinism and Arminianism." *Historical Research* 64 (1991): 312–30.

Duffy, Eamon, "The Godly and the Multitude in Stuart England." *The Seventeenth Century* 1 (1986): 31–55.

——. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400–c. 1580*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

——. "The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the Multitude." In *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, edited by Nicholas Tyacke, 33–70. London: UCL Press, 1997.

——. "The English Reformation after Revisionism." *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006): 702–31.

——. *Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition: Religion and Conflict in the Tudor Reformations*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012.

Eales, Jacqueline. "A Road to Revolution: The Continuity of Puritanism, 1559–1642." In *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, edited by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, 184–209, 272, 307–12. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Eire, Carlos. *A Very Brief History of Eternity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Ettenhuber, Katrin. " 'The Best Help God's People Have': Manuscript Culture and the Construction of Anti-Calvinist Communities in Seventeenth-Century England." *The Seventeenth Century* 22 (2007): 260–82.

Fiering, Norman S. "President Samuel Johnson and the Circle of Knowledge." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 28 (1971): 199–236.

——, "Will and Intellect in the New England Mind." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 29 (1972): 515–58.

——. *Moral Philosophy at Seventeenth-Century Harvard: A Discipline in Transition.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.

Fincham, Kenneth. *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

——. "Episcopal Government, 1603–1640." In *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, edited by Kenneth Fincham, 71–91, 236–37, 259–62. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

——. "Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 125–58. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.

——. "William Laud and the Exercise of Caroline Ecclesiastical Patronage." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51 (2000): 1–25.

Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake. "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I." *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985): 169–207.

——. "The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I." In *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, edited by Kenneth Fincham, 23–49, 234–35, 251–56. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Fincham, Kenneth, and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored; The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c. 1700.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Fiske, John. *The Beginnings of New England.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1889.

Fitzgerald, Monica D. "Drunkards, Fornicators, and a Great Hen Squabble: Censure Practices and the Gendering of Puritanism." *Church History* 80 (2011): 40–75.

Fletcher, Anthony J. "The Protestant Idea of Marriage in Early Modern England." In *Religion, Culture, and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, edited by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts, 161–81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

——. "Prescription and Practice: Protestantism and the Upbringing of Children, 1560–1700." In *The Church and Childhood*, edited by Diana Wood, 325–46. Studies in Church History 31. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994.

——. *Growing up in England: The Experience of Childhood 1600–1914.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Forde, Gerhard O. *Where God Meets Man: Luther's Down-to-Earth Approach to the Gospel.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.

Fornerod, Nicholas, "'The Canons of the Synod Had Shot off the Advocate's Head': A Reappraisal of the Genevan Delegation." In *Revisiting the Synod of Dort (1618–1619)*, edited by Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg, 181–215. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Forrell, Lori Anne, and Peter McCullough. "Revising the Study of the English Sermon." In *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600–1750*, edited by Lori Anne Forrell and Peter McCullough, 2–21. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Foster, Andrew. "The Function of a Bishop: The Career of Richard Neile, 1562–1640." In *Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church in England 1500–1642*, edited by Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal, 33–54, 259–61. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1976.

——. "Church Policies of the 1630s." In *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–1642*, edited by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, 193–223, 258–59. London: Longman, 1989.

——. "Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 159–78. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.

Foster, Stephen. "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630 to 1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 38 (1981): 624–60.

——. "English Puritanism and the Progress of New England Institutions, 1630–1660." In *Saints & Revolutionaries: Essays on Early America*, edited by David D. Hall, John M. Murrin, and Thad W. Tate, 3–37. New York: Norton, 1984.

——. "Hooker, Thomas (1586–1647)." In *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, 1:130–32. 2 vols. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO, 2006.

Fox, Adam. "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England." *Past and Present* 145 (1994): 47–83.

——. "Religious Satire in English Towns, 1570–1640." In *The Reformation in the English Towns, 1500–1640*, edited by Patrick Collinson and John S. Craig, 221–40, 297–301, 315–16. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.

Foxgrover, David. "'Temporary Faith' and the Certainty of Salvation." *Calvin Theological Journal* 14 (1980): 220–32.

——. "Self-Examination in Calvin and Ames." In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, edited by W. Fred Graham, 450–69. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.

Freddoso, Alfred J. "Introduction." In *On Divine Foreknowledge* (*Part IV of the Concordia*), translated by Aldred J. Freddoso. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Fredriksen, Paula. "Paul and Augustine: Conversion Narratives, Orthodox Traditions, and the Retrospective Self." *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 37 (1986): 3–34.

——. "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins whose Time has Come to Go." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 35 (2006): 231–46.

——. "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 232–52.

——. *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Frei, Hans. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Galeota, Gustavo. "Bellarmini, Roberto (1542–1621)." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 5:525–31. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977–2006.

Gerrish, Brian A. "'To the Unknown God' Luther and Calvin on the Hiddenness of God" In Brian A. Gerrish, *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage,* 131–49, 334–45. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Godfrey, W. Robert. "Reformed Thought on the Extent of the Atonement to 1618." *Westminster Theological Journal* 37 (1974–75): 133–71.

Goodwin, Gerald J. "The Myth of 'Arminian-Calvinism' in Eighteenth-Century New England." *New England Quarterly* 41 (1968): 213–37.

Gordis, Lisa. *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Green, Garrett. *Imagining God: Theology and the Religious Imagination.* New York: Harper & Row, 1989.

Green, Ian M. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

——. "Teaching the Reformation: The Clergy as Preachers, Catechists, Authors and Teachers." In *The Protestant Clergy of Early Modern Europe*, edited by C. Scott Dixon and Luise Schorn-Schütte, 156–75, 234–37. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.

——. "Orality, Script and Print: the Case of the English Sermon c. 1530–1700." In *Religion and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700*, edited by Heinz Schilling and Istvan Gyorgy Toth, 236–55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

——. "Preaching in the Parishes." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, 137–54. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Gribben, Crawford. "Rhetoric, Fiction and Theology: James Ussher and the Death of Jesus Christ." *The Seventeenth Century* 20 (2005): 53–76.

Grieve, Hilda. *The Sleepers and the Shadows: Chelmsford: A Town, Its People and Its Past,* I. *The Medieval and Tudor Story* II. *From Market Town to Chartered Borough, 1608–1888.* Chelmsford: Essex County Council, 1988, 1994.

Griffiths, Paul. *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England 1560–1640.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hagerty, Barbara Bradley. *Fingerprints of God: The Search for the Science of Spirituality.* New York: Riverhead, 2009.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

——. "Communion and Community: Exclusion from Communion in Post-Reformation England." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51 (2000): 721–40.

——. "Success and Failure in the English Reformation." *Past and Present* 173 (2001): 28–49.

Haigh, Christopher. "The Character of an Antipuritan." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35 (2004): 671–88.

——. *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hall, David D. *The Faithful Shepherd: A History of the New England Ministry in the Seventeenth Century.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972.

——. "Toward a History of Popular Religion in Early New England." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 41 (1984): 49–55.

——. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.

——. "Readers and Writers in Early New England." In *A History of the Book in America*, Volume 1: *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World*, edited by Hugh Armory and David D. Hall, 117–51. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

——. "From 'Religion and Society' to Practices: The New Religious History." In *Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America*, edited by Robert Blair St. George, 148–59. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.

——. "Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century New England: An Introduction and a Checklist." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 115 (2006): 29–80.

——. "Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century New England: A Second Checklist," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 118 (2008): 267–96.

——. *Ways of Writing: The Practice and Politics of Text-Making in Seventeenth Century Massachusetts.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

——. *A Reforming People: Puritanism and the Transformation of Public Life in New England.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011.

Hall, David D., and Alexandra Walsham. " 'Justification by Print Alone?': Protestantism, Literacy, and Communications in the Anglo-American World of John Winthrop." In *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England 1588–1649*, edited by Francis J. Bremer and Lynn Botelho, 334–85. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005.

Hall, Roland. "Richardson, Alexander (d. in or before 1629)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct. 2009 http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66371.

Hall, Timothy D. "Assurance, Community, and the Puritan Self in the Antinomian Controversy, 1636–38," in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, edited by Laura L. Knoppers, 197–209. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.

Haller, William. *The Rise of Puritanism; or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570–1643.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E. *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Hamling, Tara. "To See or Not To See? The Presence of Religious Imagery in the Protestant Household." *Art History* 30 (2007): 170–97.

——. "Old Robert's Girdle: Visual and Material Props for Protestant Piety in Post-Reformation England." In *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie, 135–63. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

Haroutunian, Joseph. *Piety versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology* New York: Henry Holt, 1932.

Harper, Kyle. *From Shame to Sin: The Christian Transformation of Sexual Morality in Late Antiquity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Herget, Winfried. "Preaching and Publication—Chronology and the Style of Thomas Hooker's Sermons." *Harvard Theological Review* 65 (1972): 231–39.

——. "The Transcription and Transmission of the Hooker Corpus." In *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, edited by George H. Williams, Norman Pettit, Winfried Herget, and Sargent Bush, Jr., 253–70. Harvard Theological Studies 28. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

——. "Writing after the Ministers: The Significance of Sermon Notes." In *Studies in New England Puritanism*, edited by Winfried Herget, 113–38. Studien und Texte zur Amerikanistik vol. 9. Bern: Peter Lang, 1983.

Hill, Christopher. *Puritanism and Revolution: The English Revolution of the 17th Century.* New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

——. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England.* 2d ed. New York: Schocken Books, 1967.

——. "Occasional Conformity." In *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Nuttall*, edited by R. Buick Knox, 199–220. London: Epworth Press, 1977.

Hindmarsh, Bruce. *John Newton and the English Evangelical Tradition between the Conversions of Wesley and Wilberforce.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Holifield, E. Brooks. "The Renaissance of Sacramental Piety in Colonial New England." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 29 (1972): 33–48.

——. *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570–1720.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

——. *Theology in America.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Honeycutt, Frank. "Growing Christians." *Christian Century*, Feb. 22, 2011, 34–41.

Howat, John. *Frederic Church.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Hoyle, David. *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590–1644.* Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007.

Hulse, Lynn. "The Musical Patronage of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury 1563–1612." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 114 (1991): 24–40.

——. " 'Musique which pleaseth myne eare': Robert Cecil's Musical Patronage." In *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils*, edited by Pauline Croft, 139–58. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Hunt, Arnold. "The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 161 (1998): 39–83.

——. "Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference." In *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, edited by Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger, 207–28. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

——. "A Jacobean Consensus? The Religious Policy of James VI and I." *The Seventeenth Century* 17 (2002): 131–40.

——. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Hunt, William. *The Puritan Moment: The Coming of Revolution in an English County*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Ingram, Martin. "From Reformation to Toleration: Popular Religious Cultures in England, 1540–1690." In *Popular Culture in England c. 1500–1850*, edited by Tim Harris, 95–123, 241–47. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Ingram, Martin. "Reformation of Manners in Early Modern England." In *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, edited by Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle, 47–88. London: Palgrave Macmillian, 1996.

Jedin, Hubert. *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*. 4 vols. in 5. Freiburg i/Bresgau: Herder, 1949–75. English translation of Volumes 1 and 2 in *A History of the Council of Trent*. Translated by Ernest Graf. 2 vols.. London: Thomas Nelson, 1957–61.

Kaufman, Peter Iver. "'Much in Prayer': The Inward Researches of Elizabethan Protestants." *Journal of Religion* 73 (1993): 163–82.

——. *Prayer, Despair, and Drama: Elizabethan Introspection*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 2d ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Kendall, R. T. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

——. "The Puritan Modification of Calvin's Theology." In *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, edited by W. Stanford Reid, 199–216. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982.

Knight, Janice. *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Knighton, C. S. "Baro, Peter (1534–1599)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept. 2010. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1492.

Knoles, Thomas. "Student-Transcribed Texts at Harvard College before 1740: A Checklist." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 109 (1999): 415–72.

Knoles, Thomas, and Lucia Zaucha Knoles. "'*In Usum Pupillorum*': Student-Transcribed Texts at Harvard College before 1740." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 109 (1999): 333–414.

Konkola, Kari. "'People of the Book': The Production of Theological Texts in Early Modern England." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 94 (2000): 5–34.

Kümin, Beat A. "Sacred Church and Worldly Tavern: Reassessing an Early Modern Divide." In *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe,* edited by Will Coster and Andrew Spicer, 17–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kussmaul, Ann. *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Lake, Peter G. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

——. *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.

——. "Puritanism, Arminianism and a Shropshire Axe-Murder." *Midland History* 15 (1990): 37–64.

——. "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge and *avant-garde* Conformity at the Court of James I." In *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court,* edited by Linda Levy Peck, 113–33, 303–8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

——. "The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s." In *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642,* edited by Kenneth Fincham, 161–85, 241, 275–82. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

——. "Deeds against Nature: Cheap Print Protestantism and Murder in Early Seventeenth-Century England." In *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, 257–83, 361–67. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

——. "Popular Form, Puritan Content? Two Puritan Appropriations of the Murder Pamphlet from Mid-Seventeenth-Century London." In *Religion, Culture, and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson,* edited by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts, 313–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

——. "A Charitable Christian Hatred: The Godly and their Enemies in the 1630s." In *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700,* edited by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, 145–83; 271; 301–7. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

——. "Moving the Goal Posts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660,* edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 179–205. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.

——. *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.

——. "Order, Orthodoxy and Resistance: The Ambiguous Legacy of English Puritanism, or Just How Moderate Was Stephen Denison." In *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland,*

edited by Michael J. Braddick and John Walter, 206–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Lake, Peter G. "The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s." In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten, 90–121, 229–33. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.

Lake, Peter G., with Michael C. Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Lake, Peter G., and Michael C. Questier. *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow: Persecution, Martyrdom and the Politics of Sanctity in Elizabethan England*. New York: Continuum, 2011.

Lambert, Sheila. "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship." *Past and Present* 124 (1989): 36–67.

Landgraf, Artur. *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*. 2 vols. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1952–56.

Letham, Robert. "Faith and Assurance in Early Calvinism: A Model of Continuity and Diversity." In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, edited by W. Fred Graham, 355–84. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.

Leverenz, David. *The Language of Puritan Feeling: An Exploration in Literature, Psychology, and Social History*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1980.

Levernier, James, and Douglas Wilmes. *American Writers before 1800*. 3 vols. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Levine, Amy-Jill. "Bearing False Witness: Common Errors Made about Early Judaism." In *The Jewish Annotated New Testament*, edited by Amy-Jill Levine and Marc Zvi Brettler, 501–4. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Love, Harold. *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. 1993. Reprinted Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.

Lucas, Paul R. *Valley of Discord: Church and Society along the Connecticut River, 1636–1725*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1976.

Luhrmann, T. M. "The Benefits of Church," *New York Times*, Apr. 21, 2013, op-ed.

Luttmer, Frank. "Persecutors, Tempters and Vassals of the Devil: The Unregenerate in Puritan Practical Divinity." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51 (2000): 37–68.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "The Myth of the English Reformation." *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991): 1–19.

——. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

——. "Richard Hooker's Reputation." *English Historical Review* 117 (2002): 773–812.

——. "Protestantism in Mainland Europe: New Directions." *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006): 698–706.

McCullough, Peter E. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

——. "Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1625–1642." *Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 401–24.

McCullough, Peter E. "Introduction." In Lancelot Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, edited by Peter McCullough, ix–lx. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. "Print, Publication, and Religious Politics in Caroline England." *Historical Journal* 51 (2008): 285–313.

———. "Lancelot Andrewes's Transforming Passions." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 71 (2008): 573–89.

———. "Music Reconciled to Preaching: A Jacobean Moment." In *Worship and the Parish Church in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Natalie Mears and Alec Ryrie, 109–29. Saint Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

———, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan. Editors. *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

McDonald, Walter. "Congruism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* 4:251–52. 15 vols. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907–12.

McGiffert, Michael. "God's Controversy with Jacobean England." *American Historical Review* 88 (1983): 1151–74.

———. "The Perkinsian Moment of Federal Theology." *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994): 117–48.

McGrath, Alister. "Divine Justice and Divine Equity in the Controversy between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum." *Downside Review* 101 (1983): 312–19.

———. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Volume 1: *From the Beginnings to 1500*. Volume 2: *From 1500 to the Present Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

———. *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.

———. *Spirituality in an Age of Change: Rediscovering the Spirit of the Reformers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994.

———. *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough*. 2d ed. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell Publishing, 2011.

———. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. 4th ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2012.

McIntosh, Marjorie Keniston. "Servants and the Household Unit in an Elizabethan English Community." *Journal of Family History* 9 (1984): 3–23.

———. *Controlling Misbehavior in England, 1370–1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

McKim, Donald K. *Ramism in William Perkins' Theology*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.

———. "William Perkins' Use of Ramism as an Exegetical Tool." In William Perkins, *A Commentary on Hebrews 11 (1609 Edition)*, edited by John H. Augustine, 32–45. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1991.

Maltby, Judith. *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Mandonnet, P. "Bañez, Dominique." *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 2:140–45. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1899–1950.

Marsden, Geroge. "Perry Miller's Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique." *Church History* 39 (1970): 91–105.

Marsh, Christopher. "The Gravestone of Thomas Lawrence Revisited (or the Family of Love and the Local Community in Balsham, 1560–1630)." In *The World of Rural Dissenters, 1520–1725*, edited by Margaret Spufford, 208–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

——. "Piety and Persuasion in Elizabethan England: The Church of England Meets the Family of Love." In *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, edited by Nicholas Tyacke, 141–65. London: UCL Press, 1997.

——. *Popular Religion in Sixteenth-Century England: Holding Their Peace*. Social History in Perspective. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

——. " 'Common Prayer' in England 1560–1640: The View from the Pew." *Past and Present* 171 (2001): 66–94.

——. "Sacred Space in England, 1560–1640: The View from the Pew." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002): 286–311.

——. "Order and Place in England, 1580–1640: The View from the Pew." *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 3–26.

——. *Music and Society in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Marshall, Peter. "Introduction." In *The Impact of the English Reformation, 1500–1640*, edited by Peter Marshall, 1–11. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Mears, Natalie. "Public Worship and Political Participation in Elizabethan England." *Journal of British Studies* 51 (2012): 4–25.

Meeks, Wayne. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Merritt, Julia F. "Puritans, Laudians and the Phenomenon of Church-building in Jacobean London." *Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 935–60.

——. "The Pastoral Tightrope: A Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London." In *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell*, edited by Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake, 143–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Micklethwait, John, and Adrian Wooldridge. *God Is Back: How the Global Revival of Faith is Changing the World*. New York: Penguin, 2009.

Miller, Perry. "Thomas Hooker and the Democracy of Connecticut." In Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness*, 16–47. [originally published 1931] Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.

——. *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630–1650*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.

——. "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity." *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 32 (1937): 247–300.

——. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Miller, Perry. "'Preparation for Salvation' in Seventeenth-Century New England." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 4 (1943): 253–86.

——. *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Milton, Anthony. "The Church of England, Rome, and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus." In *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, edited by Kenneth Fincham, 187–210, 242–43, 282–83. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

——. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

——. "Licensing, Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England." *Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 625–51.

——. "A Qualified Intolerance: The Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism." In *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts*, edited by Arthur F. Marotti, 85–115. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

——. "The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach." In *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell*, edited by Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake, 162–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

——. "Anglicanism by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall." In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 159–76. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006.

——. *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

——. "Puritanism and the Continental Reformed Churches." In *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, 109–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

——. "New Horizons in the Early Jacobean Period." In *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne*, 483–94. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

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

Moore, Susan Hardman. "Popery, Purity and Providence: Deciphering the New England Experiment." In *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, edited by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts, 257–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

——. "Sexing the Soul: Gender and the Rhetoric of Puritan Piety." In *Gender and Christian Religion*, edited by R. N. Swanson, 175–86. Studies in Church History 34. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998.

Morgan, Edmund. *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.

——. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Founding of Harvard College*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

———. *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century*. 2 vols.. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.

———. *The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1960. [Originally published as *The Puritan Pronaos*. New York: New York University Press, 1935.]

Morrill, John. "The Impact of Puritanism." In *The Impact of the English Civil War*, edited by John Morrill, 50–66, 145–46. London: Trafalgar Square, 1991.

Morrison, Karl. *Understanding Conversion*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992.

Muller, Richard A. "Perkins' *A Golden Chaine*: Predestinarian System or Schematized *Ordo Salutis*?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978): 69–81.

———. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.

———. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1995.

———. *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1991.

———. "Grace, Election, and Contingent Choice: Arminius's Gambit and the Reformed Response." In *The Grace of God and the Bondage of the Will. Volume 2: Historical and Theological Perspectives on Calvinism*, edited by Thomas Schreiner and Bruce Ware, 251–78. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1995.

———. "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy." *Calvin Theological Journal* 30 (1995): 345–75 and 31 (1996): 125–60.

———. "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula Prædestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, 33–61. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999.

———. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2008.

———. "Reception and Response: Referencing and Understanding Calvin in Post-Reformation Calvinism." In *Calvin and His Influence, 1509–2009*, edited by Irena Backus and Philip Benedict, 182–201. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.

Neyrey, Jerome H., S.J."Lost in Translation: Did It Matter If Christians 'Thanked' God or 'Gave God Glory?' " *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2009): 1–23.

Nock, Arthur Darby. *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Nockles, Peter. "Survivals or New Arrivals? The Oxford Movement and the Nineteenth-Century Historical Construction of Anglicanism." In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten, 144–91, 241–64. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.

Noll, Mark. *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

Norris, Kathleen. *Dakota: A Spiritual Geography.* New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1993.

Nuttall, Geoffrey F. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience.* 2d ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947.

———. *Visible Saints: The Congregational Way 1640–1660.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.

Oberman, Heiko. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.

———. "*Facientibus Quod in se est Deus non Denegat Gratiam:* Robert Holcot O. P. and the Beginnings of Luther's Theology." In *The Reformation in Medieval Perspective*, edited by Steven Ozment, 119–41. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1971.

O'Day, Rosemary. "The Anatomy of a Profession: The Clergy of the Church of England." In *The Professions in Early Modern England*, edited by Wilfrid Prest, 25–63. London: Croom Helm, 1987.

Oldridge, Darren. "Protestant Conceptions of the Devil in Early Stuart England." *History* 85 (2000): 232–46.

O'Malley, John W. S. J. *The First Jesuits.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

———. *Trent: What Happened at the Council.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Ong, Walter, S.J. *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958.

———. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word.* New York: Methuen, 1982.

Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform 1250–1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

———. *Magdalena and Balthasar: An Intimate Portrait of Life in 16th-Century Europe revealed in the Letters of a Nuremberg Husband & Wife.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986.

———. *Protestants: The Birth of a Revolution.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Page, Lucius R. *History of Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1630–1877.* Boston: H. O. Houghton & Co., 1877.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart. "Der Einfluß des Anfechtungserfahrung auf den Prädestinationsbegriff Luthers." *Kerygma und Dogma* 3 (1957): 109–39.

Parker, Kenneth L. *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline form the Reformation to the Civil War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

———. "Richard Greenham's 'Spiritual Physicke': The Comfort of Afflicted Consciences in Elizabethan Pastoral Care." In *Penitence in the Age of Reformations*, edited by Katherine J. Lualdi and A. T. Thayer, 71–83. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Parnham, David. "Redeeming Free Grace: Thomas Hooker and the Contested Language of Salvation." *Church History* 77 (2008): 915–54.

Parrington, Vernon. *Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920.* Volume 1: *The Colonial Mind 1620–1800.* New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1927.

Patterson, W. Brown. "The Synod of Dort and the Early Stuart Church." In *This Sacred History: Anglican Reflections for John Booty,* edited by Donald S. Armentrout, 199–221. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1990.

———. "William Perkins as Apologist for the Church of England." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57 (2006): 252–69.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine.* 5 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971–90.

Pegis, Anton. "Molina and Liberty." In *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance*, edited by Gerald Smith, 85–90. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1939.

Pettit, Norman. *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

———. "Hooker's Doctrine of Assurance: A Critical Phase in New England Spiritual Thought." *New England Quarterly* 47 (1974): 518–34.

———. "The Order of Salvation in Thomas Hooker's Thought." In *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, edited by George H. Williams, Norman Pettit, Winfried Herget, and Sargent Bush, Jr., 124–39. Harvard Theological Studies 28. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Pohle, J. "Molinism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* 10:437–41. 15 vols. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907–12.

Porter, Harry Culverwell. *Reformation and Reaction at Tudor Cambridge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.

Porter, Stephen. *Lord Have Mercy upon Us: London's Plague Years.* Stroud: Tempus, 2005.

Porterfield, Amanda. "Women's Attraction to Puritanism." *Church History* 60 (1991): 196–209.

———. *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Questier, Michael C. *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580–1625.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Quitslund, Beth. "Singing the Psalms for Fun and Profit." In *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie, 237–58. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

Reynolds, Matthew. *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norfolk c. 1560 –1643.* Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2005.

———. "Predestination and Parochial Dispute in the 1630s: The Case of the Norwich Lectureships." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 59 (2008): 407–25.

Rigney, James. "Sermons into Print." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, 198–212. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Robinson, Marilynne. "Open Thy Hand Wide: Moses and the Origins of American Liberalism." In Marilynne Robinson, *When I Was a Child I Read Books*, 59–83. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2012.

Rose-Troup, Frances. *John White, the Patriarch of Dorchester*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

Russell, Conrad. "The Reformation and the Creation of the Church of England, 1500–1640." In *The Oxford Illustrated History of Tudor and Stuart Britain*, edited by John S. Morrill, 258–92. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Ryan, T. "Congregatio de auxiliis." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 4:110–13. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967–96.

Ryrie, Alec. "The Afterlife of Lutheran England." In *Sister Reformations/ Schwesterreformationen: The Reformation in Germany and in England*, edited by Dorothea Wendebourg, 213–34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

——. "Hearing God's Voice in the English and Scottish Reformations." *Reformation* 17 (2012): 49–74.

——. "Sleeping, Waking and Dreaming in Protestant Piety." In *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie, 73–92. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012.

Ryrie, Alec. *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Sage, Athanase. "Praeparatur voluntas a Domino." *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 10 (1964): 1–20.

Scarisbrick, J. J. *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.

Schaefer, Paul R. "Protestant 'Scholasticism' at Elizabethan Cambridge: William Perkins and a Reformed Theology of the Heart." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, 147–64. Carlisle, PA: Paternoster Press, 1999.

Schama, Simon. *Landscape and Memory*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.

Seaver, Paul S. *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985.

——. "Puritan Preachers and Their Patrons." In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 128–42. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006.

Selement, George. "Publication and the Puritan Minister." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 37 (1980): 219–41.

Sharpe, James A. *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550–1760*. 2d ed. London: Arnold, 1997.

Sharpe, Kevin. "Archbishop Laud and the University of Oxford." In *History and Imagination: Essays in Honor of H. R. Trevor-Roper*, edited by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden, 146–64. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1982.

——. "The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England." In *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, 117–38, 315–16, 343–47. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Shenk, Joshua Wolf. *Lincoln's Melancholy: How Depression Challenged a President and Fueled His Greatness.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.

Shuffleton, Frank. *Thomas Hooker: 1586–1647.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Shuger, Debora Kuller. *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

——. "Absolutist Theology: The Sermons of John Donne." In *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600–1750*, edited by Lori Anne Forrell and Peter McCullough, 115–35. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Simpson, Alan. *Puritanism in Old and New England.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Sinnema, Donald. "Reformed Scholasticism and the Synod of Dort (1618–1619)." In *John Calvin's Institutes: His Opus Magnus*, edited by B. J. van der Walt, 467–506. Proceedings of the Second South African Congress for Calvin Research July 31–August 3, 1984. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1986.

Slack, Paul. "Religious Protest and Urban Authority: The Case of Henry Sherfield, Iconoclast, 1633." In *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, edited by Derek Baker, 295–302. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

——. "Books of Orders: The Making of English Social Policy, 1577–1631." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 30 (1980): 1–22.

——. *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

——. "The Public Conscience of Henry Sherfield." In *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays Presented to G. E. Aylmer*, edited by John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf, 151–71. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Smith, Harold. *The Ecclesiastical History of Essex under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth.* Colchester: Behnam and Company, n.d.

Smith, Vivienne. "Hartford's Founding Father." *Hertfordshire Countryside,* January 2000, 30–31.

Solignac, Aimé "Pélage et Pélagianisme." *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité,* 12:2889–2942. Paris: Beauchesne, 1937–.

Spicq, Ceslas. "*Doxa.*" In *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament,* 1:364. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

Sprunger, Keith L. *The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Backgrounds of English and American Puritanism.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972.

——. "The Dutch Career of Thomas Hooker." *New England Quarterly* 46 (1973): 17–44.

——. "John Yates of Norfolk: The Radical Puritan Preacher as Ramist Philosopher." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37 (1976): 697–706.

——. *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands 1600–1640.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Spufford, Margaret. *Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

——. *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and Its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1981.

——. "Puritanism and Social Control?" In *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*, edited by Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson, 41–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

——. "Can We Count the 'Godly' and the "Conformable' in the Seventeenth Century." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985): 428–38.

——. "The Importance of Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." In *The World of Rural Dissenters, 1520–1725*, edited by Margaret Spufford, 1–102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Spurr, John. *English Puritanism, 1606–1692*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Stachniewski, John. *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Staloff, Darren. *The Making of an American Thinking Class: Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in Puritan Massachusetts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Stearns, Raymond Phineas. "Correspondence of John Woodbridge, Jr., and Richard Baxter." *New England Quarterly* 10 (1937): 557–83.

——. *The Strenuous Puritan: Hugh Peter, 1598–1660*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954.

——, and David Holmes Brawner, "New England Church 'Relations' and Continuity in Early Congregational History." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 75 (1965): 13–45.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of West." In Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles*, 78–96. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Stieg, Margaret. *Laud's Laboratory: The Diocese of Bath and Wells in the Early Seventeenth Century*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1982.

Stoever, William K. B. *'A Faire and Easie Way to Heaven': Covenant Theology and Antinomianism in Early Massachusetts*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1978.

Stout, Harry S. *The New England Soul: Preaching and Religious Culture in Colonial New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Strehle, Stephen. "The Extent of the Atonement and the Synod of Dort." *Westminster Theological Journal* 51 (1989): 1–23.

Stromberg, Peter. *Language and Self-Transformation: A Study of the Christian Conversion Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Strype, John. *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D.* 3 vols.. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1822.

Targoff, Ramie. *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Tentler, Thomas N. *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.

Thompson, Roger. *Mobility and Migration: East Anglian Founders of New England, 1629–1640*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.

Thuesen, Peter J. *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Tipson, Baird, "How Can the Religious Experience of the Part Be Recovered? The Examples of Puritanism and Pietism." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 43 (1975): 695–707.

——. "Invisible Saints: The 'Judgment of Charity' in the Early New England Churches." *Church History* 34 (1975): 460–71.

——. "The Routinized Piety of Thomas Shepard's Diary." *Early American Literature* 13 (1978): 64–80.

——. "A Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism: The Sin against the Holy Spirit." *Harvard Theological Review* 77 (1984): 301–30.

——. "The Elusiveness of 'Puritanism.'" *Religious Studies Review* 11 (1985): 245–56.

——. "Thomas Hooker, Martin Luther, and the Terror at the Edge of Protestant Faith." *Harvard Theological Review* (forthcoming).

Todd, Margo. "The Samuel Ward Papers at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographic Society* 8 (1985): 582–92.

——. *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

——. "Puritan Self-Fashioning." In *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, edited by Francis J. Bremer, 57–87. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.

——. "'At One with Tom Thumb': Arminianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge." *Church History* 64 (1995): 563–79.

——. "Anti-Calvinists and the Republican Threat in Early Stuart Cambridge." In *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, edited Laura L. Knoppers, 85–105. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.

——. "Justifying God: the Calvinism of the British Delegation to the Synod of Dort." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 96 (2005): 272–89.

Towers, Suellen Mutchow. *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003.

Trible, Phyllis. *Texts of Terror: Literary Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Trueman, Carl, and Carrie Euler. "The Reception of Martin Luther in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England." In *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, edited by Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, 63–81. Proceedings of the British Academy 164. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Trumbull, Benjamin. *A Complete History of Connecticut, Civil and Ecclesiastical, from the Emigration of Its First Planters, from England, in the Year 1630, to the Year 1764, and to the Close of the Indian Wars.* 2 vols.. New Haven: Maltby, Goldsmith, and Co., 1818.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure.* Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

Tyack, Norman C. P. "The Humbler Puritans of East Anglia and the New England Movement: Evidence from the Court Records of the 1630s." *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 138 (1984): 79–106.

Tyacke, Nicholas. "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution." In *The Origins of the English Civil War*, edited by Conrad Russell, 119–43, 261–62, 270–71. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1973.

——. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590–1640.* Oxford Historical Monographs. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

——. "The 'Rise of Puritanism' and the Legalizing of Dissent, 1571–1719." In *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, edited by Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, 17–49. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

——. "Archbishop Laud." In *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, edited by Kenneth Fincham, 51–70, 235–36, 256–58. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

——. "Religious Controversy." In *The History of the University of Oxford*. Volume 4: *Seventeenth-Century Oxford*, edited by Nicholas Tyacke, 569–619. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

——. "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the Early English Church, c. 1560–1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier, 5–33. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.

Tyler, Moses Coit, *History of American Literature, 1607–1765* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1949).

Underdown, David E. "The Chalk and the Cheese: Contrasts among the English Clubmen." *Past and Present* 85 (1979): 25–48.

——. *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603–1660.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

——. *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Usher, Roland G. *The Reconstruction of the English1 Church.* 2 vols.. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1910.

Valeri, Mark. *Heavenly Merchandize: How Religion Shaped Commerce in Puritan America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

van Asselt, Willem J. "On the Maccovius Affair." In *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*, edited by Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg, 217–41. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

van der Meer, F. *Augustine the Bishop.* London: Sheed and Ward, 1961.

van Gennep, Arnold. *The Rites of Passage.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Vansteenberghe, E. "Molinisme." *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 10:2094–187. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1903–.

Verduin, Kathleen. "'Our Cursed Natures': Sexuality and the Puritan Conscience." *New England Quarterly* 56 (1983): 220–37.

Vielhaber, K. "Gottschalk der Sachse (ca 803–869)." *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 2:1814. 3d ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohn (Paul Siebeck), 1958.

von Friedeburg, Robert. "Reformation of Manners and the Social Composition of Offenders in an East Anglian Cloth Village: Earls Colne, Essex, 1531–1642." *Journal of British Studies* 29 (1990): 347–85.

von Rohr, John. "Covenant and Assurance in Early English Puritanism." *Church History* 34 (1965): 195–203.

——. *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*. American Academy of Religion Studies in Religion. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986.

Walker, George Leon. *History of the First Church in Hartford, 1633–1883*. Hartford: Brown & Gross, 1884.

Walker, George Leon. *Thomas Hooker: Preacher, Founder, Democrat*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1891.

Wallace, Dewey. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

——. "Puritan Polemical Divinity and Doctrinal Controversy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, 206–22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Walsham, Alexandra. "'Out of the Mouths of Babes and Sucklings': Prophecy, Puritanism, and Childhood in Elizabethan Suffolk." In *The Church and Childhood*, edited by Diana Wood, 285–99. Studies in Church History 31. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994.

——. "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49 (1998): 620–51.

——. "Vox Piscis: Or the Book-Fish: Providence and the Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline Cambridge." *English Historical Review* 114 (1999): 574–606.

——. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

——. "Preaching without Speaking: Script, Print, and Religious Dissent." In *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700*, edited by Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham, 211–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

——. "The Godly and Popular Culture." In *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, edited by John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, 277–93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

——. "The Reformation of the Generations: Youth, Age, and Religions Change in England, c. 1500–1700." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 21 (2011): 93–121.

——. *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Walter, John. "Anti-Popery and the Stour Valley Riots." In *Religious Dissent in East Anglia III: Proceedings of the Third Symposium*, Edited by David Chadd, 121–40. Norwich: Centre of East Anglian Studies, 1996.

——. "Confessional Politics in Pre-Civil War Essex: Prayer Books, Profanations, and Petitions." *Historical Journal* 44 (2001): 677–701.

——. "Popular Iconoclasm and the Politics of the Parish in Eastern England, 1640–1642." *Historical Journal* 47 (2004): 261–90.

——. "'Abolishing Superstition with Sedition'? The Politics of Popular Iconoclasm in England, 1640–1642." *Past and Present* 183 (2004): 79–123.

Watt, Tessa. "Piety in the Pedlar's Pack: Continuity and Change, 1578–1630." In *The World of Rural Dissenters, 1520–1725*, edited by Margaret Spufford, 235–72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

——. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550–1640*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Watts, Michael. *The Dissenters*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Weaver, Glenn. *Hartford: An Illustrated History of Connecticut's Capital*. Woodside, CA: Windsor Publications, 1982.

Webster, Tom. "Writing to Redundancy: Approaches to Spiritual Journals and Early Modern Spirituality." *Historical Journal* 39 (1996): 33–56.

——. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c. 1620–1643*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

——. "The Piety of Practice and the Practice of Piety." In *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England 1588–1649*, edited by Francis J. Bremer and Lynn Botelho, 111–46. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005.

Westermann, Claus. "The Role of Lament in the Theology of the Old Testament." *Interpretation* 28 (1974): 20–38.

White, Peter. "The *via media* in the Early Stuart Church." In *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, edited by Kenneth Fincham, 211–30, 243–44, 285–89. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

——. *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Whiting, Robert. *The Reformation of the English Parish Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Willen, Diane. "Godly Women in Early Modern England: Puritanism and Gender." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 43 (1992): 561–80.

——. "'Communion of the Saints': Spiritual Reciprocity and the Godly Community in Early Modern England." *Albion* 27 (Spring 1995): 19–41.

Williams, George Hunston. "The Pilgrimage of Thomas Hooker (1586–1647) in England, The Netherlands, and New England." *Bulletin of the Congregational Library* 19/l (Oct. 1967): 5–15 and 19/2 (Jan. 1968): 9–13.

Williams, George Hunston. "Called by Thy Name, Leave Us Not: The Case of Mrs. Joan Drake, A Formative Episode in the Pastoral Career of Thomas Hooker in England." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 16 (1968): 111–28, 278–300.

——. "The Life of Thomas Hooker in England and Holland, 1586–1633." In *Thomas Hooker: Writings in England and Holland, 1626–1633*, edited by George H. Williams, Norman Pettit, Winfried Herget, and Sargent Bush, Jr., 1–35. Harvard Theological Studies 28. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Willimon, William H. "Learning to Preach: Voice Lessons." *Christian Century*, Feb. 8, 2011, 10–12.

Willis, Jonathan. "Protestant Worship and the Discourse of Music in Reformation England." In *Worship and the Parish Church in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Natalie Mears and Alec Ryrie, 131–50. Saint Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

Winship, Michael P. "Reconsiderations: Were There Any Puritans in New England?" *New England Quarterly* 74 (2001): 118–38.

——. "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospelers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s." *Church History* 70 (2001): 462–81.

——. *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts 1636–1641*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Wrightson, Keith. *English Society, 1580–1680*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1982.

Wrightson, Keith. "Postscript: Terling Revisited" and "Appendix." In Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525–1700*, 186–223. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Paperbacks, 1995.

Wrightson, Keith, and David Levine. *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525–1700*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

——. "Death in Whickham." In *Famine, Disease and the Social Order in Early Modern Society*, edited by John Walter and Roger Schofield, 129–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Wrigley, E. A., and R. S. Schofield. *The Population History of England 1541–1871*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Wunderli, Richard. *Peasant Fires: The Drummer of Nicklashausen*. Bloomington: University of Indiana, 1992.

Yates, Nigel. *Buildings, Faith, and Worship: The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican Churches 1600–1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Young, Ralph F. "Breathing the 'Free Aire of the New World': The Influence of the New England Way on the Gathering of Congregational Churches in Old England, 1640–1660." *New England Quarterly* 83 (2010): 5–46.

Zakai, Avihu. *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Zimmerman, Philip D. "The Lord's Supper in Early New England: The Setting and the Service." In *New England Meeting House and Church: 1630–1850*, 124–43. The Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife Annual Proceedings 1979. Boston: Boston University, 1979.

zur Mühlen, Karl-Heinz. *Nos extra nos*; *Luthers Theologie zwischen Mystik und Scholastik*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1972.

zur Mühlen, Karl-Heinz. "Der Begriff 'signum' in der Sakramentslehre des 16. Jahrhunderts." In *Reformatorische Prägungen: Studien zur Theologie Martin Luthers und zur Reformationszeit*. Edited by Athina Lexutt and Volkmar Ortmann, 164–83. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

V. UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

Ibish, Joan Schenck. "Emmanuel College: The Founding Generation, with a Biographical Register of Members of the College, 1584–1604." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1985.

Rolph, Rebecca Seward. "Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and the Puritan Movements of Old and New England." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1979.

Tyler, Richard. "The Children of Disobedience: The Social Composition of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1596–1645." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1976.

Index